

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

1441

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Tuesday, 10th June, 1952

The House met at a Quarter Past
Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-20 A.M.

PANEL OF CHAIRMEN

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that under sub-rule (1) of Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business. I nominate the following Members on the Panel of Chairmen in place of the Members nominated temporarily earlier by me on the Panel: Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan, Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar, Shri N. C. Chatterjee and Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS
FOR GRANTS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now discuss the Demands for Grants in respect of the General Budget. The time-table showing the dates on which the Demands in respect of the various Ministries will be taken up has already been circulated to Members. Today the House will take up the Demands for Grants in respect of Defence. As regards the time-limit for speeches, the usual practice has been to fix a time-limit of 15 minutes for all Members including movers of cut motions, and 20 minutes or more for the Ministers replying. Now I will place the Demands before the House.

53 P.S.D.

1442

DEMAND NO. 11—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,23,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Defence'."

DEMAND NO. 12—DEFENCE SERVICES,
EFFECTIVE—ARMY

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,13,30,43,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Army'."

DEMAND NO. 13—DEFENCE SERVICES,
EFFECTIVE—NAVY

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,50,86,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Navy'."

DEMAND NO. 14—DEFENCE SERVICES,
EFFECTIVE—AIR FORCE.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,48,07,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course

of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Air Force'."

DEMAND NO. 15—DEFENCE SERVICES, NON-EFFECTIVE CHARGES.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,65,51,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Services, Non-Effective Charges.'"

DEMAND NO. 16—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,33,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Defence.'"

DEMAND NO. 108—DEFENCE CAPITAL OUTLAY.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,33,34,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Defence Capital Outlay.'"

- Policy of Defence Organization

Shri U. C. Patnalk (Ghumsur): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to eliminate British and Commonwealth influence over Defence Services.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Top heaviness of Armed Forces Administration.

Shri K. Subrahmanyam (Vizianagaram): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

- (i) *Pay scales and Amenities for Army, Navy and Air Force personnel.*
- (ii) *Policy behind discharge and dismissal of officers and soldiers.*
- (iii) *Economy and efficiency in defence organisation and its utilisation for nation building services.*

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): I beg to move:

(i) "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(ii) "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(iii) "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Speaker: All these cut motions are now before the House.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopalaswami): Do I take it, Sir, that no other cut motions are to be moved and this discussion will be ended within a particular time on Demand No. 11, or will it be taken on to tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: I think, according to the agreement, this goes on for the whole of today, and tomorrow till 11 A.M. The agreement has been that this particular Demand No. 11 will go on till 11 A.M. including time for the hon. Minister to reply.

Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: That means the discussion will be upto about 10-15 A.M. or so. The hon. Minister will require about 45 minutes at least as usual.

Shri Gopalaswami: Yes.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): That means before that the hon. Minister will reply.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Are these the only cut motions and no others?

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): I want to move my cut motion.

Mr. Speaker: He may do so.

Defence Policy

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Speaker: This cut motion is also before the House in addition to the six already moved.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: In addition to my own cut motion, I also beg to support the cut motion to discuss the economy and efficiency in the defence organisation and its utilization for nation-building services, that being more or less the same as my cut motion to discuss the rationalisation of army expenditure which I had given notice of.

These cut motions seek to focus attention on certain points of defence organisation, some of which I had referred to in my amendment to the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address on the 20th May 1952, which have not been replied to by the hon. Minister in this House. So, may I request that the points urged by me in connection with defence organisation at that time be also taken into consideration now and be included in the reply to be given by the hon. Minister?

I also make it clear from the very outset that by economy, some of us, particularly I, do not mean any reduction in defence expenditure. The hon. Finance Minister was very apologetic about the Defence Budget, and he told us that some Army experts are going into the question of defence organisation, and the reduction of army expenditure. The hon. Defence Minister had also taken great pains to draw a distinction between defence expenditure in unitary and in federal states, and tried to convince us that our percentage of defence expenditure would come up to about 25 per cent. taking into consideration the amounts spent by the component States. Personally I would prefer suggesting another line of approach. The real question is not how much you are going to spend on defence, but rather how that expenditure is to be incurred. It is not what you are going to spend on defence that matters but what your plans and programmes regarding defence re-organisation, and the integration of defence with socio-economic planning are. I would refer in this connection not to the budget of any unitary State, but to Federal Union Budgets of recent years, to illustrate my point. In the U.S.S.R. the defence expenditure in the year

1949 was about 18.1 per cent. of the total Budget, in 1950 about 19.6 per cent., and in 1951, it was about 21 per cent. In the U.S.A., in 1950, it was 33 per cent., and in 1951 it was 47 per cent. Then there was the recommendation of the Tax Policy Committee, to halt all development programmes, and so the proposed expenditure in 1952 came to about 75 per cent. This does not mean that the U.S.S.R. in its defence expenditure, neglects its defence machinery, nor does it mean that the U. S. A., her socio-economic structure. Different activities of the States are now so successfully co-ordinated, their defence and socio-economic planning are so well integrated, that expenditure under the one head enures to the benefit of the other. Therefore, while examining our Defence Budget, instead of looking at its form to see what ratio the defence expenditure bears to the total expenditure, we have to see whether the amounts are being properly utilised, and how far the expenditure on defence enables us to attain our main objectives, namely national security and economic stability.

I would like to refer to the policies in the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. because we are being often reminded that our defence structure is built upon the United Kingdom model. Therefore, I pointed out last time, and I would point out again that the United Kingdom defence organisation had, as its objective in 1870-71, at the time of the Cardwell Reforms, "increased efficiency coupled with diminished expenditure." As you know, even that objective has not been translated into action in connection with the defence organisation in India. Apart from that, after a period of nearly 80 years, the objective has been declared to be "national security and economic stability." You will remember that in 1947-48 the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. began to reorganize their defence structures. There were so many methods by which they wanted to reorganize the defence structure, and the Army Officer who was organising at that time the Territorial Army of Reservists in England, Lord Montgomery, declared that national security and economic stability were the objectives of defence reorganisation particularly of the Territorial Army of Reservists in England. There are others who have gone further still. I think it was Lord Alexander who said that in order to intensify war efforts, nations have to try to bridge the gulf between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots', that is, between the different orders of society. So, the conception of defence organisation has considerably changed. I

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

referred to the examples of United Kingdom and the U.S.A., because we are being told from time to time that our defence organisation is based upon their model. Since 1947, for the last four or five years, there have been so many efforts to intensify the defence potential and at the same time to utilise them for socio-economic purposes. In the United Kingdom, there has been the reorganisation of the defence services, modernisation of reservists and territorials, planned mobilisation of manpower, and the National Service Organisation which is calculated to ensure the maximum defence output and also labour for various socio-economic purposes. Similarly in the U.S.A., they have the Reserve Force Policy Board, the Manpower Mobilisation Schemes, Universal Military Training Schemes, and various other schemes integrating defence with civilian activities. Since 1947, they have been trying to maximise their military output and at the same time to see that their socio-economic objectives are achieved. Similarly, in other Commonwealth countries. While examining India's defence expenditure, let us see how far it ensures national security and economic stability. Of course, in our ancient times, we had in our country, various defence organisations which integrated defence with military activities, for instance the Paik system in certain provinces, and other military tenures whereby people enjoyed lands on military tenures for serving in the regular defence services or in correlated industries. That system was one instance of the integration of defence with development, which may be taken as the tradition of our country.

We have to see how far we can adopt modern methods, consistent with our traditions and reorganise our country on modern lines having national security integrated with economic stability. When we consider this subject of defence, we have to examine some of these aspects. Firstly, about national security: We have to bear in mind that the Royal Navy is not there to defend our coasts and the Royal Air Force is not there to guard our skies. We have also to remember that since about the Second World War, the methods of defence and methods of attack have very greatly changed and we have to examine whether our defence structure as at present constituted ensures the maximum national security. From that point of view, we have to see what kind of attack we can expect in a total war in this scientific age of aerial attacks with A, B, C, Bombs. On the land the attack will be, not with compact armies massed at

particular places, but swift attacks of mobile units commanding maximum depth and width supported by air power; parachute descents from the air at certain points; attacks and landings from the sea at vulnerable points. We have also to remember that as results in a modern war depend largely upon industrial production, the attack will be against industrial centres and supply areas; the attack will also be against the vital lines of communication. Further, as the civilian population is the main fighting power in a total war of this atomic age, we have also to bear in mind that the attempt will be to break the civilian morale through aerial bombardments, through attack on lines of communication and on industrial targets and by radio propaganda. It may be done also through sabotage, infiltration and through underground forces. These are the methods of attack in a modern war that we may expect in the present context and the question is how far our defence structure, how far do our Armies and Navy and Air Force conform to the requirements of defence in the event of such offensive. Can our Navy and Air Force defend us against attacks in a modern set-up? Can our Armies defend us against the kinds of attack that are envisaged in a modern war? Is our civilian population prepared for war efforts and prepared to withstand a modern attack or even disturbances inside if supported by foreign powers? I am afraid they are not. Therefore, we have got to consider how far our defence structure can be modernised, how far economy can be effected and at the same time efficiency be ensured in our defence machinery as far as defending our security and defending our freedom is concerned.

There is also another factor to be remembered in this connection. If I remember aright, it was Cromwell who said that every soldier must have a cause to fight for. Every army, navy and air force, even the civilian population, must have an ideology to fight for. Whether it is any socio-economic 'ism' or whether it is a political 'ism', there must be some 'ism' inspiring your soldiers, sailors and aviators. And what is the 'ism' that is here? Not even the "nationalism" of which we talk so much. The only change that was effected about a couple of years ago.....

An Hon. Member: Patriotism.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Let there be some 'ism'. Have any efforts been made in the Army, Navy and the Air Force so

far to have some sort of 'ism', whatever may be that 'ism'? I am sorry that nothing has been done. I will tell you what has been.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member may address the Chair.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Yes, Sir. The only 'ism' that has been introduced was to add at the end of the Territorial Force Handbook a sort of Lord's prayer more or less praying for the welfare of everybody. That is the only 'ism' that we have got and that is not sufficient to inspire the people. Something has to be introduced in order to inspire these people, not merely mercenary considerations, not merely their pay. I do not deny that the mercenary army of the British regime has become the national army today. I do admit that they are doing some social service work and other things. But that is not sufficient to inspire them to ensure the best kind of defence in a modern war of the present set-up.

There is another defect also in the policy of our defence administration. It is the policy of keeping everything secret. I do concede that some amount of secrecy is necessary in certain matters for ensuring the best kind of defence. We cannot give out our army manoeuvres, we cannot give out our troop movements, the disposition of our troops and we cannot give out our secret weapons. But then everything is not secret. Unfortunately, under this cloak of secrecy so many things go on. This cloak of secrecy covers not merely the arms, jeeps and other scandals in the matters of purchases and contracts but also inefficiency of organisation which is much more inexcusable. I for one am not very particular about the arms and other scandals except so far as they indicate the real factors which facilitate such shady deals and that has got to be remedied. But as far as inefficiency is concerned which weakens our defence, I feel that trying to mystify us and taking advantage of that mystification in order to perpetuate inefficiency in the defence organisation, is really inexcusable.

However that may be, as I said, our defence organisation has to be reorganised, modernised and rationalised. I do not plead for reduction of defence expenditure; on the other hand, I want that the defence expenditure should ensure better defence; we should adopt modern methods to meet any possible attack. We should also expand our educational branch, our research branch, our technological branch so that the army personnel as

soon as they are released after a short service will go back and be merged in the national socio-economic drive. We have also to accelerate the drive in defence industries.

On the socio-economic front the defence expenditure can no longer be allowed to be non-productive. It has got to be made to yield dividends. Regarding the socio-economic use of the defence forces, Mahatma Gandhi had stated in the *Harijan* in 1946 that the defence forces should be used for socio-economic purposes also. Our Prime Minister also, as President of the Congress, in his report to the Bangalore session of the A.I.C.C., had mentioned about the socio-economic use of the defence forces. But it is really surprising that the Planning Commission of which he is the Chairman, has made no mention of the socio-economic use of the defence forces. Of course, there is some excuse for it because the report of the Planning Commission at the end contains a note that the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Prime Minister have not been able to take an active part in the Planning Commission's work. But I submit that planning for the nation's reorganisation is really very important and should not be sacrificed even for foreign affairs. We require real planning for mobilization and reorganisation of our vast manpower and from this point of view I will simply point out that I had also taken the trouble of printing a book for sending it to the Planning Commission for examination as to how the Army, Navy and Air Force could be reorganised on modern lines and at the same time used for socio-economic purposes, how the entire nation from the aboriginals on the hill tracts to the coastal fishermen, the peasants and the labourers could be reorganised for defence as well as development. I got very encouraging replies but no action seems to have been taken in spite of that.

As far as the present Budget is concerned we are told by the Finance Minister that it is a budget of "Wait and see". As far as Defence is concerned, in the language of squad drill it is a "mark-time march". It is quite true that from the hon. Finance Minister's point of view he has given an order for marking-time for one or, it may even be, five years but from our national leaders the order should be "March Forward".....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is prolonging his speech by saying every time "one more minute or two more minutes".

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I do not think the hon. Member was correct when he said that the end of the Planning Commission's draft report says that the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister could not devote sufficient time.

Mr. Speaker: His point was that they were not present to participate.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: That they were not present throughout the sittings; they were not associated with the day-to-day findings.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I have not got the report here. The thing is that as they are Ministers they are not committed finally, because Government has to take a decision and they are present there in two capacities.

Shri U. C. Patnaik rose—

Mr. Speaker: It is a matter of record and might be referred to by the hon. Member.

Major-General Bhonsle (Ratnagiri North): I have listened most attentively to the speeches made in both Houses by various hon. Members criticising the Defence Budget. As free citizens of a free country they have every right to raise their voice to ventilate their grievances, to minimise expenditure which they consider could be curtailed without realising the danger in which we find ourselves today.

It must be clearly understood that so long as the British were ruling this country the role of the Indian army, apart from providing internal security troops, was to provide units and formations for the British expeditionary forces overseas, to protect the Empire's bastion until such time as Britain was able to mobilise all her resources and put into battle her whole weight of material with obvious result. Today the position has changed altogether. We stand alone to defend our own frontiers in a world divided into two camps, each striving to devise deadlier weapons, which might spell the destruction of humanity at large. Nations are not born; they are made and moulded, moulded by its great statesmen in successive generations. Today the country has put its trust in us, the representatives of the people, to safeguard our newly won freedom. I would therefore appeal to all the hon. Members to rise above party politics in order to make this country of ours a safe home, wherein our children and their children can live in peace, prosperity and security.

The best way of maintaining neutrality is to be strong ourselves. The Indian army having weathered many a storm has earned an enviable reputation. The Indian soldier has proved himself second to none in the innate qualities required of a soldier. Given proper weapons, I am sure he would fight any foe however strong. I claim to know the Indian soldier more intimately than most of my colleagues here and I can assure the House that with a little spiritual training—meaning training to infuse spirit—and modern weapons, he would not only fight in a tenacious manner but would fight like a lion against any foe. My remarks apply equally to the two other forces, namely the Navy and the Air Force.

India throughout her chequered history has stood for neutrality, equality, friendship and peace. It is therefore a matter of great pride that our Prime Minister is following this noble tradition to reconcile the two warring blocs. But should our frontiers be violated in spite of our best efforts and aspirations we must not be dependent on one or the other bloc but must be fully prepared to defend our country and our people.

Coming to the realities of a possible aggression, I might say that scientific advancements in armaments have obliterated the so-called national frontiers. I would, however, bring before your mind's eye the 2,100 miles of land and 2,500 miles of sea frontiers. I shall, however, confine my remarks to the land frontiers, owing to dynamic aggressive and intolerant ideologies existing across our frontiers. In the circumstances, if an aggressor should decide to attack India, which God forbid, the likely sequence of action would be: Large scale air attacks by bombers and fighters, followed by troop carriers aiming to paralyse our troop concentrations, lines of communication, supply centres, industrial areas and civic life of great cities in order to strike terror, alarm and dependency. To counteract this we must have a very strong air force capable of destroying the air invasion and at the same time, we must have successive lines of ground formations, meaning anti-aircraft guns, capable of dealing with any enemy formations which might, after eluding our fighters come over our cities. At the same time, to deal with any possible landings of paratroops we must aim at having what is known as guerrilla units to combat them most effectively. Also in order to concentrate a strong force of

guerrilla units at a particular point we must also have troop carrier planes as also strategic aerodromes all along the frontier. Just to give the House an idea of the cost of a modern troop carrier plane I might say that it costs in the neighbourhood of Rs. 30 lakhs. A sufficient number of such transport planes will therefore be necessary for the army to concentrate an adequate number of troops at a given point at short notice. Paratroops are dropped in order to hold a particular strategic point or an area until such time as the enemy is able to send larger forces to support them. That being the case we must anticipate bigger landings of troops—possibly brigades or divisions from an enemy of this type, in which case we must also be prepared to have a very strong force, if not slightly superior. This would show you whether or not we want an army in the country.

I have heard it said that we could cut our army down to one-third. I am sure that if the country and particularly the Prime Minister and the Government felt that it is absolutely necessary to cut down the army, then they would be the first to do so. But the international situation being what it is, it would be very difficult to cut down the size of the army. If we do so, then we do so at the great risk of endangering our country's interests. To those who say that the army must be cut, I say: No. I say, we must have a strong army capable of taking on any land forces that we may come up against. Our army therefore must be strong, very mobile, armoured and efficient. We want a model army, not for aggression, but for determined resistance of aggression.

To keep such a huge army in the field will require a large sum of money. India's standing in the international sphere will depend on her man-power, and her military strength, side by side with her moral stature.

The House knows that the Indian army today has to depend on foreign equipment. This is not a very happy situation. We must therefore aim at producing our own equipment in our country as quickly as possible. This leads us to the question of planning our industries in such a manner as to be able to switch on from peace to war. These must be in a position to produce the most difficult components required for modern equipment and armament. At the same time we must consider having a scientific and research section to progressively improve our equipment and armament.

Our Defence Budget, which amounts to Rs. 197 crores, is only about 25 per

cent. of the entire Budget. The hon. Finance Minister told us so the other day. I may quote here what other countries are spending. I cannot vouch for the figures, but as far as I know they are more or less correct. The figures for the United States of America—in millions of dollars—are as follows: The total Federal budget for 1951-52 was 71,594; and of that, for defence they spent 41,420. Again, in 1952-53, the total Federal revenue is—again in millions of dollars—85,400; and on defence they are spending 51,200. In the United Kingdom—the figures are in millions of pounds—in 1951-52, out of a total budget of 4,196, they spent 1,160 on defence; that roughly works out to 25 per cent. of the total budget. In 1952-53, out of a total budget of—in millions of pounds—4,661, they will spend 1,260—also 25 per cent. of the whole budget. This shows the value those countries put on their defences. Apart from mere percentage, I would ask the House whether Rs. 197 crores is a sizable sum for the defence of a great country like India. In the present context of food scarcity and general poverty, the amount may seem big; but when India prospers, she will have to spend a much greater amount than she is spending at the moment. Therefore, what the Defence Department has asked is not only a reasonable demand but rather a meagre amount; what they should ask for is really much more.

10 A.M.

I have told the House what large sums of money other first class nations are spending on their defence. In this connection, if India cannot afford to spend as much as she should, I would suggest that we pattern ourselves on the lines of Chinese and Japanese armies which have earned world reputation as first class fighters. These armies, though somewhat badly lacking in modern equipment, derive their strength from their spiritual training and ancient traditions. The House may have heard of Japanese soldiers refusing to surrender in the South Sea Islands because they absolutely refused to believe the end of World War II. The secret lies in their death-defying spirit, inculcated in them for years and years of spiritual training methods. Indian armies of old also had these traditions, but these traditions were lost to us under foreign domination. With a little expenditure and training they could be easily revived. The fundamental belief of the trainees of these armies is that it is not the weapon that matters, but the man behind it. "Death or glory" is their slogan. I put it to the House

[Major-General Bhonsle]

that we could also build our armies on the same principle and make the Indian army a really invincible army in the world.

It has been suggested that the Indian army should have a territorial army as a second line of defence. I beg leave of this House to say that so far as India is concerned, there is only one line, and that is the last line. In time of emergency there could be no such thing as a second line of defence. One and all of us, men, women and children, will have to take up the cudgel to fight the enemy, however strong. As I have said, it is the spirit that matters and not the weapon. I remember—I will not mention names—a very high Japanese officer telling us that if India wanted freedom before 1947, Indians could have won it with bricks in their hands. I say the same thing. In times of emergency, it is not the weapon that counts. We may have to take *dandas* and go out and fight to keep this country of ours free from aggression.

It has also been said that the Indian army might be used for producing more food. It is all very well for every one to think that soldiers could be used for any and every kind of job that is to be performed. They certainly could, and they would be only too ready; but in an emergency. If you put them on to the grow-more-food campaign, it becomes a fatigue. It is not a part of their duty. We have enemies all around. I have said that we have a 2,100-mile land frontier and a 2,500-mile sea frontier. In this House nobody makes a secret even of the Defence Budget, which, in other countries, would not be discussed so openly. Well, the army gets a telegram asking it to make available a division, shall we say, for two months, to grow-more-food in that part of the world—say Rayalaseema—where there is food shortage. The enemy gets to know that a division has been sent to Rayalaseema. Right. The soldiers get there and put in some months' hard work. The enemy waits for an opportunity of this type, and when the crops are about that high, the enemy strikes or creates trouble. Not only that; we may also need troops for internal security purposes. What happens then? Who is going to look after those crops? If normally the civilians have to, then they might as well start looking after them right from the beginning. But the army would be only too willing to help. They have done wonderful work in Rayalaseema. They have also done wonderful work whenever they

have been called up in national emergency. They are part of our own. We have all the same roots. They are our own. They would be only too willing to help. But we must not forget that they have a job of work to do. The modern army is a very highly scientific organisation that could not be disturbed from its normal work. And as such they have to keep in trim with their day-to-day work. In the circumstances it would not be fair to send the army to do your grow-more-food campaign.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): In other countries it is done.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Major-General Bhonsle: Yes. I know it.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Major-General Bhonsle: I will answer that, Sir, if I may.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He need not take the trouble of answering those irresponsible interruptions. His time is up now—he has already overshot by a minute or two.

Shri Velayudhan: He cannot answer that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member may conclude his speech.

Major-General Bhonsle: Besides, to send an army to do such a job which is not part of their own job is very expensive. What a normal man can do in one rupee the army will do in three rupees and then I am sure the hon. Finance Minister will ask for more money and it will not be a pleasant thing for the House when such a Budget is put forward.

In conclusion I would request all my colleagues here to realise the gravity of the situation and to co-operate with the Government fully in order that we build up our army into a most formidable fighting machine.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: We have before us a Defence Budget of staggering dimensions, a total of Rs. 197 crores, which is almost 50 per cent. of our expenditure. The hon. Finance Minister told us the other day that if you take all the State expenditure and revenues together, then that Defence Budget would come up to about 25 per cent. But I would contend that if you were to add up the police expenditure to the military expenditure we would have a percentage

of 40 being spent on these unproductive sources. At a time when our people are dying for want of food, when we have famine, when our children are dying for want of milk, when the industries are crying for investment and funds, when health and educational services have to be slashed down to about one per cent. of our Budget, such a bloated defence expenditure can mean nothing but disaster.

Against whom do we build up these defences so hectically, so feverishly? We say that we have friendly relations with all countries. On our borders lie the great lands of the Soviet Union and of China and with them we contend that we have friendly relations. With Pakistan too we carry on a policy of friendship, but even if we were to contend that we have to take into consideration the complicated situation arising in Kashmir and even if we were to take it for granted that there is constant fear of attack by Pakistan, there can be no justification for spending Rs. 200 crores when even Pakistan cannot afford to spend more than Rs. 70 crores. If you take into consideration the argument that behind Pakistan there are the Big Powers who can spend large amounts of money, against that we have to confess too that our entire defence machinery and our defence services are also modelled on the Commonwealth pattern. No, Sir, there can be no explanation for this colossal and dangerous spending on defence unless we seek to become a part of the Anglo-American war machinery built up for its final assault against the Soviet Union and the new Republic of China. Today the entire defence services are patterned on the Commonwealth model, and I will work this out for you. It is the British Imperial Army which still holds sway over us. It plans and models our weapons, and our army secrets are no longer secrets because they are their creators. We purchase all our stores and our ammunition from them and we are completely subservient to them for our strategy, for our weapons and methods of defence. This year we are to spend on charges in England a sum of Rs. 27 crores the majority of which is spent in buying stores. The jeep scandal etc. has shown how far we are within the British machine. In the Navy we are equipped with and we seek further equipment from the British Navy in the form of cruisers, in the form of aircraft carriers, destroyers, etc. Even today, top-ranking British officers man the key posts in our Army, Navy and Air Force. The head of the Air Force is a British

Officer, Air Marshal Gibbs. Besides him, we have the Directors of Operations, of Signals, of Equipment, of Technical Services, and also Training officers—all of them are British. The entire Technical College at Bangalore is equipped with technical staff who are British, and the sole agents for replacing our aircraft are the Rolls Royce Company, the Hawker Aircraft Company, the De Havilland and the British Airplane Company. In the Army too, General Cariappa has as his main Adviser General Russel and he also has a Principal Staff Officer called General Wilkinson. Under him there are twentyone important sections of the Army and they conduct important military training under those departments. In the Navy the head is Admiral Pizey. All higher ranks are held by Britishers—there is no Indian officer above the rank of Captain. The Officer in charge of the Armaments Section is a Britisher and the Naval Stores Officer in whose hands lies the monopoly of buying stores and arms and ammunition is also a Britisher. The code of the Navy is American and all the keys are known to them. From all these facts I contend that our army cannot have an independent foreign policy. It is a part of the Anglo-American machine. It is no use our saying we pursue a policy of neutrality and friendship with all nations and at the same time follow such a defence policy.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Let me now come to the question of the startling discrepancies in salaries. My friend on the other side has talked about the spiritual motive behind the defence services. That is a very important point but how can we imbue men with such spirit when we see that there are such sky-rocketting inequalities in the armed services. If you look into the Budget under the head Secretariat Expenditure, you find 63 officers get a total salary of nearly rupees nine lakhs, and 646 clerks and other subordinate employees are also drawing rupees nine lakhs. Sixty-three officers get the same pay as 646 clerks! Then look at the pay of officers and other ranks. The army's lowest categories are paid on an average between Rs. 25 and 40 a month. As far as the higher grade officers are concerned, their pay ranges between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 3,000. If you analyse the pay as set out in the Budget you will find that a handful of officers get about one-third of the total amount so paid. So, while we spend Rs. 200 crores on defence, our jawans about whom we talk such a lot, get wages below the subsistence level.

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

Then there is the question of discharges and dismissals. Summary dismissals without any charges—no explanation is needed, in court-martials no evidence is required. If you really want that there should be a new spirit, a new spirit of equity, justice and fair-play, the right to defend themselves must be given to them and the habit of brutal physical assaults in jails and lock-ups must be stopped. You must do this if you really want to have an efficient and able army.

Then I come to the question of wastages. I shall not go into such matters as the jeep scandal and the handgrenade scandal because that has been repeated again and again in this House. But we find, for instance, that in 1950 about 100 wireless sets 'B' Mk. II were lent to the Tibetan Government at a time when already there were complications arising on that scene. Now we find that we have lost about rupees six lakhs on that score and there is no question of repayment—it has had to be written off. Quite a substantial economy was recommended by the well-known firm of Ebeon Ltd. who suggested, as a measure of rationalisation, that the G.S.O.I. appointments may be abolished and the G.S.O. Class II service could carry on the work sufficiently well without impairing efficiency. This would have saved us Rs. 13 lakhs, but up to date we do not know what action has been taken on this recommendation. Then, lakhs of rupees are spent on travelling allowances and according to expert opinion a very considerable economy could have been effected in this respect. Moreover, Government incurs heavy losses to the tune of rupees four crores per year due to theft of materials and equipment in Armed Forces establishments. These losses have to be written off every year, and it is necessary that we should go into this and stop this type of waste which runs to crores of rupees.

Then there is a sum of rupees three crores on account of radar equipment which we took over as disposals and this amount was paid from the sterling balances. This equipment is lying unused because certain essential parts were taken away before the British left. We have been left with the baby and we do not know how to use it for we are unable to replace those parts.

Suffice it to say that our army, for all its huge expenditure, remains a top-heavy organisation, held tightly within the grasp of the British imperial army. It still continues its old policies of bureaucratism and extra-

vagance and disparities—policies which can never make a modern and efficient army. Our demand is—and we reiterate it—for a smaller and more efficient army, built up at less cost, enabling the levelling down of inequalities between the higher and lower ranks, and free from the tentacles of the Commonwealth army machine. Besides this we must develop a national militia, a peoples' militia with a strong and contented rear. Without a strong and contented rear, no amount of weapons can ensure your defence; no amount of weapons can ensure your safety. We must have more schools and hospitals, food and jobs for all. Only then there will be something worth fighting for.

In the end, I wish to say that as mothers we will vote down this war Budget. Along with other mothers all over the world, we wish to raise the cry "halt" to war. We ask the Indian Government to call a great Conference of Peace of all the peace-loving Powers of the world wherein all nations great and small will sign a mutual Pact of Peace slashing down our war budgets to turn that money for purposes of national uplift, respecting the independence and sovereignty of all nations. That way lies the happiness of our children. That way lies the building up of an era of peace and prosperity for all and the reconstruction of the world. I will end with the same words as used by my friend on the other side of the House, namely, "It is not the weapons that count, but the spirit".

Prof. D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): I do not want to speak about the Defence Budget as an expert. We have heard an hon. Member read a lot about strategy and other things and also quote very fine examples of the budgets of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. I am not interested in the military budgets of those countries. I am not trying to compare our Budget with theirs. I do not approach this Budget as one for whom the very name "Commonwealth of Nations" is anathema. For me, the Anglo-American bloc is not a bogey as it is for some other hon. Members. I view this Budget as an average citizen. When you also do that, you will find many reasons to congratulate the Government upon. The Budget as it stands, our defence organisation as it exists, our jawans and officers as they are now—all these are such that we may congratulate ourselves upon them.

An hon. Member said that the objectives of defence are two, viz. national security and economic stability. I agree there. Looking at

this question as one who lives in a border State and as one who has had some taste of being a displaced person and also as one who has known a little, though not very much, about the Kashmir campaign. I can say that our army has fulfilled the purposes and objectives of national security admirably. A tree has to be judged by its fruits, and our army has to be judged by the results achieved by it. When you look at the results during the last four years, you will be convinced that our army has done very well. As a displaced person, I must say that our defence forces served as a life belt for lakhs of migrants from Pakistan. Was that not an instance of affording national security? In Kashmir there is a fight going on between two ideologies and our army has put heart into lakhs of inhabitants of Kashmir and has enabled them to stand their ground. That also is another instance of affording national security.

I live in the Punjab. Friends coming from remote parts of India other than the Punjab may not have an idea of the conditions in the Punjab. Cries of *jehad* travel there from across the border. Even now there exist on the other side some organisations whose objective is to "annex" India. There are factors there which create trouble. So far as defence is concerned, the Pakistan budget is much higher than ours. If you understand this background, then you can understand the uncertain climate in which the Punjabi lives, and what happens to a Punjabi also affects others in India. Punjab is the gateway to India now, and if the gateway is attacked, the whole of India would soon become a scene of trouble and confusion.

Our army has done a very good deal for retaining Punjab's stability and tranquillity. Some time ago, there was a talk of the invasion of India by Pakistan. But as soon as our defence forces were stationed at strategic points along the border between India and Pakistan, the confidence of the public was restored. The exodus of the people from the Punjab was stopped and the channels of communication which would have been choked assumed their normal course. Trade was going to stop; educational institutions were going to be shut down. But since our defence forces were there, no upset took place. Commerce would have undergone a very great upset if the defence forces had not been there.

I think the uninstructed person in the village has a greater insight into

the problem of defence of our country than some of the people who talk about it. When I was touring about the countryside at the time of election I went to a village and I met an old man there. I think he was probably seventy years old. He came to me and said "I have voted for you". Though he did not know who I was he meant to say he had voted for the party on whose behalf I was seeking election. I asked him "Why is it that you have cast your vote for me?" And he replied "Do you not see? There was going to be trouble between India and Pakistan. That trouble was nipped in the bud by our Prime Minister and by our Defence Minister by marshalling our army and by placing them at these crucial points where there was likelihood of trouble". I think that villager of the Punjab saw our defence problem from a more correct perspective than many of those who have been talking about it.

There was a talk some time back that there would be no elections in the country and that there would be a civil war in the country. One leader of a communal group was openly saying that from a public platform. He was saying that no elections would be held because there would be civil war. I used to hear this statement made very often on the public platforms in the Punjab, and I think it was also reported in the Press. But he paid a tribute to the army by saying that the elections would be held only if the army would be called. I think that was, again, a tribute to the army.

So far as the objective of national security is concerned, our army has given proof of it at the time of the partition of our country. Our army has given proof of it so far as the fighting in Kashmir is concerned. Our army has given proof of it so far as the relations between India and Pakistan are concerned. And our army has also given proof of it so far as the elections were concerned. I must say that whenever some people talk about war or of aggression their psychology of war is in a way heightened, it is our army that acts as a sedative on them, that acts as an ice-cap on them, that restores them to normality, to a reasonable frame of mind and to a normal way of thinking.

Again it has been said that the objective of the army should be to ensure social stability in the country. I think it is one of the great objectives of the army. When I read the report of the activities of the Ministry of Defence for the last year I find that our army is becoming not merely an instrument of defence but it is also

[Prof. D. C. Sharma]

becoming an instrument of social reconstruction, an instrument of social regeneration. The contribution of the army to the grow-more-food campaign was made as a voluntary effort carried out in the spare time of the men without the least expenditure to the Government. As a result of the campaign the army has brought into cultivation 5,328 acres of land yielding 4,828 tons of foodgrains. This is not the only thing. This is only a beginning.

The experiment is being tried that some of the ex-service men should be settled on land. And that experiment is progressing. Again, there are schemes for vocational and technical and industrial training. This also is a measure in the direction of social regeneration. Again, some of the ex-service men are taking part in motor transport activity. That is also one of the nation-building activities in which they are taking part. Our army is also trying to improve the breed of horses and livestock. It is also engaged in farming. I believe all these things show that our army has the objective of social reconstruction and social stability before it.

This applies not only to our land army but also to our air force and navy. It applies to all these wings of our Defence Services.

I say it is not only these two objectives for which our army stands. As was said by a Member of this House, I believe that the army has acted as the moral force of the country. In one of his prayer talks in Delhi, Mahatma Gandhi said that the army had given an object lesson in discipline to the country. He said that Indians lacked in discipline and that the army was giving them lessons in discipline. As everyone knows, our country needs discipline and efficiency much more than anything else. Discipline and efficiency are not only practical virtues, I think they are moral virtues. They are helpful so far as the building up of society is concerned, so far as work in an organisation is concerned.

I believe the army has also acted as a great educational force. I am not referring here to the National Defence Academy at Dehra Dun or to the other wings. What I mean to say is that Mahatma Gandhi in one of his prayer talks at Delhi said that we should learn the lesson of self-help from the army. The army goes to a place which is far away from human habitation. There the army is able to build its own roads, hospitals and other con-

veniences of life. It is able to establish a frame-work for life. So, what I mean to say is that judged by the two objectives which my hon. friend had put before the army, I think the Indian army does not only fulfil those two objectives but acts as a moral as well as an educative force.

Again, I wish to say that we are all trying to solve our food problem. My feeling is that our Defence Minister should be asked to organize a land army for that purpose. I know there has been a great deal of talk about this land army. But my feeling is that this land army should be organized under the aegis of our Defence Ministry. If that is done I am sure that our food problem will be on its way to solution.

So far as the modernization of weapons is concerned, if we refer to this report, we shall find that this is being done all along the line. I have no doubt that our army has before it the chief aim to consolidate the freedom of India and work for the glory of India without being a danger or menace to the freedom of any country.

There is one suggestion which I wish to make before I sit down and it is this that the National Cadet Corps and the Territorial Army should receive greater help than before and that they should be broadened. At present we do not have many units of N. C. C. and Territorial Army and I think that more provision should be made for them.

With these words I commend the Defence Budget which has been placed before this House.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: While supporting the cut motions under discussion, I have a few observations to make, more particularly for the clarification of certain issues brought before the House in regard to the Defence budget. The other day the hon. Finance Minister told us that the Defence Budget does not err on the high side, though it has been made clear that we were spending as much as 49 per cent. of our revenues on defence only. I do not grudge the expenditure provided the other aspects of the administration are properly provided for. If there is any possibility of distributing a considerable portion of this amount on services that will in future develop our resources to be useful in defence, that will be a good investment. On the other hand we see that no such investment has been thought of. It has been mentioned the other day that the defence expenditure is only

25 per cent. of the total income of both the Central Government and the States. This is a new feature brought to the notice of the House because during the past years, at any rate before the 15th August 1947, the States were not committed to any Defence expenditure. If there were any Indian States that were maintaining armies, it was only nominal. On the other hand, they were not allowed to maintain very efficient armies. Any pooling of the State expenditure with the Central expenditure would only help a plausible argument and not a real one. Today even if this amount of 49 per cent. of the total income is spent upon defence, it might be justifiable if the public is taken into confidence by Government and assured that every pie is being spent conscientiously and that the commitments, sacrifices and obligations in the present foreign policy of the Government are properly accounted for. I agree with the suggestion that we cannot have a public discussion on defence but if we are thinking of expanding expenditure very much on defence, we have to infuse confidence in the taxpayer and to that extent the House at least must be taken into confidence and certain things told to them.

Mention has been made in the Defence Service estimates of 1952-53 about two things which require clarification. One is that a new department, namely, the Department of Scientific Adviser to the Minister of Defence and his staff has been created—page 37. The purpose is to make a "systematic study of the now very extensive and highly developed defence science and to deal with basic research etc." I would ask for some more clarification on this point. The expenditure on this is gradually increasing and from 1950-51 to 1952-53 it has gradually risen from Rs. 3½ lakhs to nearly rupees nine lakhs. What sort of scientific research is being done? To what extent is it useful for the Armed Services? Is it going to economise our expenditure in the long run in the Defence Budget? Is there a possibility, through this section, of manufacturing armaments or some other material for war purposes in a more economical manner? All these have not been clarified in this particularly small paragraph.

Then there is the division of the Defence Department. It is now supposed to be working under three Commanders-in-Chief, one for the army, another for the navy and a third for the air force. Hitherto, before the 15th August 1947 the whole organization was evidently working under one Commander-in-Chief. Though the

report says that wonderful things have been achieved by this trifurcation with a Defence Minister over the heads of these three services, I am not quite sure whether this method has worked quite well. I make this observation from two points of view: Firstly our relationship with Kashmir has not been very effective. So far, we find that there is only one-way traffic for our men, money and other resources going into Kashmir and we are getting back nothing by way of at least an assured friendship or continued good relationship with India or the possibility of its merging into or affiliation with India. Whether the Kashmir question had been adumbrated after the new organization was brought into existence or whether it was conceived previous to that, we are yet to be told. This "revolutionary change", after all, has not satisfied the public and any money spent on that is supposed to be a waste. But anyhow, I would like to have a clarification on that point.

Another point to which I wish to refer is the question of expenditure on stores etc. The Public Accounts Committee report gives us a glorious account of a certain amount of mismanagement or mishandling of the funds under Defence. The jeeps and rifle scandal is one of them. It was suggested by one hon. Member that it is a scandal to talk of the jeep scandal. But, I think it is equally scandalous to defend a scandal of that type especially after it has been brought to the notice of the public through this very plain and drastic report of the Public Accounts Committee. I only wish that in future, after the Defence Services have been re-organised, such incidents will not be allowed to continue or allowed to be committed. If efficiency has been increased after the trifurcation, such scandals ought not to have occurred at all. Therefore, it has to be surmised that the new set-up has not in any way affected either economy or controlled the expenditure on the Defence side and that everything has yet to take shape under the new organisation. As a matter of fact, if responsibility is divided like that, and if a Minister who is not supposed to have an overall knowledge of military strategy is placed at the head of this trifurcated organisation or rather the three Commanders-in-Chief, there is a possibility of the responsibility of the individual Commanders-in-Chief being shifted, and there is also the danger of their not acting in greater co-ordination. In England, there seems to be a system of having this sort of co-ordination properly controlled by

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

people who have got an overall knowledge of military affairs and strategy. Anyhow, if such a knowledge can be developed in our Defence Ministers, it is well and good. If that is not to be developed and if responsibility is taken over by a Defence Minister or a Committee of Ministers from the Commanders-in-Chief without knowing actually the methods of warfare and other details, it might end in disaster. I therefore suggest that the matter may have to be re-considered and that the entire responsibility might be located in one Commander-in-Chief, with necessarily an overall control of the Ministry which can only dictate policies.

With regard to defence expenditure, we have to promote such of the industries with these moneys, so that while they are useful in peace time, they would also be useful in wartime, when switched on to war work. For instance, I would ask what help or protection has been given to the Iron and Steel industry in India by the Government, with a view to increase the production of Iron and steel which are essential materials for war, and to the manufacture of armaments and transport vehicles which are essential in war. No noticeable advance has been made in the Defence Budget in this regard. So, whatever might be the size of the Defence Budget, it would have to be supported by a long range programme, and when war comes on or defence has to be tightened up, we must be in a position to switch on the peace time efforts to war time efforts effectively and more easily.

I would make only one more suggestion, and that is regarding military training. When war comes on, we usually recruit a number of people for military training. Military training during war time is more costly and more inconvenient. In peace time, if military training is given compulsorily at least to the college students, who possess the health and capacity, it might go a great way to equip and use them in time. When war comes, they will be ready to defend the country.

It has been suggested that it is the spirit and not the money that is more necessary. I quite agree with that. But, money also has a very large part to play in the discharge of duties entrusted to high-placed men. We cannot expect the Commander-in-Chief to work as an ordinary labourer on a salary of Rs. 50 or 100 or 200. Along with responsibility, a decent pay has to be given, and that pay would

certainly ensure greater responsibility in the persons that are placed in command of the armies, etc.

It has also to be pointed out that in peace time, the army may be utilised for nation-building purposes. We have been told by an hon. Member on the other side that military expenditure for nation-building enterprises in peace time would be three times the expenditure incurred by the employment of non-military personnel. Whatever it might be, instead of keeping the military idle in peace time, it might be useful to utilise their services for nation-building purposes, or at least make them work in factories, that would ultimately help in the manufacture of armaments etc. necessary for defence purposes.

श्री शाहनवाज खाँ : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं आप को इजाजत से हिन्दी में बोलना चाहता हूँ। आज सुबह से जब यहाँ पर डिफेंस (defence) के ऊपर बहस शुरू हुई तो हमारे कांग्रेस बेंचेज (Benches) और जो हमारे मध्य के मुकाबले की बेंचेज में हैं, उन लोगों की तकरीरों को मैं गौर से सुनता रहा। यह मुझे अच्छी तरह से पता है और मैं इस को दयान्तदारी मानता हूँ कि इस हाउस (House) में कोई भी ऐसा आदमी नहीं है, चाहे वह कांग्रेस बेंच पर हो, चाहे कांग्रेस बेंच के खिलाफ़ बैठा हो, इस मुल्क के डिफेंस के खिलाफ़ हो या इस मुल्क की बेहतरी के खिलाफ़ हो। इसलिये जो कुछ भी मुकाबले से कांग्रेस के खिलाफ़ बातें हुई हैं, मैं उस को भी बुरा नहीं समझता। बजाय इस के कि मैं डिफेंस के ऊपर आऊँ, चन्द बातें इस तरह की यहाँ पर कही गई हैं जिन का मैं जवाब देना चाहता हूँ।

एक बहाने ने यह कहा कि इंडियन आर्मी (Indian Army) इसलिये बनाई गई है, इंडियन आर्मी के ऊपर इसलिये बहुत ज्यादा खर्चा किया जा रहा है क्योंकि उसको सोवियट यूनियन के खिलाफ़

तैयार किया जा रहा है। मैं उन को बता देना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान का अपना एक रास्ता चुना हुआ है। हिन्दुस्तान ने अपनी तरक्की के लिये, अपने-मुस्तकबिल के लिये, एक रास्ता चुन लिया है और हिन्दुस्तान मजबूती के साथ उस रास्ते पर चलेगा। अगर कहीं सोवियट यूनिन की फौजें हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी को छीनेगी तो यक़ीनन हिन्दुस्तान उन के खिलाफ़ लड़ेगा। उन को यह मालूम होना चाहिये।

कुछ लोगों ने कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान की जो फ़ौज है वह कामनवैल्थ (Commonwealth) की फ़ोर्स (Forces) के साथ साथ तैयार की जा रही हैं। उस से उन का मतलब यह था कि यह हिन्दुस्तान की फ़ौज एंग्लो अमेरिकन फ़ोर्स (Anglo-American Forces) का हिस्सा बनाई जा रही है। इस के जवाब में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान को अगर एंग्लो अमेरिकन ब्लाक (Anglo-American Bloc) के नीचे रहना होता तो हम हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद करने के लिये इतनी भारी कुर्बानी कर्मी नहीं देते। हिन्दुस्तान ने अपना एक आजादाना जोर पर रास्ता चुन लिया है और उस पर चलने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान हर एक कुर्बानी देने को तैयार है।

इस हाउस में बजट के दौरान में मुस्तकबिल किस्म के रुपालात हाउस के सामने रखे गये। कुछ रुपालात तो ऐसे रखे गये कि हिन्दुस्तान पर जो हमले होंगे वह आज कल के ज़माने में जो जदीद तरीन हथियार हैं उन से होंगे। एयर फ़ोर्स के हमले होंगे, पैराशूट लैंडिंग (Parachute Landings) होंगी। एक तो यह सूरात पेश की गई। यह कहा गया कि ऐसे हमलों का मुकाबला करने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान

को बहुत बड़ी एयर फ़ोर्स (Air Force) बहुत बड़ी नेवी (Navy) और बहुत बड़ी फ़ौज की ज़रूरत है। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान का रक़वा इतना बड़ा है, हिन्दुस्तान की कोस्ट लाइन (Coast line) इतनी वसीज है कि इस के डिफेंस के लिये हिन्दुस्तान को एक बहुत बड़ी नेवी की ज़रूरत है जिस में एयर क्राफ्ट कैरियर हों, सब मॅरीन हों, बड़े बड़े जहाज़ और लेटेस्ट वैंटलिफ़्ट हों। इसी तरह से बहुत बड़ी एयर फ़ोर्स की भी ज़रूरत है और साथ ही बहुत बड़ी फ़ौज की भी ज़रूरत है जिस के पास लेटेस्ट हवाई जहाज़ हों और लेटेस्ट टैंक और हथियार हो। हमें ऐसी फ़ौज की ज़रूरत है। लेकिन इस के साथ ही हमें यह भी सोचना है कि जहाँ हिन्दुस्तान की इन ज़रूरियात को हम सामने रखते हैं वहाँ हम हिन्दुस्तान की माली हालत को भी नज़रअन्दाज़ नहीं कर सकते। यह चीज़ें बेशक ज़रूरी हैं और एक दिन हिन्दुस्तान को ज़रूर एक बहुत बड़ी नेवी बनानी पड़ेगी, बहुत बड़ी एयर फ़ोर्स और बहुत वेंहरीन किस्म की फ़ौज बनानी पड़ेगी। आइन्दा हमें यह सब करना पड़ेगा। और मैं चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरीके से हम फाइव ईयर प्लान (Five Year Plan) बना रहे हैं, जहाँ हम एप्रीकलचर और दूसरी इंडस्ट्री के लिये एक प्लान बना रहे हैं, एक स्कीम बना रहे हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के डेवलपमेंट (development) के लिये इसी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान के फ्यूचर (future) को सामने रख कर हमें एक बहुत बड़ी शानदार फ़ौज, नेवी और एयर फ़ोर्स के लिये भी एक प्लान बनाना होगा। जिस तरह से हम फाइव ईयर प्लान में स्टैप बाई स्टैप तरक्की की तरफ़ बढ़ना चाहते हैं, मैं इस हाउस से यह दरक़वास्त करूंगा कि अपनी डिफेंस सर्बिसेज़ के लिये

[श्री शाहनवाज़ खां]

11 A.M.

भी हमें कोई ऐसी ही स्कीम, प्लान, तैयार करनी चाहिये ।

जिस वक्त अंग्रेज़ हमारे मुल्क में था उस ज़माने में बहुत कम हिन्दुस्तानी ऐसे थे जो मुल्क के डिफेंस में कोई खास दिलचस्पी लेते थे । क्योंकि मुल्क का डिफेंस उस वक्त ज़्यादातर अंग्रेज़ की जिम्मेवारी थी और हिन्दुस्तान के जो कौम परस्त लोग थे वह उस डिफेंस में कोई खास दिलचस्पी नहीं लेते थे । जब हिन्दुस्तान आज़ाद हुआ तो मुझे एक मोतबर ज़रिये से पता चला है कि जिस वक्त लार्ड माउंटबेटन ने हिन्दुस्तान की बागडोर पंढित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के हाथों में सौंपी तो उन्होंने यह कहा कि सब से बेहतरीन, सब से अच्छी चीज़ जो बरतानिया हिन्दुस्तान के हवाले कर रहा है वह हिन्दुस्तान की डिफेंस सरविसेज़ (Defence Services) हैं । उन का कहना बिल्कूल बजा था और इस में कोई शक नहीं कि जिस वक्त बरतानिया गया उस ने हिन्दुस्तान के हवाले बेहतरीन डिफेंस सरविसेज़ कीं । मुझे आज भी यह देख कर खुशी होती है कि वह जो एक बेहतरीन किस्म की फ़ौज, बेहतरीन किस्म की डिफेंस सरविसेज़ थी, वह उतनी ही ऐकीशियेंट (efficient) अब भी है और अब भी उस ने वही काबलियत और वही डिसिप्लिन (discipline) आज तक कायम रखा है और मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि वह इस से आगे ही बढ़ेगी । हिन्दुस्तान में कौन ऐसा आदमी है जो यह बात नहीं जानता कि जिस वक्त मुल्क की तंक्रसीम हुई हिन्दुस्तान के दुश्मनों का यह ख़याल था कि इस मुल्क में फिरकेवाराना फ़िसाद होंगे और उन्होंने इस बात के लिये कोशिश की मुस्तलिफ़ दिलचस्पी रखने वाली जमाअतों ने, रीऐक्शनरी फ़ौर्वेज़ (Reactionary

forces) ने यह कोशिश की कि पार्टीशन के साथ साथ हिन्दुस्तान में ज़बरदस्त फिरकेवाराना फ़िसाद हों और उन को उम्मीद थी कि फिरकेवाराना आग हिन्दुस्तान के कोने कोने में लग कर मुल्क को तबाह कर देगी । लेकिन उस वक्त हमारी फ़ौज आई और बावजूद बहुत मुश्किल हालात होने के उस फ़ौज ने इस मुल्क में अमन कायम किया और इस मुल्क की आज़ादी उसने बचा ली । इस के लिये फ़ौज यकीनी तौर पर हमारे मुबारकबाद की मुस्तहक है ।

फिर फिरकेवाराना फ़िसाद अभी खत्म नहीं होने पाये थे तो उधर से पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर के ऊपर हमला कर दिया । काश्मीर में भी हमारी फ़ौज ने जो कुछ किया है वह सब अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं । फ़ौजी नुक्ते निगाह से हमारी फ़ौज ने यकीनी तौर पर बहुत भारी कारनामे किये हैं । लेकिन अब मैं फ़ौजी चीज़ों की तरफ़ आज रुजू नहीं कर रहा, मैं दूसरी तरफ़ इस हाउस का ख़याल ले जाना चाहता हूँ । जहां फ़ौज ने वहां बहुत बड़े कारनामे किये हैं वहां इस हाउस में काश्मीर के बारे में काफी बात चीन की गई है । मुख़ालिफ़ बेंचेज़ पर से शेख़ अब्दुल्ला के ऊपर काफी जाती एटैक्स (attacks) किये गये हैं । मैं आप की इजाजत से थोड़ा सा डिफ़स के मसले से हट कर काश्मीर के बारे में अपने ख़यालात रखना चाहता हूँ । मैं उन दोस्तों को बता देना चाहता हूँ जो लोग कहते हैं कि काश्मीर पर हम बहुत रुपया खर्च कर रहे हैं लेकिन वहां से हम को कुछ नहीं मिल रहा है कि काश्मीर के बारे में वह ऐसी बात करते हैं जैसा कि कोई चीज़ रुपये से ख़रीदने की है । मैं उन दोस्तों को बता देना चाहता हूँ कि जिस वक्त पाकिस्तान की फ़ौजों ने हमला किया उस वक्त इंडियन आर्मी

वहां नहीं पहुंची थी। इंडियन आर्मी के पहुंचने से पहले शेर काश्मीर अब्दुल्ला खड़ा हुआ और उस ने कौम परस्त लोगों को ले कर वहां खून बहाया और हिन्दुस्तान में शरीक होने का ऐलान उसी वक्त कर दिया। मैं यह भी साफ साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि नेशनल काँग्रेस शेख अब्दुल्ला के साथ थी और उस ने हिन्दुस्तान में शामिल होने का ऐलान किया। जिस वक्त शेख अब्दुल्ला ने हिन्दुस्तान में शरीक होने का फैसला किया तो वह फैसला कोई दब कर नहीं किया था हिन्दुस्तान की जबरदस्त फौज की ताकत को देख कर नहीं किया, बल्कि शेख अब्दुल्ला ने हिन्दुस्तान में शरीक होने का फैसला उस की आईडियालाजी (ideology), महात्मा गांधी की आईडियालाजी को देख कर किया। मुखालिफ बँचेज वाले शेख अब्दुल्ला के जो एक बयान को पकड़ रहे हैं उन से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह सचमुच काश्मीर को क्रूर करते हैं तो उन दोस्तों से मैं यह दरखवास्त करूंगा कि जिस आईडियालाजी को ले कर हिन्दुस्तान में काश्मीर आया है उस को वह मजबूत करें तो काश्मीर और हिन्दुस्तान कभी अलग नहीं हो सकते।

काश्मीर में हमारी फौजों ने यक़ीनी तौर पर एक शानदार काम किया है और जैसा मैंने अर्ज किया, यह शानदार काम फौजों नुक्ते निगाह से बहुत ही आला रहा। मैं यहां आईडियालाजी की बात कर रहा था, हमारी फौजें वहां काश्मीर में जहां करीबन ८० फीसदी मुसलमान हैं, गयीं उस वक्त वहां के लोगों में तरह तरह का प्रोपेगन्डा (Propaganda) खौफ और हैजान फैला हुआ था। हमारी फौज ने वहां के लोगों के साथ बिरादराना सज़ूक किया

और वहां के अवाम का कानफिडेंन्स (confidence) और एतमाद हासिल किया। एक जगह की बात मैं आप को बताऊँ जो शायद हाउस के सब मेम्बरों को पता नहीं है। काश्मीर में हमारी फौज एक ऐसी जगह पहुंची जहां खुराक की बहुत कमी थी और बर्फ की बजह से खुराक वहां तक फौजों को नहीं पहुंचाई जा सकती थी। ऐसे मौकों पर आम तौर से यह होता है कि जब खुराक वहां नहीं पहुंच सकती है तो फौज लोकली (Locally) अपने लिये अन्न जमा करती है और उस हिस्से के रहने वाले बाशिन्दों से खुराक लेती है, लेकिन चूँकि वहां पहिले से ही खुराक की कमी थी, इसलिये वहां के फौजी अफसरों ने वहां की आबादी से खुराक लेने से इन्कार कर दिया और अपना राशन आघा कर दिया, अपने सिपाहियों से कहा कि भले ही तुम और हम सब भूखे रहें लेकिन यहां के बाशिन्दों से खुराक नहीं लेनी है। यह काम काश्मीर में हमारी फौज ने किया। इसी के साथ साथ हमारी फौज ने जब आसाम में बाढ़ आई, तो उस ने वहां भी बहुत शानदार काम किया और लोगों की सेवा की। रायलसीमा में जहां अकाल पड़ा, वहां के बारे में और दूसरे साहबान भी बता चुके हैं कि वहां भी हमारी फौज ने बहुत शानदार काम किया है। लेकिन यह सब कारनामे जो हमारी फौज ने किये हैं इन सब से बढ़ कर एक और कारनामा हमारी फौज ने किया है जिस की अहमियत शायद बहुत से लोग नहीं समझते।

आप को याद होगा कि करीबन डेढ़ साल का अर्सा हुआ जब कि हम को इत्तिला मिली कि पाकिस्तान फिर पीस निगोशियेशन्स (Peace negotiations) के बाद अपनी फौजें काश्मीर की तरफ बढ़ा रहा है,

[श्री शाहनवाज खां]

यह इत्तिला सच और सही थी और वाकई डेढ़ साल का अर्सा हुआ जब पाकिस्तान ने एक बार फिर काश्मीर पर हमला करने की तैयारी की और काश्मीर की तरफ बढ़ना शुरू किया। उस का मुकाबला करने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान की फौजों ने उस दफा काश्मीर की तरफ कदम नहीं उठाया बल्कि यहां की फौजों ने वागा वार्डर पर मार्च (march) किया और मैं फौजी नुबते निगाह से कहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की फौज का यह मूव (move) प्योरली (Purely) एक स्ट्रैटिजिकल मूव (Strategical move) की हैसियत से दुनिया की तारीख में जो बेहतरीन स्ट्रैटिजिकल मूव्स की मिसालें मिलती हैं उन में से एक है। अगर हमारी फौज ने यह कदम न उठाया होता और अगर वह काश्मीर की तरफ रुख करती तो यकीनी तौर पर वहां पर एक भारी खुरेज जंग होती, लेकिन हमारी फौज ने जो वागा वार्डर की तरफ मूव किया, उस से सारा नवशा ही पलट गया और हमारी फौज ने इस मूव को लेकर काश्मीर की लड़ाई बगैर एक खून का कतरा बहाये जीत ली। इस चीज के लिये भी हम सब लोग बजा तौर पर अपनी आर्मी के ऊपर, उस की डिस्प्लन और ऐफिशियेन्सी के ऊपर फर्र कर सकते हैं और जब हम अपनी फौज और डिफेंस सविसेज के बारे में बातचीत करते हैं तो हम को उन हालात को नहीं भूलना चाहिये जिन के तहत हमारा मुल्क आजाद हुआ और जिन हालात के तहत हमारी फौज अंग्रेजी राज्य के कब्जे से हट कर हमारी नेशनल गवर्नमेन्ट के पास आई। यह बात सबको अच्छी तरह से पता है कि जब अंग्रेजों ने इस मुल्क के ऊपर कब्जा किया और इस मुल्क में अपनी फौजें बनाई तो उन्होंने न एक खास नुबते निगाह, एक खास प्वाइंट आफ व्यू (Point of view) से फौजों को आरगनाइज (organise)

किया। अंग्रेजों ने जब फौज के लिये भर्ती शुरू की तो उन्होंने सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान की बेहतरी और डिफेंस के वास्ते ही भर्ती नहीं की, बल्कि उन्होंने ब्रिटिश इम्पायर (British Empire) की बहबूदी और ब्रिटिश इम्पीरियलिज्म (British Imperialism) को सर सब्ज करने के लिये यह फौज बनाई थी। जाहिर है कि ऐसी फौज जो एक इम्पीरियलिस्टिक (Imperialistic) निजाम को कायम रखने के लिये बनाई जाती है वह नेशनल गवर्नमेन्ट की नेशनल आर्मी से बिल्कुल एक जुदा चीज थी। अंग्रेजों ने फौज में ऐसे तबकों से लोग भर्ती किये जहां तालीम बिल्कुल नहीं थी और जहां सियासी बेदारी पोलिटिकल अवेकनिंग (political awakening) नहीं थी, ऐसे लोगों को अंग्रेजों ने फौज में भर्ती किया और उन को हमेशा नेशनल मूवमेंट्स से अलग रखा और अंग्रेजों की हमेशा यही कोशिश रही कि फौज को हिन्दुस्तान के नेशनल मूवमेंट्स से अलिहदा रक्खा जाये। इस डिजाइन (design) के ऊपर उस ने यह फौज बनाई, जाहिर है कि वह मरसनरी (mercenary) फौज थी। मैं भी ब्रिटिश इम्पियन आर्मी का एक मेम्बर रह चुका हूँ और मैं जानता हूँ कि वह एक बिल्कुल मरसनरी फौज थी, तनख्वाह और इनाम की खातिर लड़ा करती थी, लेकिन जब से हमारा मुल्क आजाद हुआ है, उस फौज का रोल (Role) बिल्कुल बदल गया और वह एक इम्पीरियलिस्टिक मरसनरी आर्मी न हो कर एक कौमी फौज बन गई है। और यह जो तबदीली हुई, उस तबदीली में जैसा मैं पहिले कह चुका हूँ हमारी फौज ने बहुत शानदार काम किया है, और एक मरसनरी आर्मी से नेशनल आर्मी

में बदल जाना एक बहुत बड़ा चेन्ज (change) होता है और उस के लिये हमारी फौज पूरी कोशिश कर रही है। लेकिन मैं यहां यह जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि ऐसा करने के लिये दिल और दिमाग में भी बहुत बड़ी तबदीली होनी चाहिये। यह मेरी खुशकिस्मती है कि मैं जो पहिले एक मरसनरी आर्मी का एक मेम्बर था, बाद में नेता जी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस की नेशनल आर्मी का एक मेम्बर बना और मैं ने खुद अपनी आंखों से देखा कि एक मरसनरी आर्मी और नेशनल आर्मी में कितना बड़ा फर्क होता है और उन के हर एक मसले की अप्रोच (approach) मैं और उन के दिल व दिमाग में कितना फर्क होता है, यह चीज मैंने खुद अपनी आंखों से सिगापुर और मलाया के मैदान जंग में देखी। जब हम अंग्रेजों की फौज में थे तो लाखों की तादाद में अंग्रेजों की फौज सिगापुर में मौजूद थी और तकरीबन हर एक झाड़ी के साथ एक तोप लगी हुई थी और उन के पास जंग के सामान की कोई कमी नहीं थी। लेकिन जापानियों की छोटी तादाद की फौज के सामने इतनी बड़ी फौज ने हथियार डाल दिये। हमारे सिपाही हम से पूछा करते थे कि साहब हम किस लिये लड़ रहे हैं और हम किस लिये मर रहे हैं? नतीजा यह होता था कि जब भी जान का खतरा होता था, तो हमारे हिन्दुस्तानी, अंग्रेज सिपाही और गोरखे जान बचा कर रायफिलें उठा कर भाग खड़े होने थे, लेकिन जब बही फौज अंग्रेजों के कब्जे से निकल कर नेताजी की नेशनल आर्मी बन गई और हम बगैर सामान, बगैर तोपों और टैंकों के दुनिया की बेहतरीन फौजों का मुकाबला करने के लिये आगे बढ़े तो हम ने देखा कि हम में कितना बड़ा चेन्ज हो गया है। टाईम बहुत थोड़ा है, मैं बहुत ज्यादा नहीं बता सकता,

लेकिन मैं एक इंसिडेन्ट (incident) आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ जिस से आप को मालूम हो जायेगा कि मरसेनरी आर्मी से जब नेशनल आर्मी में चेन्ज होता है, तो कितना बड़ा फर्क हो जाता है। पोंपा बर्मा में एक मुकाम है, वहां हम आजाद हिन्द फौज वाले अंग्रेजों के खिलाफ लड़ रहे थे। हमारे एक सिपाही को आ कर एक बम लगा जिस से उस की एक टांग उड़ गई और उस के खून का फव्वारा जारी हो गया। उस सिपाही को उठा कर हैडक्वार्टर में लाया गया ताकि उस की मरहम पट्टी की जा सके। जब मैं उस सिपाही के पास उस की हालत देखने गया तो मैंने पाया कि वह चन्द मिन्टों का मेहमान है और वह बच नहीं सकता है, मैंने फौरन पट्टी बंधवाने को कहा, जिस पर उस सिपाही ने कहा कि पट्टी मत बांधो, यह खून भारत माता की आजादी के लिये बह रहा है, इसलिये इसे पूरी तौर से बहने दो।

यह फर्क होता है नेशनल आर्मी में और मरसेनरी आर्मी में। यह हाउस अच्छी तरह जानता है कि जापानी फौज के पास सामान की कमी थी। जिम वक्त जापानी फौज बड़ी भारी फौज के खिलाफ लड़ रही थी तो उस ने क्या किया। जब उन के खिलाफ बहुत भारी बेटल शिप्स (Battle-ships) गये तो उन के पास उन का जवाब नहीं था। उन के नौजवानों ने, कामाकाजे स्क्वैड्स, जांबाज स्क्वैड्स, सुसाइड स्क्वैड्स (Suicide squads) जो थे वह हवाई जहाज से जा कर उन के प्रिम आफ वेल्स जैसे बड़े जहाज से जा कर टकराये और उस को डुबो दिया। मैं ने एक मर्तबे जापानी दोस्तों से पूछा कि आप ने तादाद में कम होने के बावजूद भी

[श्री शाहनवाज़ खां]

जो इतनी बड़ी फौज का मुकाबला किया तो यह चीज आपने कहां से ली। यह जो जान पर खेलने जान कुर्बान कर देने का मादा है वह आप ने कहां से लिया। आप सुन कर हैरान होंगे कि उस ने जवाब दिया कि यह जो कामाकाजे स्पिरिट हमारी है, अपनी जान पर खेलने का हुनर जो है, वह हम ने हिन्दुस्तान के राजपूतों के जौहर से सीखी है।

मेरे पास ज्यादा वक्त नहीं है, इस-लिये मैं खत्म करना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज अंग्रेजों ने जो मरसेनरी आर्मी हिन्दुस्तान को दी है, उस आर्मी में नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस की आर्मी की स्पिरिट लाई जाय और जो राज-पूतों का पुराना जौहर है, उस जौहर से उस फौज के दिल और दिमाग को मुबत्तर किया जाये।

मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि मुझ को इस बात के कहने के लिये माफी दी जायेगी कि मुझे एक बात का बहुत अफसोस है। वह फौज जिस की रसूमात, जिस के ट्रेडिशन (Traditions) सौ फीसदी नेशनल थे, मैं यहां पर उस का जिक्र कर रहा हूँ। मुझे इस का अफसोस है कि जिस फौज ने मुल्क की खातिर कुर्बानी की, उस आर्मी को, आज सही तरीके पर इंडियन आर्मी में नहीं लिया गया और उन को मुल्क की खिदमत करने का मौका नहीं दिया गया। मैं आज इस हाउस में पहली मंताबा नेताजी का एक सिपाही होने की हैसियत से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की नेशनल आर्मी में जाने का हमारा हक था, यह हमारा राइट (Right) था कि आजाद हिन्द में, आजाद हिन्द फौज के जो सिपाही और अफसर

हैं उन को मुल्क की खिदमत करने का एक सही मौका दिया जाये।

Shri Nambiar: Is there no time-limit, Sir?

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: May I have two minutes more, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If necessary, I will prolong the time.

Shri Nambiar: The same privilege should be given to us also.

श्री शाहनवाज़ खां : मैं एक बात और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान का जो डिपेंस है वह बहुत बड़ी चीज है, उस डिपेंस के लिये मेरे दिल में बहुत सी स्कीमें हैं, बहुत सी तजवीजें हैं, लेकिन उन को रखने का मेरे पास वक्त नहीं है। मैं सिर्फ एक बात कह देना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान का डिपेंस उस वक्त तक मुकाम्ल नहीं हो सकता जब तक हिन्दुस्तान की पाकीजा, पवित्र धरती पर दूसरे मुमालिक के पजेशन्स (possessions) मौजूद हैं। आज हमारे मुल्क में गौबा पोर्चगीज का एक अड्डा है, इसी तरह से दूसरे फारेन पजेशन्स के मुकामात हैं जो हमारे मुल्क के मुंह के ऊपर एक बदनूमा धब्बा है। उस बदनूमा धब्बे को जब तक हम नहीं हटायेंगे हमारे मुल्क का डिपेंस सही तौर पर नहीं हो सकेगा। इस सिलसिले में मेरी एक तजवीज है और वह यह है कि मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारा मुल्क यह चाहता है कि तमाम मुमालिक के साथ हम दोस्ताना ताल्लुकात कायम करें, हम तमाम मुल्कों के साथ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, और जहां हमारी हुकूमत फांसीसियों के साथ, डच के साथ, पोर्चगीज के साथ डिप्लोमैटिक नेगोशियेशन्स (Diplomatic negotiations) कर रही हैं, मैं उस का हामी हूँ। लेकिन यह भी मैं बड़ी नज़रता, बड़ी हलीमी के साथ कहना

चाहता हूँ कि हम एक टाइम लिमिट (time limit) मुकर्रर कर दें, एक साल, दो साल का अर्सा दे दें कि हम तमाम मुल्कों के साथ इस सवाल को दोस्ती के साथ हल करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन अगर वह लोग खुशी के साथ हमारे मुल्क से अपने अड़डे नहीं हटाते हैं तो हम को अपनी फौज को हुक्म दे देना चाहिये कि जाओ, उन पर जबर्दस्ती कब्जा कर लो। अगर आज हम अंग्रेजों से हिन्दुस्तान ऐसा सब-कान्टिनेन्ट (Sub-Continent) छीन कर भी दोस्ताना ताल्लुकात कायम किये हुए हैं तो मुझे कोई शक नहीं है कि अगर हम यह फारेन पजेशन्स जबर्दस्ती भी ले लें तो भी हम उन के साथ दोस्ताना रिलेशन्स कायम रख सकेंगे।

इस हाउस में कई मतंबा आर्मी स्कैंडल्स (Army Scandals) का जिक्र आया। हो सकता है कि कुछ स्कैंडल्स हुए हों, लेकिन मैं एक फौजी अफसर होने के नाते जानता हूँ कि आज शायद बहुत सी चीजों का पता मेरे बहुत से मेम्बर दोस्तों को नहीं है। अगर कोई ऐसी सर्बिसेज हैं जिस पर हम रिश्वत से या स्कैंडल्स से बरी होने का फ़र्र कर सकते हैं, तो वह इंडियन आर्मी है। मैं जानता हूँ कि आज जब कि इंडियन आर्मी में सीनियर अफसरों की कमी है, हमारे पास बड़े बड़े कर्नल्स (Colonels) और जनरल्स (Generals) बहुत कम हैं, इस कमी के जमाने में भी मुझे इल्म है, जिन बड़े बड़े अफसरों के ऊपर षब्बे हैं, या यह शिकायत है कि उस ने रिश्वत ली है, या उस ने कोई ऐसा काम किया है जो, हिन्दुस्तान की फौज की डिसिप्लिन के खिलाफ़ है, तो बड़े से बड़े अफसरों को भी डिसमिस (dismiss) किया गया है। मुझे यकीन है कि जो ऊंचे रसूमात, ऊंचे ट्रेडिशनल इंडियन आर्मी के थे खास कर जो रिश्वत

से इंडियन आर्मी बरी थी, आज भी वह इंडियन आर्मी रिश्वत से बिल्कुल बरी है। बाहिर है कि तमाम इंसान फरिश्ते नहीं होते हैं, कोई न कोई कमजोरी इंसान में होती ही है, लेकिन इस बात का मुझे पक्का यकीन है कि जहां कहीं हमारे सीनियर अफसरों को पता लगे कि फलां अफसर ने बेईमानी की है, रिश्वत सितानी की है, उस के खिलाफ़ जबर्दस्त से जबर्दस्त फौजी डिसिप्लिनरी ऐक्शन (disciplinary action) लिया जायेगा।

इन अल्फाज के साथ, डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं आप का तहे दिल से शुक्रिया अदा करना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे यहां पर बोलने की इजाज़त दी। जय हिन्द।

(English translation of the above speech).

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: (Meerut Dist.—North East): Sir, I seek your permission to speak in Hindi on this occasion. I have been attentively listening to the speeches from the Congress as well as the opposition benches on the Defence budget from the morning. I know it well and believe it too that there is no person in this House, whether he be on the Congress benches or on the opposition benches, who is against the defence or the welfare and wellbeing of the country. So whatever the opposition has said against the Congress, I do not take it in any bad light. Instead of coming over to the subject of Defence I would like to express my ideas on a few issues that have been raised here. One of my sisters in the House has charged the Government with maintaining the Indian Army on heavy expenditure for using it against the Soviet Union. I would like to tell her that India has chosen a way for herself, for her prosperity, for her defence, and for her future; and she would follow that very path with determination. If the forces of the Soviet Union violate our freedom anywhere we would certainly fight them. They should know it for certain.

Some hon. Members have said that the Indian army is being prepared and equipped along with the

[Shri Shah Nawaz Khan]

other commonwealth forces. By saying so they mean that the Indian Army is being transformed into a part of the Anglo-American war machine. In reply to that I would like to tell them that had we liked that India should remain within the Anglo-American bloc, we would not have paid so dearly for her independence. India has chosen an independent path for herself and she is prepared to sacrifice everything in following that path.

Different viewpoints have been put forth in the House during the Budget discussions. It has been said that any war on India would be a war which would be fought with the most up-to-date and modern weapons. There would be air attacks and also parachute landings. A picture of this sort was put before us. It is contended that to resist such attacks India requires a big Air Force, a huge Navy and a large Army. There is no doubt that India is a vast country with a very long coastal line and she requires a big navy equipped with aircraft carriers, sub-marines and also with the latest types of battle-ships to defend herself. In the same way we require a big Air Force as well and also a large army which should be equipped with the latest types of aircraft, and the latest types of tanks and other weapons. We require an army of that kind. But along with this we have to think that while we put these requirements of India before ourselves we cannot ignore her financial position. These things are no doubt essential and some day or the other India will have to make a provision for a large Navy, a big Air Force and an Army of the best type. We will have to do all these things. And my idea is that just as the Government have made a Five Year Plan for the development of Agriculture and Industry or in other words for the overall development of the country, similarly in view of the future stability of the country they will have to make a plan for the development of our Army, Navy and Air Force. I would appeal to the House that just as we have a Five Year Plan which takes us step by step towards progress, similarly we should have some sort of plan or scheme for the development of our defence forces.

During the British regime very few Indians used to take interest in the defence of the country, because it was mostly the concern and

responsibility of the Britishers at that time. For that reason the nationalists in India too did not take any interest in this subject. I have reliably learnt that when India became independent and the reins of administration were handed over to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Lord Mountbatten is reported to have told him that the best thing that Britain was handing over to India was the Indian Army. He was justified in saying so, and there was no doubt that when the Britishers were leaving this land they were leaving behind them the most efficient and organised defence services for India. I am happy to see that these forces are as efficient today even as they were at that time. They have maintained their standard of efficiency and discipline up till now and I hope they will go on raising this standard. Who is there in India who does not know that when the partition of the country took place, the enemies of India not only thought that this country would be involved in communal disturbances but they also tried to stir them up. The interested parties and the reactionary elements tried that there should be communal disturbances on a wide scale following the partition of the country. They expected that the fire of communalism would spread throughout the length and breadth of India and would ultimately consume it. But at that time our army came forward and notwithstanding the very difficult situation prevailing at that time it restored peace in the country and saved our freedom. For that Sir, our army certainly deserves our congratulations.

Again, the communal disturbances had not yet come to an end, when Pakistan attacked Kashmir. What part our army played in Kashmir need not be told here as everybody knows it. From the defence point of view our army has certainly done many great deeds. But I am not drawing your attention to its military achievements but to something else. While, on the one hand, our army has done many great deeds there, on the other hand many a thing has been said Kashmir in this House. Some hon. Members from the opposite benches have made a number of personal attacks on Sheikh Abdullah. Sir, I seek your permission to digress a bit from the problem of Defence to that of Kashmir, and would like to put forth my ideas on that subject. To gentlemen who say that we have spent so much money

on Kashmir and have received nothing from that State. I would like to say that they talk in a manner as if Kashmir is something that can be purchased. I would like to inform those friends that at the time the Pakistan army attacked that State, Indian troops had not yet reached there. Before the Indian Army reached that place, Sher-e-Kashmir Abdullah rose to the occasion and mustered the nationalist forces in the State. They shed their blood and, at that very moment, declared the accession of the State to India. I would like to make it clear that the National Conference was with Sheikh Abdullah in his decision to accede to India. He decided to accede to India not under any duress, nor after seeing the military strength of India, but he decided to join India on the basis of common ideology i.e. the Gandhian ideology. I would like to tell my hon. friends sitting on the opposite benches who are making much capital out of one single statement of Sheikh Abdullah, that if they really honour the aspirations and wishes of the people of Kashmir they should strengthen that ideology on the basis of which Kashmir has acceded to India. If they would do that, I am sure the ties that bind Kashmir and India together can never snap.

Our forces in Kashmir have really done a magnificent job and, as I submitted, that work has been most remarkable from the military point of view. I was talking here about ideology. Eighty per cent. population of Kashmir is Muslim and when our army reached there, it became a subject of various types of propaganda. There was harassment, but the relations of our army with the people of that place remained fraternal and they earned the confidence of the masses. I would narrate a story which may not be known to many of the Members of the House. Our Army in Kashmir reached a place where there was shortage of food, and where food could not be transported because the road was blocked with snow. On such occasions, the army generally procures food locally and takes it from the residents of that area. But as there was already shortage of food, the army officers refused to procure food from the local population. Not only that but they reduced their rations to half the quantity and directed the soldiers not to take any food from the local population no matter if all of them remained hungry. That is how our

Army worked in Kashmir. Besides that, our Army did a splendid work and served people in Assam where floods had created havoc. In Rayalseema as well which is in the grips of famine these days, our army has done a splendid work as has been testified here by other gentlemen also. But our army did something more than all these things, the importance of which perhaps very few persons realize.

You might be remembering that about one and a half years ago we had received information that Pakistan was preparing to march towards Kashmir notwithstanding peace negotiations that were going between the two countries at that time. This information was true and factual. It is a fact that one and a half years ago Pakistan made preparations to re-attack Kashmir and began to move in that direction. To meet this threat of fresh aggression the Indian Army did not march towards Kashmir but towards the Wagah border. And from the defence point of view, I say that it was one of the most splendid strategic moves that we have ever witnessed in the world history. Had our army moved towards Kashmir and not towards Wagah, there would have been war and bloodshed. But our forces moved towards Wagah and won the battle of Kashmir without shedding even a drop of blood. For this too all of us take pride in our Army and in its discipline and efficiency. And whenever we have to talk anything about our defence services, we should not forget those circumstances as well under which our country became free and under which our defence forces came under the control of our National Government. It is known to everybody that when the Britishers occupied this country and raised troops, they did so with a particular point of view. Whenever they took up the work of recruitment to the army, they did so not merely for the defence purposes and for the well-being of India, but they organised it for the prosperity of the British Empire and for the expansion and development of the British Imperialism. It is evident that an army which was basically organised for the maintenance of the imperialist order, could with much difficulty play the role of a national army of a national Government. The Britishers recruited soldiers to the army from such areas where people were quite illiterate, where there was no social or political awakening. They re-

[Shri Shahnawaz Khan]

cruited persons of that type to the army and always kept them aloof from the national movements. It remained their constant endeavour to keep the army aloof from the Indian National movements. The formation of that army too took place with that very design. It is evident that it was a mercenary army. Sir, I have been a member of the British Indian Army and I know that it was completely a mercenary army. It used to fight for the sake of rewards and salary. But since our country became independent its role has completely changed; it has no longer remained an imperialistic army but is a national army now. And as I said our Army has done splendid work even under the changed conditions. If a mercenary army is transformed into a National Army, it is no doubt a major change and our army is doing its best to adapt itself to that change. But I must say it here that to effect such a change, one's mentality has got to be changed. I, who was formerly a member of the mercenary army, have the good fortune of being a member of the National Army of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose; and I have seen with my own eyes what a great difference there is between a mercenary army and a National Army, what a lot of difference there is between their respective approaches to every problem and what a lot of difference there is in their mentalities. I have seen this thing with my own eyes in the battle-fields of Singapur and Malaya. When we were in the British Army the number of British troops in Malaya was running into lakhs. There was a cannon hidden almost behind every bush and they had no scarcity of arms and ammunition too. But notwithstanding that, that formidable army gave way before the Japanese. Our soldiers used to ask us the purpose for which they were fighting and dying. The result was that whenever any danger arose our Indian, British or Gurkha soldiers used to take to their heels taking their rifles with them; but when those very soldiers, freed from the British control, organized themselves into the National Army of Netaji and when we, without any resources, cannons or tanks, marched ahead to fight one of the most organised and efficient armies in the world, we realized what a difference it had made. Sir, time is very short and I would not be able to speak more but I would like to put before you an incident by which you

would come to know that when a mercenary army is changed into a national army, what a difference it makes. Popa is a place in Burma. There, we the soldiers of the Azad Hind Army were fighting the British. A bomb hit one of our soldiers and smashed his leg. Blood began to flow out. That soldier was brought to the army headquarters so that his wounds might be dressed. When I went to see his condition I found that he was sinking fast and could not live for more than a few minutes. I directed the soldiers to bandage his wounds at once. But the wounded soldier intervening said 'Do not bandage my wounds; this blood is flowing for the redemption of mother India; let it flow freely'.

This is the difference between a national army and a mercenary army. This House knows fully well that at that time the Japanese army was fighting against a formidable opponent, it was short of war materials, weapons and other things. But what did they do? When a number of big battleships went into action against them, they had nothing to fight them with. Their youngmen, the volunteers of the 'Kamakoje' Squads or, in other words, the Suicide Squads struck against the big battleships of the enemy such as the *Prince of Wales* with the help of their aeroplanes, and sank them. Once I asked some Japanese friends how they, while being in a small number, fought such a formidable army. I asked them what was the secret of their success. I also asked them wherefrom they got that spirit of self-sacrifice and desperate fighting. You would be surprised to hear that they told me that their 'Kama Koje' spirit, the spirit of ruthless self-sacrifice, was nothing but an inspiration from the spirit of self-sacrifice shown by the Rajputs of India.

Sir, I have not got sufficient time to narrate all these things here, so I drop it here. But I would submit that the mercenary army which the Britishers left here, should be infused with a spirit that dominated the Indian National Army of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, or with the spirit of chivalry that was inherent in the Rajput blood. Let that spirit of chivalry inspire and rejuvenate our soldiers.

Sir, you would excuse me when I express my regret over the fact that the army whose traditions were cent. per cent. national and which

sacrificed everything for the sake of the country, has not been properly amalgamated with the Indian Army and has not been given a chance to serve the country. I, for the first time in this House, would like to assert as a soldier of Netaji that it was our right to join the Indian National Army. It was our right that we the men and officers of the Azad Hind Army should have been given a fair opportunity to serve the country.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Is there no time limit, Sir?

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: May I have two minutes more, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If necessary, I will prolong the time.

Shri Nambiar: The same privilege should be given to us also.

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: I would like to submit one thing more. Defence of India is a vital thing. I have many schemes and proposals in mind with regard to this problem, but I have not the time to submit them here. One thing that I want to say in particular is that the defence of India could not be said to be complete so long as there are foreign possessions existing on the sacred land of India. Today we find that Goa is a Portuguese base in our country. Similarly there are many other foreign possessions as well, which are like pimples on the fair face of our country. So long as we do not liquidate them, the defence of our country cannot be said to be complete. I have a suggestion of my own in this connection and I would submit it here. I know our country wants to have cordial relations with all the other countries. We extend our hand of friendship to all the countries; and while our Government are pursuing their diplomatic negotiations with the French and the Portuguese authorities in this connection, which I also support, I most humbly beg to submit that we should fix up a time-limit, say a year or so, to solve these problems amicably with the concerned countries. But if they do not remove their bases voluntarily, we should order our armies to march in and occupy those areas. If our relations with Britain could be cordial notwithstanding the fact that we made them quit this sub-continent, I see no reason why we cannot have friendly relations with the other countries even after we liquidate their possessions in India.

There has been some talk about the army scandals several times in

the House. There may be some scandals. But having been an army officer myself I know that there are several things of which many of my friends do not know anything. If there is any institutions of which we are proud for its being free from the curse of bribery or scandals it is the Indian Army. I know even today, when there is so much dearth of senior officers, of colonels and generals in the Indian Army, there have been instances when high officers have been dismissed for acting against the discipline of the Indian Army or against whom it was alleged that they indulged in bribery or did anything which was in contravention of the army rules. I am sure that the Indian Army has maintained its high traditions and that it is completely free from evils of bribery etc., as it has always been. But one thing is certain that all persons are not angels. There is one weakness or the other in every person, but I am quite sure that in any case where any one of our senior officers comes to know that such and such officer has not been honest or has indulged in bribery, strict disciplinary action is taken against him.

With these words Sir, I most heartily thank you for having given me this opportunity of speaking here. Jai Hind.

Shri G. S. Singh (Bharatpur-Sawai Madhopur): If story-telling earns one extra time I too can tell stories about the very same front that my friend fought on. I was a fighter pilot in the war. However, we are here to discuss the defence expenditure and not to listen to war experiences.

An Hon. Member: But whom were you fighting for?

Shri G. S. Singh: I was fighting with the rest of the Indian Army who did not join the Indian National Army. I was fighting with that army which is today present in this country. I was fighting with those Generals who today are commanding our Indian Army. I was fighting with those men who remained prisoners of war. (*Interruptions*). I was fighting against Fascism, Nazism and totalitarianism. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members will kindly hear what he has to say.

Shri G. S. Singh: To discuss the defence expenditure, we must decide who can possibly be our potential enemy, who can be our potential aggressor. We must realise that for us to enter into a conflict with any of

[Shri G. S. Singh]

the major powers is impossible. We have no territorial aims, but we are determined to resist aggression in any or all its forms. We have realised—I think the Government do realise—who is the potential aggressor, and we must base our defence expenditure and the reorganisation of our forces on that realisation. I do not wish to cut one pie from the defence expenditure. But what I wish to say is that it is unbalanced expenditure. I find that the navy and the air force are being treated as step-children of the Defence Ministry. In the United Kingdom, on which our army is patterned, we find that the navy and the air force take 60 per cent. of the total defence expenditure, whereas here we allot 5½ per cent. to the navy and 11 per cent. to the air force. As has been pointed out, we have a large land frontier and an even larger sea coast. We must give up the concept of keeping large numbers of land forces maintaining a thin, olive-green line along our frontier. We must develop our air force and our navy. We must be able to transport troops quickly from one place to another. And to do this we must have adequate transport aircraft. We must have modern aircraft. In India today a great many people see an aeroplane, and they think it is a modern aeroplane, because it is flying. But I can assure you that to a great extent our air force is equipped with obsolete aircraft. We must change this. We must get modern aircraft which will not be shot out of the sky inside of two minutes. We must have strategic landing places built all along our frontier. We must station our troops so that they can be moved quickly in transports from one spot to another in the event of an emergency. We must strengthen our tactical air force so that we can, should need arise, make it impossible for any aggressive action to take place by making it ineffective at its source. We must be able to immobilise the enemy before he strikes us.

We have heard now and again mention of aircraft carriers. Everybody, I think, will agree with me that it is essential that we should have some aircraft carriers. If hon. Members look at the map of the world, they will see that India geographically is in such a strategic place that the vast oceans to the south, to the west and to the east of us must be covered by air reconnaissance, and this is impossible by land-based aircraft. However, one point must be brought out. Should the Government today

take a decision and say "We will have aircraft carriers," it will not be less than ten years before we have sufficient trained Indian personnel to man them. Therefore, I urgently request the Government to take that decision now, so that in ten years from now we will have sufficient trained personnel to man our aircraft carriers. (*Interruption*): Where is the money to come from? There is the Five-Year Plan. In ten years there will be a Ten-Year Plan. And with any luck we hope that we will be in a position to acquire these essential parts of our Defence Services.

The air force is an absolutely essential service not only in its defensive capacity but in its striking power, and we must have a striking force to be able to play a defensive role. I can compare the defence organisation of this country to a human being who has teeth to bite with and fists to hit with. If this defence expenditure is not allotted properly and the organisational and ancillary services get too much allotment, you will find the same thing happening as in the case of the human body: the body will be corpulent; the teeth will drop out; the fists will not be able to hit; and you will be too fat to run. We must make it absolutely essential that our striking power and our hitting power is maintained at the most perfect level of health.

We have had suggestions from my hon. friends on the right that our armed forces should be reduced. I tell you that if we reduced our armed forces, my hon. friends on the right would be the first, to form a labour union of those poor retrenched soldiers (*Interruption*) and they will be the first to bewail their fate. We have already heard an eloquent speech from the other side bewailing the fate of the Indian National Army and the Azad Hind Force. Tomorrow, if we reduce our army, we will have more eloquence from here bewailing the fate of our soldiers.

We have heard a great deal about British advisers and British officers in our army. I would like to point out that our national army since Independence is a very young army, and—it may have been the fault of the British—we have not got a sufficient number of senior officers to be able to take over such a vast organisation. Our senior officers who are now doing the jobs of Generals, Major-Generals and Lieutenant-Generals should, in the normal course of events, had not Independence

come, have retired as Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels by now. It is essential in a vast organisation like our army, in modern warfare where warfare itself is an art, that we must have expert advice. We send people to America to learn to be doctors. We bring technicians to build our dams. Why should we not then send people to America or the United Kingdom—anywhere where they can learn the art of warfare? And why should we not have experts to advise us? When we have learnt these lessons, I am quite certain that we will do without these officers. But until then we must have them.

There have been unfortunate references by name to various advisers. I thought you had given a ruling that no person who is unable to defend himself in this House should be mentioned by name. These advisers, some of whom I know personally and about some of whom I have read a great deal, are experts in their line. They are not here for their pay. They are army people of independent means who are doing a service to this country, who have served India for 35 years, and who are continuing to do so.

One last point I wish to bring to the notice of the Defence Minister is this. It is essential for us to increase the production of our armaments. We must increase the production of our armaments and not rely on imports from outside. We have had great things said about our independent foreign policy. But until such time as we are self-sufficient in our own armament industry, we cannot follow any independent foreign policy. We have a few factories. We have the Hindustan Aircraft Factory, which spend most of its time, in my opinion, turning first class carriages into upper class carriages, and vice versa. We must develop our steel industries. We must make tanks and aircraft of our own. We must have these industries.

We have heard a lot of criticism of the army, and we have heard a lot of praise. But nobody has said "Thank you" to our army. This is the fate of the people of India, and I, on behalf of one-five-hundredth part of India, say "Thank you" to our armed forces.

Dr. Ebenezer (Vikarabad): While everybody talked on the detailed and material side of the programme of the defence expenditure, I wish to tell you something relating to the moral side of the question. Since the beginning of this session

we have been watching the discussions, and I regret to say that the Opposition party, especially the Communists, have taken to a non-constructive method of approach to the problems and their discussions. Their only aim, as I understand it, is to criticise any proposal that is put forward by the Congress party, whether right or wrong. We all know that life begins for some people at school, for some in work and for some when they get married: for some it begins when they begin their career in Parliament. But unfortunately by mistake if we take the wrong path then we are off the track. I say the Communist party or the Opposition Benches have taken the wrong path. It looks as if they make it a point to criticise everything whether right or wrong. They went on criticising our Prime Minister and the Government in a spirit of pouring out venom. Naturally, they were associated with underground environment and when they came out they have brought with them this venom which they acquired there. It takes some time for them to adjust themselves to human society. Knowing the international situation they criticised our defence and external policies. By all means they can criticise but it is a convention of the human society that criticism should be of a constructive type. The great problems of the world today are political, economic and social, but at their roots they are moral problems. The people of the world are not guided by any moral principles. The best contribution to the future of civilisation is a change of heart. We must believe that there is a dynamic force guiding every moral agent. It does not deal with policies but with persons. The unique contribution of our Prime Minister is that he demonstrated in the many countries he had visited how this "change of heart" can come.

An Hon. Member: Does it relate to defence?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Directly relates to defence. (Interruption). Oh, yes, it relates to *Ram Rajya* also.

Dr. Ebenezer: Someone from the Opposition, criticising the defence policy of the Prime Minister, said the other day that he has lost his place in history. On the other hand, we should think that the man who uttered those words has lost his place in human society and has gained his place in the underground world. The underlying strength of any country is the moral fibre of her citizens and the world can-

[Dr. Ebenezer]

not fail to lessen the dangers of armed conflict when the very morality of the people is shaken. Therefore it is impossible for peace to be established with such a state of affairs existing. Chaos, as you know, is the stoutest opponent of peace. Jealousy and hatred are on the increase rapidly. Fear of war and threat of war grappled the hearts of people of different countries. People are not guided by any moral principles. Under these circumstances our Prime Minister has taken a right step—a step for peace. This world-renowned-man, care-free, hate-free and, if I am not mistaken, God-inspired, is trying to bring a new life to a troubled world.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It seems to be a speech on External Affairs.

Dr. Ebenezer: His policy of Defence and External Affairs inter-linked with each other is commendable and worthy to be copied by other nations. The Prime Minister has said that we are friends of every country and we have no enemy. It is remarkable. And he has not aligned himself with any power bloc nor has he associated himself with any pact. This is a courageous act and it is unchallenged. The Opposition has asked several times to cut down the defence expenditure. In fact, our country has not increased the defence expenditure on the war path. We are only on the defensive. We should necessarily build up our defence out of nothing and it takes some time for our defence to come up to the mark for any eventuality or for any external aggression. Our Prime Minister has said that we shall not attack anybody but if we are attacked we are ready to meet any eventuality either from within or from without.

Men's passions and hatred are quick, jealousy and hatred are still aboard in the hearts of men. So, these twin incendiaries may start conflagration at any moment. When they do start, they will wipe away the entire civilisation. This is the international situation now: fear of the past, fear in the present and fear in the future, and fear of war. Millions of men and women are in the grip of fear. All the nations are in the grip of fear. Hatred grows amidst fear. It is fear that demands security and security in modern days means increase of armaments. Hate bred of fear lets violence loose. We think that by law and pacts we can break the vicious circle. We think in vain. Our Prime Minister has kept our country away from these

pacts and blocs. We are thankful to him for his undaunted courage. I submit that the international situation and our defence must be studied with special reference to fear which grips all the countries: I mean the fear of war, the fear of being attacked, the fear of lack of security. In a condition of fear, the reasoning power of human beings fails to operate normally as it does in Members of the Opposition. Senseless things are done by the Governments of various countries and the result is chaos.

I shall give you an example. There were two neighbours, A and B. One day A was walking in his garden and he noticed that B looked down into his garden from the top of the window next door. "This will never do", said A. In mortification A thought that his private garden was no longer private. So he raised the height of the wall around his house by several feet. "Hullo!" said B, "what is A doing that for? Of all the unfriendly acts I have known, this is the worst. Building up that wall is simply an insult to me, and is obviously aimed at me." So, he set to work and built another storey on the top of his house in order to be able to look over A's wall. "What is this?" asked A, and promptly built his wall several feet still higher. "Another insult", thought B and he raised another storey. So they went on doing this, A raising his wall and B putting up more and more storeys, but all the time A was not really afraid of B looking into his private garden! They went on getting more and more angry and the wall and the storeys grew higher and higher till finally both collapsed in ruins. So, with security! Mankind has really passed the stage of development. To ensure security, armaments are increased, but that at once raises fear and apprehension in the minds of the neighbours who see that their security is threatened and in turn increase their armaments. Though our leader has warned us against any fear of this type, yet I believe that we should have a peacetime line of defence in view of the present international situation—I mean, not on the war path, but in the normal way. But even this the Opposition Members want to reduce. If they have the interests of the country at heart, they would never ask for a reduction in defence expenditure. On the one hand, they ask for a reduction in defence expenditure and on the other, they want people to be militarily trained. I can see

their state of mind. It can be put down to an attitude of mental aberration. Confused state of mind indeed! I wish that defence expenditure could be slightly increased and quickly, and the morale of armed forces maintained.

A small digression. In Parliament many orators and politicians speak. I wish they had an electrical device fitted over their heads—something like the headphone, with three lights resembling the traffic signal lights. This electrical device may be similar to the blood pressure instrument which the doctors use or the cardiogram which records heartbeats of the patients. Then, assuming that the colours of the Opposition Members indicate their emotions in control of their hearts, we would get signals like the following: If it were hatred it would be indicated by the red light; jealousy by green; and if fear be the controlling factor, out would flash the yellow light. What a sight that would be, just imagine! Similarly, when we speak with our lips, if our thoughts and emotions are put on the screen, so that the whole world can see, then how uncomfortable we will be.

Shri B. C. Das (Ganjam South): Is the hon. Member a fiction writer?

Dr. Ebenezer: We cannot think of any reduction in our defence expenditure. We are in the infancy of building up of our defence. Our navy, air force and army should be at a normal level, a level at which we can meet external aggression or any grave emergency. I am unable to understand the viewpoint of the Opposition. When they speak like this I am led to believe that their minds and hearts are somewhere else, while their bodies are on the Indian soil, and most probably, their spirit is underground.

In order to make our defence more effective, our industrial policy should be on a par with that of other countries. Our industries must produce more in order to meet the demands of our armed forces and if our economic condition is not bettered at a rapid pace, it will hinder the progress of our defence programme. Economic conditions are inter-linked with defence. China was able to meet its economic deficiency within a short time and by increasing their production they were able to maintain adequate defence. Economic reconstruction is of vital importance to the defence of our country. Under economic reconstruction, I would suggest agrarian reforms.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: From defence he has switched on to agrarian reforms now.

Dr. Ebenezer: One minute, Sir. Land should be given back to the peasants. Production should be increased so that thereby we can increase our wealth, and this will enable us to build up our defence forces adequately.

An Hon. Member: He is always relevant, Sir.

Dr. Ebenezer: On the question of industries, I want to suggest profit-sharing. The profits should not go to the few and the wages to the many if industry is to thrive. That alone will increase our economic stability and which in turn will enable the security of our country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I request the hon. Member to wind up.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Instead of wasting the time of the House like this, he may say something that will contribute to defence.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No hon. Member need say another hon. Member is wasting time.

Dr. Ebenezer: In regard to my hon. friend's suggestion, I would like to request the Opposition Members to give up sabotage, avoid subversive activities, and develop a constructive approach towards the day-to-day problems of the country. We welcome healthy criticism and opposition—of the constructive way to help the smooth working of the Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has exhausted his time. Will he resume his seat?

Dr. Ebenezer: We are thankful to our Leader of the Nation for his new leadership in the matter of foreign policy and Defence and for the master-pattern of peace. We need to go forward this year and the years to come with this master-pattern in home industry, civic and national life and with master-passion to bring in the new era—a new type of personality and new civilisation with economic stability and security of the new freedom of our country—I think everybody wants it.

Shri K. Subrahmanyam (Vizianagram): When I rise to speak on a more or less technical subject like Defence, I am conscious of my limitations as a layman. Added to them, I suffer from a self-imposed restraint, for it is not our policy to cast asper-

[Shri K. Subrahmanyam]

sions on hundreds and thousands of people who have been braving their lives to defend our country from external aggression and internal disruption. I am not a protegee of any of the war camps to suggest that India should hitch her wagon to the star of one power or the other and that our fighting forces should be built on the model of some foreign army, navy and air force.

Today no realistic discussion of the budget is possible without a thorough consideration of the expenditure on Defence, which is now estimated at Rs. 197.94 crores as against Rs. 203.3 crores to be spent on civil heads. Moreover, Defence expenditure is met both from Revenue and Capital budgets, which adds to its importance.

Shri Namdhari (Fazilka-Sirsa): Sir, on a point of order. Is the hon. Member reading his speech?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Some hon. Members in their expression appear to be reading. They are only referring now and then to their notes.

Shri Namdhari: The Opposition Members are mostly from the rice-eating area, and their tongue slips fast!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may go on.

Shri K. Subrahmanyam: In a way, I am sorry to say it has become a vicious circle. At the outset a large amount of Defence expenditure can be saved if the Kashmir issue is decided. It must now be clear to the Government that a decision on merits is impossible to expect from the United Nations; especially now, with the entry of Russia into the arena, it has become a pawn in the Big Power cold war and has ceased to be an Indo-Pak dispute. They want both India and Pakistan to bleed to submission. How long can we afford to spend such large sums? It is time the issue is withdrawn from the United Nations and efforts made for direct negotiations with the people of Pakistan over the heads of their rulers. That will anyhow be a quicker solution than a plebiscite under U.N. auspices. For patriotic and other reasons it is held objectionable to demand a reduction in Defence expenditure. Without a cut in Defence expenditure the nation-building activities which are being starved today cannot have a share of the taxpayers' money. It is thus a vicious circle. It must be cut at

some point or other, at some time or other.

The Defence organisation has again, two aspects: one flowing from the country's foreign policy and another from domestic policy. At home, if the people are contented, if they have enough food, clothing, housing and other necessities of life, a Government can take them into confidence, they can be trained in the national defence, and there will be no need to have a large standing army to defend the country from the people, as it was during the British regime and to an extent as it is today also. This is what is called an armed people or nation on their arms, to be pressed into service at the time of need.

12 Noon

Externally, if we have no aims or others, if we are not involved in Big Power rivalries, and if we have friendly relations and security pacts with our neighbours, there will be no need to live in constant fear of attack from outside and keep a large army mobilised for action. It is commonsense that India cannot expect itself to be respected in international councils by virtue of its armed strength. Firstly, we do not have the necessary industrial potential to make our armed strength felt. Secondly, a poor country like ours cannot afford to join the mad armament race that is going on in the world. Theoretically, our foreign policy is sound inasmuch as it refuses to partake in the Big Power rivalries and join the armament race; but in reality such a foreign policy is not being implemented by India, by our Prime Minister. We have reduced neutrality to a game of joining with one bloc at one time and with another at another time. For instance, if another war breaks out tomorrow, can India expect to keep out of it and still receive American aid for the development of our Five Year Plan? I do not think. Similarly, there was nothing wrong in sponsoring China's case for a seat in the United Nations, but to have linked it with the war in Korea amounted to a championship of Russian power political game. From the positive point of view also, India has failed to develop a third force of free and neutral nations like Yugoslavia and Burma which would have been a real bulwark against another world conflagration. Had there been such an active third force today the world tension would have

eased a lot and we could have reduced our standing army without any fear. Secondly, from the practical point of view, in the event of an attack by a highly mechanized army, like the Russian Red Army or the American Army for the matter of that—whatever it may be—our fighting forces with all their valour and patriotism will not be able to withstand for long. Only the people will have to be roused into a patriotic war of national defence, and as Mahadeva Desai once aptly put it, "Spirit can often be weighed against planes", but how much more helpful and useful it would be if our people had been trained in national defence?

Coming to the organisation of the fighting forces, it is very painful to note that the old structure of the British days remains unchanged. It may be that the leadership of the fighting forces has been decentralized to an extent with a Commander-in-Chief each for the army, navy and air force and with the Defence Minister at the top of them all. But it is a small change. Essentially the gulf that divides the fighting forces from the common people is still there, unbridged. The disparity between the officers and men of the fighting forces is still so great that while an officer draws a salary ranging from Rs. 350 in the first year of service to Rs. 3,000 for a General, in addition to numerous allowances running to large amounts, the ranks have as low a salary as Rs. 25 and Rs. 30 plus some meagre allowances. Then we are told that there are special grades of salaries and allowances for British officers volunteering for the Indian Army. If they are volunteering for service in the Indian Army, why should special allowances be given to them? They can as well have the terms of service obtaining for all. If they are indispensable, it is of course a different matter.

Shri Lokenath Mishra (Puri): What does the Russian General get?

An Hon. Member: It is not written in the paper.

Shri K. Subrahmanyam: With regard to the Defence Services establishments, the discontent prevailing among the workers in the Armament Depots all over the country is too well known. If my memory does not fail me, there was some time ago a token strike at the Ordnance Factory at Kirkee. Because the Trade Union movement among these personnel is guided by patriotic considerations

and is free of disruptionist tactics, the Defence Ministry is taking undue advantage of it. There is even a statement in one of their publications that the labour situation is satisfactory. Such a wooden attitude is not likely to enthuse the workers to put their heart and soul into the work.

One of the ways of cutting down the expenditure on a standing army and at the same time bringing the army closer to the people is to employ increasingly the fighting forces in national reconstruction tasks. We have now tried it in Rayalaseema under extraordinary conditions. It should be extended to normal times also. There is a large area of fallow land to be reclaimed.

Shri Namdhari: Is the hon. Member reading a speech on behalf of Mr. Gopalan, or what is he doing?

Shri K. Subrahmanyam: The army can be profitably employed for it. It will then bring the military man as a son of the soil into close association with the peasantry and thus revolutionize his outlook towards people's problems.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. A number of new Members have come. Possibly this is the maiden speech of the hon. Member. He has done quite well. If he only speaks a little slowly, that will be understood to be a real speech and I am sure he will do so next time. Hon. Members will kindly hear it with patience. Speakers do not become so overnight. Let him have an opportunity.

An Hon. Member: Let him read slowly.

Shri K. Subrahmanyam: Above all the fighting forces will be put to productive use during periods when they are not on active service. Similarly small scale industries could be attached to military units. The forces could help in the implementation of the Five Year Plan by partaking such constructive activities as reclaiming waste lands, checking soil erosion, building roads, digging tanks, canals and reservoirs, sinking surface and tube wells and counteracting the menace of wild animals to standing crops. In short the men in uniform will be one with the villagers in their toil and struggle. How much we would have gained in man-hours spent on national reconstruction work need hardly be stressed here.

[Shri K. Subrahmanyam]

Further such constructive activities will have to be included in the military curriculum itself. In China during the days of the Long March—I do not know what the position is now with so much Russian dictation from above—the Red Army used to earn its living by work in the villages.

The territorial army which is still a token force in the country will have to draw from all walks of life and from the workers in the fields and factories as well. There will be greater enthusiasm for this force if the present habit of employing these men and women for unpleasant tasks such as breaking a strike or putting down a popular demonstration is given up. It must be a live wire defence organization with no political colour attached to it. It must not be used by the vested interests to put down toilers' struggles. In Bombay for instance, at the time of the Textile strike in 1950, these men were employed as a punitive force to drive the workers to the factories which is a very reprehensible act.

Then there are the scandals galore which are sickening to the core. The argument that the money advanced for anti-tank grenades will be recovered is fallacious. If circumstances in Kashmir had been different and if need had been felt then in the war there, what would have happened? India would have been at a disadvantage. And I understand that an officer of the Defence Ministry has been dismissed for bringing the jeep scandal to light. Is this meant to strike terror into the hearts of employees and to see that such scandals are hushed up there and then?

Before I conclude, I once again stress that we must have a highly mobile but small standing army which should be the army of the people backed by an entire nation under arms.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserve—Sch. Tribes): I thank you for enabling me to repeat my admiration, un-qualified admiration for the defence services. During the debate on the Presidential Address, I drew the attention of the House to the President's reference to the magnificent work the army had done in Rayalaseema. It is unfortunate that references here in this House have been made to personnel who are not in a position to defend themselves

or whom the Minister himself dare not defend. A certain amount—much too much—of personal propaganda has been made by one Member at least about himself which is, I think, very unfortunate. I think that kind of personal propaganda might well be done outside and not on the floor of this House, because the army has its own reasons and the Nehru Government also has its own reasons for having done this or that in regard to the I.N.A. personnel. The attitude of the Congress Government also is very well known. I have to say this only by way of contrast because there is the other side which is very heartening. Most of the speeches have shown a conversion of mind and a new approach to the problems of the country *vis-à-vis* the army. Generally, the people have been very very critical of our defence services, but during this session, I find a welcome change. Instances of hostility and bitter criticism have been very rare and I hope this will continue.

In appreciating the defence services we have to look at the various vestiges of our army. The army is not merely a fighting unit. It is also, in its own way, in its own pattern of life and existence, a nation-building body. I wish hon. Members of this House could have taken the trouble to visit the National Defence Academy, only a few days ago, when there has a passing-out parade. I would ask them to take a little bit of trouble and visit the National Defence Academy to see how our officers are trained, what kind of education is imparted there and what type of first class men the army is producing. All this is an asset to our nation. That is an aspect which is not always appreciated. The army is doing more than an army job and whenever a civilian administration is in a tight corner, as I said previously, it is the army that has to come to the rescue of the civilian Government. Therefore in making an appraisal of the sums of money spent on our defence services, we should not be scared by the astronomical figures of other countries. One hon. Member has already quoted figures running into millions and billions. I say we could also make them into billions. Instead of saying Rs. 197.9 crores, we could say 32 thousand million annas. If you multiply that figure by 12 it will become an astronomical figure in pies.

The question is: Are we getting proper dividend out of the money that we are spending? My contention is that we are getting more than the dividend that we deserve, in the prevailing circumstances of this country. It is the army that has kept the country intact. To quote my hon. friend the Finance Minister it is the edifice of our prosperity. If it is not the edifice, certainly the edifice of prosperity in this country is founded on our strong army which is one of the finest bequests of the previous regime.

Much has been said about the officers being overpaid. I do not know whether people know what they are talking about. Are you going to look at the officers in the context of other people of the same rank or are you thinking of them as *Jawans*? There was one instance quoted and it was said that the *Jawan* got only Rs. 25. The fair lady forgot to mention that Rs. 25 meant everything else found and that gives a different picture. Not for one moment am I suggesting that the *Jawan* is over-paid. He is not. I have already said on the floor of this House and I hope now that we have Mr. Gopaldaswami Ayyangar as the Defence Minister, certain of the proposals of the Reorganisation Committee, of which he was a member, will be put into effect and the army will have less cause for grouse. It is an open secret that the army officers are not too happy about their financial circumstances. I would request hon. Members of Parliament to visit some of these officers in their homes, see them in their domestic circumstances before they criticize whether they are overpaid or grossly underpaid. Do you want them to look like officers or do you want them to look like coolies? Please make up your mind. Do you want them to lead men? If you want a particular type of work to be done, will you not give the person the wherewithal to enable him to do that work?

I am fully in sympathy with the defence services, but at the same time there are certain criticisms which I am bound to make. Only a few of them I can make in the short time that is at my disposal. Why is this much-maligned army hailed today as a nationalist army? I would like to ask the Nehru Government to make this army more representative of the nation than it is today. Out of about 8,000 officers, I find nearly half are Punjabee officers—I am not trying to be sectarian and do not make that mistake. I was associated for nearly

three years in the selection of officers for our armed forces. But it seems to me that something must be done so that every section of the Indian community is fairly represented in our defence services. At present, it is not the case. Something will have to be done. Somehow or other, whether we admit it or not, we are still suffering from the victimisation of martial and non-martial classification, this dichotomy that the British had in their regime. It is a well-known fact that given the opportunities, and other things being equal, one person of our society is as good as the other. I hope the armed forces would see to it that, hereafter, in the expansion, in the building up of the armed forces, they try their best to get out of this rut of martial and non-martial idea that unfortunately still prevails today.

I for one would have liked in the Defence Budget a specific provision for defence production and its development. How much longer are you going to depend on foreign supplies? One hon. Member spoke of the secrecy of the armed forces. There is nothing secret, believe me, as far as the armed forces are concerned. When you are purchasing your armaments in foreign markets, how can it be a secret? There should be in the Planning and in the Budget every year some provision for expansion of our defence production. The way we are going about in the Hindustan Aircraft Factory is not one that holds out any promise. We should begin with the manufacture of critical spare parts. We can do that. Another thing that I would suggest is that we should resort to what every other sensible country has resorted to, that is, production under franchise. We are not going to produce a radar instrument or something like that. As New Zealand has done, as Australia has done, as other countries have done, we should resort to buying out the licence of other manufacturers which can easily be done, without involving the country in extraordinary expenditure. Defence production is not properly attended to in the financial planning, and as far as I can see, by the Planning Commission also.

There is this thing also. I think the rate at which we are expanding is very slow. I do not want to go into figures. Take the Indian Air Force. One hon. Member in his admirable speech has already made reference to that. Are we in a position, considering the size of our country, considering the problems that we have next-door, to say that we have an ade-

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

quate number of squadrons? Can the hon. Defence Minister tell me that 15 squadrons are in any way adequate for the present needs, even though the danger of attack or aggression is not so great at the present moment? I think we have to be prepared to spend much more, and be less critical of the Defence Budget, if we really mean the security of the country.

I would like our friends here to go to any Regimental Centre to see with their own eyes what the army does, how it lives. It is not merely a question of being in uniform. They are doing so many other things. Time was when an hon. Minister went mad about growing trees. If you go into the statistics, of *Vanomahotsava*, you will find that the trees that Mr. Munshi planted were washed away in a couple of days whereas the trees planted by the army are up there and bearing fruit. Going into the statistics of the response that we received and we continue to receive whether it is grow-more-food or grow-more-trees or grow-more something, you will find that the army has been responsive to any demand that has been made on it. The army has its own job to do and while I think it must be able to do other things as well when an emergency is there, it should not be rooted firmly away from its own line. Some people say that because there is no threat of war, the army in peace time should be converted into a production army. Up to a point that may be possible. But, the army must always be mobile. Our frontier situation has changed. After the Partition, our frontiers are different. Our cantonments were differently poised previously. After the Partition we have other problems. I would like the hon. Defence Minister to tell us whether he is in a position to meet with the new problems that have been created as a result of the Partition.

Take the question of the Eastern Command for example. The Eastern Command is, at the present moment, based in my province Bihar. There has been partition eastwards. The frontier problems on that side of our country have, in consequence, become different. How long is it going to take the Nehru Government to make up their mind as to whether the headquarters should be in the province of Bihar or in the province of U. P.? The sooner a decision is made, the less extravagant will the expenditure be in regard to the construction of permanent headquarters

for the Eastern Command. We have heard it said that the Government is going to review the position about headquarters of the Eastern Command after five years. The net effect of this is that for the next five years, money will be spent on a temporary basis. Hutments will be put up; barracks will be made on a temporary basis. If the decision is that the headquarters should continue where they are now, well and good. If not, all this money would be a waste.

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): I thought it was Ranchi.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Ranchi is in the province of Bihar. It is the capital of Jharkhand.

Similarly in other areas. I was only giving an instance as to how we must make up our minds quickly. Just as our hon. friend, an ex-fighter pilot, appealed to the Treasury Benches, to make up their mind quickly in regard to aircraft, there must be some quick planning about it. Now-a-days, aircraft gets out of date quickly. Suppose we decide today to buy jet fighters, five years hence, the jet fighters we have chosen are completely out of date by that time. Let us be quick in our decision because our neighbours, everywhere, not only next-door, are stealing a march in regard to this. It is a question of security. I am not thinking of security from the civilian side. Men may cherish different faiths. But the blunt fact is there that we have to fight with the same guns. We cannot be fighting with out-moded equipment. We have to be up-to-date. To be up-to-date, we have to be prepared to spend. Nothing comes to us free; we have to spend a lot. Therefore, I urge that the defence production programme had better be gone into quickly so that this enormous drain—everyone realises it is an enormous drain—may be reduced and we may be more and more self-sufficient every year and thereby not only make our army not dependent on foreign supplies, but an army that can live, in every sense of the word, in regard to its equipment, in regard to its food, in regard to its vitality and in regard to its very existence, in the country and for the country alone.

Shri Altekar (North Satara): Having watched the proceedings in this House from the beginning of this session till now, I am rather thinking in my mind whether it is not more easy

to take a seat in this House by catching the eye of the electorate than to catch the eye of the Speaker and get an opportunity to speak. I have to thank you, Sir, for giving me an opportunity to speak on this occasion.

The first and foremost duty of an independent Government of an independent country is to protect it from attacks within and from attacks without. I mean to suggest that no sacrifice is too great, nor any military expenditure too heavy, to protect the hard-won liberty of our country. And from this point of view, I have to congratulate the finance Minister for making what adequate provision he can for the sake of our defences in the Budget of a poor man's country. I, at the same time, congratulate him for the consummate art of presenting figures in such a way as to minimise the shock that may be felt by persons who take fright at the military expenditure. If we go into some well-known firm, we find the prices of articles fixed as Rs. 9/15 or Rs. 14/10. Well, as a matter of fact, we have to take a ten rupee note or a ten and five for that. So, in our Defence Budget, we find that the Defence estimate is put at Rs. 197.95 crores. Well, it comes to Rs. 198 crores. But, of course, all that provision which has been made there is necessary for the purpose of the defence of our country.

We need not be in any way afraid of being criticised for spending nearly 50 per cent. of our Central income for the purpose of our defence. Many figures have been quoted with respect to the amounts that are spent by foreign countries outside Asia. I will rest content with what is being done by our neighbour, *viz.* Pakistan. In the budget estimate of 1950-51, the total income of that country excluding, of course, the Railway finance, was about Rs. 73 crores and a little more, but the figure put in for the purpose of defence was as high as Rs. 50 crores. In the revised estimate that came afterwards when they got better receipts from elsewhere, they put the defence expenditure at Rs. 60.70 crores. Of course, that worked out to a little more than 51 per cent. but they were prepared to spend so much for the purpose of the defence of their country. For the year 1951-52, their total receipts were estimated at Rs. 113 crores and the defence estimate is put at Rs. 62 crores. That works out at 54½ per cent. When that is the expense that is being made by our neighbour who also is, I may say, in the early days of liberty, we also have to look from our own point of view.

We cannot in any way lend countenance to such tactics as providing arms to some martial tribes on the borders and let them loose on the nearby country. We, of course, can give arms to persons or the residents on the border and ask them or teach them to protect themselves against any sort of infiltration, but we cannot allow them to deteriorate into the position of bandits who ultimately live by robbery or something like that. Once such forces of anarchy are let loose, the necessary corollary is that civilisation is in danger, and it leads to anarchy in the country. Therefore, I have to submit that in order to defend our country, we must have an army that is efficient and at the same time sufficient for the purpose. From that point of view, we have to look into the context of the present situation, the situation which has arisen on account of the partition and the things that are there as a corollary to it.

Owing to this partition, we have lost the natural borders on the western side of our country, that is, the Hindu-kush and Suleman mountains, and we are now faced with a border which is purely a plain of an extent of not less than 800 miles and absolutely no point of vantage wherein we can pitch. We have to guard such a frontier on the west, and at the same time, a situation has arisen on the east where we have got a sort of double frontier—one is on the east of Assam, and the other is on the west of Assam as also on the east of West Bengal. And that, again, is a large border, and for the purpose of that, we have to maintain an army. From that point of view, I submit, we must develop the strength and maintain our army, and keep it efficient so that it will be sufficient for the purpose of the defence of our country.

The thought was suggested, or a suggestion was thrown out that this army has been, as a matter of fact, maintained at such a big expenditure for purposes of meeting the revolutionaries inside. I submit that they are placing too high a premium upon their capacity to create disturbances and trouble in the country. Not even a fourth of the army will be necessary for that purpose. It is not for the purpose of quelling any disturbance or trouble that may arise in the country, but rather to protect any aggression from outside that we have to wield our own defence. Of course, if any disturbances arises in the country, that will be dealt with in the proper manner. The Police

[Shri Altekar]

and the civil administration will take care of that, and should some emergency arise for taking any swift action on their part, the army may be brought in, but that is not the primary and first necessity of the army. Our primary consideration is to protect our country against any emergency that may arise in the context of the present situation in the world. I beg to submit that the expenses that are being met and incurred for this army—for the personnel of the army as also for purposes of equipment that is necessary—are, as a matter of fact, far short of what should have been possible—what this country should have been able to make in that respect.

I submit that when we ought to defend our own country, we should be in a position not to depend upon any one else. History teaches us that in the past the Marathas and other powers at that time were not manufacturing their own up-to-date arms and relying upon the supplies from others, and that was one of the great causes why they failed in the past. That should not in any way be repeated. We should rely on ourselves for the equipment of our army, manufacturing our own arms. If we purchase them from others, it costs a lot, and at the same time, there is the possibility of their letting us down at some time. That should never occur. Furthermore, a great economy would be effected if we build a great factory, and our resources, so far as equipment for our army is concerned, I believe, are not in any way short, and if we take to this manufacture—and the earlier the better—we will thereby make a great saving in the cost of our defence expenditure. There is another great advantage to be had in that respect and that advantage is that our strength, our actual capacity and ability to cope with any situation, will not be made known to any outsider. If we are purchasing from others, they know what our strength is. They know with what we are fighting and going to fight, but if we manufacture all our defence equipment, we will be masters of our own, and at the same time, we will not be revealing any secret to others. From that point of view, and taking into consideration the nations or rather those who supply us with arms and their relations with others, I submit that the earlier we take to manufacture of arms, the better, and in the best interests of our country.

So far as the taking over of the navy and the air force are concerned, we have to take them at an early date. In doing so, a criticism has been made that we are bringing a large number of experts in this country, from outside, both for the purposes of officering the army and also for purposes of scientific research. We are in a state of transition. During the transitional period, for about four or five years, we shall have to take the aid of foreigners. If any one, therefore, criticises that we are relying too much on foreign experts, I submit, that it is not a fair one. Even in Russia, they had to take the aid of foreigners at the beginning, before they could ultimately develop their own factories, and manufacture their own arms and other machinery. The same stage has come in the path of our nation also, which is rising from power to power, after the hard-won liberty. I do not think, therefore that there is any harm if we rely upon foreign aid for the time being.

While we are progressing in this way, we are also being criticized for being required to pay a high salary to the officers. When my hon. sister from the other side quoted certain figures, she quoted only the figures at the extreme, that is, at the entrance stage of the soldier in the army, and at the end of the service of the officer. It is not a fair way of criticism. If a trained soldier enters into the army, his pay in the beginning is Rs. 90 and he can by his own ability rise to the position of a Risaldar-Major or a Subedar-Major when his pay will be from Rs. 250 to Rs. 265.

An Hon. Member: How many persons can become like that?

Shri Altekar: That will depend upon the ability and scope he will have, and I am sure many of them will have it. (*An Hon. Member:* Only one per cent.) In the case of a Second-Lieutenant, his pay is only Rs. 350 at the beginning, but when he becomes a Colonel, it rises to Rs. 1,400 which is again a consolidated amount. Formerly, in 1947 the pay of the Second-Lieutenant was Rs. 490 inclusive of lodging and marriage allowance at the beginning. That amount has since been reduced by the New Code to Rs. 350. This is an instance of economy. When an officer has to lead the army, when he is charged with all the responsibilities of an army, he should get a pay which is consistent with the position which he occupies.

Shri Velayudhan: What is the marriage allowance for a *Jawan*? Only rupee one a month.

Shri Altekar: There has been no marriage allowance, since the year 1947. The highest pay in the army, that is, Rs. 3,000 compares not very favourably with the highest pay in other civil services. If we are going to reduce the pay of high officials, as a measure of economy, the question of reduction of pay on the civil side should come first, and then only on the military side. Our army then will have a certain stimulus and inspiration. It is not in any way less national in spirit than that in any other nation in the world. There are now many among us who were formerly with the British Government, and serving the Britishers; they have changed their ranks and come to fight with us in our national struggle, and to serve our country in the best possible manner. In the same way, our army which was formerly under the British has since come over to our side, with such national spirit which is really an exemplary one. I shall just quote you the instance of Captain Roy who first went to Kashmir to withstand the onslaught of the tribal forces that invaded Kashmir. He went there only with a handful of persons. With courage in his hand he at once rushed to Baramulla where he met with his end. Was he purely a mercenary? Can anyone say that he was a mercenary Captain? He was inspired by the best possible national spirit. In the same way, the officers of our army are all as national, and as patriotic, as any one of us here. The exploits that have been made by our forces in different lines are such as have elicited praise from outside. Outsiders were all wonder-struck at the way in which supplies were carried by our Dakota planes over a height of 24,000 ft. and how with such ordinary planes we were able to render such great service whereas they have their own special planes and apparatus for flying over such a high altitude. While our pilots with such ordinary planes performed such feats, there is not even a word of praise said here by any one on the other side. They have achieved things which have elicited praise from every one of us. We need not say anything against them simply because they were with the British formerly. The spirit of patriotism and nationalism which has inspired the hearts of every one in this country has also inspired the heart of every one in our army, to whichever rank he may belong. I believe that our army

deserves every sort of praise and gratitude from every one in this House and also from the country outside.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. He may kindly conclude his speech.

Shri Altekar: Out of the Rs. 197 crores, about Rs. 77.20 crores is for purposes of pay and allowances, and about Rs. 15.58 crores is for the Non-Effective Services, namely, pensions and gratuities. I believe very little can be made in that by way of economy or retrenchment. But I believe there is every scope for the retrenchment in the purchasing of stores, which is now being done to the extent of about Rs. 80.20 crores. The sum that is paid towards maintenance and construction of works is about Rs. 10.72 crores. If some care is taken in these items while spending, some reductions are possible. If we purchase the stores by inviting tenders, there is scope for economy, and some possible reduction in the expenditure under the head 'purchase of stores', service stores like food, clothings etc.

With an astute Finance Minister, and a man of great ability in our Defence Minister, all of them matter-of-fact statesmen, guided by our great Prime Minister, there is every scope for economy and I hope they will do their very best in the matter. I am sure, considering the very high place which our Prime Minister occupies in the heart of every one in this country, our destiny is safe in his hands.

Shri Keshavaingar (Bangalore North): The only opportunities we have had here to make our voices heard have been the occasions when at the termination of the proceedings you have been pleased to put cut motions to vote. We have then the opportunity to say 'aye' or 'no'. After all I have an opportunity to address this august House for the first time and I crave the indulgence of your goodness and the hon. Members of this House to enable me to say a few words opposing the cut motions moved by the other side.

So far as the question of defence is concerned, the freedom which we have earned at very great cost in such a unique manner has got to be preserved at any cost. We should always be guided by the rule 'first things first' and I am happy and gratified to know that some of my friends on the other side, in spite of the cut motions, have been pleased not to press them and say that they are also for the establishment of

[Shri Keshavaiengar]

national security and safety in the first instance. Personally I feel that even economic stability comes only next and we should not grudge any money that is required for the purpose of establishing national security.

It so happened—perhaps it was a matter of historical accident—that we had been under the clutches of the Britishers for the past several years, and now we have just attained freedom. We have, therefore, to take every precaution possible and provide ourselves with the utmost care and caution to safeguard this well-earned, hard-earned freedom under any circumstances, both from aggression from outside as well as from internal insurrections. In one way I am even thankful to the Communist friends on the opposite side for the troubles that we have had in our country and also for the apprehensions we have had from our neighbours. In fact, in my humble view, that has given us an opportunity to know our own strength and to have confidence and self-reliance in ourselves. That has brought out the very simple fact that our army must always be kept very trim under all circumstances and at all times. The one thing that the army should be engaged in in times of peace is to prepare itself for war. We are not aware at what point of time and where and when things will happen and we may have to face an external aggression. We cannot falter when there is an occasion of that kind. Therefore, I feel that they should always be kept trim and in that way the opportunities that have offered themselves have helped the army to a very great extent.

Something was said by my friend, Mr. Patnaik, regarding the socio-economic function of the army and all that. Not a word was suggested by my friend in a constructive manner as to how our army should engage itself according to his notions, except it be by way of suggesting that it should be done. Our army has had many momentous achievements to their credit. In fact, they have stood by us and by our leaders at the most critical points of time. Where would we have been but for our army in the early days of Partition? Have they not been responsible for the transfer of millions of our countrymen? And can we ever forget the part that the army played in Hyderabad, and in Kashmir in warding off aggression? It is not a question of expressing thanks to our army. I would even

go to the length of saying we should express our gratefulness to the army for the splendid achievements for which they have been responsible in accordance with the traditions that they have already built for themselves while under the British regime.

One lady member on the Opposition mentioned a list of some foreign technical personnel at the head of the army branches. As some of my friends have already replied to that point, I would also join hands with them and say that after all it is very necessary that some of these technical assistants have to be taken from outside. It so happens that in spite of the fact that we have freed ourselves from the British rule, they are being sporting enough to be friendly with us. They respect our contact. There is nothing wrong in securing their help and if I may say so and am permitted to say so, I would even go to the length of saying it is better and well for us to deal with a known devil than an unknown one.

I would further beg to submit that so far as the point made by my friend opposite about socio-economic activities is concerned, our armies, whenever there was a national emergency have come forward and done their level best and acquitted themselves very eminently. Is that not a socio-economic function? We cannot indent upon their services ordinarily all the time. As I have already submitted, they should be always engaged in preparing themselves for any national emergency whenever it may occur.

Something has been said by my friends about the question of the voluminous nature of the task that is being faced by our army. It is a known fact that we have a very long stretch of coastal line. Our navy is still in its infancy, and so also is our air force. If only we are serious in having a sufficient force to take care of our country and protect us and protect our shipping in the Indian Ocean, we must have a sufficiently large air force and navy too. In fact when the Britishers left us, they cleared away all the naval bases, and none of their battleships were left behind. Now we have got to make a beginning at every point. And that requires very great expense no doubt. Subject to correction, I think the strength of our air force is very meagre. It cannot even come up to the total loss of one day's action in

Korea, I suppose. Whatever it is, it is not possible to suggest anything connected with reduction of expenditure so far as the defence proposals are concerned.

I would beg to suggest to the hon. Minister of Defence for his kind consideration the other proposal, put forward in a rather constructive way by some of my friends, regarding the development of industries connected with the equipment of our army. Several of the ordnance factories. I suppose, are manufacturing exceptionally good articles for the army. May I suggest that those of them that can be thrown open for being manufactured by private industrialists be

allowed to be manufactured in private factories? It will indirectly help the development of industries as well.

I do not want to take any more of the time of the House, and I rest content with saying that it is very necessary that we should safeguard our national security first at any cost. We cannot take risks and forge the danger that we may have to face.

1 P.M.

With these words, I oppose the cut motions moved by the other side.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Wednesday, the 11th June, 1952.