

[Shri M. C. Shah]

brought forward because there was pressure. As a matter of fact, we have gone further and we have taken a very bold step to move forward towards the attainment of our goal, the socialistic pattern of society. As regards the taxation proposals, we have increased the tax and if, still, my friend Shri Gadgil feels that we have taken a retrograde step, then I can only say that he is very much mistaken and he only wants to say things for the sake of saying things.

He also spoke about a ceiling on incomes. That matter was also explained at great length. Even the Taxation Inquiry Commission have suggested that the ceiling on income should be 30 times the income of a family, and that too net income. If we consider the *per capita* income at about Rs. 264 or Rs. 300 and take 5 members in a family, it comes to Rs. 1,500 and that multiplied by 30 gives Rs. 45,000 net. As a matter of fact, it has been explained that those people who will get an income of Rs. 5 lakhs will have a net income of about Rs. 94,000 or so. At the same time, this goal of having Rs. 45,000 net also cannot be achieved all of a sudden. We have to go gradually towards that end, and we are just considering, as I have already stated, all other recommendations of the Taxation Inquiry Commission. Therefore, one must hold patience and proceed slowly and see what the pattern that is coming before us is. So I say that that argument was many a time exploded. Still he has got that pet phrase 'ceiling on income' every now and then to parade before the House.

There are no other points which have been raised, and I do not propose to take the time of the House further.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

The motion was adopted.

COMMANDERS-IN-CHIEF (CHANGE IN DESIGNATION) BILL

The Minister of Defence (Dr. Katju): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend certain enactments for the purpose of changing the designation of the Commanders-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, be taken into consideration."

The House is aware that two months ago, or rather a month ago, the Prime Minister announced in this House that having regard to the fact that under the Constitution the President is the Supreme Commander of all the Defence Forces, it has been decided that the designation of Commander-in-Chief of the Army, Commander-in-Chief of the Navy and Commander-in-Chief of the Air Force should be dropped and those officers—high officers—should be called Chief of the Army Staff, Chief of the Naval Staff and Chief of the Air Staff. In many enactments, the word 'Commander-in-Chief' is used and a certain authority is also vested in those officers by them. It is not the intention of the Government to reduce the authority of these officers. Therefore, what this Bill intends to do is that wherever the expression 'Commander-in-Chief' is used, it should be replaced by the words 'The Chief of the Army Staff', 'The Chief of the Naval Staff' or 'The Chief of the Air Staff', as the case may be, so that the structure may remain as it is and there should be no reduction of authority. The object of the Bill is concisely explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It is a purely formal measure and I commend it for the approval of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to amend certain enactments for the purpose of changing the designation of the Commanders-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, be taken into consideration."

श्री महत्त दर्शन (जिला गढ़वाल - पूर्व व जिला मुगदाबाद - उत्तर पूर्व): इस विधेयक का

स्वागत और समर्थन करते हुए इसके सम्बन्ध में
 मुझे कठु शब्द कहने हैं।

पहली बात तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि
 शायद गवर्नरमेंट को "कमांडर" शब्द से बिछ
 हो गई है और इसी लिए यह बिल लाया गया
 है। मालूम पड़ता है कि सरकार समझती है कि
 यद्य के समय ताँ "कमांडर" शब्द का कठु अर्थ
 हो सकता है, परन्तु शान्ति के समय इसका
 कोई अर्थ नहीं होता। लेकिन जिस प्रकार से
 यह विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया गया है और जिस
 प्रकार से कि रक्षा मंत्री भावोदय ने इसका स्पष्टी-
 करण किया है उससे विद्यत होता है कि इन
 अफसरों के अधिकारों में कोई बन्नर नहीं
 पड़ता है। मैं समझता हूं कि यह हर्ष की बात
 है।

दूसरा निरोदन मैं यह करना चाहता हूं कि
 रक्षा मंत्रालय इस बात का प्रयत्न कर रहा है
 कि सेना में जितने अंगजी के शब्द प्रयोग में
 आते हैं उनका हिन्दी में अनुवाद कर दिया जाए।
 लेकिन मैं इसता हूं कि इस अनुवादों के करने
 में कई जगह गड़बड़ी हो रही है। जैसे कि
 "चीफ आफ आर्मी स्टाफ" है। इसका अनुवाद
 हिन्दी समाचार-पत्रों में दिया जा रहा है: "थल
 सेना के कार्यालयाध्यक्ष" और शायद रक्षा मंत्रा-
 लय ने भी इसको स्वीकार कर लिया है। इसका
 यह मतलब होता है कि वह केवल दप्तर के इनचार्ज
 हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि रक्षा मंत्रालय का यह
 मंशा नहीं है कि वे केवल कार्यालय के चार्ज में
 हैं। सरकार का मंशा तो यह है कि सभी सेना
 का संचालन उनके हाथ में रहेगा। इसलिए
 इसका स्पष्टीकरण कर दिया जाए। मैं समझता
 हूं कि यदि सरकार "जल सेनाध्यक्ष, थल सेना-
 ध्यक्ष और वायु सेनाध्यक्ष" इन शब्दों को स्वीकार
 कर ले तो ठीक होगा।

तीसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि आपने इन
 तीन अधिकारियों का नाम तो बदल दिया,
 लेकिन क्या आप इनके नीचे के अधिकारियों के
 नामों में भी परिवर्तन करना चाहते हैं या नहीं—
 यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं। जैसे जनरल अफिसर
 कमार्डिंग इन चौक, ईस्टर्न कमांड, या पैस्टर्न
 कमांड या सदर्न कमांड हैं। क्या इनके नामों

में परिवर्तन करने का भी विचार किया जा
 रहा है? इनके अतिरिक्त कठु स्थानीय अफसर
 भी हैं जैसे अफिसर कमार्डिंग वि स्टेशन आदि।
 यदि आप "कमार्डिंग या कमांडेंट" शब्दों को
 हटाना चाहते हैं तो इनके नामों में भी परिवर्तन
 किया जाना चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन
 करता हूं।

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This Bill has
 to be disposed of in 15 minutes.

Shri K. K. Basu: I shall finish in
 four or five minutes.

This Bill has been moved to give
 legal sanction to the scheme which
 has been stated earlier by the Prime
 Minister that they want to give the go-
 bye to the system that was prevalent
 in our country, and in the new set-up
 of things they are going to have this
 new nomenclature. So far as it goes,
 certainly it is necessary in the new
 set-up of things that we have since
 1947 that the system of administration
 of the three wings of our defence
 forces may have to be changed and
 the nomenclature has necessarily to
 be altered. But what I feel is that
 just by changing the nomenclature
 the situation will not improve.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): What else does he want?

Shri K. K. Basu: We all want that
 after 1947, as things have changed in
 our country, the relationship of the
 Defence Forces with the common man
 of the country must find expression in
 a better relationship. I do not say
 that there has not been any alter-
 ation; there might be some. As a
 matter of fact, the defence forces have
 been utilised sometimes for good work
 in the interest of the common man.
 But we still hope that the Defence
 Minister will make an effort to see
 that it is improved. Unfortunately,
 the relationship of the officers, who
 were trained in the British atmos-
 phere, with the ranks of the army still

[Shri K. K. Basu]

continues to a large extent to be the same. There might have been some improvement. But what I feel is that it is absolutely necessary to do away with all the past connections, the ill effects of the past relationship, based upon the tie-up with the British system. It is a good thing that in the Army and the Air Force, we have Indian Chiefs but in the Navy we still continue to have a British Chief.

Of course, the Prime Minister said the other day that we do need some more experience in the Navy. That I can understand. When you want to build up a modern defence organisation in the Army, Navy and Air Force, it may be necessary to have for advice some experts. But their functions should be merely limited to that; their relationship with the organisation should be limited to that, and they should have nothing to do with the administration or executive functions. I hope that if not in the course of a few months, at least by the end of this year, the entire defence strength will be thoroughly Indianised, except possibly that there may be one or two experts who might be necessary. I hope our new Defence Forces will see that not only the nomenclature is changed, but the outlook and attitude is changed, not only as between themselves and the common man but also as between officers and the other cadres, which will be in tune with the democratic concept that we are trying to build up in our country.

Dr. Katju: Little has been said about the Bill itself, but other points have been raised. I should like to assure my hon. friend, who just preceded me, that there is no greater anxiety than the question of Indianising the entire services. We have been making rapid progress in this direction and during the last seven years, the aim has been kept in view and the utmost effort has been made to appoint suitable Indian officers. Very large numbers of people have been sent abroad for training. Wherever you find a non-Indian officer, the

House may take it that that is because of compulsion, because of necessity, because we cannot find a suitable officer here. Please remember always that our Navy is a new Navy, that our Air Force also is a new Air Force, and that it requires very highly trained technical staff to run it and to show the way. We are doing very well. I cannot say, however, that, within 12 months, our aim of complete Indianisation shall be reached, but I do hope that within a very few years we shall be able to do it.

So far as the point that was raised by my hon. friend who spoke in Hindi is concerned—he spoke something about interpretation—I am not myself a great scholar, but I shall look into this matter and see to it that proper designations are used. It is not a question of liking the word "Command". Wherever you go, in a cantonment station, there is always an Officer Commanding. Similarly when we go to a Command, say, the Eastern Command, there is an Army Commander. So far as the Chief of Staff is concerned, it was done so because it was considered unsuitable that the word "Commander-in-Chief" should be used.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to amend certain enactments for the purpose of changing the designation of the Commanders-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 to 3 were added to the Bill.

*The Schedule was added to the Bill.
The Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.*

Dr. Katju: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.