

(ख) हेरन हवाई जहाजों ने १९५६-५७ से १९५६-६० तक के सालों के दौरान कुल २०,७८,००२ रेवेन्यू मील की उड़ान की ।

(ग) और (घ) इस बात को मद्देन रखते हुए कि उन रास्तों से मुनाबिस उजरत नहीं होती थी, जिन पर हेरन हवाई जहाज चलाये जाते थे, कारपोरेशन ने नवम्बर, १९५७ में एयरक्राफ्टों को बेचने का फैसला किया ।

(ङ) अप्रैल, १९५८ में एक एयरक्राफ्ट ५,१६,८७० रुपये में ।

††THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI AHMED MOHIUDDIN): (a) Eight Herons were purchased by the Indian Airlines Corporation during April-July, 1955 from M/s De Havilland Aircraft Co., U.K. at a total cost of Rs. 74.25 lakhs inclusive of spare engines and spares.

(b) The total Revenue Miles flown by the Herons during the years 1956-57 to 1959-60 came to 20,78,002 miles.

(c) and (d) The Corporation decided in November, 1957 to dispose of the Aircraft, keeping in view the un-remunerativeness of the routes operated with Herons.

(e) One aircraft for Rs. 5,19,870 in April, 1958.]

PUBLICATION OF "PACKAGE PROGRAMME NEWS"

117. SHRI GURUDEV: Will the Minister of FOOD AND AGRICULTURE be pleased to state in what languages "Package Programme News" is published and since when?

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI S. K. PATIL): The Package Programme News, a monthly bulletin, is being published in English only, by the Directorate of Extension, since February, 1962.

i/] English translation.

12 NOON

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE NOTIFICATIONS

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD (SHRI A. M. THOMAS): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table—

- (a) A copy of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture Notification GSR. No. 422, dated the 29th March, 1962, publishing the Sugar (Regulation of Production) Second Amendment Rules, 1962, under section 7 of the Sugar (Regulation of Production) Act, 1961. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-58J62.]
- (b) A copy of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Food) Notification G.S.R. No. 495, dated the 18th April, 1962, in respect of the selling price of rice or paddy in any locality in the State of Orissa, under subsection (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-36J62.]

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued

श्री मैथिलीशरण गुप्त (नाम निर्देशित) : श्रीमन् सभापति जी, इस विशेष अवसर पर जब कि नये चुनाव हो चुके हैं और हमारे महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी अवकाश ग्रहण कर रहे हैं, मैं सदन में कुछ कहना चाहता था । उसकी आज्ञा पाकर मैं आभारी हूँ । मुझे खेद है, मैं जो कुछ लिखा था, अपनी अस्वस्थता के कारण उसमें से आधे से भी अधिक अक्ष छोड़ देना पड़ा । शेष जो मैं सुना रहा हूँ, वह भी

[श्री मैथिलीशरण गुप्त]

डाक्टरों की १४४ घारा का उल्लंघन करके। कदाचित् उल्लंघन करने के लिए ही यह घारा बनी थी।

गये सदस्यों का शुभपथ हो, स्वागत नवागतों का है,
लक्ष्य एक निज मातृभूमि का, मंगल सकल मतों का है।
मिली पुनर्नवता सत्ता को उसे भार यह लेना है,
लेकर एक सहस्र गुना कर सब के हित में देना है।
भली योजनायें कितनी ही चलीं और चल रहीं बड़ी,
किन्तु राष्ट्र भाषा तपस्विनी यहां जहां थी वहीं पड़ी।
बिना एक व्यापक वाणी के एक राष्ट्र की सत्ता क्या,
किसी देश में निजता का पद पाती है परवत्ता क्या ?
करते रहे सदन सम्बोधन प्रथम राष्ट्रपति हिन्दी में,
बहु न जाय यह परम्परा भी दिल्ली की कालिन्दी में।
अधिक रेल भाड़ा देकर लो, आ पहुंचा लेखा-जोखा,
लेगा वह जितना लेना है, देना है हमको चोखा।
शासन सब हैं बिना हृदय के पड़े पदों पर पलते हैं,
चलते नहीं परन्तु पदों से, सदा करों से चलते हैं।
कर क्या, सिर देने में भी है अहोभाग्य अपनों के अर्थ,
पर कब तक घर घाल हमारा किया करेगी घूस अनर्थ ?
यही सोच कर समाश्वस्त हों क्या करदाताओं के चित्त,
बने हमारे बड़े बांध तो, बहा क्यों न यों ही बहुवित्त।
राज्य धर्म निरपेक्ष हमारा, प्रजा विवशता की मारी,
फंसती है पर धर्म चक्र में, फिर भू भंग न हो भारी।
रहे हमें यह ध्यान अन्त में, हम ऋण लेकर घी न पियें,
रखकर अपनी साख हमारी आगे की पोड़ियां जियें।
लोक राज्य राजेन्द्र हमारे भारत के मन के आदर्श,
देते रहें निवृत्त हुये भी शुभ दर्शन का पुण्य स्पर्श।
लिया नहीं जो कभी उन्होंने लें वे अब वह सुख विश्राम,
उनके गौरव से नत सादर करते हैं हम उन्हें प्रणाम।

SHRI V. T. KRISHNAMACHARI (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I propose in what I am going to say today to confine myself to the portions of the President's Address that deal with social and economic development. This is an occasion for taking stock of our achievements in the past few years. This is also an occasion for us to get a grasp of the tasks that lie ahead of us and the increased efforts that will be needed in the coming years if we are to achieve the objectives we have placed before ourselves. The President's Address has

set out the achievements in the various economic sectors. In agriculture we have very nearly reached the targets of foodgrain production. We are short in cotton and jute. In industry we are short in coal and there have been transport bottlenecks. As regards social programmes, education, health and so on, our achievements have been in accordance with the targets we placed before ourselves. This broadly is the picture that arises from the facts given in the President's Address.

The *per capita* national income is admitted to be a fairly reliable index of economic progress. Judged by that test, I believe we have every right to say that the economy has gained appreciably in strength in these years. When we began planning in 1951 the *per capita* national income—these are based on 1948-49 prices—was Rs. 247.5. In 1961—it is a provisional figure—the *per capita* income was Rs. 292.5. I understand that recent calculations show a slight increase over this figure. For the first time in this decade, 1951 to 1961, in this country we have attained rates of economic growth, which after offsetting the effects of population growth, have resulted in steadily and continuously increasing *per capita* income. This is unique in India during the last one hundred years. By and large, therefore, we have every reason to say that the economy has gained considerably in strength during the last eleven years.

I now proceed to the long-term objectives we have placed before ourselves. In connection with this I should like to refer to recent developments that have taken place in the highly industrialised countries which are members of the organisation called the OECD—Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development. The Ministers of these countries—there are twenty highly industrialised countries with a population of 500 millions—met in November 1961 and decided that they should work for an economic growth of fifty per cent in the decade 1960 to 1970. As a result of this, hon. Members are aware, in Great Britain, there has been set up the National Economic Development Council, the composition of which was described by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd in his speech in Parliament on the 9th April. He said:

"We shall have a body with its own staff which will include Ministers, representatives of the Trade Union Congress, some outstanding men chosen from the management side of industry, public and private, two distinguished independent mem-

bers, to meet together to consider the problem of how to achieve a faster and continuing rate of economic growth."

This is a permanent body with very wide terms of reference. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd said:

"This Council has to set for itself an ambitious but realistic target figure."

He mentioned a minimum of just over four per cent a year, that is, 50 per cent growth in ten years. This is the objective which these highly industrialised countries have placed before themselves. In India we placed before ourselves the goal of doubling by 1976 the *per capita* national income, as it stood in 1956, that is, doubling in about twenty years. This is the economic goal that India has placed before itself. Considered in the light of what the highly industrialised countries are proposing to do, this objective must be reached, if we are to reduce the ever widening disparities between the national incomes of highly developed countries and the under-developed countries. There must, therefore, be a sense of urgency in the country in regard to the achievement of this long-term goal.

The key to the success of this long-term programme that we have placed before ourselves lies in increased agricultural production. The President in his Address has referred to the experiment of Panchayati Raj, to the Panchayat institutions that have been set up in several States. The main objective of these Panchayat institutions is increased employment and increased production. As hon. Members are aware, these institutions have been set up in several States. Practically all the States have passed legislation. In the States in which they have not been set up, action is being taken to hold elections. By the end of this year all the elections will have been completed and Panchayat Samitis will be at work in all States, except West Bengal and Kerala, where these institutions will be set up

[Shri V. T. Krishnamachari.]

in 1963. This is the progress has been made in the establishment of Panchayati Raj. As I said, the functions of these bodies are defined and we have in the Planning Commission's Report a clear enunciation of the manner in which these bodies are expected to work. They have been instructed to pay attention to three very vital functions in regard to rural improvement. The first is, as I said, increased employment and increased production based on the utilisation of irrigation facilities, improved techniques, soil conservation programmes—all the facilities that have been provided under the expenditures included in the Plan. The full utilisation of these facilities—provision of increased employment and increased production—is the first duty of these Panchayat bodies.

Their second duty is to spread the co-operative movement widely. They have been instructed that every rural family should come into the co-operative movement in its own right and that the steps necessary for this should be taken. I have got some figures here which show the progress of this movement in the last ten years and which may interest hon. Members. In 1951 we had 4.4 million members in primary agricultural societies. I am not including any other societies. In 1956 the membership rose to 78 millions. In 1961 the figure rose to 17 millions. All this progress took place before the Panchayat Raj came into existence. As regards credit facilities, these amounted to Rs. 22.9 crores in 1951; to Rs. 49.6 crores in 1956; and Rs. 200 crores in 1961. The goal is that within ten years all rural families must be brought into the movement and that the movement should provide about Rs. 800 crores to Rs. 1000 crores of credit for agricultural improvement programmes.

The third function is the strict enforcement of the obligations of those who benefit from irrigation sources, soil conservation schemes and other big projects, including also projects

for utilising the unutilised energy in the countryside for building up community assets.

The hon. Member, Mr. Avinashilin-gam Chettiar, referred yesterday to the rural employment programmes in the Third Plan. These programmes are all worked out by the panchayat: will be carried out by the Panchayats as part of a comprehensive rural improvement programme. They do not stand in isolation from the rest of the rural plans. I have been having discussions with the State Governments recently in regard to the manner in which these Panchayat institutions are being set up in the states. I find that in most States much thought has gone into settling the composition and functions of these Panchayats, and there is a great deal of enthusiasm in organising the work. There is no doubt whatever that the agricultural production targets in the Third Plan will have to be worked out again because the basic idea of Panchayat Raj is that all these programmes should be built up from the village upwards by the Panchayats and should be implemented by the Panchayats with the maximum measure of public participation. It is only in this way that we shall be able to realise the target that we have placed before ourselves of doubling agricultural production, that is, doubling the national income from agriculture in the next ten years.

I now leave this question of Panchayat Raj and come to a different point. I want to refer to the question of getting adequate returns from the investments that have been made in the economy from the commencement of the Plans. I am referring to irrigations projects, power projects, industrial projects, and so on. Successive Finance Commissions have been pointing out that these projects are not worked economically. There are annual losses on them which are made good from current revenues by the State Governments. This is obviously an undesirable state of things, and hon. Members will find that the Planning Commission has devoted much attention to this and given instructions

to State Governments as to the ways in which these projects can be worked remuneratively. More and more our Plans will have to find increasing finances from the returns on these investments.

Hon. Members referred to the price situation. There is no doubt that in the last few months there is a trend towards stabilisation of prices. The course of prices will have to be watched carefully and if prices rise, strong steps will have to be taken.

Shri Avinashilingam Chettiar referred to export promotion which again is very important from the point of view of the working of our Plans. I have no doubt that hon. Members have read the report of the Committee on Import control and export promotion of which Sir Ramaswamy Mudaliar was Chairman. A number of gentlemen with intimate knowledge of the working of industries in the private sector were members of that Committee. In that report recommendations have been made as regards the steps which should be taken to stimulate exports. The Government of India have passed orders on those recommendations, and in the Budget speech the Finance Minister has indicated the tax incentives and other forms of encouragement that are proposed to be given for stimulating exports. I am sure that the adequacy of these measures will be discussed when we discuss the Budget statement here. The main point is that our industries should develop competitive capacity. Their cost structure should be reasonable and they should be able to stand competition on their own merits. Without this we shall not be able to build up exports permanently. Quite recently the Government of India have asked the National Council of Applied Economic Research to study the cost structure in certain industries in which it is considered probable that exports can be built up. These are cement, sewing machines, bicycles, iron ore and ferromanganese. Further studies should be undertaken of other indus-

tries also and the steps needed to rationalise the cost structure of industries should be taken. Otherwise we shall not be able to face the increasing competition we shall meet in the coming years in our export markets. I mentioned the Ramaswamy Mudaliar Committee on import controls, the recommendations of which are familiar to hon. Members. It will be useful to get our ideas on controls clarified. Now, broadly speaking, controls can be grouped under three heads. The first is controls which are dependent on world causes in which we cannot take isolated action. Controls which are related to foreign exchange come under this category. Even the highly industrialised countries have to take steps from time to time to meet their foreign exchange difficulties, and we, with an underdeveloped economy, have to take similar steps. How far these steps can be simplified from time to time is a matter for investigation and it is from this point of view that the Government of India appointed two committees, one under the Chairmanship of Mr. G. L. Mehta some years ago and another under the Chairmanship of Shri Ramaswamy Mudaliar recently. The orders issued on the second Committee's recommendations are resulting in a great deal of saving of time and work. The second reason for controls is the scarcity of essential commodities. Whether there is planning or not, no government can allow prices of essential commodities to rise to levels which would cause hardship to vulnerable sections in the community. These controls have nothing to do with, have no relation to, planning. Thirdly, there are controls which are parts of the planning process, which embody the social disciplines, which are the concomitants of large-scale social and economic developments, which are inevitable, if you want large-scale economic developments. These need not be elaborate. The efficiency of planning depends on imposing controls at strategic points. Here also, as planning gets more and more familiar and those who plan get more and more experience, a great deal of simplification

[Shri V. T. Krishnamachari.] can be effected. Also, if public opinion recognises that certain social disciplines are inevitable, the administration of these controls will become much more easy.

I should like, before I conclude this section Of my speech, to emphasise the great importance—the vital importance—of the programmed of social progress which we have placed before ourselves. In the next ten years it is the intention that free and compulsory education should be introduced for boys and girls between the ages of six and fourteen and that at all higher levels—secondary education, university education and technical education—there should be the largest possible expansion of facilities. We have also laid down that there should be a very large number of scholarships so that no one is deprived of the opportunity of obtaining the benefits of higher education for want of means. This programme is vital for progress. Without this social base, no programme of economic development can be of any value. No financial considerations should stand in the way of effect being given to this programme. I should like to refer here to what R. H. Tawney, the great socialist, said: "Equality of opportunity is not the absence of violent contrasts of income and condition but equal opportunities of becoming unequal." I have no doubt that, with the experience gained in the last eleven years and with the new institutions which we have set up, the large national effort needed for achieving our long-term goals will be forthcoming. This is the challenge which we, as a nation, have to face in the coming years.

Before I conclude, I should like to join in the warmest tributes that have been paid to the retiring President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, for his invaluable services to the nation. His life is a dedicated one in the best sense. Our best wishes will be with him always.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI (Madras):
Evered Chairman, I am extremely thankful to you for having given me

this opportunity to associate myself with the observations made in this august assembly. Of course, I was a bit hesitant to take part in the discussions this session, because I thought that my method ought to be to listen and learn this session rather than talk and rake up controversies. But the very congenial atmosphere that I find in this august House has emboldened me to join the rich chorus of praise that has been showered upon the President of this great country. I join along with others in paying my tributes to the unstinted service of our President though he has got failing health, and when I pay a tribute to Babu Rajendra Prasad, the President, I do not claim to have been a camp-follower of the President. I do not have an identity with the ideologies which the political party to which he is wedded has got. I was admiring the very able effort of the President from a vast distance. Perhaps, that gives me strength as well as weakness, weakness in the sense that I cannot have the same amount of warmth that others who have worked along with him would have claimed, and strength in the fact that the amount of tribute that I pay to the President is not to be construed as a dutiful partyman's tribute to another partyman but of one who having seen from a distance the unstinted service of the President pays the tribute that is due to him. Therefore, Sir, while I express my respect, when I pay my tribute, to the hon. President, I have to couple it unfortunately with a sense of disappointment with the Address that he has favoured to deliver to us. As students of constitutional history know, it is only the Government that is speaking through the President and, therefore, any remark, bitter or otherwise, which is stated about the Address is not to be construed—and I am very confident it would not be construed—as anything against the President. But in spite of the President, the Government have failed to deliver the goods as it were. Therefore, Sir, Members on the opposite side have got certain sentiments to express about that.

I have had the benefit of having \ listened to a veritable disposition on planning by the Father of Planning, if I may call so, the hon. Mr. V. T. Krishnamachari. But on going through the President's Address, I find that it reads more like the prospectus of a company rather than a message of hope and ideals—prospectus of a company because that company today seems to be in need of more and more members—prospectus of a Company because that Company has been found to be needy. Therefore, Sir, throughout the speeches from the ruling party on the Address and the Motion of Thanks, I found a sort of jubilation, a sort of elation on their part—"Oh, we have been elected by the people for three consecutive terms. Therefore, whatever we say is correct, whatever we do is correct and the smaller parties have no right to question our rights and our prerogatives."

Sir, I may point out that after having got victory in the General Elections, any party has got the right to be jubilant. But may I, with your permission, point out to the ruling party that it is not very astounding for a well-organised and well-funded party like the Congress to win the elections pitted as it is against opposition groups of varied interests and varied ideologies? May I point out, Sir, that the strength of the Congress does not lie in itself; the strength of the Congress lies in the weakness of the opposition parties? Therefore, instead of being jubilant over the victory, the ruling party should learn to be humble, magnanimous, liberal and democratic. Therefore, the very first thought, the very first sentiment that Members on this side were pleased to state was about the corrupt practices in elections.

Sir, as the Members on this side spoke about the corrupt practices in the elections, the people of the ruling party rose up to ask whether it could be proved. Sir, may I point out that if we were able to lay our hands on

proofs, we could have dragged them into courts of law rather than come to this august assembly to present our sentiments? It is not always easy for parties placed at a disadvantage to produce proofs. We lay more emphasis on the philosophic side rather than the legal side of the matter. Did we not see some time ago strictures from High Courts that the ruling party—though it may be legal on their part to take donations from industrial firms which is highly immoral—got their weapons from the armoury of Tatas and Birlas? They did not find it below their dignity even to go to the Mundhras for funds. Has the country forgotten wherefrom their election fund was built up? Is it on this basis that the ruling party is jubilant? Perhaps, the ruling party Members might say that corrupt practices can be found in other political parties too. But as the premier political party of this vast sub-continent, is it not the duty of the Congress to set high traditions? I am reminded, Sir, of the sayings of Sanskrit Pandits, "Yatha Raja Tatha Praja". Whatever traditions the Congress set, other political parties may follow. I conveniently use the word "may" because "may" imply "may not" also. Therefore, our first point is that this election was not fair and free and the people's will was not legitimately consulted. Therefore, if at least during the next elections the ruling party does not associate itself with the protagonists of free bonus, profiteers and permit-mongers, and as Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha stated the other day, if Members of the ruling party and the Cabinet resign at least six months before the general elections, I challenge, Sir, the ruling party to come back to power. Therefore, the first ingredient that the President wants in his Address is that we should build up high democratic traditions by dissociating ourselves from the . . .

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Is there any democratic precedent for this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is asking whether there is any democratic precedent for resigning six months earlier.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): There is hardly any precedent, Sir, to interrupt a maiden speech.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Of course, Sir, this is my maiden speech. I am not bashful of interruptions therefore, I like them.

The second point that I want to make on the President's Address is that I understand that three cardinal principles are being enunciated in the President's Address—democracy, socialism and nationalism. As far as democracy is concerned, unless we have got proportional representation coupled with a system of referendum initiated in a vast sub-continent like this, you cannot have any utility for democracy. It is, therefore, that I regret very much that the President in his Address has not given the shortcomings of democracy as it has been worked out for the past ten or fifteen years. Therefore, I would request this House to consider the matter, whether it is not necessary and expedient now at least to have a free thinking on the tenets of democracy.

About socialism, Sir, the other day I found in this House a new meaning given to socialism. When my hon. friend, Mr. Ramamurti was telling the House about the big industrial concerns, the Tata[^] and Birlas, I found an hon. Member giving an amazing interpretation of shares and profits. He was pleased to say that though crores and crores of rupees are gathered as profit, it does not go to the coffers of the individual capitalist like the Tatas and Birlas, but it is being disbursed to the shareholders. Sir, if that is the economic interpretation, why do we have two sectors, public and private? If my hon. friend thinks that private is public, that private industries controlled by Tatas and Birlas are after all public, why

make a differentiation between public and private? Sir, he was far off the mark when he said that these shares and profits were distributed and disbursed.

Sir, we have had Committees which have gone into the question and they have stated that powerful industrial empires have been built up, monopolies have grown. I find that the Prime Minister of this country has stated that the question should be looked into. I understand that, a Committee is working and they are going to find out how and where the amount of wealth produced by the two Plans has gone. Therefore, Sir, instead of arguing that socialism is to be of a different kind, give it some other name; why drag in the name of socialism and give your own interpretation to socialism? Socialism is not mere welfare because socialism is something other than guaranteeing welfare. It works out to create equality. I am aware, according to Laski, that equality is not identity of treatment, but affording equal opportunities for all. But in this country of ours, can we say that equal opportunities have been given or is being given to all? What about the Scheduled Castes, what about the Backward Classes?

Some time ago I read in the papers that there was a conference at Hyderabad of the Scheduled Castes and Tribes wherein the Prime Minister and hon. Mr. Jagjivan Ram were present, not to present a united front but to give varied opinions. The Prime Minister was said to have stated there that distinctions like Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes were not to be allowed hereafter and Mr. Jagjivan Ram, naturally enough, rose to say that the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes need patronage because they have been driven to the last rung of the society. If two such stalwarts can hold different views and remain in the same party, is it any wonder, Sir, that there is difference in ideology between the ruling party

and other parties? Therefore it is that I would say that the interpretation given to socialism and the implementation of socialism are not leading us towards socialism.

Here I have got to refer to what a great friend of India, an admirer of this Government, the Ambassador of the United States of America, but an economist, D*. Galbraith, says about our socialism. He has called it "post-office socialism". Why is it that Prof. Galbraith calls it "post-office socialism"? That is because he says that public enterprises should be run to maximise revenues, that is to say, profits, in a developing country like India. He points out that both America and India do this. The idea is that the profits made should in turn be ploughed back into the unit, should be reinvested, and it should be used for the good of the people. Just now we have been hearing the observations of the hon. Member, Shri V. T. Krishna-machari. He was stating that in the public projects, whether they be irrigation projects or power projects or industrial projects, the returns are not up to the mark. He says that the returns are not up to the mark and adequate. It is because of the difference in the interpretation of socialism that we are not getting enough returns. I would say that much money has been sunk in the public sector. But neither have the targets been reached nor are the returns commensurate with the efforts taken or the sonnets sung about Sindri or Bhakra or other projects.

Sir, I would hasten to state that I must not be misconstrued to mean that I am against planning or against the public sector. I am all for planning and all for the public sector, but if in the public sector the return is so meagre, if in the implementation of the public sector there is so much of wastage we have to see to it. There are rumours about corruption. I am not in a position to present facts and figures, but the rumour is wide-spread that there is corruption and maladministration.

nistration and other evils connected with the public sector. Therefore, I feel that the President should have stated in his Address that in spite of having the vision of socialism, we are not moving towards that socialism.

The third point which is a point that is very intimate so far as the party to which I have the honour to belong is concerned, is nationalism. Or to put it in the current turn, a term which has become very current now, I would call it "national integration". But, Sir, before coming to the point and to the nature or method to be followed for national integration, may I point out that to think about national integration fifteen years after independence, fifteen years after the working of a national Government, is something which is against all that we have been thinking and doing all these years. Are we to take, Sir, that all the efforts of the national leaders all these years have not been fruitful? Why is it that we are forced today to speak or to chalk out methods, of national integration? We, from the South, especially from Tamil Nad, while we are sitting here, find hon. Members though they know English, speaking in Hindi and putting questions in Hindi and getting answers in Hindi. At that time I find a twinkle in their eye, as if to say "You people, unless you learn Hindi, you have to keep quiet." Is that the way to national integration Sir, may I say, even at the point of being misunderstood, that the very term "national integration" is a contradiction in terms? People integrated become a nation and if they become a nation, where is the necessity for integration? Therefore, that term "national integration" shows the poverty of ideas which has been holding away all this time. I would, therefore, say this. Let us have a re-thinking. We have a Constitution, of course. Stalwarts of this country sat and devised the Constitution. But the time has come for a re-thinking, for a re-appraisal, for a re-valuation and for a re-interpretation of the word "nation".

[Shri C. N. Annadurai.]

I claim, Sir to come from a country, a part in India now, but which, I think, is of a different stock, not necessarily antagonistic. It does not mean it is antagonistic. It means only being supplementary to or complementary to not necessarily antagonistic to one another. I belong to the Dravidian stock. I am proud to call myself a Dravidian. That does not mean that I am against a Bengali or a Maharashtrian or a Gujarati. As Robert Burns has stated, "A man is a man for all that." Therefore, it is that I say that I belong to the Dravidian stock and that is only because I consider that the Dravidians have got something concrete, something distinct, something different, to offer to the nation at large. Therefore, it is that we want self-determination.

After coming here I must say that many times I have found great kindness from hon. Members. I did not expect so much kindness when I came here. I find that this kindness even make me forget the animosities that had been created by certain Hindi people. I would very much like to be one with you. I would very much like to be with you as one nation. But wish is something and facts are different. We want one world, one government. But we forget national frontiers. The other day I found the hon. Member Shri Dahya-bhai Patel speak and when he spoke about Gujarat there was such fire in his words and I felt, about such an industrially advanced State—Gujarat— he speaks thus: "I come from Gujarat, I am talking of Gujarat" and so on. Take my State of Madras. It is backward taking into consideration everything. You have here four steel plants. We have been crying hoarse for a decade and more for a steel plant, but what have they given? They gave the portfolio to a new Minister, not the steel industry to us. Perhaps, if hon. Subramaniam had not come here he might have been pre sing for

the steel industry from there. Is it diplomacy or prudence or political expediency? I don't know which— but y'ou have brought him here ana" you are going to ask him to reply to the demand of the South. That is what the Britishers were doing— divide and rule, barter and get money, marshall out figures and demolish arguments.

I would say that the fact that we want separation is not to be misconstrued as being antagonistic. Of course, I can understand the feelings that Would very naturally arise in the minds of people in the northern area whenever they think of partition. I know the terrible consequences of partition and I am deeply sympathetic towards them. But our separation is entirely different from the partition which has brought about Pakistan. I would even say that if the ideal is being considered and if sympathetic treatment is afforded, there need be no heat generated. There would not be any amount of consequences. Fortunately, the South itself is a sort of a geographical unit. We call it the Deccan plateau or the peninsula. There will not be any amount of people migrating from this place to that. There will not be any refugee problem. I would ask you to very calmly favour deeper thoughts sympathetically towards that problem.

1 P.M.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): And what will be the language of the Southern State?

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Sir, the language and other details will be worked out by a Constituent Assembly. Therefore, Sir, the position today is, whatever may be your reading

bf the situation, fox whatever we do not get in the South, the masses are ready to lay the entire blame on the Indian Government. There will be very natural reasons for not opening certain industries there but the moment we are denied a steel plant, the moment we are denied new railway lines, the moment we are denied an oil refinery, the man in the street in the South gets up and says, "This is the way of Delhi. This is the way of northern imperialism and unless y'ou come out of that imperialism you are not going to make your country safe, sound, plentiful and progressive". Therefore, it is, Sir, that when I talk about separation. I represent the resurgent view of the South and as the illustrious pers'on, Mira Behn, stated some time ago, the natural unity that we found when we were opposing the Britisher is not to be construed as a permanent affair. The principle of separation or, to put it in its own correct way, to call it an act of the principle of self-determination has been accepted by leaders of international repute and more than that, by the Prime Minister of the sub-continent of ours. During the days of Pakistan controversy, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, speaking, if I remember correctly, on the Kapurthala grounds, stated categorically that the Congress as an organisation would try to keep every unit within the Indian Union but if any Indian unit decided to secede, the Congress would give consent for that. Thus, the Congress has recognised the principle of self-determination. I make this bold appeal to that liberal thought, to that democratic spirit and despite the fact that he has become the Prime Minister, I think part of the old fire is still burning in his heart. Why ntot give self-determination to the peninsular India? After that India will not be impoverished. I would say that that decision would pave the way for raising the stature of India. I am inviting those people who want to keep India one and indivisible to make it a comity of nations instead t)f being

a medley of disgruntled units here ana there.

Sir, whenever Members representing different units get up and plead for this project o, that project, do they not to that extent forget that India is one and indivisible? Did not our Maharashtra friends, when they wanted a Maharashtra State, at that time forget that India was one and indivisible? Was not the Bengali infuriated when Berubari was taken away and switched over to Pakistan? Was not Bihar infuriated over the claims of Orissa? Is it not a fact that animosity was created over language between Assam and Bengal? While I like that supreme Indian unity and idealogy, whatever these things are, just to brush aside other things by saying that these are all regionalism, parochialism and the like, is to burke it. I would like this House to face this issue squarely and grant self-determination for that part of the country from which I come, the Dravidian part.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): Why not self-determination be granted, following your logic; to all the States constituting the Union? That would be logical.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Well, my hon. friend can advocate that. I am pleading for separation 'of Dravida Nad not because of any antagonism but because if it is separated, it will become a small nation, compact, homage-neous and united wherein sections of people in the whole area can have community of sentiment. Then we can make econ'omic regeneration more effective and social regeneration more fruitful.

Sir, it was only ten days ago that I came to Delhi. I did not wander or saunter along all the avenues but wherever I went, I found avenues, new roads, parks—they are to be found in New Delhi. Why is it, Sir, that it did not occur to the Indian Government that a single avenue be named after a Southerner?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON) : There is the Thyagaraja Road.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Does that mean that people of the South will have to be second-rate citizens?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: There is the Thyagaraja Road, named after the great musician saint.

AN HON. MEMBER: What more do you want?

(Interruptions.)

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Sir, I am surprised at the advocacy of the hon. Mr. Lingam. If he is satisfied with Sir Theagaraya—or is it the Thyagaraja of *kirtana* fame—road, if he is satisfied with that, I beg to submit that that is n't enough for the South. Come to any southern town. You can saunter in Motilal Nehru Park; you can enter Jawaharlal Nehru Reading Room; you can go to Kamla Nehru Hospital.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: That shows integration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, Order. Let him continue.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: You can mot'ox through Abul Kalam Azad Road. Why is it that such a thing is not found in this part of the country? And, Sir, look at the sentiments of the Southerners. When I am pleading for the South it is only my southern friends who come and say, "Don't plead; we are quite all right". This is due to the fear complex instilled into the mind of representatives of the South because if they plead for something they are dubbed as separatists and it may be taken that these people have joined the D.M.K. and, therefore, it may be that their political future might be lost. That is why people get up and say, "Oh, you have got this road and that road". Am I not aware of that? I am as fully J

aware of that as Members from the South 'of other political parties are. I am pleading for a national cause, not for parochialism, not for party principle. I want that this great State of ours should have self-determination so that it can contribute its mite to the whole world because, Sir, we have got a culture peculiar to ours. There may be a similarity between the culture obtaining in Dravida Nad and the culture that is to be found in other places.

And I am reminded, Sir, of your very scholarly statement made some time ago that India is united because Rama and Krishna are being worshipped and venerated from the Himalayas right up to Cape Comorin. So too is Jesus he'd in respect and veneration throughout the world and yet you have got nation—States in Europe and new and newer nation—States are coming up in the world and in what has been termed erroneously as the sub-continent of ours.

Therefore, I regret very much that His President has not stated anything about the neo-nationalism that is surging up in the South. Sir, I have stated that there are three tenets, democracy, socialism and nationalism. I would conclude by saying that democracy is distorted, socialism is emaciated and nationalism misinterpreted. I think in the coming years there will be a new sense of appreciation and the needs and philosophy of the South will be more appreciated and self-determination accorded to Dravida Nad from where I have the honour to come. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at ten minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

ABSENCE OF MINISTERS DURING THE DEBATE

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pathak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Who is representing the Government?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is there no one here?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think the Government should be censured by the House.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, yesterday also we had a scene. We had all the Opposition Members speaking. This is very unfair to this House. It is not conducive to parliamentary etiquette or parliamentary practice. I think, Madam, you should draw the Prime Minister's attention to this repeated practice of Ministers remaining absent from this House. It is grave discourtesy to this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am not very keen on making my voice heard by the hon. Ministers of Government, but parliamentary decorum is something which should be cherished and observed. I think the matter is becoming serious. Yesterday you yourself were good enough to draw the attention of the Government to this matter and it is in the Press today and the only way they have replied is by completely boycotting it.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): I would also like to support the Opposition in regard to this matter. The House should be taken seriously by Ministers and I think it is highly improper for Ministers to absent themselves when discussions are going on; there should be some Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I suggest that the House be adjourned.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar): I would suggest that till the Ministers come you may kindly adjourn the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can adjourn the House; you are perfectly within your rights.

(Interruptions.)

HON. MEMBERS: Very unfair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I agree with the Members who have expressed their opinion. This House should be treated with proper courtesy and senior Ministers should be present when the House meets at 2.30.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Thank you very much. Till the Ministers come, Madam Deputy Chairman, I request that we adjourn.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned for ten minutes.

The House then adjourned at thirtytwo minutes past two of the clock.

The House reassembled at forty-two minutes past two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we begin the debate, the Chair demands the attention of the Treasury Benches that this House be treated with proper courtesy and I do hope that such a lapse will not occur again.

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION
AND POWER (HAFIZ
MOHAMMAD
IBRAHIM) :

Madam, may I say something about this? This was perhaps only by chance. I myself entered the Lobby at 2.30. I was coming inside when I came to know that the House was adjourning. I did not know it. There was some difference between the clock here and my watch. Otherwise I came in time. He also came two minutes before.