

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the Members that the following dates have been fixed for receiving nominations and for holding election, if necessary, to the Central Advisory Board of Anthropology:—

1. Number of Members to be elected—One.
2. Last date and time for receiving nominations—27th February, 1961 (up to 3 P.M.).
3. Last date and time for withdrawal of candidature—28th February, 1961 (up to 3 P.M.).
4. Date and time of election—2nd March, 1961 (Between 3 P.M. and 5 P.M.).
5. Place of election—Room No. 63, First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.
6. Method of election—Proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

12 Noon

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—*continued*

THE MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI A. K. SEN): Mr. Chairman, it is with very great hesitation and, if I may say so, with diffidence that I rise to reply to the debate because I am conscious how much more ably and with what greater thoroughness the reply would have been given . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): But we are having young blood all the same.

SHRI A. K. SEN: . . . if we had that master of debate present here amongst us today, but I hope and while hoping so, I am sure I am expressing the unanimous desire of this House that this House wants to see Pantji recover quickly and attend the House again.

At the very outset, I must say that it would be a matter of great satis-

faction to any Government that there have been only three amendments and also not so serious in their content as the three amendments we have before us. It has also been apparent from the course of the debate on the President's Address that the Government's policy for the coming year has by and large the support of the House. It could not have been otherwise and the Government is certainly appreciative of the various suggestions made on the floor of the House as also of their attention being drawn to various aspects of administration and policy. The Government is at the same time grateful for the support which has been evident from the course of the debate on the floor of the House.

Now, Sir, the points which have been seriously urged are with regard to the question of the rise in national income, the question of food production and the price level, the question of social welfare and welfare of backward classes and lastly, the various questions concerning the foreign policy of the Government.

If I may take the last item first and dispose of it as quickly as possible, having regard to the fact that the Prime Minister in his intervention has already dealt with it fairly elaborately, I do not think one could profitably add anything to it or even venture to improve upon it. It is enough to say that the foreign policy of this Government has now not only impressed the entire world but has also been responsible for the forging of a solid Afro-Asian bloc pledged to the termination of imperialism wherever it may function, racialism wherever it may threaten world peace, and international amity through the instrumentality of the United Nations and its forces. In this task, the contribution of India under the leadership of our Prime Minister has not only been most valuable for this country but has also been freely acknowledged by the entire world. We are deeply grateful to the Prime Minister for having guided the destiny of this nation at a time

when not only this country but the entire world was passing through a critical period.

Having said this, may I now try to answer the criticisms which have been levelled concerning the question of national income, increase in production in industry and agriculture and the general improvement which has been fairly well marked in the economic development of the country during the last ten years in the course of the First and the Second Five Year Plans? The hon. Member, Shri Govindan Nair, levelled a criticism based on some newspaper report. I think he quoted *Mathrubhoomi*, and he appears to have based his argument on that report which may be summarised as follows: That in 1950, people with *per capita* income of less than Rs. 200 constituted 50 per cent. of the population and that in 1957-58, that means, eight years later, according to him, this proportion had risen to 65 per cent. Well, it is always possible to make such arguments provided one chooses to pick up odd data or statistics from odd places. But if we have to base our arguments on reliable data and statistics, then naturally such arguments cannot possibly be built up. Where he got his 50 per cent. and his 65 per cent. God alone knows, excepting this paper *Mathrubhoomi*. If I may give a few figures to the House, it will help us in appreciating the true position on this question. The figures are as follows: In the First Plan period, the population was estimated to have increased by 8 to 9 per cent. whereas the national income went up by 18 per cent. This means, even allowing for the increase in population, the net increase in national income was 10 per cent. Over the Second Plan period, the increase has been of the order of 19 to 20 per cent. in respect of the national income whereas population increased only by 10 per cent. **Over the ten years** covered by the two plans, namely, the First and the Second Plan, the national income is estimated to have increased by about 40 per cent. and population by 20 per cent. This will illust-

rate that though the rate of increase in our population has been nearly 2 per cent, annually or, in other words, 20 per cent. in the course of the last ten years covered by the two plans, the increase in national income has been 40 per cent. This, I think, is no mean achievement especially having regard to the great difficulties which this country had to face initially and even now has to face before it reaches the point where we may say a self-generating economy is expected to function. It will be appreciated that when this country started on its gigantic plans for national and economic reconstruction after independence, it was weighed down by an economy which today is described as an under-developed one. In olden days it was called a backward one. While the Industrial Revolution had touched Western Europe, the New World and parts of Eastern Europe, this country unfortunately was governed under a system of imperialistic exploitation. The common feature for every such country has been a backward economy for the colonies with a modern self-developing economy for the governing country. Exploitation of cheap labour and earning of huge profits in the colonies made the colonies impoverished in every way. It was a system of retrograde economy which is outmoded and for which none but the diehard imperialists take pride. From this state of backwardness, we started our venture to create a modern economy which develops itself every year, which generates savings and increases national wealth enough to sustain a self-developing economy. It is described today as a self-generating economy but the process by which a backward economy is sought to be converted into a self-generating economy is an arduous one and it has to be achieved with the unified dedication and hard work of an entire nation. I think we can well take pride in the fact that the last ten years have set the pace when we can very well expect the start of a self-generating economy to be brought about at not a distant date. In fact it is expect-

[Shri A. K. Sen.]

ed that during the next ten years or after the completion of the next two plans we shall possibly start, without being unduly optimistic but at the same time having faith in ourselves and in our ability, God willing, with a self-generating economy. Nevertheless . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is that? God willing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't bother.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have a secular State and he is saying 'God willing'. It is just a correction.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Secular State does not necessarily mean a Godless State. I do not think such expression of belief in the Supreme Being at all conflicts with our views about a secular State.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not at all saying that, but . . .

SHRI A. K. SEN: I am very sorry but I am quite prepared to withdraw this expression if it shocks the conscience of the hon. Member.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It shocks because the hon. Minister says that the plans will be fulfilled God willing, not man willing.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I said, Sir, having regard to the faith in ourselves and God willing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Even Mr. Khrushchev used the word 'God' in the United Nations Assembly. It does not matter.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Now, Sir, nevertheless it is necessary to give a few facts concerning our economic growth during the last ten years; if not for anything, at least to remind ourselves of what we have achieved and to take encouragement from our achievements. We are now in the last year of the Second Five Year Plan. The First Five Year Plan started in April 1951. The annual rate of investment then was only 4.9 per cent. of the total national income whereas

population was rising at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum. It is now well recognised that such a state of economy not only generates a stationary economy but also leads to a deterioration in the economic condition of the country or if we may use a technical term, it creates a retrograde economy, a receding economy. And to keep up the necessary rate of progress and to keep up the existing level of national income a rise of 2 per cent. in population requires an investment of 15 per cent. of the national income and if the rate of investment falls below that, it causes again not only a stationary economy but a retrograde economy. It is the aim of our planning to reach a state of economy where the annual rate of investment will not only be 15 per cent. but will be more than 15 per cent. so that we can quickly reach a point from which the takeoff will start for a self-generating economy. That does not underestimate the necessity of family planning because it will be unwise to ignore the fact that this increase of population, though looking at the rate merely, it does not seem very excessive, will, looking at the total impact which that rate produces, bring about a pressure on the economy which will be too great especially in the initial stages because every increase in the national income of the country and every increase in the total production of the country is apt to be negated or nullified to a large extent by the corresponding increase in the population. We, therefore, have to combine a well-planned campaign for family planning coupled with maximum efforts to increase our production and our national income and at the same time bring about a large and larger rate of investment annually. Now, Sir, as I have told you, the national income has risen by 40 per cent. in the last ten years whereas population has increased only by 20 per cent. though that increase has been very big.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Kerala): What about the distribution of the national income?

SHRI A. K. SEN: I am coming to that. That is a different point. I shall certainly deal with that aspect. Now, I am dealing with the question as to how far we have succeeded in increasing the national production and also in increasing our production in every sphere. So far as capital and producer goods are concerned, we have successfully laid the foundation for heavy industries. The three new steel plants are not only gigantic in their capacity but they have also successfully laid the foundation for heavy industries in this country because without steel we cannot have any heavy industry. In fact, we cannot have any capital goods production in the true sense of the term without a heavy steel base. Whereas in the beginning of the First Plan the production of steel was only 1 million tons or just a little over, today we have reached a production figure of 4.5 million tons and at the end of the Third Plan it will reach about 10 million tons. A large part of our capital goods requirements is now supplied by our own industry; locomotives for our railways, industrial machinery for our textile factories, sugar factories and other factories, machines for our cement factories. In fact, the production of machinery for every purpose has marked such a tremendous improvement not only in production but in the quality of the products that it has not only amazed us but amazed the entire world parts of which at least were highly critical of our capacity to produce heavy capital goods. The production of industrial machinery in 1951 was only of the order of Rs. 11 crores whereas it has reached the figure of Rs. 79 crores in 1958 and in the last two years it has recorded much bigger increases. Since 1955 industrial production has gone up by 37 per cent. and by 120 per cent, over the last ten years and this year the rise in production in the industrial sector records the highest since independence. This has not only convinced us of our capacity to produce heavy capital goods for ourselves but also given us confidence in our future. I have myself recent-

ly visited again some of our important public sector undertakings, I went the other day to Bangalore.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is why you did not go to Assam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI A. K. SEN: It does not follow, Mr. Gupta. I do not know how the two are conflicting at all. I went to Bangalore and I had the good fortune to visit the Hindustan Aircraft Factory where aircraft are now being produced, integral coaches are produced and we are now starting on the production of watches. I also went to the Hindustan Machine Tools Factory and to the Indian Telephone Industries. I was amazed at the quality and the variety of products that these factories have started turning out. In fact, I want to repeat what I was told by one of the engineers of the Hindustan Machine Tools Factory. He was there from the very beginning. It is well known that the Hindustan Machine Tools Factory was started with the collaboration of the well-known firm of Orlikon Brothers of Switzerland. Orlikons produce first class lathes and other machine tools, not possibly the automatic ones, but many precision tools and good quality lathes. When they planned the production, they put our maximum capacity at 400 lathes per year for all time to come for that factory, and only lathes. I was told that they never thought that we could produce drills or other types of difficult machine tools. In fact, when the proposal was first made, they were very angry that we were trying to undertake a venture which they thought was doomed to failure. As a result they quitted India and I think the Government of India purchased their interests. Within a couple of years after that not only has the production of machine tools exceeded the maximum target of 400 but it is also going to reach one thousand this year. They started manufacturing drills, grinders and various other machine tools without the help of anyone and the quality is as good as the best in the world.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): There is a demand for export from various countries.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Yes, Sir. In fact, we were quite capable of exporting roughly two hundred pieces to China and to other countries also apart from these two hundred pieces. But Orlikons put up difficulties saying that under the original agreement we were debarred from exporting these until we reached a particular total production figure. Even today we are quoting a much lower price for these lathes in markets like Holland and so on and we are ready to supply them, if certain legal difficulties are not put in our way. That is for machine tool which is the base for heavy machinery manufacture. I would invite every Member of Parliament, when he can, to go and visit some of these big factories to see what wonderful strides have been made in recent years in the way of laying down a true and solid base for heavy industrial production. Look at the locomotives that are coming out, not only the steam ones but also the electric ones from our factories. The integral coaches that we have made are now competing in the international market, notwithstanding the great demand that we have in our own country and which we have to meet. Look at the wonderful job the railways have done in handling the tremendous increase in traffic, which the two plans have generated. We have opened up 1,200 miles of new railway lines, added 1,300 miles by way of doubled track and electrified 880 miles, and opened an entirely new link to Assam. Now, this has been coupled with punctuality in the running of trains, which is a new feature in our railway system.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I suggest that the Railway Budget is coming up just now. All these things can be taken up then.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I have no doubt that the hon. Member will put forward such criticisms as commend to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As usual irrelevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Who is irrelevant, to talk about the railways before the Railway Budget?

SHRI A. K. SEN: Notwithstanding the great shortage of foreign exchange through which our economy has been suffering and the tremendous and heavy imports of capital goods, which we have had to do in order to create the industrial base which we have been creating all these years, we have in the field of industrial production not only crossed the hump, but are well on the way to the goal of a self-generating economy.

So far as agriculture is concerned, this country started with a very bad beginning. It will be appreciated that with partition our main wheat and cotton producing area in the west was taken away. Our jute growing area in the east also went over to East Pakistan. And yet we had to supply cotton to our textile mills which form one of the biggest sectors in our industrial economy. We had also to feed the great jute industry, which is one of the biggest export earners of the country. Yet we had no raw cotton worth the name. We had no raw jute worth the name. Large tracts of new and good land had to be diverted to the growing of cotton and the growing of jute in order to be self-sufficient in these two important commodities. It is a matter of common knowledge that in these two commodities we are almost self-sufficient, except with regard to long staple cotton of very good quality. Even in that sphere a good deal of progress has been achieved in recent years and we are now producing almost as good and long staple cotton as we used to grow in West Punjab in olden times. So far as raw jute is concerned, progress has been phenomenal. From about less than two million bales a year, our production has gone up to nearly

six million bales and the jute industry is now self-sufficient in the supply of its raw materials.

With regard to food production, again, as I said, we started with a bad beginning, the main wheat growing areas of the Punjab having gone to West Pakistan. We had bad harvests, floods and droughts from 1955 onwards almost every year, which devastated large areas of rice-growing districts as also of wheat growing districts. The great floods of 1958 and 1959 are still vivid in our memory and we know how district after district was devastated in West Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. Floods and droughts had affected other areas. Notwithstanding all these, we maintained an increase in production, though that increase was to a very large extent nullified by the increase in population at the same time. We were producing during the First Five Year Plan about 62 million tons of foodgrains on the average every year. During the Second Five Year Plan it is about 70 million tons. This year it has gone up to 75 million tons. We can look forward with hope to better times in the future and I think it is refreshing to quote again what the Prime Minister has said that in the food front we seem to have crossed the hump. With the extension of co-operatives and supply of better seeds, with the increased supply of chemical manures and the further production of chemical fertilisers in this country and the use of better implements, we have no doubt that we shall not only be able to keep pace with the increase in population but we shall also be able to create a comfortable surplus.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is the yield per acre?

SHRI A. K. SEN: I have not got the figures, but even that has increased appreciably.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is inconvenient for you to give it.

SHRI A. K. SEN: It is not inconvenient. I do not happen to be the Minister of Agriculture at the moment. I have noticed the increase, and I assure him that the yield per acre has gone up in Madras, in the Punjab, in Andhra Pradesh and various other areas.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please give the all-India figure.

SHRI A. K. SEN: As I said, if the hon. Member will have patience, I am sure he will be supplied with that figure later on, but even in that sphere we have nothing to be dejected about. Our achievements are increasing and the per acre yield in regard to every conceivable agricultural commodity has been remarkable. Though we need not be very complacent about it, we need not lose faith in ourselves at the same time.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will know that in all countries like India and China where there are large populations dependent upon agriculture and where agriculture has for centuries been dependent on the weather, rain, flood, drought and so on, it is difficult to bring about a state of affairs where agriculture becomes free from the vagaries of the winds or the weather and becomes completely self-sufficient so that, whether there is rain or not, it grows its gains or whether there is drought or not it grows its wheat or rice, whether there is flood or not it grows its food. Whether we shall achieve that within the near future we do not know. Notwithstanding the tremendous resources and energy put in the agricultural front in a country like China, where we know that tremendous efforts were made to make China completely free from famine, the vagaries of the weather have dealt very severe blows even there. Shortage of food has been very very acute there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know how much we have spent so

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

far on food imports since independence?

SHRI A. K. SEN: Substantial amounts no doubt and I hope progressively . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Figures.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I have not got them here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Anything about figures is inconvenient.

SHRI A. K. SEN: If the hon. Member thinks that the figures have to be carried in memory and to be hurtled whenever a demand comes, I think he is mistaken. Man has not become a calculating machine capable of producing figures whenever a demand comes. If in future we have such demands, we shall put a robot on the table with all figures so that they shall get them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The long brief is there . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You go on, Mr. Sen.

SHRI A. K. SEN: As I said, they have been substantial, and we hope that we shall soon be relieved of the necessity to import food.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

With regard to the question of Goa, I think one of the amendments which has been tabled is specifically directed to the policy of the Government with regard to Goa. It is common ground not only for the people of this country but I think for the entire colonial world. It is a matter of great shame, that this tiny but at the same time ugly spot, the last vestige of imperialism in this part of the world, still retains its hold on the soil of India. What more can we do

than to declare firmly and openly our determination to rid the soil of this country of this ugly spot and thereby to eradicate the last trace of colonialism on the soil of Asia? Yet, consistent with our policies and declarations, we can only do so by peaceful means. There are many who certainly think that it takes only a tiny effort on the part of the Government of India to solve this problem militarily. It may not be so tiny, but it may not be a very difficult matter having regard to the geographical position of Goa and the might of the entire nation behind its resolve to rid this country of this festering sore. Yet once we seek to look at military solutions, we shall have to bid goodbye to all those principles which not only we have been declaring but which we have been trying to follow in our own humble way with faith and dedication. We have to be consistent with our peaceful endeavours. I do not think the President's Address could have indicated anything more. The speakers themselves have not indicated anything more excepting to say that nothing concrete has been indicated in the President's Address. There are matters on which concrete things cannot always be indicated, and yet vast movements of the human mind and of human endeavours can be focussed and channelled, and for us and for the entire colonial world these vast movements of the human mind are far more important than a few concrete steps here and there. We have no doubt that the time is not very distant when not only Goa but the entire colonial world will see the last days of decadent imperialism.

With regard to the question of backward classes, there is an omnibus amendment of Mr. Kureel. He has combined in his amendment various matters including failure to create a welfare State, failure to eradicate unemployment, absence of declaration by Government of its intention to implement the report of the Backward Classes Commission, absence of declaration regarding compulsory and

free education, and so on and so forth. All the omnibus things have been lumped together but let me just take up the question of the backward classes because the other points are similar to those which have been touched upon by other speakers. His grievance is that we have not followed up the report of the Backward Classes Commission. Certainly the criterion laid down by them—and that is not unanimous. hon. Members will remember that—of choosing backward classes by caste has not commended itself to the Government. While we are trying to create a casteless and classless society, to determine backwardness only by caste is a thing which conflicts with our basic ideas of an equal and just society. Therefore, I do not think that any exception can be taken to the fact that Government has failed to accept that part of the report of the Backward Classes Commission specially when it has not been unanimous. On the contrary, a good deal of effort has been made in the last twelve years in assisting all backward classes on the way to progress. I do not think anything was done during the last two hundred years compared to what has been done during the last ten years for the backward classes by way of education, by way of scholarships, by way of creating facilities for their employment in civil Service and in various other fields. In fact there is a complete awakening today among the backward classes to their true and proper existence as live citizens of a democratic State.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): Sir, may I interrupt for a minute? The Backward Classes Commission was appointed under the Constitution. So it is an important Commission. When the Commission was appointed, Government was discharging its duties, its obligations under the Constitution, and Government has not even thought it fit to have the report discussed on the floor of the House. It may be that Government has its views on classification of backwardness and backward classes. The criteria for back-

wardness may be different according to Government.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not make a speech in the midst of the Minister's speech.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: No, Sir. It is a Commission appointed under the Constitution and Government have not given an opportunity to Parliament to discuss the report of such an important Commission. What we want to know is whether Government is right in not giving an opportunity to discuss such an important report irrespective of its merits or the eventual conclusions arrived at by Government.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I do not think that I ever contended that it was not an important report and I do not think that I gave the impression that the Government was not discharging a Constitutional obligation in appointing that Commission. I am sorry. It was never my intention to create an impression that the Government was creating this Commission as a matter of favour. In fact, Government was obliged to set up this Commission and the report certainly of a Commission of this character is of the utmost importance. But that does not mean, it does not follow, that all the recommendations of that Commission are to be accepted *in toto*. I suppose this Government, as any other government, has the option to accept such of the recommendations as are considered acceptable and fruitful.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: No recommendation has been accepted. Nothing has been done. No orders have been passed on the Commission's report. It has not been implemented.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are other ways of raising that point, Mr. Lingam.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I was even answering that part of the argument of the hon. Member. I was saying that the report was before the two Houses. And it was open to any Member to raise a discussion on it. What the Government was doing was well known. From the questions and answers and from the many debates during which the Government has expressed its views, what it has been doing for the backward classes—the Ministry of Education, the Home Ministry and the State Governments, everybody—is well known. If any particular aspect was sought to be emphasized or a discussion was sought to be raised, I do not think the Government had ever declined to allow a discussion to be raised, and it is open to any Member to raise it in the way it is open to him according to the rules of this House or the other House.

Sir, there is now only one other point on which I would like to say something and which appears to me to be of importance. I am very obliged to the House that a good deal of interest has been shown on the question of national integration and unity. I think this House would have failed in its duty if it had not emphasized once again the paramount importance of national unity. It is painful to everyone who really wants the country to progress and to attain the greatness which it so richly deserves, to find our energies wasted, our strength dissipated and our attention diverted by various movements whose only aim is to create disunity. Whether these movements show their ugly faces in Jabalpur or in Assam or in the Punjab, the basic problem is the same. Look at the Punjab, look at the marvellous way in which its people have rehabilitated themselves and have created a viable State, a State which is now the envy of the rest of India, having regard to its achievements in the field of agriculture and industry and the prosperity which its people have achieved in the course of the last ten years

notwithstanding the heavy blow of partition and look at the way in which the energies of those people have been diverted to wrong ends. After the setting up of regional councils, we hoped that there would be an end to the linguistic trouble there. If ever two languages are the same, they are Hindi and Punjabi, and nobody ever bothered about the conflicting claims of Hindi and Punjabi and nobody even now bothers about them. And yet in the form or linguistic controversies, all sorts of separatist movements are launched creating not only a problem for that State but for the rest of India. And when once these parochial movements start, all sorts of undesirable tendencies, all sorts of antinational forces, gather together to sap the very vitality of the country and the nation. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that this House should once again take note of these things and declare its strong voice against any such movements whose only purpose and whose only effect are to create disunity in the country. I do not think that anybody doubts in this country that the policy of this Government has been, as it must be, to give the utmost facility for all the regional languages so that by the proper development of these regional languages the great culture of India which it has always enjoyed, thrive and thrive well. And yet in the name of language, we have all sorts of troubles. Look at the ugly incidents to which reference has been made—rightly made, I should imagine, by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—the events in Jabalpur, the events in Assam, the events in the Punjab and elsewhere.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was not a language riot in Jabalpur.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I do not say it was about language, it is the other thing. But these are all separatist tendencies. They are worse. People who speak the same language are fighting among themselves. These are all really manifestations of the

same tendency to think separately and not to think in terms of the nation. Only the other day—I was not quoted very well in some papers—somebody asked me while I was in Kerala about my views on the change of the name of Madras State. I said openly that if it was a mere change of name, the people of Madras were at liberty to choose any name so long as Madras remained a part of India and it expressed itself as a vital limb of India. But, I said, if the change of name was used as a spearhead for other separatist tendencies, then it became objectionable.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The people of Madras want the change of name from Madras to Tamil Nad, and the task has to be done here by changing the Constitution. They cannot do it there.

SHRI A. K. SEN: What I say is nobody can ever oppose a change of name if the people of an area want it but what is objectionable is the change of name being utilised as a spearhead for other separatist movements, because everybody knows that the Provincial Congress Committee in that State is known as the Tamilnad Congress Committee.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras): Firstly the original demand came from an organisation which had nothing to do with any separatist tendency or politics.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I am not judging the merits or demerits of the question. What I say is if it is a pure demand only for a change of name, no objection can be taken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Home Minister is a good Minister. He should not be utilised for that purpose. This is a different purpose. The point is when the demand is just and stands on its merit, then we should amend the Constitution.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): The Madras Government is there, and

it will be able to look after the question.

SHRI A. K. SEN: What I was saying was that some papers reported that I was opposed to the change of name, which certainly was not a proper thing. I am only pointing out how separatist movements always seek to take different garbs in different areas and basically their object is the same, namely to destroy the great unity of the country, which unity alone gave us freedom and which unity alone will allow us to retain our freedom. Let there be no mistake about it. And I hope that not only this House but the entire country will be unanimous in its demand for ending all the separatist and fissiparous tendencies which can never be encouraged unless we are prepared to commit suicide ourselves. I hope that the stern voice of this House will work for the fulfilment of that great objective, namely not only to preserve that unity but also to strengthen it in every possible way.

So with these words I again thank the House and I commend the Motion for the acceptance of the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I just had been to see the Chairman and so I do not know whether he answered the points I raised about the supremacy of Parliament as a constitutional—political point since the Law Minister was replying.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I talked to the Chairman . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why, Sir, . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am putting the amendments . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Law Minister is willing to answer, I find.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I do not know what is the point you raised; please put it again.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yesterday . . .

SHRI A. K. SEN: I have read your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very good. Thank you.

SHRI A. K. SEN: What is the precise question?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the first part of my speech I posed the question: Who is supreme, Parliament or President, whether the powers of the President in the Indian Constitution are the same—broadly speaking—as those of the British Crown? That is a constitutional point, political point, being debated in the country. It requires a clear and straight answer, and the Law Minister, I believe, constitutionally speaking, legally speaking, is the fit person, although the Prime Minister would be the fittest person to answer.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I am not going to discuss anything about the President, because any discussion concerning his status is not in consonance with the dignity of this House, which this House must preserve, and unless the dignity of the President as Head of the State is preserved, this House automatically will get affected, but what I am saying is a matter of constitutional law. In a written constitution, Parliament, as it is here, is supreme in its own sphere. For instance, ours is a federal structure; Parliament is not supreme in the State sphere, where only the State Legislature is supreme, and if Parliament rushes in and impugns upon that sphere reserved for the State Legislature, Parliament's action will be declared bad. Similarly, judiciary is supreme in its own sphere. Likewise there is no question of conflict between Parliament and President.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir; I raised a point in reference to an article of the Constitution. In article 74 or 75 it is there that the Council of Ministers headed by the Prime Minister aids and gives advice to the President, and we take it that the President is bound by the advice even under our written Constitution. The point is whether our interpretation of the Constitution is right or wrong. We interpret that the President is bound by the advice given to him by the Council of Ministers headed by the Prime Minister.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Sir, the President, when he was Chairman of the Constituent Assembly, answered that question, and I think in a recent article of mine I had quoted the President's own words. I shall give you his own words.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You tell here. Have you read that article, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are going far beyond . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order; please sit down. If you want, you seek a further clarification later; not now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: With your permission, Sir, . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry; I am putting the amendments.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That sort of an approach will be an end of Parliament.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendments.

*Amendment Nos. 1 and 2 were, by leave, withdrawn.

*For texts of amendments, vide col. 231 supra.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Next amendment; Mr. Kureel is not here.

The question is:

3. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

"but regret—

(i) that no solid programme has been presented in order to bring socialism in the country and to establish a welfare State with the co-operation of all the opposition parties;

(ii) that no definite programme has been presented for eradicating unemployment and poverty in the hilly and other backward areas of the country and no concrete suggestion has been made for ending the injustices that are being done to the poor landless farmers and tillers in the country nor any programme has been presented for increasing food production in the country;

(iii) that no declaration has been made of the Government's intention to implement the report of the Backward Classes Commission;

(iv) that no declaration has been made for compulsory and free education upto the 8th class;

(v) that no reason has been given for the indifferent attitude of the Government towards the question of conducting all business in Hindi, the national language in place of English in the High Courts of Hindi-speaking States;

(vi) that no concrete programme has been put forward to end the unauthorised occupation of thousands of square miles of our territory by China'."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:—

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 14th February, 1961'."

The motion was adopted.

THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS), 1961-62—GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the Railway Budget. Dr. Kunzru.

Dr. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): May I suggest, Sir, that we may take up the Railway Budget after the lunch-break?

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You just begin; it is not yet time for adjournment; there are a few minutes left.

Dr. H. N. KUNZRU: It means I shall speak for four or five minutes and then there will be a break. Thus I shall not be able to deal even with one topic in four or five minutes.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta (West Bengal): We should accommodate the hon. Member. We may rise now.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can just begin your preliminary remarks, and then we adjourn. Why adjourn the House earlier?

Dr. H. N. KUNZRU: Sir, if it is your pleasure that I should speak immediately, I shall do so.

I should like to refer first to those points in the Railway Minister's speech which must have given unalloyed satisfaction to the House. I