

held today has recommended allocation of time for Government business as follows:

<i>Government Business</i>		<i>Time Allotted</i>
1. General discussion on the General Budget for the year 1967-68	1 day	(28-3-1967)
2. General discussion on the Railways Budget for the year 1967-68	4 hours	} (29-3-1967)
3. General discussion on the Goa, Daman and Diu Budget for the year 1967-68	1 hour	
4. Consideration and return of the Appropriation Bills relating to the following :—		
(a) Demands on Account (General) for 1967-68.	} 1 day	(30-3-1967)
(a) Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for 1966-67		
(c) Demands on Account (Railways) for 1967-68		
(d) Supplementary Demands for Grants (Railways) for 1966-67		
(e) Demands on Account (Goa, Daman and Diu) for 1967-68		
(f) Supplementary Demands for Grants (Goa, Daman and Diu) for 1966-67		
5. General discussion on the Rajasthan Budget for 1967-68	} 1 day	(30-3-1967)
6. Consideration and return of the Appropriation Bills relating to the following :—		
(a) Demands on Account (Rajasthan) for 1967-68		
(b) Supplementary Demands for Grants (Rajasthan) for 1966-67		
7. The Armed Forces (Special Powers) Continuance Bill, 1967		
8. Motion regarding Proclamation issued under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Rajasthan	1 day	(3-4-1967)
9. Short duration discussion under Rule 176 regarding disclosures contained in the Book "The Untold Story" by Lt. General B. M. Kaul	2 hours	

In order to be able to complete the business, the Committee further recommended that the House might curtail or dispense with the lunch recess and sit up to 6.00 P.M. on all the days up to the 31st March, 1967.

3 P.M.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENTS ADDRESS—contd.

SHRI M. N. KAUL — (Nominated): Madam Deputy Chairman, I should like to make a few suggestions arising out of the crisis in Rajasthan. I have had the advantage of listening to the debates in this House and also of following the debates in the other House. There have been many speeches, but the facts lie within a narrow compass. The election results were completed on 25th February. The Assembly was dissolved on the /

28th February. So, it was open to the Governor on the 1st of March to summon the leader of the Congress Party, which was the largest single Party in the Assembly to form a Government. If he had done so, that would have been in accordance with constitutional practice. The Congress Party did not have a clear majority, but it was the largest single Party. The Governor would have been perfectly in order to ask *Mr. Sukhadfa to form the Government, but he adopted the alternative course, which had also the sanction of constitutional precedents. In England when no Party has a clear majority in the House of Commons, the King must then use his own judgment as to which leader he would summon, subject only to the condition that the person summoned must be able to command a majority by some coalition or comoromise with the other Parties. So, the Governor met

[Shri M. N. Kaul.] the leader of the Congress Party and also the leader of the Opposition groups. His main business during these days was to ascertain the loyalty of the fifteen Independents, as to which group did they attach themselves. Eventually, he" summoned a press conference on the 4th March. This was an unprecedented step. Governors have issued statements justifying their decisions, but they have not called press conferences to answer questions about their decisions. Anyway, he adopted that course and then said that he was not certain about the loyalty of the Independents and so he would disregard the Independents and ask Mr. Sukhadia to form a Government. This course he could have adopted, as I indicated earlier, in the beginning, but he did not do so. Having tried to take the other course, he should have explored all the avenues open to him.. So far as I am able to follow, there were fifteen Independent members. It was not beyond the realm of possibility for the Governor to ascertain for certain individually the wishes of these fifteen members. The Opposition parties have alleged that three of the independents owed loyalty to the Congress and twelve independents owed loyalty to the Opposition groups. So, the position in a nutshell was, the Congress had 88 plus 3 and the Opposition, according to them, 80 plus 12. If you add up these figures, the position is: the Congress commanded 91 votes and the Opposition, according to their showing, commanded 92 votes. So, they claimed a majority of one vote. Such was the precarious position of the voting strength. As soon as the Governor announced his decision, an agitation started and the House is familiar with the incidents which have been recalled by many Members. It ultimately led to police firing on the 7th March.

The Governor had originally fixed the 20th March as the date for the commencement of the Session. The matter was reviewed by the Central Government and they applied a brake

on the Governor. They requested him to accelerate the date of commencement of the Session and it was later fixed by him as the 14th March. The position taken by the Governor and the Central Government was that the Governor's decision was an initial decision, a preliminary decision. Under the Constitution, it was open to the House to upset the decision by a vote of noconfidence. Now, much has been canvassed on both sides, but I think the crucial issue lies within a narrow compass and could be summed up in one sentence. Prof. Keith has written in one of his books: "It must always be remembered that the power to award high office gives the nominee of the Crown a considerable measure of power to secure support." I think that was the crucial issue. The opposition felt that if the Congress were installed in office, they would be in a position to command more votes. That was a fact of politics, whatever you might say about the morality of it. The fact of politics was that there was a very strong feeling among the Opposition groups that if Mr. Sukhadia was installed in office, then he would be able to command a majority by influencing the independent members. That feeling was very deep-rooted in the Opposition groups and they had some experience in 1962 when Mr. Sukhadia got in by a narrow majority and he was able to continue in office, because he had the power of patronage. I do not at all justify the action of the Opposition in making inflammatory speeches, in parading 92 members in the streets of Jaipur. That action was very unseemly. Their parading these 92 members in Jaipur in the streets, their coming in strength to the President and interviewing him, all that was completely unnecessary, because all this testing of strength could have taken place more properly within the precincts of the Legislative Assembly. But they were nervous of adopting this course, because they thought if the Assembly met on the 14th March and Mr. Sukhadia, who was offered the formation of the Government, did

form the Government and faced the House," he would be able to command a narrow majority. So, they were determined that it should not happen and a chain of events followed. The Home Minister conceded that we may not completely agree with the course the Governor took. There had been alternative courses open to him, but certainly the course that he took was one of the courses that was constitutionally open to him and in any case his decision was not final. It was subject to being tested in the House. I, however, feel strongly that the Governors have not only to consider their strict constitutional responsibilities but they have got to take into account the political consequences. The whole atmosphere was surcharged with this strong feeling that whoever was offered the task of forming the Government would eventually entrench himself in that office. I think the Governor should have taken that fully into account.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You can argue the question, but why did you not allow the members to test their strength and choose their own leaders on the first day of meeting of the Assembly?

SHRI M. N. KAUL: I am coming to that. I will develop my points. I think as the events unfolded themselves, the position was further clarified when Mr. Sukhadia intimated to the Governor on the 12th March that he was unwilling to form a Government in view of the prevailing tense and inflammable atmosphere in the city. At that time the Governor's hands were perfectly free. He could call the Opposition groups to form a Government, or as I think he could have called a meeting of the Assembly. A meeting of the Assembly could have been called and a Speaker could have been elected. The election of the Speaker would have been an indication as to which way the wind was blowing and it may have been a forerunner of the opinion of the Assembly as to who should form the Government. The Governor however put /

the issue to the Central Government in a different light. I have read his report; it is a short report, but I feel that the whole temper of the Governor is that he is angry with the Opposition. He has used almost the words which the British Government used at the time when the Congress was in opposition. He says:

"The important leaders of this group are members of the Legislature who by their precept and example are expected to foster respect for the law but they have deliberately broken the law. I cannot for a moment expect such persons to follow democratic methods and procedures in administration."

He may have good grounds for it; I do not know—I was not on the spot—what was the law and order situation. But surely we all knew that what was behind this agitation was that the Governor should not give an initial advantage to the leader of the Congress Party. Ultimately, the Governor suggested to the Centre that not only the President's rule should be introduced but the Assembly should be dissolved. As you will recall, Madam, the Centre had to restrain the Governor first on the question of the summoning of the Assembly. They asked him to accelerate the date and, secondly, they had to intervene again and reverse the Governor on the question of dissolution. They said: "No, dissolution is not necessary, the Assembly will be suspended." That, in brief, is the position. I feel, Madam, that the time has now come when the entire position should be reviewed.

In British times when the Governors acted under the Government of India Act, 1935, the Instrument of Instructions to the Governors was approved by Parliament. With the coming into force of the new Constitution that Instrument of Instructions lapsed, and in any case it was not suited to present-day conditions. Our Government took no steps to frame a new Instrument of Instructions or Directions to the Governors. The

[Shri M. N. Kaul.] position is that today the Governors have no guidance whatsoever. In other Commonwealth countries the [instrument of Instructions to the Governor is an exhaustive document. W is time that the Government should examine all the constitutional precedents on the subject and also take into account the precedents that have taken place in India during the last twenty years or so and frame a set of instrument of Instructions or Directions to the Governors. Further, this Instrument of Instructions or Directions to the Governors should not be an executive act only. This should be placed before Parliament and all sections of Parliament should be given an opportunity to make their contribution to the drafting of this Instrument of Instructions. If this Instrument of Instructions is not drafted in the way in which I have indicated in consultation with Parliament, then trouble will arise again on many occasions. Different Governors will adopt different courses of action. It does not look nice that when a Governor is exercising his discretion he should look up to Delhi to seek instructions. The instructions should be in a written document approved by Parliament and issued by the Government under the authority of Parliament which should set out as far as humanly possible all contingencies and guide the Governor in the exercise of his discretion.

The other thing to which I should like to refer is that the provisions in our Constitution on this matter contain an apparent contradiction. One provision in the Constitution says that the Governor shall appoint the Chief Minister in his judgment and the Ministers shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor. The other provision says that the Cabinet is collectively responsible to the House. The first of these provisions has been borrowed from the Government of India Act when in turn borrowed the provision from the colonial Constitutions. The Constitution that was drafted in Ireland did not follow these

colonial precedents. I think it is time that we should seriously consider whether the existing provisions are in accord with modern practice. The present-day conditions in India have shown that an amendment of the Constitution is necessary. In Ireland there is a simple procedure and if that procedure had been embodied in our Constitution, there would have been no difficulty at all. The procedure is this, that the Constitution enjoins that the Lower House of Ireland is to nominate the Prime Minister. Just as the House meets to elect the Speaker, similarly, the Lower House in Ireland meets to nominate the Prime Minister. Once the Prime Minister is nominated by the Lower House, that Prime Minister is automatically appointed by the President. I think that this procedure may even now be available to the Governor as a matter of convention. I feel that the Legislature should be summoned. The Governor may send a message to the Assembly requesting it to recommend to the Governor the name of the person whom he should ask to form the Government. I deliberately use the word 'recommend' because as our Constitution stands at present the power of appointment is vested in the Governor, but there is nothing to prevent the Governor from asking the Assembly by a motion to recommend to him the person whom he should appoint as the Chief Minister. That course is still open to him. I think if that procedure is adopted, all the difficulties will be removed.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, I feel much honoured and I am also thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to support the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address. The President's Address is significant in more than one respect. It is an honest and realistic appraisal of the situation as it exists. The President has taken note of the vitality and vigour of our democratic process wherein we could bring about a change in the Government through,

ballot boxes. It would have been better if instead of so many parties coming up to defeat the Congress, a party founded well on sound principles had come to enable the democracy to function by providing it an alternative sort of Government. Today there are Congress and non-Congress Governments, and it is a happy augury that the Chief Ministers have said that things will go on smoothly. But as I see in the State of Bihar Urdu is going to be a second official language, and there are some rumblings about it. So with these divergent views the question is whether all of them will be able to pull together. Congress defeat is attributed to so many factors. But the main thing is that the burden has so much increased on our common man and the difficulties have become so tremendous that he got fed up with us and has said, "I will vote for anybody but not you". But still the vast majority of the voters who have supported the Congress even in these elections have kept up the balance of their mind saying that none is able to deliver the goods as the Congress can, and that is why principally in these two Houses of Parliament Congress still retains its majority.

Madam, each one is on trial, not only the Congress. We hear so many lectures of the opposition benches telling us to do this and that, and we would tell them something that you at least please keep up your united front or you carve out a common minimum programme among yourselves consisting of independents, Swatantraites, Marxists, Socialists, Left Communists, and so on, owing allegiance to different ideologies. They have little right to preach unity on this side where we stand as disciplined soldiers following the behest of our inspiring leader, the Prime Minister, and the Cabinet, and we do stand as a party.

Now I will refer, Madam, . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Who is your leader, the Prime Minister or the President?

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN: The leader of the House is the Prime Minister. The Swatantraites should know that they had got three political parties even during the last Lok Sabha and a few independents.. They stand for nothing but for vested interests. They are reactionaries of the first order and you shall be the first casualty when the leftist parties like the Communist party and the Socialist party come into power and you shall rule the day when you dared to go against the interests of the Congress because the Congress stands for all interests inclusive of your interests

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You are more worried about us than we ourselves.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN: Now, there are certain issues like the language issue and the cow slaughter issue. There has been a feeling, as one of the hon. Members from the South has said, that the South does not want imposition of Hindi. I can understand that. But the South cannot say that so long as it does not consent, this foreign language, a relic of British imperialism, shall continue till eternity. Equally there is the other extreme also. Hindi is the *lingua franca* or inter-provincial language. There is a section of opinion, particularly in the State of U.P. which wants to make Hindi so bombastic and Sanskritised that it will break our jaws and will not be understood by, or intelligible to, the common man. It is between these two-extremes that some way has to be found. Hindi should be intelligible. Why do we abject to a foreign language? Because our people, who are ultimately the masters, and the administrators and rulers have to communicate in a language which they understand, and since they do not understand English, it should be in Hindi. The President's Address to the Joint Session of Parliament was in such bombastic and Sanskritised Hindi that even our Vice-President had diffi-

[Shri G. H. Valimohmed Momin.] culty in reading it out from the paper. If such a bombastic style of Hindi comes up, then the hiatus remains created between the people and the rulers.

There have been such questions as, •say, cow slaughter. This issue should not be viewed from a narrow point of view. Now some people say that the 'ban should cover not only cows but the progeny of the ro"ws also. Now the Supreme Court has clearly said "that this question should not be viewed from a narrow sectarian point of •view. There are several viewpoints. The cow is sacred I belong" to the Muslim faith and I say "no objection, let cow be saved." But you should not go further under threats and pressures. Madam, let me tell you that in 'Gujarat, this cow slaughter agitation has played an important role and given a good stick in the hands of the Swatantra particularly to beat the Congress with. But I must compli- ment the ruling party, the Prime Minister and her Cabinet colleagues for having stood firmly as they ought to hav_e stood against all those pressure tactics.

There is another auestion we have been talking about, that is, where English stands. Nobody i_s biased against English. It is not like that. Hindi also should develop-simple, intelligible Hindi plus the 14 other languages. We have got linguistic provinces. In Gujarat the medium of instruction is Gujarati. Bihar will have Bihari—there is no such language as Bihari. they may be having Hindi or Urdu, If they want, as the second official language.

AN. HON. MEMBER: There W Bihari.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN: All right, but not as a recognised language. Madam, my view is that the claims of Urdu should be well recognised. Here I must that under the leadership of ou_r Syed Mahmud, Member of *the* Rajya Sabha, the Mashavarat

has also played a great havoc amongst my people, the Muslim followers, dislodging them from supporting the Congress. It is in the interests of the Muslims to stand by the Congress and the Congress alone, for if chaotic conditions come, the Muslims themselves will be the first casualty. But, however, we have not been definitely stating the position of Urdu, and therefore, there are certain persons exploiting the situation. It is high tim_e that we, now standing on the brink of a precipice, take a bold, firm, generous and sympathetic stand on Urdu.

There are other things like Planning. This is very simple. How do we finance it? This is something which Mr. Asoka Mehta should understand. He has to cut the coat according to the resources of the cloth. There is no use planning for Rs. 5,000 crores or Rs. 6,000 crores, and then beg and borrow—but steal you can't do. If you go on like this and don't understand the burden it causes, then probably it will be the last feather to break the camel's back. We must develop our economy. We must not abandon economic development. But we must plan within our resources and do it in such a way that we take the people with us in planning and then they will come when we get out of this economic chaos.

Madam, I have also some suggestions to offer. The Opposition parties from their own different angles have criticised us. Some hon. Member from Madhya Pradesh spoke about the alleged atrocities and the highhandedness of Chief Minister Mishra and so on. What have they done? Have they not spent money? Have they not clearly misrepresented the Congress deliberately? Had they any ideology to put before the people? They were only fishing in troubled waters and they exploited the discontent that somehow existed against the Congress. The time has now como when we must take a very realistic view and we should see that our people remain contented and tak* the

burdens easily, and that we have a planned economic development within our resources.

Then, Madam, a word about food. Is there no food? Then how is it that when raids take place, so many thousands of tonnes of foodgrains come out? It is because we have not been able to take out this food from the black-market or from these merchants or anti-social elements.

Much is said about the citizen's rights and constitutional rights and the use of the Defence of India Rules. We are running a State. We are not running an *ashram*. We have to deal with the situation as it exists. If some of the political opponents, for their own purposes, want to exploit the gullible masses, then somewhere the State has to intervene to save law and order. What happened in Rajasthan? Whatever may be the theoretical niceties about this, the Governor should have done this. Who makes a mess if not the independent members? To-day there is parity of votes in Rajasthan. One hon. Member died and another crossed the floor. Who can stop these Independents from crossing the floor from one place to the other? At 5 O'Clock he could be paraded before the President and the same independent member, because he is an independent member, could be paraded before the Governor or before the Parliament. So we must understand the problem and not become very sensitive as some of the hon. Members have become. The hon. Member Mr. Setalvad, became sensitive and asked "Where are the citizen's rights?" What rights do you want? You have to save society from those who, in the name of democracy and freedom of expression, want to exploit the situation and bring into disrepute the ruling party. These things, Madam, should be fairly and squarely faced and told to the people. When people say here that shooting took place or bullets were fired, why were they fired? One hon. Member said he

was beaten. Was he beaten in his home or was he beaten when he was taking rest or when he was taking food or when he was in bed? He must have gone out to break a Congress meeting or somebody else's meeting. Nowhere has the Congress gone to any opponent's meeting to break the meeting. But the Opposition parties have sent small boys with notes or chits to do some sort of *gadbad* about some *tfptas*, about the cow slaughter issue or about some mosque. Every local issue was exploited. What is to be done to save the society, to save the country from chaotic conditions coming in because of those multifarious political parties? What has to be done to stop this and to establish and stabilise the Government, which is the need of the day? It is through proper use of force against those who do not understand any other language than that of force.

Madam, I have one or two words to say about the austerity drive. I do not say that our Ministers should reduce their needs and follow the examples of other Ministers who want to become popular. There is a saying — it is a new broom which sweeps better and wants to show better. But honestly speaking, when our Ministers come to Parliament in their big luxurious cars, this is also marked by the common man. He says, there is famine, there is drought. Why should not these Ministers go in their Ambassadors or in their Fiats or station wagons? Why should they have such luxurious cars? They have their house decorations, their flowers, all sorts of things. The manner of their moving about also makes the common man feel that one raja has gone and another raja has come. Our workers do not become Members of this House or the other House or of the Legislatures. We have been calling upon them to lead a simple life; we have been calling upon them to follow the lead of Mahatma Gandhi, walking in foot-steps. But even when we want to open a simple emporium, we do

[Shri G. H. Valimohmed Momin.] not open it in a foreign country with some austerity. We take up a luxurious house on a big rent. Cannot our embassies do without a bottle of wine? Living in a very big style, you cannot project the image of this country. Gandhiji while in England refused to see the Crown, the King of England, in a formal dress. He said: "I will come simply dressed because I represent my poor masses". Under protocol they asked him to put on a tie. But if our leaders look westernised, when their photographs come, the common man says, here is the man who we have seen struggling in the streets, whom we have seen leading our procession, whom we have seen attending to the ration shops, whom we have seen serving us. But he now poses pompously as if he is a monarch, assuming feathers like the bird known as the peacock. So, this sort of thing also, according to me, has a very deleterious effect on the common man. My appeal is not only to the Ministers but to ourselves also.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: To the Opposition also.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN: The Opposition will never stand corrected. So there is no use in correcting them. (*Interruptions.*) Yes, yes.

Madam, one word more. Sometimes in the international context when there is a confrontation or tension between us and Pakistan and China, a suggestion is made, why not initiate some action against China, why not do something against Pakistan? This might appear to be a simple suggestion but the atmosphere that is tried to be created is to show that the attitude of India is some recalcitrant. India's attitude is very clear. It holds out its hand to friendship to Pakistan and China, to America and Russia; it holds out its hand of friendship as a sovereign State, with dignity and self-respect and opining independently, whether it hurts America or Russia. That is, Madam, non-alignment which has come to be vindicated and which

our President, a philosopher and a wise man—I will not call him an old man because he is a young man in spirit—has stressed in his Address.

Thank you for having given me this opportunity to speak.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Madam, we are discussing this Address of the President after the Fourth General Elections. The Fourth General Elections have brought about significant changes and you know, although the Congress has retained power at the Centre with a heavily reduced majority, non-Congress Governments have emerged in a number of States. I know, these non-Congress Governments are of various complexions, and in spite of their varying complexions, these non-Congress Governments are bound to run the States within the limits of the present Constitution. I know that the present Constitution does stand in the way of bringing about radical policies at the State level. In spite of all these limitations, those non-Congress Governments are working hard to bring about certain changes in the socio-economic policies in those States.

You will agree with me, Madam, that the emergency of these non-Congress Governments in certain States have posed before us a new problem of Centre-State relations. I think it is high time that the people who are at the helm of affairs are re-evaluated or reassessed the old relationship between the States and the Centre because there has been a new context, there has been a new perspective. In this new context and new perspective, there should be a re-evaluation and reassessment of the Central-State relations. You might not have overlooked the statements or observations made by the three Chief Ministers, the Chief Minister of Kerala, the Chief Minister of Madras and the Chief Minister of West Bengal, who have demanded, almost in an identical manner, a large amount of

autonomy for the States. There is no denying the fact that in the past there was the Congress monolith's rule over the country and there is no denying the fact that certain States were discriminated against, for the reasons best known to the Congress despots, in the matter of allocation of financial assistance from the Central pool, in the matter of Plan allocations, on the plea of recognition of a particular language as the official one. All these past experiences have goaded the Chief Ministers into demanding a larger autonomy for the States, to serve their people who have returned them to power.

In this context, I may draw your attention to the fact that although our President has been pleased enough to refer to this problem, he has not referred to any concrete proposal. In his speech, we do not find any indication as to how he proposes to re-evaluate and reassess the old State-Centre relations. My humble suggestion in this respect is that there is a Constitutional provision, article 263, which envisages the constitution of an inter-State Council. May I request the House, through you, Madam, to plead for the appointment of such a Council which can make appropriate recommendations to the Government *r> that there may be harmony between the States and the Centre in this new context and the new changed perspective?

Madam, I want to draw your attention to another important subject. You might have noticed that there were persistent demands of the employee* of the State Governments for granting clearness allowance to them on par with the dearness allowance of thf Central Government employees. There have been popular movements, democratic movements, run by the State Government employees in several States, in West Bengal, in Kerala, in UP, in Mysore, in almost all the States. Their demand is pure and simple. They want dearness allowance on par with the dearness allowance of the Central Government employees. The other day, we heard

the Finance Minister and the Deputy Prime Miniister saying that the granting of additional dearness allowance to the State Government employees is the concern of the States and not that of the Centre. Madam. Deputy Chairman, I strongly feel that this is a deliberate shirking of responsibility from the side of the Centre. Not only that. It is a calculated move to put particularly the non-Congresg Governments into trouble because those Governments in several States are committed to redress immediately the grievances of the State Government employees, because they feel that if they are to fight corruption at the Government level, *it* they «re to ensure a clean administration to the people which is the need of the day, then the unstinted support of the State Government employees ir, to be enlisted. You cannot <j,e\ the unstinted co-operation of government servants unless you are there to look into their grievances, unless you are there to assure them of a decent living in these days of spiralling price;. Therefore, if there are spiralling prices, there is the question of increased D.A. and I strongly feel that to meet the additional grant on account of D.A. to the State employees is the responsibility of the Centre because it is those wrong, anti-people and disastrous fiscal policies of the Cent.r* which hav_e led to the spiralling of prices. Therefore, the Central Government cannot shirk responsibility. Therefore, I strongly feel that the Government of India should immediately assure the State Governments, particularly West Bengal, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh where there has been commitment from the side of the State Government leaders that for immediate redressal of the grievances of the State Governments employees sufficient financial aid to these State Governments would be given.

Madam, in this connection we cannot leave aside the question of increased D.A. to the Central Government employees. You might have noticed that the All-India Consumers' Price Index has now risen to 186.5 points

LShri Chitta Basu.]

while the D.A. to the Central Government employees is related to 175 points thereby registering an upward rise of 11.5 points. Madam, this upward revision of D.A. has been necessitated by the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission. Not only that, the Gajendragadkar Commission has also made it abundantly clear that the question of neutralisation of dear-ness, as specified by the Das Commission, should be made on the basis of 10 points rise. Therefore, while there has been an upward trend in prices by 11.5 points in the All-India Consumers' Price Index, there should be immediate revision of the D.A. allowed to the employees of the Central Government.

Madam, I want to draw your attention to another question of very high importance, namely the food problem. I do not like to dwell much upon this subject because in this House many hon'ble Members have touched it and discussed it. I would only limit my remarks to three or four points regarding this vexed problem.

The first question is: What is the actual production potential of our country? I have seen difference in figures in different books and booklets circulated by the Government of India. A set of figures says that the production potential cannot be more than 80-85 million tonnes, whereas our Government claims that the production potential is Rs. 100 million tonnes. Madam, I would simply ask the Government of India, particularly the Department of Food to overhaul the machinery which is responsible for collecting these figures. Unless we have got enough of farm figures we cannot plan our production, we cannot know what is happening in the country in the matter of agricultural production. Madam, we are passing through a great crisis particularly in relation to food production. There is chronic deficit. Not only that, the quantum of food import is likely to

be decreased this year because of certain international events that have already taken place. In the context of this wide gap, in the context of a wide deficit in the country, in the context of the expected decrease in the import of foodgrains, we feel that the key to meet this situation is to energetically follow the procurement programme. Unless the Government seriously takes up the procurement programme and takes recourse to State trading on all-India basis, we cannot ensure food to the weaker sections of our community. But I am pained to say that the Government of India is not very energetic in the matter of procurement and introducing State trading on an all-India basis.

Madam, I have got figures to show that the Government has a programme of less procurement this year. In Andhra there is 50 per cent, procurement while in other States the procurement is just 10 to 15 per cent of what it had been during the same period last year. A very small quantity is still left to be procured or purchased through the normal channels. Madam, you will be one with me when I say that even after the import of 3 million tonnes of foodgrains which is likely to reach our land towards the second half of this year, there will still be a shortfall of 2 million tonnes. We cannot get this 2 million tonnes of foodgrains unless there is internal procurement at an energetic speed. Therefore, I would urge upon the Government of India to restart the programme of procurement and introduction of State trading if we are to meet this shortfall of 2 million tonnes.

Madam, as I told you during the earlier part of the day, Bihar presents a grim picture of scarcity. Here the people are dying of starvation. Shri J. P. Narain, an all-India political leader of our country, has stated that there have been at least 4 deaths

due to starvation. The Government of Bihar have now said that they are prepared to call a spade a spade. Earlier it was the practice with the Congress Government there not to give the figures of deaths due to starvation in Bihar. But the non-Congress Government will not conceal facts and they will let the whole country and Governments abroad know how people are dying of starvation. Therefore, we cannot meet this starvation and a grim situation unless the Government has enough stock to meet this situation and rush food to the places where there is absolute necessity.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Listen, every one has conformed to me.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Only one minute if you so like.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yea, one minute you can take.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I want to place the case of West Bengal which I represent for your sympathetic consideration. There are 8.5 million people under statutory rationing today in Calcutta and the adjacent belt. In the coming few months the West Bengal Government needs about 10 lakh tonnes of rice and other variety of foodgrains to meet the needs of people under statutory rationing. The other day the Chief Minister, the Food Minister and the Finance Minister of the State had been to the Capital and urged upon the Government of India to rush food to West Bengal in order to enable them to maintain the statutory rationing system. Madam, they have suggested that at least 1-5 million tonnes of rice or foodgrains will be necessary during the year. Through you, Madam, I would urge upon the Government of India to fulfill that demand and save the people of West Bengal from hunger because it is the responsibility of the Government to have in-

creased the jute acreage due to which they are able to earn larger foreign exchange. This they have been able to do at great sacrifice and the Government of India should deem it incumbent upon themselves to supply food as is required by the West Bengal Government to meet their needs. With these words I finish.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, as you know and as the House knows, my Party stands against all monopolies, whether it is political, economic or otherwise. I had been speaking against the Congress monopoly on the floor of this House and I am happy—at least I had my contribution to it—that we have broken this monopoly. In many of the States we have either as the combined Opposition shared the power or in some States independent parties have taken over the power. The Congress has a slender majority in the Lok Sabha now but I was not happy about the way the Prime Minister was elected. In the election of the Prime Minister I thought the Congress would become wiser, that Congressmen would prove wiser and behave better. I saw in the streets of Delhi beheaded Congressmen who were anxious to choose the Prime Minister. There were the beheaded Congress people, the ghosts of those politicians, roaming about the streets of Delhi. It was Mr. Atulya Ghosh who was wirepulling here, it was Mr. S. K. Patil who had been beheaded.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJMC: What about Mr. Ranga?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He did not have anything to do with the election of the Prime Minister. My friend does not understand anything but gets up to interrupt whatever is said in the House. He must conform to certain standards of behaviour.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEB: How was Rajaji elected? How was Prof. Ranga elected?

SHRI LOKANATH M. ISRA: Mr. Yajee should know how to conform to the standards of debate in the House. (*Addressing Mr. Yajee*) If you do not know it, you do not deserve to sit here. I was just telling how the political ghosts of certain 'beheaded heroes' were roaming in the streets of Delhi and how they nominated the Prime Minister. I did not like it. It was not in good taste. The people who have been elected, whether it is the Central executive of the ruling party or the Central Parliamentary Party executive, should have done the election. I did not somehow relish the beheaded heroes, the political ghosts roaming about the streets here choosing the Prime Minister.

Since you have allotted me a little time only. . . •

SHRI N. PATRA: Why are you having a ghost as the President of the Swatantra Party?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I would have replied to all the interruptions but I do not have the time.

" SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): They are like Ravana. They have ten heads.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I come to the next point which is a very serious one for the consideration of the Central Government. Now a certain party is in charge of the Central Government and the administration of the Central Government and other parties are there in the States. Now the Centre-State relationship has become very important in the present context. It has been indicated by many but a specific point which has not been indicated by any other Member I am going to take up. The Chief Minister of Orissa has recently indicated that the Finance Minister, Deputy Prime Minister. In other words, whom I have not seen in this House to-day till now, has written to the Chief Minister that the loans or overdraft of Rs. 8 crores must be repaid

within three months. There is a certain difference between the overdraft of the Centre and those of the State. Both indulge in the same overdrafts. When it comes to the Centre it is called deficit financing. When it comes to the States, it is called overdraft. As long as the Centre does not stop this deficit financing, it has no moral right to ask for the repayment of the loans or overdrafts by the States.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He has promised to do it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Let us see. Their promises have no value at all. The promises of Congressmen have absolutely no value as you have seen in the last 20 years. Let us see. If the present Deputy Prime Minister proves it to be correct, then I will be satisfied that you have a moral right to ask for the repayment of the overdrafts by the States. Otherwise they have forfeited their right to ask for the repayment from the States because they indulge in overdrafts at the Centre. They order the Reserve Bank which is under them, they get as much money as is necessary for the Central need and it is not called overdraft. It is just phraseology. The great Planning Commission is sitting just to find out a new phraseology for that, but all the same, they indulge in the same thing and in the case of the States, it is called overdraft. Naturally these must be defined as to how far the Centre can take overdrafts and how far the States can take overdrafts. That must be defined clearly and unless that is done, the Centre has forfeited the right to ask for the repayment from the States.

Secondly these are legacies of the past. These are all debts or loans taken by their own partymen, who squandered the money, against whom there are allegations in this and the other House and in the Assembly and everywhere, and for that money, good people are now asked to pay back.

The third point is this. The Constitution of India clearly defines what are the subjects that can be dealt with by the States and what are the subjects that could be taken over by the Centre. Till to-day, since, as I told you, there was a monopoly of power both in the States and in the Centre there was the same party—a direction from the Centre was enough to be law for the States. I will read out one or two items which are very relevant. Seventh Schedule item 23 reads:

"Regulation of mines and mineral development subject to the provisions of List I with respect to regulation and development under the control of the Union."

Item 24:

"Industries subject to the provisions of entry 52 of List I".

I will also read out List I items 7 and 52.

"Industries declared by Parliament by law to be necessary for the purpose of defence or for the prosecution of war."

Beyond that the Centre cannot go. Now according to the new set-up, the Planning Commission orders where a particular plant "has to be located. Who are they? Even the Centre does not come in.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): Let him read item 52 which reads:

"Industries the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest."

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I will come to that. I do not want to leave a single loophole which can be taken advantage of by the leader of the House. Now we have no legislation also for legalising the action of the Central Government. That I was going to take up. The industries in the States which are not very essential

for the prosecution of the war and for defence purposes cannot be taken up by the Centre. Number two is, provided there is a legislation to take up some industries Centrally that can only be taken up. Now I would like the Leader of the House to indicate to me if they have any such legislation in respect of such Plants which they have taken up. This is a very serious matter. A conference of the Chief Ministers belonging to the non-Congress parties is to be convened some time in April. I hope the Chief Ministers there will take this up and combine themselves to assert their own rights which have been infringed upon by the Central Government till to-day because the same ruling Congress Party ruled both at the Centre and in the States. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think we will have the statement now.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER RE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): The General Assembly by its Resolution 1722 (XVI) appointed an Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee of which India is a member. The General Assembly recommended that that Committee should undertake negotiations with a view to reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

2. As the Honourable Members are aware, the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC), which in reality is a Seventeen Nation Committee because of the absence of Franco, has been meeting in Geneva since 1962. Various measures collateral to the question of disarmament have been discussed in the Committee, and one of these is non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The ENDC has been giving particular attention to this