

Shri Nanda: Yes. This idea was thrown up in the last meeting of the NDC that this should specially be kept in view.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: Would any extra expenditure be involved if planning boards are to be set up in the States? Is that the main reason why State Governments are averse to the idea?

Shri Nanda: This question was raised from one State. But the answer is that no considerable expenditure should be incurred simply for that reason, because even otherwise adequate arrangements will have to be made for the purpose.

Shri Shivananjappa: May I know whether there is any body at the State level to evaluate the progress of the plan?

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: It has already been stated. Usually it is the Chief Minister with a few officials under him who try to evaluate it at present. But we find it inadequate in view of the complexities of the Fourth Plan and various other things, especially perspective planning.

Shri Tyagi: Have Government examined the feasibility of transferring some experts from the Planning Commission to various States? At present, there are, I understand, 229 officers, 376 ministerial staff and 246 peons in the Planning Commission.

Mr. Speaker: It is a suggestion for action.

Shri Nanda: In the Planning Commission, there is the messenger system. There is a certain number of messengers, of course. Considering the various aspects of the work of the plan and development in the whole country, I would like to give a fuller account to the House about what is being done. It may be that there may be some superfluous people. If so, they should not be there. But if all the functions are to be performed, there

may have to be even strengthening in some directions.

Shri Tyagi: It is difficult to believe that they are all busy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is expansion of the Planning Commission.

Shri Tyagi: The House has also some intelligence.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

Indians working in Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference Secretariat

*462. **Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Indians working in the Secretariat of Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference and for how long they have been there;

(b) whether the Government of India have, at any time, extended pecuniary support to any Indian delegate visiting the said Conference;

(c) whether there is any unit of this Conference functioning in India; and

(d) if so, the personnel thereof?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) to (d). A statement is placed on the table of the House.

Statement

The unit of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation functioning in India is known as "Indian Association for Afro-Asian Solidarity". There is an Indian Secretary in the Permanent Secretariat of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation at Cairo, working there since 22nd April, 1961. Prior to the present incumbent, there had also been an Indian working in the Permanent Secretariat from 1958 to 1960.

2. Government have at no time extended monetary support to any Indian delegate attending the various Conferences held by the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation.

3. A list of names of the office bearers of the Indian Association for Afro-Asian Solidarity elected at the Third Conference of the Association held in Bombay in December, 1960 is given below:

President Smt. Rameshwari Nehru
Vice-Presidents Shri Mathura Das Mathur
 Smt. Aruna Asaf Ali
 Shri Brahm Prakash
 Shri S. S. Mirajkar
 Shri Naushar Ali
 Shri Darbara Singh
 Pt. Onkarnath Thakur
 Shri R. K. Patel
 Dr. Syed Mohd.
 Shri K. Subramaniam
 Shri B.A. Dalal

General Secretary Dr. Anup Singh
Jt. General Secretary Shri M. Govinda Reddy
Office Secretaries Smt. Perin Romesh Chandra
 Shri O.P. Paliwal

Members of the Executive Committee
 Diwan Chaman Lal
 Shri Harsh Dev Malviya
 Smt. Littoo Ghosh
 Shri A. K. Gopalan
 Shri Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafar
 Shri Inderjit Gupta
 Shri Radharaman
 Shri Romesh Chandra Maj.
 Gen. S.S. Sokhey
 Pt. Sunder Lal
 Shri A.S.R. Chari

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: It is stated that there was no pecuniary support extended to any Indian delegate attending these conferences. What is the extent and form of the non-pecuniary support or recognition extended to this organisation by Government?

Shri Dinesh Singh: People were provided with travel documents, and have been given some publicity material.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Have Government investigated the antecedents and composition of this body at the international level? If so, do Government propose to continue to allow delegates from India to this organisation's conferences.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Normally, Government allows delegates to go to conferences like this. The real question that is involved is that of foreign exchange or any other expenditure. It was made quite clear in this case, as in others, that no expenditure, no foreign exchange, would be paid by Government. Thereafter, a list of some people was given. They were apparently of the Indian branch of the Afro-Asian Solidarity conference. Many of them had passports already. I am not sure if they required any more passports. We thought in the circumstances that they might be able to put the Indian case in regard to this conflict with China better there because the Moshi Conference itself, apart from those who sponsored it, had a large number of important African leaders attending.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: In view of the fact that the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference is dominated mainly by China, what steps have Government taken to watch the activities of this conference branch in India and whether any action has been taken against them here for their activities?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are not aware of any particular activities that require action. Naturally in the normal course some information is received about the various activities. So far as this Conference is concerned they do not come in for adverse notice.

Shri Hem Barua: In view of the fact that the Indian delegation to the Moshi Conference achieved nothing in relation to the India-China border dispute, except disgrace for the country . . .

Shri Hiren Mukerjee: Sir, on a point of order. This is supposed to be part of a question in pursuance of a practice which is being pursued by this particular hon. Member for a long time now. I wish your guidance in this matter, if a question might be

prefaced by this sort of a thing: . . .
(Interruptions.)

Shri Hem Barua: Before I have finished this question, here is a point of order raised by a Member. It is usurpation of your powers and violation of a privilege enjoyed by Members. We are not going to tolerate this.

Mr. Speaker: He will kindly resume his seat.

Shri Hem Barua: I have not finished my question.

Mr. Speaker: He will kindly resume his seat. So far as putting of questions is concerned, it is not one Member but a very large number of hon. Members who always preface their questions with long statements.

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit, Sir . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Is he not prepared to listen to me also? There is no question of any point of order being raised because it is not one Member who does so. It is mostly the case with at least two dozens of Members if I could give a figure. I am always taking exception. But when a Member begins to do so, these things have to be heard because it is to be seen whether it is really necessary to make the question intelligible. Only that much can be allowed so that the question might be understood. Nothing beyond that. But I might take this opportunity, not related with this point of order, to request the hon. Members to confine themselves straight to the information that they require and not to preface it with unnecessary statements that could be avoided, because during question hour this is not the form in which questions should be put.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, before he finishes his sentence, there cannot be a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. Almost in 99 out of 100 cases of points of order raised during the

Question Hour, they were irrelevant. What should I say about a particular point of order at this moment? What point of order can be raised when a supplementary is being put? When a Member stands up on a point of order, under the Rules I have to listen to him and ultimately it turns out that there is no point of order at all. I will request the hon. Members to exercise self-restraint instead of my saying that I would not listen to them . . . (Interruptions.)

Dr. M. S. Aney: May I submit that the point of order which arises is whether a Member can raise a point of order before the question is put? That is the point of order for you to consider.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order is only the excuse that the Member can take. He had understood what is going to follow and he objects to it.

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit on your ruling that preface a question with a statement in order to make it . . . (Interruptions.) Let me finish what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: I request him to proceed with his question. I might repeat that whatever he has said is not necessary for asking information.

Shri Hem Barua: I bow to your ruling, but when I put the question like that it is only because I want to make my question more intelligible. I am not temperamentally suited to put a question like: "How many women in India are married?"

Mr. Speaker: The only difficulty is that he might think that all that statement is necessary to make the question intelligible, though it may not be necessary. That is all.

Shri Hem Barua: You will agree with me that I always pack them in only one question.

Mr. Speaker: There is no need for entering into any further argument. He might put the question straight.

Shri Hem Barua: In view of the fact that the Indian delegation achieved nothing for India—

Mr. Speaker: Again I will stop him there. Why does he presume things? That is his opinion only, and not a question for information.

Shri Hem Barua: I am giving my opinion.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. When I am dealing with the hon. Member, others should not stand up in this manner. What the hon. Member said is his opinion. It is not the time now that he should give his opinion on that. He should come straight to the question, to the information that he wants from the Minister.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether the Government have enquired from the Indian delegation to the Moshi Conference the actual position about the situation there and how far the mission that the Government entrusted them to fulfil there succeeded? As the Prime Minister has just said, it had the Prime Minister's blessings also. I want to know whether the Government had enquired from them about the correct position, the correct perspective.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am very sorry to say that the hon. Member's questions are always so involved that my poor brain reels under them. There are so many provisos, if's and but's and insinuations that I just cannot understand what he is driving at. This question, as framed by him, obviously is full of insinuations, and, as you were pleased to say, he is expressing his opinion. It is open to him to express his opinion, but . . .

Mr. Speaker: The only question that can be formed out of what he said is whether the Government has enquir-

ed from the delegation whether they have been able to achieve anything.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, if that is the question, I shall certainly answer it, but he himself . . .

Shri Hem Barua: That was my question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hem Barua: There was no insinuation. I am in a weak position because you are on me.

Mr. Speaker: No. He is entirely mistaken. He is in a very strong position.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member, before he asked that question, gave his opinion and the answer to that in his own opinion!

Shri Hem Barua: No, Sir. I never did that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He said, in view of the fact that they have completely failed, whether these things have failed or not. It is an extraordinary thing, to put a question like that, if I may say so, with all respect. I may say that the insinuation contained in that question is totally wrong and unjustified. Secondly, they did not fail. I think by their going there, they did some good. I do not say they changed . . .

Shri Hem Barua: They passed a resolution with reservations.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon. Member wants to discuss this thing, he can discuss it at some other time. Having enquired into this matter from various sources, from our Missions and others, apart from the members of the delegation, we find that the position would have been much different, it would have been much more disadvantageous to us, if those people had not gone there.