

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch at Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

STATEMENT UNDER DIRECTION  
115 RE. FOODGRAINS SUPPLIED  
TO KERALA

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Peermade): Sir, under Direction 115(1) by the Speaker, I seek to make a statement correcting the statement made by Shri Jagjivan Ram, Hon. Minister for Food, concerning monthly food supplies to Kerala.

I am quoting a portion of the statement made by the Minister on 22nd May, 1967 while replying to the debate on the adjournment motion. He has repeated the same in Rajya Sabha also.

"Shri Jagjivan Ram: In April, the shortfall had been quite sizeable. Instead of 70,000, it has been 53,00.

Shri P. Ramamurthi: 41,000. That was what the Kerala Chief Minister told me the day before yesterday.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am quite sure of my facts. I am not going to take figures from my friend."

Subsequent to this statement by the Central Food Minister, the Kerala Food Minister has sent a message to Shri A. K. Gopalan, M. P. In that message, the April supply is shown as 43,869 tonnes. I have attached a copy of the telegram to the Speaker. There is a disparity of nearly 10,000 tonnes for April.

This statement of the Union Food Minister is a misleading one. So, it has to be corrected.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Jagjivan Ram): I have already stated that in April, the shortfall had been quite sizeable and that instead of 70,000 tonnes the supply was 53,000 tonnes. The Food Corporation of India handled all foodgrains issued in Kerala whether moved from

other surplus States within the country or from imports or from their local procurement. The Food Corporation has confirmed that 63,000 tonnes of rice was issued through its depots to the Ration Shops in Kerala during April 1967. The figure of 43,869 tonnes mentioned by the Kerala Revenue Minister in the telegram quoted by the hon. Member presumably relates to the actual receipts in the State out of the quantity of about 45,000 tonnes despatched from Andhra Pradesh and Madras or received through imports during April.

There has been no attempt on my part to mislead the House. (Interruptions).

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): What is this? We do not understand this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No discussion now.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Vasudevan Nair made a statement and the Minister has made a statement in reply. There cannot be any discussion now.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasargod): Generally, according to rules, it is correct. We do not disagree. But we have seen what the rules are and how the rules are followed. The Chief Minister and the Food Minister of Kerala have given some figures. The Food Minister here also gives a figure. There is difference in those figures. This is what we are pointing out. It is not only giving an answer and saying, "this is what the Kerala Minister says, this is what I say, I am correct". There must be some inquiry into it. The Food Minister says that his figure is correct. The Chief Minister and Food Minister of Kerala have given their figure and they have written to Members of Parliament here. It is not a question of pointing out the rule and saying that that is the rule and that we cannot say anything. If it is not misleading, then what else is it?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Will the hon. Member please resume his seat? I am not just pointing out the rules of procedure, but I am only saying that if he is not satisfied with the reply, then there are other methods. He can put a question and pursue the matter, but if we continue like this, it would be very difficult.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** We are forced to continue this discussion.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** I want to rise on a point of order . . .

**Shri A. Sreedharan (Badagara):** He must apologise to the House.

**Shri E. K. Nayanar (Palghat):** He should apologise to the House.

**Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour):** We have been misled all the time with wrong figures.

**Shri E. K. Nayanar:** Let the hon. Minister say whether the figure is correct or not; if it is incorrect, let him apologise to the House.

**Shri A. Sreedharan:** Let him say that his figure was incorrect. He cannot just make this statement and get away with it.

**Shri E. K. Nayanar:** Let him say whether the figure is correct or not, and if it is incorrect, he should apologise.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has given certain figures which he has ascertained to be correct; his agencies are there. If the hon. Member wants to challenge those figures, he can certainly request him to clarify the position. Beyond that, what is possible in the circumstances? Could the hon. Minister enlighten me on that?

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** We have got this information that a ship that was going to Cochin with 10,000 tonnes . . .

**Shri Jagjwan Ram:** If the hon. Member would give me some time for a little clarification, perhaps, there

may be no necessity for any discussion.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Before he clarifies the position, I want him to answer this point also. A ship laden with 10,000 tonnes of rice had gone to Cochin; out of that, 5,000 tonnes had been unloaded, and 5,000 tonnes had not been unloaded, and that ship then went to other places. That is what the Chief Minister and the Food Minister of Kerala have said. If they are wrong, then certainly the hon. Minister can make an enquiry and punish them for saying that. But if the Food Minister here is wrong, then something must be done in that regard and there must be some inquiry about it. We have been supplied with certain facts by the Food Minister and Chief Minister of Kerala. When we had asked them why they were saying like that, they told us that this was the position and that the ship had gone to other places after half the quantity had been unloaded. It looks as if, therefore, that if a ship goes to Cochin with 10,000 tonnes, that goes into the account of Kerala. Is this the way in which it should be done?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let the hon. Minister have his say.

**Shri Jagjwan Ram:** I was going to explain why this divergence had arisen. There is no intention to withhold anything from either the hon. Members of Kerala or from the whole House, because I have admitted that there has been a shortfall. The point is that we have been maintaining here the figures of supply to Kerala, which the Food Corporation gives us, and that is what has led to this difficulty. I have no difficulty in admitting that.

**Shri Vasudevan Nair:** Who is wrong? Is the Food Corporation wrong?

**Shri Jagjwan Ram:** The Food Corporation is wrong to this extent that what they are supplying includes not only what we have given from Andhra Pradesh or may have procured in this

(Shri Jagjiwan Ram)

country but also imported from abroad it may contain also certain quantities procured locally. Therefore, this difficulty has arisen.

**Shri E. K. Nayanar:** Let the hon. Minister accept that his figure is incorrect.

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** As regards why this divergence in figures has arisen, I have since gone into that. What I said was the quantity supplied to Kerala. Naturally, one will presume that the supply meant supply from outside Kerala. The practice has been that the Food Corporation has been releasing from its stock. 53,000 tonnes is the quantity moved from rice procured in Andhra Pradesh, imported from outside and also released from the stock of the Food Corporation which they may have procured locally there. I shall give the figures presently. Since then I have ascertained the position. That is the figure of supply, and that is what we have been maintaining here. I have got the figures for the last year and also this year.

I shall give the quantities which have actually moved into Kerala and that will remove the misunderstanding that has arisen.

In January, the total movement of rice was 66,300 tonnes.

**Shri E. K. Nayanar:** That is incorrect.

Some hon. Members: Let us hear the hon. Minister fully.

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** In February, it was 48,200 tonnes. In March, it was 70,700 tonnes. In April, it was 45,200 tonnes.

**Shri E. K. Nayanar:** That is wrong. It was 43,869 tonnes.

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** There are according to the figures that have been supplied to me. There is a difference there also because according to them it is 43,869 tonnes. I shall look into that and see why this divergence of

about a thousand tonnes has arisen. I shall try to see why this divergence has arisen.

**Shri Vasudevan Nair:** That is not the main divergence. The hon. Minister made a statement that it was about 53,000 tonnes. We challenged it at that very time. Shri P. Ramamurti said that it was not 53,000 tonnes. And now the hon. Minister says that it was only 45,000 tonnes. That means that his statement at first was incorrect.

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** I am saying that 53,000 tonnes is the quantity that has been supplied by the Food Corporation which functions on our behalf, and on the order of the Kerala Government releases to the various ration shops and fair price shops. That has been the misunderstanding. The figure that I had quoted was the figure supplied by the Food Corporation which had been doing this for the last . . .

**Shri E. K. Nayanar:** That is incorrect.

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** There is no intention to withhold information . . .

**Shri A. Sreedharan:** The main point is that the hon. Minister had made an incorrect statement on the floor of the House. What was the actual quantity supplied?

**Shri E. K. Nayanar:** That means that the hon. Minister admits that he had made an incorrect statement to the House.

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** I do not admit that. I say that the figure that I have supplied is the quantity supplied by the Food Corporation to the Kerala ration shops and fair price shops and other places.

**Shri A. Sreedharan:** Will he verify it with the State Government? Has he verified it, and if so, what is the reply given by the State Government?

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** I am giving the figure that the State Government thinks has been received there. The difference has arisen because the

quantity supplied and the quantity received from outside are different. I shall give the quantity received . . .

**Shri A. Broedharan:** What was the reply from the State Government?

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** This is the figure that the State Government presumably quotes; and if there is any divergence in this figure, I have said that I shall ascertain from the State Government why this divergence of 2,000 or 3,000 tonnes has arisen.

So far as April is concerned, I have said that the figure is 45,000 tonnes, but according to them and according to the telegram, it is 43,869 tonnes. So, there is a slight difference of about one thousand tonnes. We shall have to check up why this difference has arisen.

That was why I wanted to explain to the Members that there was no intention to withhold any information, because I have admitted already that there has been a shortfall. The difficulty has arisen only because we have given the figure of supply made to Kerala. . . .

**Shri P. Ramamurti (Madurai):** What about May?

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** . . . from the stock that is maintained in Kerala, either the imported foodgrains or foodgrains procured in this country or procured locally in Kerala itself.

**Shri P. Ramamurti:** What about May? The hon. Minister had said that by the end of May, about 63,000 tonnes would have moved to Kerala. That was the solemn promise that he had made. We would like to know how much has actually been moved to Kerala so far?

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** I have not got the up-to-date figure showing what quantity has moved there up to this day. I have not got the up-to-date figure about that.

**Shri P. Ramamurti:** Would he be surprised if I tell him that till the 24th of this month, as against 63,000 tonnes, only 29,000 tonnes have been moved?

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** I shall not be surprised.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** It is a very serious matter. I can understand his saying that there was no time to enquire. Before the day of the adjournment motion also, I had sent a letter to the Food Minister giving all these figures. I had got a letter from the Food Minister of Kerala where all the figures had been mentioned, and the April figures were also there. I had sent a letter to the Food Minister here pointing out all those figures. When the hon. Minister here knew from the letter that I had written on the basis of the information supplied by the Food Minister of Kerala, that there was some difference between his figures and the figures given by the Kerala Food Minister, he should have enquired about it and found out why the difference had arisen. On the day of the adjournment motion also, we had referred to it. Then also, instead of going into the matter, the hon. Minister said that we might have got the information from some other place, and it might not be correct. This morning, the Chief Minister of Kerala has given a press statement wherein also the figures are like this. So, it is not a question whether there is some discrepancy. Why is it that when we, Members of Parliament, get some information from our State, from the Minister, the Food Minister or the Chief Minister—and I wrote a letter to the Food Minister saying all these things—the Food Minister here did not at least look into it? Even though he does not reply, and when he understands that there is some discrepancy? It may be that when we wrote letters some figures may not have been correct, but he should have said "No; your figures are not correct", or he should have enquired from the

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

State and then said, "there is some discrepancy. I shall enquire into it." So, it may not have been done consciously or unconsciously, but it is misleading the people and it is misleading the House also, because, so many times the letters have been sent to the Food Minister. The same copy of the letter sent to me was sent to him. In that, the figures are given. At least at that time, he should have enquired into it. He must have respect; it may not be a Congress Food Minister in Kerala, but when the Food Minister of Kerala says something, he must have enquired and then advised the Food Minister, "Your figures are not correct," or told the Food Minister that "my figures are correct, or the information that I have got is not correct." It is not a simple thing today to say that "there is some discrepancy and I shall enquire into it." It must have been enquired into earlier.

We are sitting here as Members of Parliament. I have respect for Shri Jagjiwan Ram. I am also a Member of Parliament elected to this House from 1952 onwards. When I send a letter to him saying this is the position, he must reply and say "Your figures are not correct," or "I shall enquire into it." There were 15 days' time for enquiry. Even now, it is not being done.

श्री प्रमोद ठाकुर (सहरसा) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बिहार के सम्बन्ध में भी यही हालत है।

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Mr. Gopalan wrote a letter to me. Unfortunately, at that time, I was out of the headquarters. I returned only on the 21st morning. Unfortunately, I saw the letter of Mr. Gopalan after the Adjournment Motion was over. That is why I have not been able to send replies to his letter.

Shri Manoharan (Madras North):  
Even now you are not in a position to say.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: There is no question of mincing matters. I am

saying that a misunderstanding has arisen because here, in the department, they have been maintaining the figures of supplies from the Food Corporation,—

श्री बबु लिम्बे (मुंबेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। निदेश 115 के मामला इस सदन में कई बका उठ चुका है। जब मंत्री महोदय कोई भूलतयानी करते हैं या गलत ब्राकड़े या जानकारी देते हैं, तो उन को सीधे कुबूल करना चाहिए और अपनी जिम्मेदारी को स्वीकार करना चाहिए। इस तरह की चर्चा नहीं करनी चाहिए कि मेरे डिपार्टमेंट में फलां प्रकृति ने यह किया। उस से हमें कोई मतलब नहीं है। हमारा सीधा सम्बन्ध मंत्री महोदय से है। यहाँ पर इस बारे में कई बार निर्णय हो चुका है, लेकिन मंत्री महोदय अपनी धादत नहीं बदलते हैं। उन को अपनी जिम्मेदारी कुबूल करनी चाहिए।

श्री जगजीवन राम : इस में धादत बदलने का सवाल नहीं है। मैं पूरी जिम्मेदारी लेने के लिए तैयार हूँ।

The figures that have been maintained are the figures relating to the supplies from the stocks of the Food Corporation to the fair price and other shops of the Kerala State.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Even in regard to the allocation, there is a difference of 10,000 tons. The Ministry has given to the press that 78,000 tons have been supplied, but the Chief Minister of Kerala says it is only 60,000 tons. How is it that always the figures given by the Government of India are higher than what we receive? It is a question of human life; it is a question of human suffering. It is not a question of mere figures.

श्री बबु लिम्बे : बात रास्ते में बाध हो जाता होगा ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him finish.

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** So far as the figures quoted by the Kerala Minister or Mr. Gopalan are concerned, they are the figures of arrivals in Kerala. One is the supply; the other is the arrival. And even in arrivals, there may be a difference of one thousand or two thousand tons, because it may be on the last day. As I have said, these two figures are there. I have read the figures. (Interruption). Even if there is a divergence or discrepancy in regard to that, certainly I will check up with the Food Minister of Kerala and my own Ministry and find out why there has been this discrepancy.

**Shri P. Ramamurti:** It is not just so simple as the minister would make out that there is a discrepancy in the figures supplied by the Food Corporation and these figures. The point is, 10,000 tonnes of rice which were arriving by a steamer was also taken into account here. But the Kerala Food Minister had specifically pointed out in her letter to Union Food Minister that after unloading 5000 tonnes, the ship went to unload the balance at Bombay. In spite of her repeated telegrams asking the Food Ministry to allow the entire quantity to be unloaded in Cochin, it was not done. Even after all this, on the 22nd, on the floor of this House, the Minister said that the 10,000 tonnes of rice were unloaded in Cochin. He cannot throw the whole blame on the Food Corporation. There has been a deliberate attempt to mislead the House by saying that much more has been supplied to Kerala than has been the case actually. This question had to be brought to the notice of the House under rule 115. I do not see why the Minister on his own did not come forward with a statement that he has made a mistake. We are faced with a situation where on the 22nd he made a statement that by the 30th of this month, 65,000 tonnes would have moved there. 3 days later in Rajya Sabha, he says, it will be 60,000 and not 65,000. Then to the press on the 25th he says it is 50,000. Is the Food Corporation to be blamed for these misleading figures also?

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** So far as 10,000 tonnes are concerned, the figure of 10,000 has not been taken into account here. Only 5,000 has been taken into account. It so happened that in the previous month, the 10,000 tonnes that was to be unloaded arrived two days later. It came on the 2nd of the succeeding month and it was taken into account in the succeeding month as 10,000. So far as the 5,000 is concerned, only 5,000 has been taken into account. (Interruptions).

**Shri Vasudevan Nair:** What is the explanation for giving out, various figures like 63,000, then 60,000 and then 50,000?

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** So far as the supply to be made was concerned, that was on the expectations of the despatches from Andhra. When there was a meeting of the Southern Zonal Council, the Food Secretary met the Chief Minister and Food Minister of Andhra and he was assured that the despatches will increase. On that basis, it was expected that larger quantities of rice would move from Andhra to Kerala. On that basis, I said our expectation is that larger quantities of rice will move to Kerala. I never said that it has moved.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East):** It does seem very queer that on the basis of the hypothetical proposition that certain quantities might have moved, a Minister made a statement in this House which has led to all this imbroglio. We are confronted with a very peculiar situation, where the Chief Minister of a State issue a press statement after paying a visit to Delhi only the other day that in the six-month period, nearly 80,000 tonnes have been short as far as receipt is concerned and the Minister comes forward and says, "If only you look into the figures more closely, the Food Corporation supplies would seem to cover up the lag." That does not seem to be the view of the Chief Minister. I do not belong to Kerala, but I am confronted with a position

(Shri H. N. Mukerjee)

in Parliament where the Central Government gives some figures which are entirely controverted by the Chief Minister of Kerala, which Chief Minister was here only the other day. The Minister's explanation ultimately boils down to this that "we were expecting certain things to happen and on that basis I had told the House that the supply would be adequate, but it did not happen."

It was for him to come first of all *suo motu* before the House to say that his expectations regarding supplies to Kerala had been falsified and, therefore, the statement that he made on that day was not correct. It was for him to come forward and say that. But, unfortunately, it was the duty of the Members of the Opposition to put in a statement and get him to come and try to explain sophistically what the reason was. This is a very peculiar situation for which there are remedies and those remedies should be applied.

Shri F. Ramamurti: Sir, this is a very strange thing. Here is the Food Minister of the Government of India who does not understand that there is a Food Corporation which supplies food not only from whatever is procured from inside but also from outside. He came and made a statement on the floor of the House on the 22nd. Then we asked him what was the actual supply from outside. That was a specific question, because the Central Government was committed to supply 75,000 tons of foodgrains per month from outside Kerala. That was the only question that was being discussed. Here is our wonderful Food Minister who does not understand what is the difference between food supplied from outside and the supply... that is procured from inside. Either the Food Minister does not know any of these things or he must honestly admit that he was deliberately trying to mislead the House. The only question that

was being discussed on the floor of the House was not what was procured from inside but what was actually the commitment of the Government of India for supply from outside the State and out of which what was actually fulfilled. That was the real issue in the adjournment motion. For him to come and say that the Food Corporation had given something, that also stands, and all that sort of thing is a wonderful way of explaining things. Either he does not know how the Food Corporation functions or he is deliberately trying to mislead the House. What sort of Ministry is this?

श्री क० ना० तिवारी (बेनिया) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब फर्टीलाइजर के लिये इरिगेशन के लिये और दूसरी चीजों के लिये पैसा स्टेट्स को दिया जाता है ताकि उनकी फूड प्रोडक्शन बढ़े, इन के अलावा और भी मदद भी जाती है, तो स्टेट्स को खिलाने की रेस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी कम्प्लीटली सेक्टर की है या स्टेट्स की है? अपनी पोपुलेशन को खिलाने और उन के अन्दर अवादा पैदा करने का काम तो स्टेट्स का है, जहाँ कमी हो, उस में थोड़ी बहुत मदद कर देना सेक्टर का काम है..... (अवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not relevant to the issue under discussion (Interruptions). We are discussing the discrepancy in some figures of supplies (Interruptions).

Shri F. Ramamurti: Let him offer to make Shri Tiwary the Food Minister.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : मैं सोच रहा था कि प्रोपोजर के पास, बाहर के अलावा स्टेट्स को खिलाना, इरिगेशन प्रोपोजर के पास—ये सब चीजों की रेस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी स्टेट्स की है..... (अवधान)

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** Sir, he has no business to interfere. I can understand the Food Minister giving a reply. Our people are starving. He must sit down.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. Let all hon. Members resume their seats. This being a sensitive issue I allowed some latitude and allowed questions seeking clarification to be put. There is no question of arguments and counter-arguments being put forward at this stage. What I would suggest is, the hon. Minister has given an explanation and, therefore, let us stop it here. If there is any further argument... (*Interruption*).

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Sir, on a point of order. From the statement of the hon. Minister it is clear now that whatever he said on the 22nd, some of the figures have been proved to be wrong. He has taken shelter under the plea that he did not know exactly what was supplied or procured by the Food Corporation. As mentioned by Shri Ramamurti, the Chief Minister of Kerala, who is here today has given a statement that the total allotment from December to May was 3,94,059 tons while the actual receipt up to 24th May was only 3,14,269 tons. If you will permit me, Sir, I would like to pay it on the Table of the House so that hon. Members may see for themselves who is confusing the country, whether it is the Chief Minister of Kerala or the Food Minister of the Union Government. I shall lay it on the Table of the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This will be published and sent to the Food Minister. He will go through it. It is not necessary to lay it on the Table.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Sir, if you will allow me, I will lay it on the Table.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If public statements of either the Food Ministers or the Chief Ministers of different States are to be laid on the Table of

the House, it would create a difficult situation. He can send it to the Food Minister so that he can go through it.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I wish to know whether that statement is correct or not.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has already replied to it.

**Shri Chengalraya Naidu (Chittoor):** Sir, on a point of order. The Minister has given a statement. Are we to rely on that statement of the Food Minister or the statement of somebody who does not belong to this House?... (*interruptions*). If this continues you are not going to get any more rice from Andhra... (*interruptions*).

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर : इसकी जांच हो, जांच कमिशन बैठाया जाय ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Members are within their right to quote what their Chief Minister has stated and try to seek further clarification from the Central Food Minister. There is nothing wrong in it.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham (Visakhapatnam):** I would like to say a word. I understand that a friend from Andhra Pradesh has said that if this continues Andhra will not supply rice to Kerala. Did I hear him correctly?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not think he has said anything of that sort. That is a personal expression... (*interruptions*). It is not the Government's view nor is it the party's view; it is an individual opinion and it has no value. Anyway, I thank you for pointing it out to me.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** Shall we take it that he has not said it?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I would like to agree with you.

**Shri Tenneti Viswanatham:** He has not said it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Yes.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** Two weeks ago there was a statement by the official spokesman of the Andhra Government that because the attitude of Kerala was not reasonable, they were not going to give Kerala the priority. We are not at anybody's door with the beggar's bowl. If you cannot give us rice, we will get rice from outside; give us the foreign exchange. We are not begging. We do not go about seeking alms at the doors of Andhra. We are people who do our work and earn foreign exchange.

**Shri Jagjiwan Ram:** Sir, may I say just one thing? As regards the question of figures, I attach great importance to the figures given by the Food Minister or Chief Minister of Kerala—I cannot brush them aside—and I will have to see that we reconcile our figures of arrivals in Kerala with their figures of arrivals in Kerala.

So far as Andhra is concerned, it will be our endeavour to see that Andhra meets the commitment of 6 lakh tonnes of rice to be given to the Centre for supply to Kerala.

**Shrimati LakshmiKanthamma (Khammam):** I just want to remove the misunderstanding or misapprehension in the House. Andhra Government has been very anxious to help the people in other States and I do not think there need be any fear or misapprehension on that score. In spite of the suffering of the people of Andhra, we have been giving rice to others.

14.33 hrs.

#### ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEES

##### (1) INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

**The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Jagjiwan Ram):** Sir, I beg to move:—

"That in pursuance of Rule 3(13) of the Rules of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research,

the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves to serve as members of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That in pursuance of Rule 3(13) of the Rules of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves to serve as members of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research."

*The motion was adopted.*

##### (II) NATIONAL SHIPPING BOARD

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri Annasaheb Shinde):** Sir, on behalf of Shri V. K. R. V. Rao...

**Shri A. B. Vajpayee (Balrampur):** Has he been authorised?

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh):** Yes.

**Shri Annasaheb Shinde:** I beg to move:—

"That in pursuance of sub-section (2) (a) of section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves to serve as members of the National Shipping Board to be reconstituted with effect from the 8th June, 1967."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That in pursuance of sub-section (2) (a) of section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as