

श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह : यह बिलकुल प्रत्यक्ष बात है। वैसे भी देखा यह जाता है कि पाँच, पाँच कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर्स बैठे रहते हैं लेकिन कहीं उनका पता नहीं रहता है।

12.39 hrs.

**STATEMENT RE. INDO-PAKISTAN
MINISTERIAL MEETING AT
RAWALPINDI**

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): As the House is aware, the Tashkent Declaration provides for various measures to be taken and various issues to be discussed between India and Pakistan. Both sides have been taking action in fulfilment of some provisions of the Declaration, notably Articles II, V and VII, which relate to the withdrawal and disengagement of forces, the restoration of normal diplomatic relations, and the exchange of prisoners. There has also been partial progress, in respect of the restoration of communications envisaged in Article VI, as also under Article IV, which calls for the discouragement of propaganda directed against the other country. However, for further progress in pursuance of the Tashkent Declaration numerous other issues of immediate as well as of long-term importance need to be settled and as a result of exchanges between the two Governments it was decided that to this end a meeting be held at Ministers level between the two sides at Rawalpindi on March 1st and 2nd.

Accordingly, the Indian Ministers of External Affairs, of Transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism, and of Commerce, accompanied by several advisers, had a brief formal opening meeting with the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, of Commerce and of Communications of the Government of Pakistan and their advisers on the morning of 1st March. Thereafter many meetings, formal and informal at Ministerial and official level, were held and a joint communique was is-

sued on the evening of 2-3-1966. I place on the Table of the House a copy of the communique. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5692(66).]

As stated in the Communique, the talks in Rawalpindi were of an exploratory nature and led to useful exchange of views. During their exchanges with the Pakistan Government preparatory to the Conference, the Government of India had suggested that it be held to consider further steps towards the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration. The Government of India had added that, in particular, discussions take place on the questions of restoration of trade economic relations and communications and the property and assets taken over by either side. The Government of Pakistan had proposed that Ministerial meeting should discuss six additional items which were briefly, according to them, the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir, the reduction of armed forces following settlement of the Kashmir dispute, the creation of conditions preventing the exodus of people, the so-called evictions, the Farakka Barrage and the implementation of existing agreements.

Eventually it was agreed that the meeting take place without any agenda, each side naturally being free to raise whatever issues it wished to. At the discussions held on March 1st and 2nd, each side explained to the other at length which issues they felt could most appropriately and usefully be discussed at this stage to achieve the purposes of the Tashkent Declaration. The Pakistan Delegation highlighted the question of Kashmir, which they appeared to consider as the root cause of all other Indo-Pakistan issues and which had to be tackled if progress were to be achieved in improving Indo-Pakistan relations. The Indian delegation reiterated the Government of India's views on the Kashmir question and explained that, as no useful purpose could be served by discussing it, the Conference should proceed to complete the normalisation of relations in the

[Shri Swaran Singh]

fields disturbed by the conflict and also take up some other major issues, the solution of which would lead to a better understanding between the two Governments and greater goodwill between the two peoples. We pointed out that the significance of the Tashkent Declaration was that on the one hand the two sides would not resort to force but would settle their differences by peaceful means, and on the other, they would proceed with the settlement of various individual issues even though on some other issues their positions might remain far apart.

Both sides reaffirmed their resolve to adhere to the terms of the Tashkent Declaration and to discharge their obligations under the Declaration and, having exchanged views on the approach which each considered would best further this cause, decided to meet again at a later date.

Some hon. Members rose—

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): We have given a call attention notice on this.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think any questions need be put at this stage. The whole thing has been discussed during the debate on the President's Address. Why should we spend time now?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): People are anxious because it has come out in the press that Indian property worth hundreds of crores of rupees with Pakistan would not be returned, whereas the property we have, belonging to Pakistan, is very little.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Is it fair conclusion, after reading the statement and the communique that were issued after the conclusion of the talks that very little progress is being made in upholding what is called the Tashkent spirit and practically a dead-lock has been reached....

Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda):
No, no. ||*||

Shri Nath Pai: You are free to hold a different view, Madam...and only for the sake of public consumption a semblance of so-called progress is benignly maintained? In view of the fact that even such matters of common interest like releasing the property impounded during the conflict, Pakistan has sternly and persistently refused to discuss, where do we stand, except the continuation of the semblance that the talks are going on?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is true, Sir, that much progress could not be made, during the discussions, about the return of property. The fact that we have agreed to meet again and to discuss it further is the only report that I can make.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhutto, has expressed satisfaction at the use of the word "dispute" in the Joint Rawalpindi Communique. The Tashkent Declaration tells us that Kashmir was discussed at Tashkent and each side presented its respective point of view at Tashkent. May I know, in that context, what is the special reason on account of which the Government started discussing Kashmir again at Rawalpindi before the ink on the Tashkent Declaration could be dry?

Shri Swaran Singh: On this occasion also when this matter was raised, we on our side reiterated the Indian position on the question of Jammu and Kashmir. On this question of the use of the word "dispute", if the hon. Member studies the Joint communique he will find that that is the statement which was made by the Pakistani delegation, and each side can describe any matter as a dispute. Each side, therefore, reiterated their position and further progress could not be made. So the position of the Government of India on this question of Jammu and Kashmir is exactly the same what it was at the time of the Tashkent Declaration.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Why don't you say that it is not a dispute?

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, my question was very specific. Only two months back you discussed Kashmir at Tashkent, and before the ink on the Tashkent Declaration could be dry why is it that you started discussing Kashmir again at Rawalpindi and they succeeded in introducing it as a dispute?

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, the hon. Member is asking me as to why we discussed Kashmir. On that I want to make the position clear; we have consistently adopted this attitude, that on any matter that might be raised by one side the other party should not say "no" even to talking on that point. It is quite another thing that in the course of the talk you reiterate your position, but it will not be correct just to say that we are not going to talk on any matter.

Shri Hem Barua: Is not Kashmir a settled matter for us?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Sir, I am sorry there was not quicker progress at the meeting in implementing the Tashkent decision, but what I want to find out from the Government is, we are rather disturbed to find that Government is taking up an attitude which is not objective, which is something of an old medieval conundrum as to how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. and what I want to find out is, what exactly do we mean when we say that in regard to Kashmir we reiterated our position? Today, the world knows and we also know that the question of Kashmir has got to be settled at one point of time, sooner rather than later, if our interests are to be taken into consideration. It is necessary, therefore, that whenever we meet, particularly when there is the Tashkent Declaration or the Tashkent spirit of which we are making so much we should only try to pursue it. Whenever we meet we should not

take up a purely abstract attitude. When Pakistan says, and the world knows and we also know, that we do not have nearly half the Kashmir area in our control, do we not envisage a course of operation, slow but sure, which will lead to a solution of the Kashmir question, or do we feel that we should flap our wings in the air and do nothing to satisfy the people? Do either one thing or the other concretely. The Prime Minister should say something about it to the House, because from Pakistan reports are emanating regarding their taking on the Kashmir question a positive stand on the agenda in a particular way. I want to know whether we want to tell the world and ourselves that we shall always go and talk or we shall never discuss Kashmir and it shall be hanging fire as long as we can see in the future or we shall try to settle the Kashmir question, trying to satisfy our own position which we say is right.

Shri Swaran Singh: If I may say so, the hon. Member has given some reasons why we should not say "no" when they raise the question of Kashmir. And this is what we say. When they raise the question of Kashmir, we shall say "we will not refuse to talk about that issue". But that does not mean that if they continue to take a particular attitude on Kashmir...

Shri Hem Barua: We thought Tashkent has settled Kashmir finally.

Shri Swaran Singh: ...we should leave it at that. We have to consider what should be the reply to that attitude. Therefore, whereas we are always prepared to have talks...

Shri Hem Barua: Why do you not refuse to talk?

Shri Swaran Singh: ...if this question or any other question is raised, we have to talk consistently with the stand which we have taken on the main issue, namely that the sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir is not negotiable.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: May I know whether it is or it is not a fact that the question of Indian property held by Pakistan was specifically raised and that discussion was turned down by Pakistan on the ground that only after the settlement of the Kashmir question would they discuss this matter?

Shri Swaran Singh: As I have mentioned in my opening statement, this question was also suggested by the Indian delegation for discussion. The attitude of Pakistan was that there should be some progress made on another issue at the same time, and they talked of simultaneity in discussions. We pointed out that this attitude is not correct. We have not accepted the correctness of the Pakistani stand and there the matter stands.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Tyagi.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): I am sorry to say that this Government requires.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have called Shri Tyagi. Only one Member from one Group.

Shri Shinkre: This is not a Group matter. This is a matter which concerns the whole country. I want to know whether....

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, I cannot allow him.

Shri Shinkre: Only one remark.

Mr. Speaker: No, Sir.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना): जिन लोगों ने काल-एटेन्शन नोटिस दिये हैं.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय: मैं उसे नहीं ले रहा हूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक ग्रुप के अर्धी दो लोगों को आपने बुलाया, हमारे भी उस पर हस्ताक्षर हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: ठीक है।

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I am afraid, I could not just follow the view of the Government with regard to not taking Kashmir to be a disputed question, because I have felt that we are the aggrieved party with regard to Kashmir, and we have gone to the United Nations because of aggression by Pakistan. Are we not claiming back from Pakistan the territory they have illegally occupied? Have they not violated our sovereignty? So the real question is this. Because we are not pressing it, the world will think that we are not the aggrieved party and Pakistan is already making capital of it.

Shri Shinkre: Ask Shri Jagjivan Ram about it.

Shri Tyagi: Pakistan was under orders of the United Nations by the Security Council Resolution to vacate the areas they have illegally occupied. They have not vacated that area. Are we not even insisting that they must vacate the occupied Kashmir area which you say is an area over which you have sovereign right?

Shri Swaran Singh: This is another reason why we should never say "No" when they talk of Jammu and Kashmir.

Shri Tyagi: Why do you not take the initiative in the matter?

Mr. Speaker: It is one thing to say that we should never say "no" whenever Pakistan says that the Kashmir question should be discussed. But the other point, according to Shri Tyagi, is that we should talk about the occupied territory being given back to us.

Shri Tyagi: We are shy of that.

Shri Swaran Singh: We are not shy of that. If the hon. Member is interested in the historical background, if he goes through the debate which we had in the Security Coun-

cil, we have consistently held the view, as the hon. Member knows well.....

Shri Tyagi: Not after Tashkent. Shri Chagla has done it but since Tashkent you have stopped it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): I fully understand that you cannot say "no" if Pakistan raises the question of Kashmir. But may I know whether it is not a fact that it is on the Kashmir question that the whole thing has stalemated, which is a complete negation of the Tashkent spirit? Not only that, Pakistan has gone a step further. Monitoring from their radio in East Pakistan they have now said something about the Mizo revolt. They are doing propaganda against India all the world over, which is against the Tashkent spirit. Only the other day when certain questions were put to the Defence Minister he said that this was before the Tashkent Agreement. Now, after the Tashkent Agreement, Pakistan has not stalemated it but has completely violated the Tashkent Agreement and has carried propaganda against India.

Shri Swaran Singh: Any propaganda that Pakistan carries on against the Tashkent spirit and the letter of the Tashkent Declaration will be a serious violation of the Declaration, and we will certainly lodge a very strong protest against that. About the specific issue of monitoring, I think it is a matter which is being looked into and if it is established it will be a very serious violation and a very serious act of interference in our internal affairs, and as such something which we cannot tolerate.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फरखाबाद): मंत्री महोदय ने अभी इस सदन में और बाहर भी अक्सर दो विरोधी वाक्य कहे हैं। एक वाक्य है कि काश्मीर की प्रभुसत्ता पर कोई बहस नहीं हो सकती और दूसरा

वाक्य है कि काश्मीर पर बात-चीत करने के लिये वे हमेशा तैयार हैं। अब ये दोनों वाक्य एक ही दिमाग से निकल सकते हैं। मैंने इसको समझने की बहुत कोशिश की कि यह कैसे सम्भव हुआ। उसकी एक ही सम्भावना है कि मंत्री महोदय प्रभुसत्ता का अर्थ ऐसा समझते हैं कि कभी यह सरकार अपनी राजी पूरा काश्मीर या काश्मीर का कोई हिस्सा दे देना चाहे तो वह उसको प्रभुसत्ता के अन्दर समझेंगे। तो मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि क्या मंत्री महोदय काश्मीर या काश्मीर के किसी हिस्से की प्रभुसत्ता को राजी-खुशी छोड़ देना प्रभुसत्ता के अन्दर समझते हैं।

Shri Swaran Singh: This is a hypothetical question. There is no question of surrendering any part. We have never taken that attitude. I do not know why the hon. Member asks that question.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं फिर से अपना सवाल रखना चाहता हूँ।

Mr. Speaker: The question about surrendering of sovereignty was answered.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: ये दो वाक्य हैं और ये दोनों वाक्य एक ही** से निकल सकते हैं, तो ये कैसे निकल सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: यह तो बहुत बुरे लफ्ज हैं, डा० साहब, आपको ऐसा नहीं कहना चाहिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: **दिमाग सब एक ही अर्थ रखते हैं। अगर आप गांव में जाय तो वहां **कहा जाता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: यह शब्द निकाल दिया जाय।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : दिमाग कह लीजिये। एक ही दिमाग से ये दो जुमले कैसे निकल सकते हैं, इसकी संगति बताइये ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह बता रहे हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कहां बता रहे हैं। एक तरफ कहते हैं बात नहीं होगी दूसरी तरफ कहते हैं बात होगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप कुछ और कहना चाहते हैं ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not want to add anything to what the learned Doctor says, because I cannot beat him in his vocabulary and it is not my intention to use the same type of expressions. But I want to say that, in any talks, if the mentality, the actual feeling or attitude of the hon. Member is that you have to give up the hope of persuading the other party to accept your viewpoint, then what is the meaning of the talks?

13 hrs.

श्री हुकम चन्द कश्यप (देवास) : ताशकंद घोषणा के बाद जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में रवैया रहा है मैं उसकी चर्चा करना नहीं चाहता हूँ। हाल में हुई वार्ता के बाद जो वार्ता अब बाद में होने वाली है उसके सम्बन्ध में क्या सरकार ने इस बात के लिए पूरा मन बना लिया है कि उसमें काश्मीर की कोई चर्चा नहीं की जाएगी? क्या आप ऐसा कह कर वहाँ आए हैं ?

ताशकंद समझौते के अन्तर्गत सेनायें अपने अपने स्थानों पर वापिस चली गई हैं और जिन इलाकों पर पाकिस्तान ने कब्जा किया था उनको उसने खाली कर दिया है और जिन इलाकों पर हमने कब्जा किया था उनको हमने खाली कर दिया है। पाकिस्तानी सैनिकों द्वारा भारतीय संपत्ति को जो हानि पहुंचाई गई है, मंदिरों, गुरुद्वारों आदि को जो

हानि पहुंचाई गई है, लोगों के मकान जो तोड़े गए हैं, इसके बारे में भी क्या आपने वहाँ पर चर्चा की थी?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : इसका जिक्र हुआ था। वह इलाका जो दोनों देशों की फीजों के कब्जे में रहा और वहाँ मकानों की और दूसरी चीजों की जो तबाही हुई दोनों तरफ से उस बात की चर्चा हुई थी। लेकिन हमने इस बात पर ज्यादा और कुछ विचार नहीं किया क्योंकि हमने कहा था कि अगर किसी वक्त पर जरूरत हो तो दोनों तरफ से इस बात पर चर्चा की जा सकती है।

जो दूसरा सवाल उन्होंने किया है उसके बारे में मैं यह बात साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि कोई बात भी एक देश उठाना चाहे तो उस पर बातचीत करने में हमें कोई इन्कार नहीं है और इस बात को मैं साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ ताकि दुबारा इस बात के भूतात्त्विक कोई शंका न रहे।

श्री स्यानी : क्या काश्मीर खाली कराने की भी बात कर रहे हो या नहीं ?

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I have gathered the impression from their communiques that we captured some *mujahids*, infiltrators and spies and that they also have all been returned. Is it a fact that in spite of the assurance given to the House the draconian legislation we passed in Kashmir with regard to *mujahids* and spies, they also have all been returned to Pakistan and treated on a parity with their regular armed forces?

Shri Swaran Singh: This question was answered by my colleague, the Defence Minister, on the floor of the House yesterday and he said that there was the agreement to return these.... (Interruption). This was the agreement entered into between the two Governments through their Army Chiefs and the fact that Pakistan ac-

cepted those also, indirectly shows that they have accepted the responsibility for them.

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : भगवान का लाख लाख शुक है कि रावल-पिंडी में दोनों देशों की मंत्रियों की बातचीत में भारत के विदेश मंत्री की आंखें खुल गई और उनको पता लग गया कि पाकिस्तान कितने पानी में है मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि ताशकंद समझौते के बाद रूस और अमरीका और उनसे सम्बन्धित जिन राष्ट्रों ने इस समझौते की भावना का स्वागत किया था और यह विश्वास किया था कि अब दोनों देशों के सम्बन्ध बहुत निकट आ जायेंगे। पाकिस्तान के इस कड़े रवैये को देखते हुए क्या भारत सरकार ने उन देशों को पाकिस्तान की इन भावनाओं से भ्रमगत कराया है? यदि हां तो उनकी क्या प्रतिक्रिया है?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : मैं हैरान हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य को यह क्यों खयाल है कि आंखें रावलपिंडी जा कर ही खुलती हैं? आंखें हमेशा खुली रहती हैं। कई दफा उनकी आंखें बन्द हो जाती हैं। मुझे खुशी है कि अब उनकी आंखें खुली हैं और वह देख रहे हैं कि क्या हो रहा है। मुझे समझ में नहीं आया है कि जब हमें कोई परुलीफ हो या जब हम समझें कि कोई काम उनकी मर्जी के मुताबिक नहीं हो रहा है तो हमेशा उनका दिमाग दूसरे देशों को समझाने और उनको राय जाहिर करने की तरफ क्यों होता है। हमें यह बात समझनी चाहिये कि हमारे जो भी आपस के झगड़े हैं, हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के जो झगड़े हैं उनको आपस में मिलकर इनको हल करना चाहिये और दूसरे देशों की तरफ बिल्कुल

नहीं देखना चाहिये व्हाह वह रूस हो या अमरीका हो या कोई और देश हो।

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री : तब फिर ताशकंद क्यों गए थे ?

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Sir, I have stood up half a dozen times. I have not put a single question this session.

Mr. Speaker: Then he should thank himself.

Shri Joachim Alva: Only the **get a chance.... (Interruption).

An hon. Member: That is not a proper word to say.... (Interruption).

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order, Sir.... (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, Shri Alva shall have to withdraw that word.

Shri Joachim Alva: I shall not withdraw this word because they are **.... (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: If he does not withdraw it, then he should withdraw himself.

Shri Joachim Alva: The hon. Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, was ** sixty times and you never stopped that.... (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Now he should withdraw himself.

Shri Joachim Alva: I go out. I stood up against the British Raj.... (Interruption).

Shri Joachim Alva then left the House.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I move a motion.

Mr. Speaker: He cannot move it. Unless I have named him, how can you move it?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, on this matter, withdrawal does not solve the problem. The words should be expunged.

Mr. Speaker: Those words might be expunged.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): May I remind you, Sir, that another hon. Member, Dr. Swell, from the Opposition side.... (Interruption).

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Sir, in the first seat is the leader of their party and in the second seat the Leader of the House. Are they satisfied with the behaviour or the misbehaviour of their party member? Are they prepared to offer an apology to the House?

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit that while withdrawing, the hon. Member said, "Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was interrupted by these** as many as sixty times and you did not do anything to stop that**". That is what he said. That is a reflection upon you also.

Mr. Speaker: Now, he knows.... (Interruption).

Shri Nath Pai: The whole thing should be expunged.

Shri Tyagi: He was ordered to withdraw.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha (Barh): In view of the fact that Government took a very high power delegation consisting of the Minister of Shipping and Civil Aviation and the Minister of Commerce.... (Interruption).

Shri Ranga: This is very wrong. I have made that appeal to you. Have they any responsibility towards this House? The leader of the party and the Leader of the House are there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The opposition should also remember that these very words used by one of the Members on the Opposition side.... (Interruption). I did not take action on that and never anyone of them stood up and took any objection to it. If a Member is here even now and he repeated it in such a voice that nothing else could be heard, nobody could protest.

Shri Nath Pai: For the sake of record, Shri N. C. Chatterjee will bear me out and I think Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad also heard it that when the word was used, I rose and said, "It is not fair to call anybody a **just because one does not succeed in catching the Speaker's eye; the Member should go on trying to catch it, but it is not fair to say so".... (Interruption).

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: At least the protest was not so loud and strong as it is today. I do not support my hon. friend on this side, but this is going on every day. If hon. friends see that all sides should have a certain decorum, we will be prepared to abide by it; but every day such things take place. The word** may not be used but such tactics are being used by the Opposition.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: In view of the fact that a very high power delegation went to Pakistan.....

Shri Ranga: What happens?

Shri Hem Barua: He should apologise to the House.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: In that high power delegation the Minister of Civil Aviation and Shipping and the Minister of Commerce were there. In view of this fact, why could no successful conclusion be arrived at about the Indian cargo which runs to hundreds of crores of rupees seized by Pakistan? When Pakistan has already accepted that it is Indian cargo, why was no progress made and what

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

were the limitations of the Indian delegation in pressing that point and getting some conclusive statement from Pakistan?

Shri Swaran Singh: We did raise this point and, as I have explained in the statement as also in answer to some of the other supplementary questions that have been put, they did not show any willingness, readiness and keenness to discuss the other economic issues. We pointed out to them that their stand in the respect was not in accordance with the Tashkent Declaration. This matter is likely to be discussed in the future meeting here.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): May I put one question?

Mr. Speaker: I do not allow any more questions. Now he will excuse me.

13.10 hrs.

KERALA BUDGET, 1966-67

The Minister of Finance (Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri): Sir, with your permission, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the State of Kerala for the year 1966-67.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): Sir, I strongly protest against the attitude of the Government and the Finance Minister in laying the Budget of the Kerala State before the House as if it is a report of a match factory being presented before the House. When the General Budget is presented with all the fanfare and the decorum in the House, what is the meaning in doing like this in respect of the Kerala Budget? There is no Legislature in the State. The public must know what it is. This is the only occasion when we can hear the Finance Minister making a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the State of Kerala. . . . (Inter-ruption).

Mr. Speaker: He may kindly resume his seat.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): It is just like presenting a match box to you!

Mr. Speaker: I had also the impression that normally, when a State is under President's Rule, the budget is read out here and presented to the House as if it was a budget of the Central Government. Ordinarily, that is done. But last time also I find that Shri T. T. Krishnamachari did the same thing. . . .

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: What was done last time need not be repeated this year.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): It was not a precedent for the future.

An hon. Member: He may read it.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: With all respects to the House, I must say that I had myself found out as to what was the procedure adopted last time. I was told that last time this was the procedure which was accepted by the House and I thought it was no disrespect shown to the House if I followed the same procedure. I have all respects for this House. I am entirely at the disposal of the House and I shall certainly read it out.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): I think, when Orissa Budget was presented the then Finance Minister made a statement while presenting the Budget to the House. I do not know about the Kerala Budget, whether it was a supplement budget or a general budget.

Mr. Speaker: He had only followed the procedure that was followed last year: He might present the Budget to the House.