

- (d) the result of these operations;
- (e) whether any new operation sites will be added during the year; and
- (f) if so, the names of such sites.

The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) Deep drilling operations are in progress at Jawalamukhi and Bathula near Hoshiarpur. In addition, two structural holes are also being drilled on the Jawalamukhi structure near Jawalamukhi and Ranital.

(b) Approximately Rs. 64 lakhs upto the end of Financial year 1957-58.

(c) There is a budget provision of approximately Rs. 1.39 crores for the year 1958-59.

(d) It is too early to assess the results.

(e) and (f). Depending on results of present drilling and availability of drilling rigs, more sites are likely to be drilled at Jawalamukhi and Janauri.

Police

1695. Shri Arjun Singh Bhadauria: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of written complaints made against police officials in Delhi during the years 1957 and 1958 so far and the number of complaints looked into;

(b) the number and category of officials of Delhi Police against whom departmental action was taken for dereliction of duty, corruption and insubordination during the above period; and

(c) the number and category of police officials against whom criminal cases were registered during the period mentioned in part (a) above and the result of the trials, if any, with the type of crime charged stated separately under the following heads: (i) assault on women, (ii) theft and robbery, (iii) assault on other persons, (iv) murder, and (v) torture?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

Foreign Missionaries

1696. Shri Jadhav: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to lay a statement showing:

(a) the immovable properties held by the foreign missionaries in each State and Union Territory of India;

(b) how much agricultural land they have with them; and

(c) whether they are using this land for agricultural purposes or not?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) to (c). There is no special law regulating acquisition of property by foreigners. It is, therefore, not possible to give information regarding properties held by Foreign Missionaries.

12 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Alleged food crisis in Uttar Pradesh

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Sarvashri S. M. Banerjee and Tanga mani relating to the food situation in Uttar Pradesh, arrests and complete failure of the Central Government in solving the food crisis in Uttar Pradesh resulting in a reign of terror etc. I do not want to read the whole thing. All kinds of allegations have been made here against another Government. Unless it is the subject matter here and there is a motion, which I may or may not admit after looking into all the details, why should we discuss the administration of any other Government?

In this motion all sorts of allegations are made. I have been repeatedly holding, and even the other day

[Mr. Speaker]

when a number of adjournment motions were brought here I have given my ruling, that we should first of all consider the exact limits of responsibility. The other day I asked the hon. Minister here as to what exactly is his duty with respect to the food situation in a State. I agree that food is not completely the duty or the obligation of a State; the Centre has also taken some responsibility. Under the constitution, as has been referred to, under Entry 33, the Centre is bound to take some steps. I am not confining myself only to those obligations which arise out of the Constitution. If, in addition, it has been declared in a particular case that the Centre should better deal with a subject which is common to all the States and the Centre has taken power under a law passed by Parliament, even with respect to that I impose responsibility upon the Central Government. The third category is, even without a constitutional liability, even without any responsibility imposed by a law of Parliament, if the Centre has entered into an agreement with the States that it will do certain things, even with respect to such things I am prepared to allow any matter to be raised here if there is dereliction of duty on the part of the Central Government. Otherwise, I cannot understand as to how we can argue out all these points. Where it is the responsibility of the State in conjunction with the Centre, I will allow only those things which can be raised so far as the Centre's responsibility is concerned.

I want to apprise the House that I am not indifferent to this matter. I am alive to the serious nature of the problem that is there. But my feeling is that we might be embarrassing the State. After all, there are only two ways. If the State Government is not able to manage the show, a situation may arise when the Centre has to take it up. Now, when each State Government is trying to do its best to tackle the situation, are we to em-

barrass them by entering into a discussion here as to what ought to be done or what ought not to be done?

There are some cases where some persons will have to be arrested. I am not justifying the arrest of any. But if in the due course of managing that show they are trying to do their best, are we to interfere by embarking upon a discussion?

What I have done is this. I want to know with respect to food, education, irrigation and health—these are four subjects common both to Centre and States—what exactly is the allocation of responsibilities. Therefore, I have requested the various Ministers to submit to me a memorandum as to what according to them are the limits of their responsibilities. In the meanwhile, I have received notice of a motion for discussion on this matter, signed by Shri Mahanty and 12 or 13 other hon. Members. They want to raise this matter on the floor of this House. It is not a matter which can be raised on the floor of the House. But I have invited them to come and discuss with me as to what exactly are the limits of responsibilities. I want to have a fair statement from both sides, and after ascertaining the views of both sides I will look into the matter.

I have not yet received the memorandum from the Government. But in the meanwhile, day after day, if an arrest is made there is an adjournment motion here; if somebody goes on hunger strike there is an adjournment motion here.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): If somebody is murdered.....

Mr. Speaker: Yes. What can be done? The hon. Member may go and take charge of the Ministry there.

Therefore, these are the inconveniences. In the meanwhile I can only suggest, as I suggested the other day, that the hon. Minister, in view of the

fact that many hon. Members here have expressed very grave concern over this matter, may call the leaders of various groups, sit with them and discuss.....

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):
It has been done.

Mr. Speaker: If it has been already done, I am only too happy. Let us try to avoid discussion on the floor of the House. It can be better tackled if he calls a small conference of all leaders of various groups and other interested persons from the State. Let him try to satisfy them as far as possible. Let them also understand what are the limits of the responsibility of the Centre. If they are still not satisfied, they may come to me and I will look into the matter.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): Sir, I had also submitted an adjournment motion. You wanted to know why we raised that question in this House, and you also stated that you did not want to enter into a controversy at a time when the situation is bad in the States. Now an unseemly controversy has already started between the Union Food Minister and the State Chief Minister on this very question of the responsibility between the State and the Centre. Sir, while thousands of people are starving they are bandying words as to what is the responsibility. Only yesterday Dr. Sampurnanand has made trenchant criticism about our Union Food Minister. He has stated very clearly—I am just reading out what is given in the papers, because that is something which this House has to take notice of—that, besides Essential Commodities Act is a central legislation which vests power in the Centre which it may delegate to a State. He has gone on to show how in Eastern U.P., while 14 districts have banned rice and millet being exported all these grains have come to

Western U.P. and from there sent to Bihar. He has categorically stated that this would not have happened if the State could have had a food policy independent of the Centre. The same thing has happened in West Bengal. The Chief Minister has made a statement in the Press Conference.

In this situation, while people are starving, while, on the one hand, there is repression against the movement which has already started and, on the other hand, there is an unseemly controversy already raging in the country, I think it is a very apt state of which we have to take notice, and this question of food is a very vital one which affects the entire country and it should be debated by this House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): Sir, I was a signatory to her adjournment motion, and I feel that a very important point is involved. The papers have reported that only yesterday the Prime Minister gave a Press conference and there, according to reports, he was pleased to say that he found the statement of the U.P. Chief Minister in regard to the food problem unsatisfactory. We have also found the Food Minister in the House the other day making certain statements which were nearly fantastic. For example, he said that a State could import food from outside; perhaps, being accustomed to P.L. transactions he was rather unaware of foreign exchange difficulties. But the main point is that there is no co-ordination, on this most urgent of national problems, between the Centre and the States, and this co-ordination between the Centre and the States is the keystone of the Constitution arch, and that seems to be doubted by pronouncements made in Lucknow and in New Delhi.

In the meantime, Sir, there are movements, very powerful movements, in the U.P. Our friend, Shri Saksena is here hunger-striking, as everybody knows, and in West Bengal, as Shrimati Renu Chakravarty just pointed out, the position is bad

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

and a movement has been announced. What we want is that there should be such coordination between the Centre and the States as would prevent the emergence of any movement, as would really solve the food problem. I know Government is perhaps very hesitantly trying to take a few steps here and now, to contact the States and all that. That is all very good. But in the meantime there is a position where there is confusion, where there is lack of co-ordination between the Centre and the States. And the Food Minister here makes a statement which is taken strong exception to by the Chief Minister of a very important State.

Therefore, Sir, a position has arisen when this House as the House of the People should discuss the position and clarify the situation, and make it possible for real co-ordination between the Centre and the States.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, about the arrests I would like to mention one thing.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to read the letters I have received about the arrests.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have mentioned in my adjournment motion that certain provisions of the law have been wrongfully used. I have mentioned about the arrests of some very respected leaders of U.P., two Members of this House and the leaders of the Opposition of U.P. Assembly. And they have been arrested under sections 151, 107 and 117. May I submit for your information that during the communal riots, to prevent them, these sections were used. In Kanpur itself, 94 people have been arrested.

Mr. Speaker: Does he want to say that no Member of Parliament should be arrested?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Mass arrests are going on.

Mr. Speaker: Let them go on.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: More than 500 people.

Mr. Speaker: 500 or 5,000 in some emergencies. What are we to do? (Interruptions). Order, order. What I would like to know at this stage here is, whether the matter is urgent and whether it is recent. There have been adjournment motions. There has been a motion of no confidence elsewhere. Arrests and other things are going on. So, this is a matter which has been continuous. It did not occur yesterday. The hon. Members will kindly read and re-read the rules under which we are proceeding. It is not a public meeting where I can allow "Bhayio, Bahano", etc. I have to look into the matter thoroughly and then say yes or no. It is a matter which has been going on from day to day. It is rather unfortunate that these things should go on there. God alone knows what exactly the truth is, as far as it goes.

Now, there is another adjournment motion by Raja Mahendra Pratap:

"Agitation of the "Opposition" parties in U.P. on a scale which can be considered the brink of revolution, seriously disrupting administration".

Raja Mahendra Pratap rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I need not hear him. He is now clearly of the opinion that those people are trying to take the law into their own hands and are trying to upset the Government which has been established by the Constitution so as to create a revolution by force. This is an answer, if it is an answer, to the other two adjournment motions. Therefore, I need not go further into it. One hon. Member says that this is political agitation to upset the Government. Other hon. Members want to bring it up because it is a matter of law and order and

people are arrested. A third hon. Member wants to have a decision here, on the floor of the House, whether the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh is right or the Food Minister at the Centre is right. These are all matters beyond my jurisdiction. All that I can say is, the hon. Food Minister should call for a conference of all the party leaders here and other persons who have tabled motions for adjournment and they might sit together and deal with this matter as if it is a family affair.

Several Hon. Members rose—

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru) rose .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Prime Minister wants to say something.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As you were pleased to suggest that we should call a conference of party leaders, I should like to have a little more light thrown on this: to discuss what matter? Are we to discuss the activities of various gentlemen who are on hunger-strike, or who have proclaimed that they would break the law and seek arrests or who have proclaimed that they will go and seize possession of the godowns? What are we to discuss? I say this because when motions for adjournment are brought here, because people have been arrested, it is not quite remembered that they loudly proclaim that they want arrests. They break the law technically to seek arrests, and the Government there presumably obliges them. What exactly do we discuss then?

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): People have been arrested from their houses.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I want to answer the query of the Prime Minister as to what exactly is to be discussed.

Raja Mahendra Pratap rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member is irrepressible. I would ask him to go out of this House if he persists. He cannot take advantage of his age here. I have been putting up with this. The hon. Member must also follow the rules and regulations of this House. I am giving him an opportunity. Why should he rise as and when he likes irrespective of what is happening in this House?

Now, the hon. Prime Minister wants to know exactly what is the scope of this conference or the meeting of the leaders, which I suggested. All that I meant is this. It is said—quoting the Chief Minister of that place—that on account of some steps which are being taken by the Central Government, the food situation has deteriorated, or something like that. That has been read. What I meant was, if they sit together and explain to those hon. friends who have been coming here from time to time and tabling adjournment motions from time to time, and to the leaders, "This is all our jurisdiction; we have done our best", that might give satisfaction. I would like to know if the Central Government has done its best, and nothing more can be done. Otherwise, if some people want to take the law into their own hands, the State Governments will certainly deal with them. Beyond that, it is not my jurisdiction. If it is a matter of law and order, maybe some people are arrested, and it is impossible to get along if they want to break the law.

As a matter of fact, I am going to read some information that has been given by a magistrate, namely that one gentleman, a Member of Parliament, went there, and wanted to get a number of people, saying, "let us all go together and break open those granaries". How can any magistrate allow him to do that, and continue to wait on until he breaks open the granaries and the food in the granaries is taken away? That is an impossible situation. I am not dealing

[Mr. Speaker]

with that. It is a matter of law and order. The Chief Minister of that place is sufficiently strong. If he is not then other Governments will take charge. All that I am concerned with here is, what is the jurisdiction and the responsibility of the Centre. I myself am thoroughly satisfied that does not appear that any responsibility of the Centre has been shirked, but however, if those hon. Members come here and invoke the jurisdiction of this House from time to time and want to be satisfied, I want the hon. Minister to tell them that he has done all that he is responsible for. However, if there is any serious difference of opinion, then I shall look into it. That is all that I meant; not that this House has got any jurisdiction to enter into this or to encourage persons to break the law.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You may be pleased to bear with me for a while when I explain why I wanted to have this discussed in this House. Food is a national issue, and we do not want unnecessarily to raise any heat in this House; we may be very dense, compared to the Prime Minister, but I do not understand why he fails to see our purpose. It has happened no doubt that the law and order position in a certain State has become rather difficult. It may be that we feel very strongly in regard to that.

Mr. Speaker: I shall put him one question. It is only a short time ago when we had a food debate here. I have also ruled—it is about a year or two now—that in every session we will have a debate on food, for which one or two days will be allotted.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You will permit me to pinpoint my particular objection. My difficulty today is this. Why I want a discussion in this House is, it is only by means of an adjournment motion that I can ask for it and the point is this. There has arisen,

quite obviously, a confusion of approach as between the Centre and the States; from the pronouncements of the Congress Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh for whose interests I am sure the Government here is particularly solicitous, from the pronouncements made by the Congress Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh and the pronouncements made by the Prime Minister here and the Food Minister here, there appears to be a contradiction, and there is in other States also a position where there is a lack of co-ordination between the activities in regard to food on the part of the Centre and on the part of the States. We have been trying to impress upon the Food Minister the desirability of forming contacts with the different States and not only with his party but with other people besides. We want, therefore, that there should be a co-ordinated policy pursued in regard to food. If the Food Minister here would say such a very peculiar thing as that, "the States could import food from outside", naturally, it is important that the States should know where they stand. Unless today the Centre and the States, both together, proceed in a co-ordinated fashion for the solution of the food problem and for the production of more quantities of food, we shall be in the soup, as we already are. Therefore, since at the very present moment, a situation of considerable confusion has arisen, we want that confusion and that complication to be clarified.

There is the other point also. The Food Minister would not have come here today unless we had raised an adjournment motion. Therefore, we want this position to be clarified, that the confusion is removed and this kind of shilly-shallying with the food problem, this kind of the Central Government accusing perhaps the State Governments, this kind of—

Mr. Speaker: He need not argue.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: ... pronouncements from the Centre in regard to the movement in the States should cease. That is what I wanted to say and that is why I wanted to have a discussion.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Sir, you did not give us any chance to submit our case.

Mr. Speaker: Everybody should say about this?

Shri Nath Pai: My party is most intimately connected with what is happening in Uttar Pradesh. After all, they have been accused, as just now you have heard.

Mr. Speaker: If I allow the adjournment motions to be discussed, I will certainly call upon the hon. Members, the leaders of groups or representatives of groups, to take part in the debate. When an adjournment motion is given notice of by some hon. Members, I usually call upon them to satisfy me on these three conditions: how it is urgent, how it is the responsibility of the Centre, etc. These are the two or three matters with respect to which I have to be satisfied. I have given sufficient opportunity to the hon. Member who tabled the motion and now I am asking the hon. Minister. Then if I feel that there are grounds to admit this motion, then Mr. Nath Pai will certainly have an opportunity, but not at this stage.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): You have not given me an opportunity; I have to say something very important. I say re-thinking is necessary. Some people think that by this method our Ministers have become Ministers, and they adopt the same system of strikes and hunger-strikes in order to become Ministers. This is the whole trouble. We need re-thinking. This method of strikes and hunger-strikes should end for all time and we should all co-operate. I say that our first principle is, all to work for all to make all happy and

to have a frictionless society. This should be the ideal. Then, all this agitation will cease.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): At the outset I want to make it clear that I have never said that the Centre has no responsibility in the matter of food. You will recollect that the other day when the adjournment motion was being discussed, you asked me certain questions. One question was whether it is the entire responsibility of the Centre to meet all the food requirements of the State. To that, I answered 'No'. There were certain specific questions put to me. I am not going into all those details, but everyone of the answers which I gave, I believe, was constitutionally correct. May be some other hon. Members hold a different opinion.

In fact, if one carefully reads the interview given by the Chief Minister of U.P. and what I have said in the House there is no substantial difference, because he says that the Centre bears certain responsibility and the State Government also bears the responsibility. He admits that agriculture is the responsibility of the State Government and the food position depends on production. In certain matters, we have enacted legislation and so far as the law goes the responsibility is ours.

At any rate, you have been pleased to say that my Ministry and some other Ministries must give you a statement showing what are the responsibilities of the Centre and what are the responsibilities of the State. I am getting that statement prepared. Maybe that I have to consult the Ministry of Law and certain other sister Ministries, because one will have a bearing on the other. This question is not a question of controversy between me and the Chief Minister of U.P. It is a question of what is going to be the interpretation of the Constitution and to the extent the responsibility lies on the Centre, I will be answerable.

[Shri A. P. Jain]

Another question which you were pleased to raise was that I must have informal discussions. Let me assure you that I have been having informal discussions from day to day. The hon. Prime Minister has invited some Members of the Opposition to discuss the food situation. One meeting has been held already and another meeting is going to be held this evening. There is going to be a sort of a standing committee, which will consider the position from time to time. Again I have discussed this question formally and informally. Tomorrow some Members of the Opposition, myself and some other Members of Parliament are proceeding to West Bengal to have a discussion on the food situation with the Chief Minister of West Bengal. I am prepared to give all the possible information; I am prepared to do my utmost to satisfy any Member of the Opposition who wants to discuss this matter with me as to what we have done. If there is anything remiss, I must be held responsible for that; I do not deny that. There are certain responsibilities which I have to fulfil and I can assure you that I am prepared to share the information and to discuss the matter with the Members of the Opposition. It is for them to indicate what matters they want to discuss.

So far as U.P. is concerned, I only want to submit that there has been a debate there in the Assembly and I will read out a quotation from the speech of the Chief Minister of U.P. He says:

"I declare with full sense of responsibility that nowhere in the State do famine conditions exist. The panicky picture painted by the other side is cent per cent false."

An Hon. Member: They are dying of starvation.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We have full details about it.

Shri A. P. Jain: Then, certain news has been appearing; I will read out a PTI news item which has been published in today's paper:

"According to the official sources here, the prices of wheat and rice have eased in several parts of the State. The price of wheat has fallen by Rs. 2 a maund, but the price of rice has recorded a sharper decline."

(Interruption).

Some Members of the House have visited their constituencies and as a result of the efforts which we made—here I might mention that the hon. Member from Dehra Dun visited his constituency and the price of rice has come down by Rs. 6 to Rs. 8 and the price of wheat by Rs. 4. So, instead of the situation getting worse, it is positively improving.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: So there is mass satyagraha?

Shri A. P. Jain: But if only the Opposition co-operates more, the situation will improve more quickly. We have already despatched foodgrains to U.P.; some of which have reached and others are reaching. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There cannot be a discussion going on like this I entirely agree with the hon. Minister when he read out the statement of the responsible Chief Minister of the State. Whatever might be said regarding the responsibility of the Centre, the supply of food, production of food, etc. by means of agriculture is the primary responsibility of the State. Of course in matters connected with inter-State movement or import of food, supply and distribution, to some extent, the Centre has shared the responsibility. But the Centre cannot send its own executive officers to deal with the situation. After all, the Centre can only go to the help and support of the State Government.

When the Chief Minister says definitely that there is absolutely no food crisis there, am I to yield to the hon. Members here who have tabled the

adjournment motion? Do hon. Members want to create a disturbance here? I am really surprised to....

Shri H. N. Mukerjee rose—

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow the hon. Member to interrupt me like this. The hon. Chief Minister, who is responsible for law and order in the State and also for food, definitely declares in a debate relating to food that there is no situation arising out of food, no crisis; but evidently, some other agencies are there; it is rather unfortunate. I am not going to deal with that situation. The Ministry is strong enough to deal with it. What I am concerned with is whether there is any default on the part of the Central Government here in relation to food, whether it has failed to discharge its responsibility. Who is the person who has to judge it? It is the Chief Minister of that State or Food Minister. If they say, notwithstanding our best efforts, it is the Centre that is standing in the way and there is this crisis, I would have certainly allowed not one hour, but a full day for a debate as to whether.... (Interruptions). The hon. Member is not the Chief Minister of U.P. Hon. Members will bear with me there is no good interrupting me like this.

Under these circumstances, I rely upon the hon. Chief Minister's statement which has been read out. There is no crisis nor has it been brought to my notice that there is default. A crisis can always be created. But this is not a crisis arising out of food. It is rather unfortunate that the very essential of life has been taken advantage of for the purpose of bringing out something else. (Interruptions). Order, order. I am not going to allow this forum to be used for this purpose. Not once, not twice, but this is the third time this is coming up here. (Interruptions). I do not say hon. Members in the Opposition are taking advantage of it. I do say there seem to be some elements there....

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Who are those 'some'?

Mr. Speaker: I prefer the statement of the hon. Chief Minister as more authoritative and this House will always depend on that.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Is it for you from the Chair to say that, Sir? It is for the Prime Minister to say that. You are not the judge of facts, Sir.

Shri Nath Pai: The Minister is accusing my party.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You must be impartial in regard to facts. Find out the facts. Have an investigation.

Mr. Speaker: Let there be order in this House. I shall deal with all the points. Some extracts from the U.P. Chief Minister's statement were read out by Shrimati Renu Chakravartty. As against this, I asked the hon. Food Minister to give us the particulars, to clarify this matter. As a matter of fact, she wanted a clarification on this. The hon. Food Minister read an extract from the speech of the U.P. Chief Minister in a food debate. Therefore, as between the two placed before me, which one is quite reliable? On the one side, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty wanted me to refer to, and rely upon the newspaper report. I am relying upon one newspaper report. What is the harm? What am I to do? (Interruptions). Under those circumstances, I reject all those adjournment motions. There is no question of any default on the part of the Central Government and there does not appear to be a food crisis. Under those circumstances, all the adjournment motions are rejected.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In regard to the food position, I am very sorry to hear....

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to hear.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You cannot give judgment. The question of propriety is there.

Shri Nath Pal: You, Sir, promised to give me a hearing. I want you to give me a chance, as serious allegations are being made against the P.S.P.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I have a word, Sir, if I may presume to say something as a Leader of this House and not merely as leader of the party? We are discussing a matter—we were discussing a matter—and I am not going to refer that particular matter, since you, Sir, have given your ruling on that subject. But I would beg of the hon. Members of this House, on both sides, to consider how best we can further the objective we have in view. It may be that we feel strongly about it, it may be that the opposition feels strongly about something that is happening. Well, we can understand that, and it is not for me to say who should feel stronger and who should feel less stronger. But one thing is obvious to me that we do not serve any purpose by behaviour of an excited kind, which takes us away from the realm of any normal arguments and merely makes people more and more excited. It is not perhaps very becoming of this House, whoever might do it. I am not blaming anybody, because we are all apt to get excited occasionally, but we have to face difficult situations from time to time and it is just when we have to face a difficult situation that we cannot afford to get excited. We may occasionally get excited when the matter is not serious. But, if it is a serious situation, it means that we have to deal with it seriously, and not in an excited way. I would, therefore, appeal and beg of all hon. Members of this House to consider this matter calmly. So far as I am concerned and my colleagues are concerned, we are at their disposal, if they want any information or if they want to confer with us in any way, because the matters that we have been discussing are not, normally speaking, matters on

which policies differ; minor policies may differ, of course, and there may be criticisms, right or wrong, but the objectives are common. Therefore, at any rate, there is a large ground where we can discuss without any conflict and we are, in fact, trying to pursue that line of action. I have ventured to suggest to the State Governments also to pursue that line of action. Even though steps have been taken and things have been done which make it a little more difficult, nevertheless, after all, we cannot all proceed on destructive lines when a constructive line is needed. So, I would appeal to the hon. Members of this House, as well as others, to approach this question, in so far as it is possible, in a constructive, cooperative way, and the Government would do all in its power to satisfy them in regard to information, in regard to discussions or in regard to any matter that is in its power.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I would like to say on behalf of the opposition parties that we never tried to introduce heat in this matter. As I said before, we want a co-operative atmosphere. The Food Minister will testify that on this side of the House the parties in the opposition have tried to co-operate with him to the best of their ability, and it is only because we found that in regard to food, a very complicated and potentially dangerous situation was arising that we have brought up this question. It is only in that spirit we did it, Sir. And in this connection, I would make a special appeal to you that when we bring up matters before this House, on the basis of whatever information we have in our possession, there should not be on your part—because you, Sir, hold a most exalted position—any pre-supposition that our facts are very likely wrong and the facts given by Government, whatever their source of information, are very likely right. That kind of observation brings a kind of peculiar temper into the atmosphere which we all wish to avoid. And I

wish to tell the Prime Minister that if on behalf of Government there is a serious effort to meet the other people in the country apart from the Congress party—and even inside the Congress party there are a number of dissidents—over this issue, if on the part of the Government there is a real desire to meet them, then possibly many of these undesirable things could be eliminated. It is only because tempers are lost, not merely on this side of the House—excitability is nobody's monopoly—it is merely because the Government sometimes behaves in a manner which is the very definition of excitability that there is no co-operation in the country, and that is something which the Government should very particularly bear in mind, and I would wish the Prime Minister particularly to remember this.

Shri Nath Pai: I welcome the note struck by the Prime Minister, so far as the atmosphere is concerned. It has been the constant endeavour of my party to approach in that spirit, and not to make political capital out of what may be called a national tragedy.

You must give me one or two minutes, because I have been struggling, and further very serious things are said about my party, both here and in the States. We were most patient when you started reassuring us that we will be given an opportunity to have our say. But in the course of the discussion you made certain remarks which, though we do respect you, we submit in all humility, have hurt us profoundly. Nothing is farther from our mind than to find out how we can meet the situation. You took two similes, quoting the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, what he said before an attempt was made to raise an adjournment motion in this House and what he said subsequently. He has used, to my surprise, words which I used in this House—the Food Minister of India cannot absolve his responsibility towards food. You, Sir, in your ruling

also said that import is a matter wholly within the jurisdiction of the Centre, that procurement from the surplus area and distribution to the deficit area, comes under the Centre. May I, in all humility, ask you: can we treat this matter as a shuttle cock, one holding the other responsible? That is why we wanted to raise this question.

There was no attempt by anybody to raise this question on a political basis. Finally, I should like to point out one thing. We have been accused, if you will permit me to say so, of using war-like language. Here is a respectable paper, and these are the words used: "Swooping on the PSP offices", "out-manceuvring them" "arresting them at dead of night". These are not my inventions; a respectable news agency to which the Food Minister referred, is using this terminology. They swoop on the offices and arrest people at the dead of night. According to eye witnesses, the party offices at Azamgarh were cordoned off by the police.

Mr. Speaker: I am not worried over the language used.

Shri Nath Pai: You said that we are making political capital by trying to use it. No such thing is there. So far as this matter is concerned, our approach has always been one of co-operation. It is the failure of the Uttar Pradesh Government and the shirking of responsibility by the Centre that compels us again and again to raise this subject.

Mr. Speaker: I am exceedingly happy that ultimately there is a kind of calm atmosphere here. I am very happy. The hon. Prime Minister is equally interested, much more interested than any others, as the Leader of the House and the Prime Minister of India, to settle this matter as amicably as possible. So far as food is concerned, it does not relate to any particular party. All of us eat our food. Therefore, there cannot be any dispute about that. When I hear one

[Mr. Speaker]

version, let it not be understood that I have pre-judged the issues. All that I wanted to say was this. I have given a decision regarding the matter that has been brought before me. Three adjournment motions were there, two of them about food and one by Raja Mahendra Pratap that there is a revolution. It is sought to be brought up indirectly by taking advantage of the food situation. Therefore, the hon. Member makes that charge. When once a statement is to be made regarding the situation, the ultimate person who is to make that statement is the Chief Minister of that particular State. He is to deal with the situation. There seems to be a difference between his earlier statement and the latter statement. We do not know why. But the situation seems to be that there is no food crisis.

An Hon. Member: No, no.

Shri Tangamani rose—

Mr. Speaker: That is what he read.

I wish to remind hon. Members that in such cases my predecessor and others before him who held this office very respectably ruled that if there is a conflict of versions between the Opposition and the Government with respect to some matter, the version of the Government will be relied upon. Otherwise, we cannot carry on the administration. Now, not only this Government, but the other Government and the Chief Minister also have made some statement; I will urge upon hon. Members to go and ask him to explain as to why he made a statement earlier entirely different from the later one.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Later one is this.

Shri Nath Pal: If there is no crisis in the State, why is the Chief Minister now following in the steps of the hon. Prime Minister wanting to hold nego-

tiations and why did the hon. Prime Minister call upon Opposition leaders to meet him?

Mr. Speaker: That is only inferential.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Sir, a particular difficulty arises in my mind. You say that the official version must always be accepted. I am now seized of the question of privilege. If the Treasury Benches make a statement, according to you we must accept that. I go one step further. We have a right to pull them to bits and pieces according to the information which we have with us and which they may not have.

Similarly, though I fully agree that the State's version, i.e., the Chief Minister's, or whoever he may be, is more reliable, does that mean that we have no privilege to challenge that statement? Maybe, we may have better information than the Chief Minister. Have we no privilege to challenge that statement? It is a question: Have I or have I not the right to discuss that? This is a question of privilege. Once you admit that a particular subject, be it food or be it something else, comes within my power to be discussed, then surely I am not bound to accept what the other hon. Minister says. I have a right to give my facts to the House.

Shrimati Renn Chakravartty rose—

Raja Mahendra Pratap rose—

Mr. Speaker: What does he want to say?

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I have to explain something which may not be misunderstood. I am only opposed to bloodshed.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: There is no bloodshed.

An Hon. Member: Don't worry.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I am a revolutionary. I want revolution, but I want revolution in a way that there will not be bloodshed. Some hon. friends are rushing for this agitation and when these friends come against the Government there will be no end to bloodshed. I, as an experienced revolutionary having experience of four revolutions, want to conduct a revolution in a way that we shall transform the Government, so that there will be a real, moral state where all will be happy and not one will be dissatisfied.

Shrimati Beau Chakravartty: I just want to supplement what Shri Jaipal Singh has said. Only a few days ago when the question of Kerala Government came up, you, in your long ruling, made some reflections against the State Government itself about which we are thinking of discussing the matter with you. How can any statement be ignored when the Chief Minister of a State makes a statement which is accepted as correct by you? I feel that on two occasions you have given a completely contradictory ruling. Therefore, I feel that this is a very serious matter and we take objection to the fact that you have given your ruling

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member is bringing something else on this occasion

So far as this matter is concerned, I may make the position clear. Shri Jaipal Singh raises a question whether I accept the statement of the Government on all occasions. There is a difference between these two. If this Government makes a statement and hon. Members want to refute that statement, in proper cases certainly I will allow an opportunity. I do not go merely by the statement of the Government, because the House is superior to them. I must give an opportunity to everyone. But when it relates to a statement of the Government as against an expression or a statement of one person with respect to such matter, then it is the practice

of this House to rely on the statement made by the Chief Minister of the State Government. In exceptional circumstances, when it is alleged that there is break-down of the Constitution and this Government has to take up the matter, I will reserve my judgment. In the circumstances, this matter is set at rest.

Now, I have to inform the House...

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi) rose—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. I have disposed of that.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I am exceedingly sorry. It is not necessary. I have to inform the House (*Interruption*). Order, order.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Can't the hon. Lady Member sit down?

I have now to inform the House....

Shri Goray (Poona): Sir, can we not have clarification of your ruling?

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of clarification.

12.46 hrs.

ARREST OF TWO MEMBERS

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that I have received the following wireless message dated the 6th September, 1958, from the District Magistrate, Deoria:—

“Shri Ramji Verma, Member, Lok Sabha, has today been arrested under section 117, Indian Penal Code, after he addressed a public meeting in Deoria town at 19:15 hours, in which he instigated public to assist his men who