

NOES

Akkamma Devi, Shrimati
 Berua, Shri R.
 Besra, Shri
 Bhanja Deo, Shri L. N.
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.
 Bist, Shri J. B. S.
 Borooah, Shri P. G.
 Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
 Chakraverti, Shri P. R.
 Chaturvedi, Shri S. N.
 Chaudhry, Shri Chandramani
 Lal
 Chavan, Shri D. R.
 Chavda, Shrimati Joraben
 Daljit Singh, Shri
 Das, Shri B. K.
 Das, Shri Sudhansu
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
 Ering, Shri D.
 Gandhi, Shri V. B.
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Iqbal Singh, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri M. L.

Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
 Jannanadevi, Shrimati
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Kindar Lal, Shri
 Koujalgi, Shri H. V.
 Kripa Shankar, Shri
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Malaichami, Shri
 Marandi, Shri
 Maruthiah, Shri
 Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
 Mehta, Shri J. R.
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Murti, Shri M. S.
 Muthiah, Shri
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Patel, Shri P. R.
 Patil, Shri D. S.
 Pratap Singh, Shri
 Rai, Shrimati Sahodra Bai
 Raju, Shri D. B.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Rane, Shri
 Rao, Shri Muthyal

Reddy, Shri Linga
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Sadho Ram, Shri
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Shankaraiya, Shri
 Shao Narain, Shri
 Shree Narayan Das, Shri
 Shyam Kumari Devi, Shrimati
 Sivapraghassan, Shri Ku.
 Subramaniam, Shri C.
 Subramanyam, Shri T.
 Sumat Prasad, Shri
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Thomas, Shri A. M.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tiwary, Shri R. S.
 Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Vijaya Ananda, Maharajkumar
 Wadiwa, Shri

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The result of 14.41 hrs.
 the division is:

Ayes: 29

Noes: 70

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me now
 put the motion to the vote.

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the
 Seventy-second Report of the
 Committee on Private Members'
 Bills and Resolutions presented to
 the House on the 10th November,
 1965"

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, there is
 a motion to be moved by Shri D. N.
 Tiwary and several other Members.
 Let Shri D. N. Tiwary move his
 motion.

RESOLUTION RE: INDIA QUITTING
 THE COMMONWEALTH—contd.

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी (गोपाल पंज) :
 उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं अपना प्रस्ताव पेश करता
 हूँ, जो कि इस प्रकार है :

(1) "That the debate on the
 resolution regarding India quitting
 the Commonwealth moved by
 Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad on the
 24th September, 1965, be adjourned
 to the next day allotted for
 Private Members' Resolutions."

And the second is.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The second
 one will come afterwards.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Bar-
 rackpore): I oppose it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hos-hangabad): Sir, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri D. N. Tiwary wants to say a few words on his motion. Let him speak first.

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कोई नई बात इस हाउस में नहीं है। इस के पहले श्री प्रीसीडेंट्स मौजूद हैं। एक रेजोलूशन मुत्तबी कर के दूसरे दिन के लिए रक्खा गया था। इसी साल 12 मार्च को सिधवी साहब का रेजोलूशन था उस पर श्री एन० सी० चटर्जी ने प्रस्ताव पेश किया कि रूल्स को सस्पेंड किया जाय और उस को दूसरे दिन के लिए रक्खा जाये। बहुत बहस के बाद यह तय हुआ कि इस को ऐसा किया जाये। उस वक्त स्थान का प्रस्ताव पेश करते हुए चटर्जी साहब ने कहा था —

"Will you kindly allow me to have this motion held over till the next day allotted for Private Members' Resolutions and allow Shri Prakash Vir Shastri to take up his resolution?"

बहुत बाद विवाद के बाद यह पास हुआ था।

"The motion was:

That rule 30(1) be suspended in its application to the Resolution moved by Dr. L. M. Singhvi".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that this rule should be suspended in its application to the motion moved by Dr. Singhvi?"

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. That rule is suspended."

वह रूल सस्पेंड करने की बात थी इसलिये सबान यह धाया कि चकि धोन दी स्प्रीट श्री चटर्जी ने धपना रेजोलूशन मूव कर दिया इसलिये वह हो गया। मैंने ना बहुत

पहले से नोटिस दिया हुआ है कि इस रेजोलूशन को धगले दिन जो नौन-धाफिशिएल रेजोलूशन धाने का दिन हो उस दिन के लिए मुत्तबी कर दें और उस दिन उसे डेड थंटा दें।

एक धामनीय सबस्य : धाज क्यों नहीं ?

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी : इस के दो कारण हैं। इस रेजोलूशन के मूवर, पेश करने वाले यहां नहीं हैं वह बाहर गये। हुए हैं और दूसरे दिन जब रेजोलूशन पेश होगा तब वह धा जायेंगे। जबाब उन को देना है और जितने प्वाएंटेस उठेंगे उन का जबाब वही देंगे। दूसरी बात यह है कि इस तरह कुछ समय मिल जायेगा। देश का रिपब्लिकन मालूम हो जायेगा और कुछ धोपीनियंस क्रिस्टिलाइज हो जायेंगी। ब्रिटेन का भी रूख मालूम होगा इसलिये कोई पक्का विचार तभी किया जा सकता है। इसलिये मैं धपना यह मोशन पेश करता हूँ कि मूवर को धा लेने दिया जाये, कुछ समय भी मिल जायगा और उस वक्त तक के लिए इस को मुत्तबी कर दिया जाये।

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : का समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are amendments. I shall take them up first.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: First of all, this should be taken up; if it is passed, the second one comes. Otherwise, this is lost.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are amendments to the main resolution. I meant those amendments. Now, Shri Madhu Limaye's amendment is out of order.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : वह कैसे हो गया ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Either it is adjourned or it is not adjourned. It cannot be adjourned after one hour and all that.

श्री मधु लिमये : उस से क्या हुआ ? यह खारिज कैसे हो सकता है ? मैंने तो यह चाहा है कि आज एक घंटे बहस चले फिर बहस मुत्तबी हो जाये और भगले दिन श्री भागवत झा प्राजाद उस का जवाब दें ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let Shri Shree Narayan Das move his substitute motion.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"That the debate on the resolution regarding India quitting the Commonwealth moved by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad on the 24th September, 1965, be adjourned."

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I wish to say a few words in support of my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Shri Kamath.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I invite your attention to the Rules of Procedure. I presume that my hon. friend Shri D. N. Tiwary has moved this motion under rule 109. There is no other rule applicable to this motion. Rather, there is a similar rule applicable to resolutions. Rule 109 applies to Bills.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is rule 340 which applies here.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Yes; I suppose it is, *mutatis mutandis* the same Rule 340 of the Rules of Procedure reads thus:

"At any time after a motion has been made, a member may

move that the debate on the motion be adjourned."

That is the rule which provides for this kind of motion. Now, there is no rule extant in the Rules of Procedure under which a Member can bring a motion before the House, seeking an adjournment to a particular date, that is to say, two days later, a week later, or two or three weeks later. There is no such provision in the rules as far as I am aware. If you can kindly point out the rule, I shall be happy, but there is no such rule providing for such a motion.

Only the other day, we have had a precedent; when the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs got a severe fright and was badly cornered about the report of the Governor of Kerala, the Speaker almost in effect—I see Shri Hathi is present here—said, or rather, called upon the Government to produce the report and place it on the Table of the House. Of course, there was a loophole which saved him at that time and, like a drowning man catching at a straw, he got out of the impasse. That day, I think my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee sought to move a motion that the debate be adjourned till such time as the Government lays the report on the Table of the House. The Speaker said that that was out of order, because there is no such rule providing for some such contingency, something happening, precedent to the adjournment. So, that part of the motion moved by Shri Mukerjee was deleted; when it was put to the House, the Speaker only said that the debate be adjourned. Therefore, my objection here is that this motion moved by Shri D. N. Tiwary and his colleagues—to adjourn it to the 28th November, a fortnight hence—is completely, wholly and unmitigatedly out of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri D. N. Tiwary's amendment does not mention any date.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is to be taken up on the next day; it means a fortnight.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is only Shri Shree Narayan Das's motion which mentions the date.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I support Shri Shree Narayan Das's substitute motion. But the motion moved by Shri D. N. Tiwary is wholly out of order, while Shri Shree Narayan Das's motion is in order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Rule 109 applies to Bills; it does not apply to Resolutions. Now so far as rule 340 is concerned, it says:

"At any time after a motion has been made, a member may move that the debate on the motion be adjourned".

So, that rule applies to this case. The ruling given by the Speaker on Shri Chatterjee's motion applies to this case also. So, there is no point of order. So, we can put it to the vote.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What is the motion moved by Shri N. C. Chatterjee?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am putting Shri Shree Narayan Das's motion first.

I will now put Mr. Shree Narayan Das's amendment to Mr. Tiwary's motion.

The question is:

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"That the debate on the resolution regarding India quitting the Commonwealth moved by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad on the 24th September, 1965, be adjourned."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put Mr. Tiwary's motion as amended

1732 (A) LSD—7.

by Mr. Shree Narayan Das's amendment.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is finished, because it is out of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is a substitute motion which has been passed. Mr. Tiwary's motion falls through. The second amendment also falls through. The debate is adjourned.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): For purposes of procedural rectitude, I want to point out that a substitute motion is contingent upon the original motion being in order. If the original motion has nothing to do with order or propriety, then the substitute motion does not come into the picture at all. A substitute motion derives its existence from the fact of there being an original motion of which the House can take notice. Till the House has condescended to take notice of the original motion, the substitute motion has no legal existence whatever. And, we must proceed in a legal manner.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have ruled it is in order under rule 340.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We are not in a position to question your ruling and we cannot question your ruling . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Chair is as much bound by the rules as we are.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We have to function in this House from time to time and we have to be sure about the rules and regulations under which we function. On this occasion, there was an original motion which was notified to the members. After it was notified to the members, it was open to any of us to give or not to give a substitute motion. The question of a substitute motion only arises after the original motion has been taken cognizance of by the House. The House is not under the rules in a position to

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

take any notice of the original motion. If the original motion goes, the substitute motion also automatically goes by the board. You can perhaps postpone your ruling, because this is a very serious matter. It may be that later on, on Monday the External Affairs Minister brings a motion. Suppose that motion is ruled out and I have a motion asking the government to do something else. Are you going to accept that motion? You would not. I know you cannot; your hands are tied. The law is specific in this matter. I do beg of you to consider this matter more carefully; you cannot give a ruling like this.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): When you gave the ruling, when it was pointed out that this motion is out of order, you said, "I am not putting this motion. I am putting the amendment of Mr. Shree Narayan Das." That means you have held that Mr. Tiwary's motion is not in order. If that is not in order, the other thing cannot be taken up.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ, जो प्राप की मदद करेगा। मैं साधारणतः ऐसी कोई बात नहीं करता हूँ, लेकिन मुझे ऐसा इसलिये करना पड़ रहा है कि मैं इस प्रस्ताव को बचाना चाहता हूँ।

मैं प्राप का ध्यान सब से प्राखिरी नियम-नियम 389-की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अंग्रेजी में बोलिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं इस सदन में अंग्रेजी में नहीं बोलूंगा।

1 नियम 389 में यह बताया गया है कि जिस विषय के बारे में कोई नियम नहीं है,

उस के बारे में अध्यक्ष को व्यवस्था देने का अधिकार है। इस तरह तिवारी साहब का प्रस्ताव बच जाता है।

श्री शिव नारायण : हम श्री लिमये की बात का समर्थन करते हैं। उन की बात मान ली जाये।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं प्राप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि 24 सितम्बर को भी हम ने जो कार्यवाही की और कार्य सूची में परिवर्तन किया, वह सर्वसम्मति से किया, नहीं तो वह व भी न होता। उस दिन हम ने सर्वसम्मति से यह तय किया कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों या काश्मीर के मामले पर भी बहस होगी और साथ साथ श्री भागवत झा झाड़ा के संकल्प को भी ले लिया जायेगा, जो कि राष्ट्र-मंडल के सम्बन्ध में है। उस का मतलब भी यही हुआ कि उस दिन सारे नियम स्थगित हो गये। अगर न होते, तो श्री भागवत झा झाड़ा के प्रस्ताव को हम नहीं ले सकते थे। इस लिये मेरा निवेदन है कि नियम 389 के अन्तर्गत प्राप को यह पूरा अधिकार है कि प्राप तिवारी साहब के प्रस्ताव को लें, उस पर गय लें और श्री भागवत झा झाड़ा के संकल्प को बचायें। क्योंकि इसके बारे में हमें भी बोलना है और हमारी राय है कि राष्ट्र-मंडल से हिन्दुस्तान को भ्रम होना ही चाहिये।

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Subramaniam): The rule only says that a member is entitled to move for adjournment. As far as adjournment is concerned, there is no restriction. It can be indefinite adjournment or to a particular date. As far as this rule is concerned, there is no restriction that adjournment should be indefinitely made, without fixing any date. Adjournment is a comprehensive term and includes adjournment to a particular date. I really do not see how if a member is entitled to move for adjournment, he will be

debarred from moving for adjournment to a particular date.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Speaker held that rule against us when the Kerala Governor's report came up.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: If Mr. Tiwary's motion is in order, you should put that first to the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I feel Mr. Tiwary's motion is quite in order, because it does not mention any date. It simply says "be adjourned to the next day allotted for Private Members' Resolutions". No date is mentioned.

Even on that day, Mr. Chatterjee said:

"Dr. Singhvi is very ill. He is not in a fit state of health to continue with the discussion. Will you kindly allow him to have this motion held over till the next day allotted for Private Members' Resolutions and allow Shri Prakash Vir Shastri to take up his resolution?"

The ruling given was:

"I have no objection to the postponement if the House agrees with the suggestion for the adjournment of this discussion. But it cannot be put for discussion on the next allotted day. It has to be balloted."

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am not against this motion being discussed. But we cannot bypass the rules and go against the rules made by this House. Rules are rules. They apply to you, to me, to the entire House. The very fact that after this motion that is before the House, there is going to be another motion seeking to suspend the rule shows that under the rules this cannot be done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the House agrees to the suspension of the rules, I have no objection.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The reason given that the member who moved the motion is unfortunately not pre-

sent in the House today is no valid and convincing reason for adjournment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House can throw it out if it wants.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The House is seized of the motion and it has been tabled for today. I raise this fundamental objection which has been so vigorously reinforced by Mr. Mukerjee that the first motion by Tiwary is out of order, because there is no rule providing for such a motion which contains any words like "next day, next week, two weeks later" etc. It should be simply "adjourned". I remember another occasion when Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri (*Interruptions*).

15 hrs.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): Sir, when you have put the amendment to the vote of the House and declared that the debate on the motion moved by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad is adjourned, after that how can this discussion go on?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has raised a point of order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I reiterate, Sir, for the benefit of my hon. friend, Shri Bhattacharyya, that this is a point of order that is being discussed.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Point of order cannot be in a vacuum.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There can be no vacuum here, as long as you are here. When you are here, where is the vacuum?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Sir, will you kindly let the House know whether the amendment of Shri Shree Narayan Das has been accepted?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The ostensible reason advanced for the postponement of this debate is that the hon. Member who moved the motion is absent. That can be no reason because the House is seized of the motion. If the hon. Member had not

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

been present to move the motion I could have understood it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Any hon. Member can move it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He has moved the motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But the amendment to the motion can be moved by any hon. Member.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Not this one. I meant that Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has moved the motion. The fact that he is absent today . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendment is that that motion be adjourned.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I hope you will have the patience to hear me. Other hon. Members may interrupt me, but I hope you will not interrupt me. I was saying that the hon. Member who moved the motion, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, is absent today.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह प्रस्ताव नहीं है मकल्प है ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The fact that he is not present today, his absence, is not a valid reason for adjournment of the debate because the House is seized of a resolution which has been already moved and the House can proceed to discuss the motion even in his absence. Do you agree with that proposition or not?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there is no adjournment of the debate.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There is no reason for adjournment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is for the House to decide.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: When a motion for adjournment of the debate is brought before the House, as you will agree, and I am sure the House will agree, it should be in consonance with the rules of procedure and it

should not set a dangerous, ugly, dirty precedent for the future.

श्री मधु लिमये: मेरी भी एक बात आप सुन लीजिये ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No further discussion can be allowed on this.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Sir, all this discussion has been held on my motion. Let me have a chance to reply to the points.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not necessary. I am sorry. The wording of the amendment is the same as the one moved by Shri Chatterjee on an earlier occasion and which has been accepted by the House. So there is a precedent. There is no point of order. The amendment has been carried by the House and the debate is adjourned.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You did not put it to the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall now take up the next resolution.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Let us understand, Sir, which one has been accepted by the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The debate on the motion moved by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has been adjourned.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Sir, are we correct in understanding that we have now adjourned the debate on this resolution without putting any date for further discussion which means that it will have to be balloted again.

An hon. Member: Yes.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: This is a clever way of getting the whole thing out of the way.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Sir, the precedent which you have read, if you read it to the end it will be shown . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let us take up the next resolution.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Sir, kindly give me one minute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Sir, I want only one minute.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There will be no discussion now. You should have thought about it before.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Sir, everybody has spoken except myself.

श्री मधु त्रिवे : मैं कब से खड़ा हो रहा हूँ। मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। उसको घाप सुन लें।

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Sir, the precedent that you have read, if you read to the end you will find that there also it was adjourned to the next day.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Yours was a wrong motion. Now it will be balloted again and there will be no discussion on the question of quitting the Commonwealth.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let us have food first and then Commonwealth.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: That means this resolution is now finished in the sense that it has to be balloted again.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The rules will apply. If it has to be balloted again it will be balloted.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Then it is finished. It is a very clever way of doing it.

श्री मधु त्रिवे : मेरा भी एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। घाप मूझ को बुला ही नहीं रहे हैं। घोरों को घाप बुलाते चले जा रहे हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may resume his seat.

श्री मधु त्रिवे : घापने इस मामले को चरम कँडे कर दिया है, यह हमारी

समझ में नहीं आया है। घाप नियम को तोड़ रहे हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member cannot go on like this.

श्री मधु त्रिवे : बैठ जाओ, बैठ जाओ, इतना ही घाप कहेंगे। बिस्कुल गलत कार्रवाई हो रही है।

15.06 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: IMPORTS OF FOODGRAINS UNDER PL 480

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Sir, I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that continued dependence on imports of foodgrains under P.L. 480 agreements with the United States is derogatory to our honour and injurious to our economy."

Sir, the number of amendments given notice of indicate the very wide support to the basic points raised in this resolution (Interruption). In view of this, I shall try to put my case on the platform of maximum unity among ourselves here in this House as well as in the country.

Sir, what is called in modern medicine "shock therapy" has recently been administered to our body politic. Call it "arm twisting" or by any other name, the United States attitude towards Indo-Pakistan conflict over Kashmir has shown us where we are likely to stand if we depend on aid, which aid, as the United States Government is never shy to declare, is intended to promote its own foreign policy and has nothing whatever to do with international benevolence. It is not only that revered men like Vinoba Bhave have strongly criticised our dependence on foreign food and its main symbol the P.L. 480 agreements. I find from the "self reliance" special number, Yojana, our Professor Dantewala, Chairman of the Agricultural