

the number of questions to be admitted.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Peeramade): We do not know what you said about the point raised by Sreekantan Nair on the Kerala food situation.

Mr. Speaker: Some of these motions have come and some had been allowed. Others have been disallowed. Those that had been allowed had been sent to the Ministry and when they give their reactions, that will be included here as and when they are known. Therefore, I cannot say anything about them now.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: You will intimate to me whether it has been accepted or not.

Mr. Speaker: Naturally, it will be intimated to you. Hon. Members who have tabled the motions would be informed.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): That means that you are withholding your decision on the adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that is correct. Shri Vajpayee.

12.03 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

DEPARTURE OF MRS. SVETLANA
 ALLELUEVA FROM INDIA TO THE WEST

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अविलम्बनीय लोक महत्व के निम्नलिखित विषय की ओर वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इस बारे में एक वक्तव्य दें :—

“श्रीमती स्वेतलाना एलिलुएवा का भारत से पश्चिमी देश को प्रस्थान” ।

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mrs. Svetlana Allilueva, a national of the USSR,

arrived at Palam airport from Moscow on the 20th December, 1966 by Aeroflot with a Soviet passport issued at Moscow on 5th November 1966. The passport was valid for 2 years, i.e. up to 5th November 1968 and had a visa dated 16-11-1966 valid for one month issued by the Indian Embassy in Moscow. The visa had been issued in the normal course by our Embassy in Moscow at the request of Mrs. Allilueva. Her visa for stay in India was later extended up to 15th March, 1967 at her request received through the Soviet Embassy. No further request for extension of visa was received.

The facts as ascertained by us appear to be as follows:

Mrs. Allilueva stayed in the Soviet Embassy from the 20th to 25th December 1966 when she left for Kalakankar. She was carrying the ashes of the late Kanwar Brajesh Singh of Kalakankar who had died in Moscow on 31st October 1966 for immersion in the Ganga at Kalakankar. She was offered, and accepted, hospitality at Kalakankar by Shrimati and Shri Dinesh Singh, who is the nephew of the late Kanwar Brajesh Singh, and by Shrimati and Kanwar Suresh Singh, brother of the late Kanwar Brajesh Singh. She returned to Delhi on the 5th March, 1967 and stayed as the personal guest, of Shrimati Dinesh Singh on the 5th night. On the morning of 6th March, an officer of the Soviet Embassy called for her and escorted her to the Soviet Embassy where she stayed in the Embassy hostel.

It is understood that she was to have departed for Moscow by Aeroflot on 8th March 1967, in the morning, but it was subsequently learnt that she had actually left by commercial flight, Qantas No. 751, on the night of 6th/7th March at 0240 hours for Rome. Till the morning of 8th March neither the Government of India nor any Indian officials had any previous information about her

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

intended or actual departure on the 7th morning.

She had valid travel documents. She departed from Palam airport with a valid Soviet passport and a visa for USA under her own name, no 'P' form is required by foreigners leaving India, nor is anything like an exit permit required by a foreigner leaving India before 3 months

According to our information, her decision to leave India for Rome was entirely her own. She had not previously contacted any Indian officials in regard to her departure on the 7th March morning, nor had she discussed her plan with her Indian host or the Indian authorities. It appears that she telephoned for a taxi from the Soviet Embassy hostel on the evening of 6th March and went in that taxi, unaccompanied by anyone else, to the US Embassy. A US visa was given and a ticket for Rome was bought for her by the US Embassy. The Embassy sent an officer who accompanied her to Palam airport and from there to Rome.

Mrs. Allilueva was not a guest of the Government of India. The Government of India had no occasion to consider the question of giving her asylum as no such request was received at any time from her.

Initially when the fact of Mrs. Allilueva having left India in the company of a Second Secretary of the US Embassy became known, the Soviet Embassy made representations to us. (An hon. Member: He is a CIA agent.) We immediately took up the matter with the US Ambassador.

In the light of the information we have subsequently received, Mrs. Allilueva has chosen to stay in Switzerland for some time for what appear to be purely personal reasons. Her departure from India was purely her personal matter and, so far as we are concerned, there is no failure

of any kind on the part of any of the Government of India agencies in the matter.

श्री अटन बिहारी बाजपेयी अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी विदेश मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि श्रीमती स्वेतलाना मायत में ठहरना चाहती थी, इसके बारे में उन्हें कोई सूचना नहीं मिली और न उस पर उन्हें विचार करने का मौका मिला। क्या मैं इस सम्बन्ध में विदेश मंत्री का ध्यान स्विट्जरलैंड के न्याय पुलिस मंत्री श्री लुडविग वान मायस द्वारा 13 मार्च को दिये गये वक्तव्य की ओर दिला सकता हूँ जिसमें श्री लुडविग ने कहा था

"She decided to come to Switzerland because her wish to remain in India was not fulfilled"

क्या कारण है कि स्विट्जरलैंड के पुलिस मंत्री दृढ़ परिणाम पर पटन कि श्रीमती स्वेतलाना स्वयं भारत में रुकना चाहती थी और जब भारत में रुकने की उनकी इच्छा पूरी नहीं हुई तो उन्हें स्विट्जरलैंड आने के लिए मजबूर होना पड़ा। समाचार पत्रों से ज्ञात होता है कि श्रीमती स्वेतलाना प्रधान मंत्री से मिली थी, श्री विदेश मंत्री से भी उनकी मुलाकात हुई थी। हो सकता है कि उन्होंने स्पष्ट शब्दों में यहाँ राजनीतिक शरण न मागी हो लेकिन क्या भारत सरकार की ओर से उनसे यह कहा गया कि भारत सरकार उन्हें भारत में रहने का आमन्त्रण देती है? यदि नहीं कहा गया तो क्या नहीं कहा गया? उन्हें भारत का श्रेष्ठ यहाँ खीचकर लाया था और क्या न कहने का कारण यह है कि भारत सरकार को डर है कि अगर श्रीमती स्वेतलाना को भारत में रुकने के लिए कहा गया तो सोवियत रूस नाराज हो जायगा? क्या सोवियत रूस के भय के कारण भारत सरकार इस मामले में अपने कर्तव्य से चूक गई?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am sorry to say that the allegations made by my

hon. friend are not correct and necessarily the inferences drawn from those allegations are equally unfounded.

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: I have not made any allegations.

Shri M. C. Chagla: The allegation is, she wanted to stay in India, but was not allowed.

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: I have quoted the statement made by the Police Minister in Switzerland. That is not an allegation.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have got the statement here with me.

"The Swiss Minister of Justice said on March 14 that both India and the United States have refused Mrs. Allilueva's request for asylum".

This is incorrect. The position is, she came, as I said, with a Soviet passport with a visa for a certain period. When she asked for the extension of the visa, we granted it. After that, at no time did she indicate any desire on her part to stay further in India nor was any request received by us from the Soviet Embassy or from her that she wanted to continue to stay in India. Therefore, no question of giving her asylum in India arises. She came with a passport and if she wanted to stay further, we would have considered the question of extending the visa. The question did not arise because she never suggested that she wanted to stay beyond the time the visa would expire, which was 15th March.

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: What about the latter part of my question? Why did not the Prime Minister on her own accord invite Mrs. Svetlana to stay in India?

Shri M. C. Chagla: She was a private citizen on a private visit. I submit with great respect that it is not for the Prime Minister in her official capacity to invite a private citizen to stay in India when her home is in USSR.

श्री श्रीकार सिंह (बदायूँ) : क्या सरकार स्वेतलाना स्टालिन के भ्रम भारत आने पर उन्हें भारत में रहने की इजाजत देने को तैयार है ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: At present she is in Switzerland. If she wants to come back to India, we will certainly consider her application in the usual course. That means, she should apply for a visa. She has not expressed any such intention at present. We have been informed and our information is correct that her present intention is to continue to stay in Switzerland. She has not expressed any desire to come to India from Switzerland. If she changes her mind, if she wants to come to our country, the hon. Member knows the usual procedure, which is to go to our Embassy and ask for it. The question is hypothetical and it does not arise.

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: Sir, the facts are being suppressed and the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs is trying to mislead the House. Is it not a fact that a Special Officer of the Ministry of External Affairs was sent to contact Mrs. Svetlana in Switzerland and, if so, may I know what report he has brought?

श्री कं० ना० तिवारी (बेतिया) : मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर है। ध्यान आकर्षण पर अभी तक यही परम्परा रही है कि एक ही क्वेश्चन एलाउ किया जाता है। दोबारा क्वेश्चन एलाउ नहीं किया जाता।

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. The answer was not clear and, therefore, he asked for a little clarification. Normally we allow only one question to be put.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, I rise to a point of order. When a specific question is put a specific answer, a clear answer should come. All these Calling Attention Notices—even we have tabled several questions on this—about Mrs. Svetlana are

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

based on certain press reports where it was said that there was collusion..

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The circumstances leading to the departure of Mrs. Svetlana show that it was with the connivance of CIA and a senior officer here. That has not come in his statement. There should be a straight answer to this question.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): Sir, it has been widely reported in the World Press that Mrs. Svetlana was whisked out of this country via Rome to Switzerland by a CIA agent who happened to be the Second Secretary of the US Embassy in this country. It was also reported how the visa was extended with the active help and co-operation of a Minister of the Government of India and an official of the Ministry of External Affairs. In that context, may I know whether the Government have enquired into the antecedents of this Minister who is responsible for extending her visa and offering hospitality to her and, secondly, whether it is a fact that a suggestion was made to the Government of India not to offer asylum to Mrs. Svetlana in this country because she was married to an Indian and she might claim a share of the property belonging to that family?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Sir, I will answer each of these questions. With regard to the CIA agent I saw a report in the New York Times and we put it squarely to the American Embassy. The American Ambassador categorically and emphatically denied that he was a CIA officer.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): They never agree. The US Government have never agreed that they are CIA

agents. Are we merely to depend upon American admission on questions relating to CIA agents (Interruptions)?

Shri M. C. Chagla: If my hon. friend says that notwithstanding this denial of the Ambassador of the United States of America, which *prima facie* must be accepted—he is an Ambassador—we must take action, if anything comes to light or comes to our information or knowledge which detracts from what the Ambassador has said, we will certainly take necessary action. But today the position is, apart from what appeared in the New York Times the only fact that is before us is a categorical denial by the US Ambassador that he is not a CIA agent.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What is your information (Interruptions)?

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is absolutely false to say that she was, to use his word, whisked away. The facts, as I have stated, are that she went to the US Embassy with a valid passport and she was given a visa (Interruptions).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: A Cabinet Minister and Shri T. N. Kaul are involved.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour): His answer does not give any satisfaction to us (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: There are other methods of seeking that satisfaction.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: We are here to get satisfactory answers.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I will answer any number of questions. I am not keeping anything back from the House. But give me an opportunity to answer the questions without interruption.

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): They are not interested in the reply.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Shri Hem Barua said that she was wishked away. That is not correct. She had a valid passport. She went to the American Embassy for a visa and the visa was granted. She went to Palam airport. She was in the Palam airport for an hour. She got a ticket in the ordinary course and she travelled by an ordinary commercial plane.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Who gave her money? Was it in Indian rupee?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I will first answer the questions of Shri Barua. I wish to deny emphatically, categorically and unequivocally that any Minister or any officer of the Government of India had anything whatever to do with her departure from India to Rome and to Switzerland. It is an absolutely false and malicious charge. It is equally false to say that she ever claimed asylum in this country. The question of asylum did not even arise. What Mrs. Svetlana wanted was extension of visa. If she had asked for extension, very likely we would have granted it.

Mr. Speaker: Shri P. K. Deo.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I rise on a point of order. My question has not been answered satisfactorily.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) : प्रश्नोत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह स्थापित नियम है कि मंत्री महोदय को पूरी सूचना देनी चाहिये, कोई चीज अपने अन्दर नहीं रखनी चाहिये, सब बतानी चाहियें, झूठी बात बताना भी सदन की मर्यादा का भंग होता है। इसलिये मंत्री महोदय ने अभी तक जो कहा है कि स्वेतलाना जी ने यहां पर शरण नहीं मांगी, वह झूठी बात कही है, क्योंकि स्वेतलाना जी ने मंत्रियों में से किन-किन से कई बार कहा कि वह भारत में अपना रहना बढ़ाना चाहती हैं और उस वक्त कुछ मंत्रियों ने और भारत सरकार के कुछ आदमियों ने उन्हें एक तो स्वास्थ्य के बारे में

Shri Randhir Singh: Under what rule is he raising it?

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्योंकि वह सब बातें बता नहीं रहे हैं। स्वेतलाना जी ने यहां पर रहने की इच्छा प्रकट की थी। मैं आपसे प्रार्थना कर देना चाहता हूँ कि उस तरफ के लोगों को छोड़ कर

Shri Randhir Singh: Is he replying to the question?

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, my question has not been answered. I will explain it in a minute.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Lohia is on his legs.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस बारे में वह बता नहीं रहे हैं।

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Already another hon. Member is on his legs, raising a point of order.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: So am I.

Mr. Speaker: Let one be over I find the hon. Member is going into details. What is his point of order? Let him state that. I would like to hear that.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : पाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर यह है कि मंत्रियों के पास और इतिला है और वह उस इतिला को रोक रहे हैं सदन को बता नहीं रहे हैं। यह एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, इनके पास इतिला है जो बता नहीं रहे हैं, मुझे बताने दीजिये कि कौनसी इतिला है जिसे ये लोग रोक रहे हैं और सदन को नहीं बता रहे हैं।

Mr. Speaker: The point which he is raising is a different one. He says that the information which is in his possession should be given. That is a different matter.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह रोक
हैं।

Shri Hem Barua: I have put a question. The reply was not satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different matter. I now call Shri P. K. Deo.

Shri Hem Barua: What about the extension of the visa?

Mr. Speaker: He has answered it.

Shri Hem Barua: He has not answered it.

Mr. Speaker: He has answered it. It may not be satisfactory, but he has answered it.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली-सदर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, वाजपेयी जी ने सवाल किया
था कि स्विटजरलैंड जो आफिसर भेजा गया
था उसकी रिपोर्ट क्या है उसके बारे में जवाब
नहीं दिया गया।

Mr. Speaker: If the answer is not satisfactory . . . (Interruption).

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: He must answer. He has not replied at all.

Mr. Speaker: I have called Shri P. K. Deo. Other Members can seek further clarification.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप नियम
41 देखिये।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : स्विटजरलैंड जो
आफिसर भेजा गया था, उसकी रिपोर्ट क्या
है ?

Mr. Speaker: What all you wanted to say, you have said.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्या आप
मुझे व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने देते हैं ? मंत्रियों
ने स्वेतलाना जी को एक तो यहाँ की गर्मी
के कारण, दूसरे स्वास्थ्य के कारण, तीसरे इस
कारण कि जब कोई अपने देश को छोड़

कर और किसी देश में रहता है, चौथे भारत
और इस के सम्बन्धों के कारण कहा कि आप
बली जाइये और वे बड़ी दुखी थीं . . .

Mr. Speaker: You are again making a speech. There is no point of order.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप उनसे
पूछिये।

Mr. Speaker: Other Members are there. They will ask that point.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): While it is interesting to note the defection of Soviet dignitaries from the Iron Curtain to the free world, is it not the rule in this country that you change the nationality after marriage? After her marriage to an Indian national has she not changed her citizenship and is she not entitled to stay in this country?

Shri M. C. Chagla: This marriage was not registered in Russia. The Indian gentleman had a wife here who was judicially separated but not divorced from him. That is the position with regard to the marriage.

Shri P. K. Deo: Then, was she a mistress?

Mr. Speaker: It is left to you.

Shri Hem Barua: We are interested in knowing more about this marriage. Was she really married or not?

Shri K. P. Singh Deo (Dhenkanal): When the External Affairs Minister has stated categorically on the floor of the House that Svetlana was a private citizen and was on a private tour, then what was the need for a Minister of the Central Government to ring up the Russian Ambassador, personally, for the extension of her visa?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Even a Minister of Government can have private visitors and a private life. She was a guest; she was bringing the ashes of his uncle. It had nothing to do

with Government. He was not acting as a Minister of Government; he was acting in his private capacity. He gave her hospitality. He and his wife looked after her. Is it a sin if a Minister has a friend or a guest?

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय (सलेमपुर) : श्रीमान्, जैसा कि समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित हुआ है कि वैदेशिक मंत्रालय के कुछ आफिसर स्विटजरलैंड गये और स्वेतलाना स्टालिन से परामर्श किया और वे परामर्श करके भारत-वर्ष लौट आये, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इन आफिसरों ने उनसे जो परामर्श किया, क्या उससे वैदेशिक मंत्रालय के मंत्रियों को भ्रमगत करा दिया गया है, यदि करा दिया गया है तो सरकार की उस बारे में क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: In order to leave no doubt in my mind I had sent on my own responsibility an officer of my Ministry to Switzerland to contact this young lady so that I should know first-hand what her reactions were. I want to assure the House that I am satisfied beyond any doubt that what I have stated in this report is absolutely correct.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Before I proceed to ask the question proper I would like your guidance on one thing and that is the mysterious process by which an adjournment motion undergoes *kayakalpa* and becomes a calling-attention notice. I wanted to censure the Government for its culpable lapse about a variety of matters in this regard. Instead, it has come to me as a calling-attention notice. I register my protest against it. I do not know how an adjournment motion, by a mysterious process, becomes a call attention notice.

Mr. Speaker: There was the No-Confidence Motion only yesterday. There are so many opportunities to censure the Government. This is also one of them. After all, it is an

important matter and I wanted to give you a chance here.

Shri Nath Pal: I am grateful to you for giving me a chance but I have a right which is better than a chance.

This Ministry somehow is getting no orious about its lack of ability to handle affairs where women are concerned, whether it is Reita Faria or Svetlana Stalin. I should like to ask, though he has said that categorically, decisively, resolutely and emphatically also, in spite of all these adverbs which he has used, whether it is not a fact that this unfortunate lady did pathetically plead, not for extension of visa—let not the ex-Chief Justice of Bombay take shelter behind the word 'asylum' which Mr. Vajpayee used—and ask for permission, not once but repeatedly, and did write letters to the External Affairs Ministry requesting for permission to stay in India and, if so, whether the request was also made personally to the Prime Minister of India and why was this request denied by the Government of India. Let me read this:

"It has now been established that Madam Svetlana was to be in contact with Mr. Royal at the residence of a Union Minister. At least one senior civil servant knew Madam Svetlana intimately and was involved in making arrangement for her exit from India."

May I know whether she was scheduled to dine with a senior official of the External Affairs Ministry on the day she made her departure?

Sir, I would not like to take shelter behind raising a point of order to claim the time of the House. I have asked very clear questions and I would expect him to be equally clear in his replies.

Shri M. C. Chagla: She did not meet or dine with any Indian official

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

after she shifted to the Soviet Embassy on 6th March morning. It is absolutely incorrect to say that this lady made any request to the External Affairs Ministry, to any Minister or to the Prime Minister, to stay on in this country. Leave aside a pathetic request but even an ordinary request was not made. I have said it before and I repeat that we extended the visa and there was no question or suggestion that she wanted to stay on in India.

Shri Hem Barua: What is the difference?

Shri M. C. Chagla: She gave her friends to understand which include Mr. Dinesh Singh and an official of the External Affairs Ministry that she wanted to go back to the U.S.S.R.

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया : यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Dinesh Singh was under that impression when she left his house and went to the Soviet Embassy. It came to him as much of a surprise as to others, including the Soviet Embassy, when she suddenly disappeared to Rome instead of going back to Soviet Union. Therefore, this charge of any intention on the part of the External Affairs Ministry, its officers or Ministers, is absolutely false.

Shri Nath Pai: There are five letters from this lady to the Ministry of External Affairs.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am not taking any refuge under any legal concept of 'asylum' or 'visa'. I want to state the fact that she expressed no desire whatever to continue to stay in this country.

Shri Nath Pai: What about these letters?

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is absolutely false suggestion made by Mr. Nath

Pai that at Mr. Dinesh Singh's house she was brought in contact with any American official.

Shri Nath Pai: It is from the Patriot. I asked about the letters.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I hope Mr. Nath Pai has sufficient detachment and impartiality and will not accept, as gospel truth, anything that appears in the papers.

Shri Nath Pai: Particularly, the Patriot.

श्री प्रेम चंद वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : यह जो कहा गया, है कि पत्रों में जो कुछ छपा है, गलत है। तो पत्रों पर यह आरोप नहीं लगाया जा सकता है।

Shri M. C. Chagla: Any paper, whether it is the *Hindustan Times*, the *Statesman*, the *Patriot* or the *Times of India*—of course, the *Times of India* is not being published now. I look at all the four papers and I have learnt during the years, and I hope Mr. Nath Pai also will learn during the years, not to accept everything that appears in the papers.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): About letters, he has not said anything.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): A specific question was put about five letters that were sent.

Shri Nath Pai: I beg your indulgence.

Mr. Speaker: On the letters?

Shri M. C. Chagla: No letters were sent by her to the External Affairs Ministry.

Shri Nath Pai: Did she not request the Prime Minister? Did she plead with the Prime Minister for permission to stay or not?

Shri M. C. Chagla: No.

Shri Baburao Patel (Shajapur): It was said by the External Affairs Minister that Svetlana was not the wife of an Indian citizen. This matter has now taken a very romantic and colourful complexion. She was the sweetheart of an Indian and therefore the matter becomes very emotional in that case. If this lady, whose husband died in Soviet Russia, came to India, she naturally became our guest and she was treated as a guest. She probably wanted an asylum in the country and she approached the first persons whom she knew, namely, Mr. Dinesh Singh and the Prime Minister. It was our duty to give her some sort of an asylum because we know what are the conditions in Soviet Russia. If some one comes to us, out of sheer humanity we often give the person an asylum and protection. It is quite obvious from the discussion that took place in this House that this protection was denied. It is also quite obvious that our Government became panicky; our Government is very much concerned about what Soviet Russia thinks of us. But I want to know one thing. What is the reaction of the Government to this attempted kidnapping done by the Americans in India? Do we allow people who come to our country as guests, or even as tourists, to be kidnapped by Americans? If the Americans are here in this country for this purpose, then this is a shameful business. This is a case of kidnapping and not of mere elopement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may conclude now.

Shri Baburao Patel: This is a case of kidnapping, somebody who has been taken away from our country right in the presence of our officers. So, I want this question to be answered.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is not correct that she was the guest of the Government or an official guest. She came on a private visit, on a private affair which concerned herself and

had nothing to do with Government. She applied for a visa in the ordinary course in our Embassy in Moscow. The visa was granted and she came here as any Russian or a foreigner would do. Therefore, Government had no responsibility whatever towards her.

Secondly, it is entirely incorrect to say that she was kidnapped by U.S. Embassy or by American authorities. As I said, she held a valid passport, she went to the Embassy and she got the visa as any other person having a valid passport could have gone and obtained a visa. If you kidnap a person, you do not take a person to the Airport and let her be there for one hour.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): Money was supplied.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is perfectly true that the United States Embassy or officer paid for her ticket. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia has given . . .

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On a point of propriety:

A question has been asked which you, in your wisdom, have permitted, namely, something which amounted virtually to kidnapping has taken place on the part of a foreign embassy operating in this country. The hon. Minister says that a foreign embassy had offered money to a foreign national who happened to be our guest, at least the guest of a Minister of Government, for a considerable length of time. Is it open to any guest or any Indian national for that matter to be taken away in that manner by foreign embassies operating under our damn nose?

12.39 hrs.

RE. MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia has moved a privilege motion and that is about some statement made