

has been decided, in principle, to set up a unit in the public sector for the manufacture of scooters with an annual capacity of 1,00,000 Nos. based on a proven foreign design. In pursuance of this decision, offers have been invited from foreign parties by the 15th November, 1970. Further action will be taken on receipt and examination of such offers.

(b) Does not arise.

12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED BY INDIANS IN CEYLON

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance, and I request that he make a statement there on :

"The reported difficulties experienced by Indians in Ceylon and steps taken by the Government of India with regard thereto."

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH, : Government's attention has been drawn to recent comments on difficulties faced by Indian businessmen in Ceylon.

Following the formation of a new Government in Ceylon in May, 1970 that Government announced that it had decided to nationalise certain types of business. They also announced that they intended to Ceylon various occupations. In pursuance of these policies they have acted to reduce the quota of imports allowed of the Food Import Trade, while preferential treatment has been given to Ceylon Cooperative Wholesale Establishment. The import licencing procedure has been changed and the import of certain commodities permitted under the open General Licence is now on a quota system. The Government has also announced its decision to set up a State Trading Corporation to take over import and export trade. It has also not extended the residence permits of a number of Indian nationals working in the gem trade. These steps are part of a general

policy which is non-discriminatory and is not directed specifically against Indian concerns and nationals. Ceylon, citizens and other foreigners are equally affected. This will result in a certain number of Indian nationals being displaced from their present employment and it is likely that some of them will now seek to return to India. Government have the situation under constant review, and will render appropriate assistance to those returning to India, if necessary.

The implementation of the 1964 Agreement regarding the grant of citizenship to stateless persons of Indian origin, and the repatriation of those who have to come to India under the Agreement is continuing. The Government of Ceylon have affirmed their determination to implement it in letter and spirit and, and the Government of India have informed the Government of Ceylon that they will do likewise. The feasibility of streamlining the procedures under the Agreement are at present being discussed between the two Governments.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: My call attention notice was not concerned with Indian businessmen; it was based on a news report that certain Indians working in the plantations etc. were finding themselves in difficulties. But the reply of the hon. Minister concerns only the Indian businessmen. I take this opportunity to congratulate the revolutionary Government of Ceylon for taking over the export-import trade under the State Trading Corporation. I hope the Government of India will also derive inspiration from that and will do the same in this Country also. Coming to the question the big businessmen can take care of themselves. The small businessmen and other citizens had already approached the Indian High Commission for passport and other facilities to come back to India. What steps have been taken to rehabilitate them as they have no source of livelihood? In the statement, they say: "The feasibility of streamlining the procedures ... are at present being discussed between the two Government," I should like to know whether any discussion is likely to take place between the Prime Ministers of the two countries because it is necessary that such a discussion take place in the light of the decision of the Government of Ceylon. If not, at what level is a meeting contemplated?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The question of the hon. Member was attempted to be answered in para 3 where the 1964 agreement was referred to. This matter was informally discussed at the Minister's level in Lusaka and the Minister of the Ceylon Government stated clearly that it was their intention to implement the 1964 agreement in every way. There are two parts to that agreement. We have agreed to take over a certain number of persons and the Ceylonese Government have agreed to grant citizenship to a certain number and the implementation of that agreement will reduce the problem to a considerable extent.

The question of granting facilities to those who want to come here in our national question and it is for us to decide. Apart from the obligation of the Ceylon Government to make available foreign exchange for repatriation of the amounts that might be with them. We are in touch with the Government of Tamil Nadu and other State Governments. Certain schemes for rehabilitation of those who have to be rehabilitated had been worked out and on the whole the arrangements appear to be satisfactory.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : What are those arrangements? Can you give us some salient features of the schemes?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The arrangements are given them facilities for rehabilitation in life. Some of them are proposed to be resettled on some plantations; others will be helped to resettle in some other work. That is a matter of detail which is handled in the Ministry of Rehabilitation. If the hon. Member is interested he can address a question to that Ministry.

श्री शशि झुषण (खारगोन) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सीलोन की क्रान्तिकारी सरकार ने वहाँ के व्यापार का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने की दिशा में जो कदम उठाया है, उस का सब एशियाई-अफ्रीकी देशों के प्रगतिशील लोगों को स्वागत करना चाहिए। यह बहुत अच्छा है कि उन्होंने अमरीका और ब्रिटेन के मुनाफाखोरों को अपने यहाँ से निकाल दिया है। हमारे देश के जो बहुत बड़े बड़े मुनाफाखोर व्यापारी हैं,

वहाँ पर जो ग्वालियर के भूतपूर्व राजा की टैक्सटाइल रियाज रहा है, उन के साथ तो किसी की हमदर्दी नहीं हो सकती है। लेकिन इस बात का ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए कि वहाँ पर हमारे जो काम करने वाले लोग हैं जो कमेरे भाई हैं, उन के सामने कोई दिक्कत है या नहीं। क्या हमारे हाई कमिश्नर ने उन लोगों के साथ बात की है कि वहाँ की बदलती हुई स्थिति में राष्ट्रीयकरण मूवमेंट और को-आपरेटिव मूवमेंट का समर्थन कर के वहाँ की सरकार के साथ सहयोग करना चाहिए? हम यह प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं कि नेपाल और अफगानिस्तान के साथ हमारे व्यापार के साथ हमारे व्यापार सम्बन्ध स्टेट ट्रेडिंग के द्वारा हों। इस से बड़े बड़े व्यापारी तो शायद दुखी होंगे, लेकिन हमारे देश और उन देशों की गरीब और मेहनत करने वाली जनता इस बात का समर्थन करती है। क्या सरकार ने हमारे हाई कमिश्नर के जरिये सीलोन सरकार से इस बारे में बातचीत की है कि हमारे कमेरे भाइयों को वहाँ कोई दिक्कत न हो और उन को उचित सुविधायें दी जायें? अगर इस के बावजूद वे लोग अपनी मर्जी से यहाँ आते हैं, तो क्या उन को अधिक से अधिक सुविधायें देने की व्यवस्था की जा रही है?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Sir, one has to go back to the 1964 agreement to find an answer to these various points that have been raised. Under that agreement, an assessment was made of the total number of persons of Indian origin who could be described, for want of a better name, as stateless-neither having Ceylon citizenship nor Indian citizenship. This was a long outstanding question between the two Governments, and in 1964, an agreement was arrived at between the two Prime Ministers-India and Ceylon. Now, it is a question of implementing that agreement and it is hoped that a fairly large number of persons in this category-the exact number is given in that agreement-will get Ceylon citizenship and certain others will have to come out to India, to be repatriated

[Shri Swaran Singh]

to India. For those who were repatriated to India, as I have already mentioned, rehabilitation plants have been formulated, and every effort will be made to ensure their rehabilitation and reabsorption in our economy. This is the broad framework.

It is true that those who come out will have to face certain difficulties, because it will not be realistic for us to imagine that they will not face any difficulty. They are bound to face some difficulty, and it will be our effort to ensure that the rigour of this movement is reduced as much as possible.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur) : Sir, in Ceylone and in any other country for that matter, Indians have been treated badly, and the human approach has not been shown toward them, and this has come out on several occasions. This is not the first time that Ceylon is going anti-Indian. There are instances to show that even the lukewarm policy of Sirimove Bandananaike has been contradicted several times in Ceylon so far as Indians are concerned.

In Cylon, the majority of Indians are South Indian population and they have been ill-treated by the Ceylonese on a number of occasions. The 1964 agreement between Mr. Shastri and Mrs. Bandaranaike has not been followed strictly. The Government of India has failed to see whether that agreement has been implemented in letter and spirit. Just now the minister has made a statement saying that these steps are part of the general policy which is non-discriminatory and is not specifically against the Indians. But under the grab of a certain general policy, the Ceylon Government is specifically taking action against Indian nationals. Regarding repatriation also, the 1964 agreement has not been respected by the Ceylon Government. They have given quit notice to Indian nationals' giving them only two or three months' time. How can they ascertain their assets and Liabilities within that time? What concrete steps have Government of India taken to relieve the tension there and to safeguard and South Indian in Ceylon consisting of workers, labourers, tradors and bussiness people?

Are the Government of India showing any human respect to them and taking any concrete steps to streamline the 1964 agreement.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It will not be correct for us to say that the present Government of Ceylon is pursuing any policy which can be described as anti-Indian. It will not be a fair statement. Regarding the 1964 agreement, it is common ground between the Government of India and the present Government of Ceylon, it was common ground also between the Government of India and the former Government of Ceylon which was in power before the elections—that this agreement will be implemented. There is no dispute about the 1964 agreement. Both the Governments adhere to the policy that it should be implemented. If the hon. member can point out any precise matter in respect of which the 1964 agreement has not been implemented, I am prepared to look into it. No instance has come to my notice on the basis of which I can say that the 1964 agreement has not been implemented by the present Government of Ceylon.

About repatriation, we have to look after all those who come out of Ceylon under the agreement. It is our responsibility to see that the difficulties of those who come to India are minimised.

About quit notice in two or three months' period, I would like to get precise information from him. There is an agreement of issuing residence permits to those who may be non-Ceylonese. If any case comes within that, it can be examined. We can ask our Higher Commissioner to pursue the individual cases. Let us not confuse individual cases with the main problem which is sought to be tackled by the faithful implementation of the 1964 agreement to which both the Governments adhere. We should try to discharge our responsibility under that agreement and I am sure Government of Ceylon would also discharge their obligation.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : I have asked a specific question about the quit notice that

has been served on many Indians. The Minister has not replied to that.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : If we follow this practice of point of order in a Calling Attention Notice there would be no end to it.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Normally I do not raise it. It is only because of its importance that I am doing it now.

MR. SPEAKER : Let the reply of the Minister be over.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : If the hon. Member is referring to press reports in this respect, the correct position that we have ascertained is as follows. Temporary residence permits have been given to non-nationals to stay in Ceylon at the discretion of the Ceylon Government. For persons covered by the 1954 Agreement they are renewable up to the age of 55. They have been used sometimes to create conditions in which Indian nationals have to leave Ceylon. Our High Commission is of the view that the figure of 22,000 quoted in the press reports is not correct. There are possibly about 10,000 temporary residence permit-holders in Ceylon. A fair proportion of this number would be entitled to stay on under the 1954 Agreement. This is the way that we are dealing even with that problem which is somewhat outside the 1964 Agreement.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : I am sorry to point out that the answer given by the hon. Minister of the External Affairs is misleading. He has categorically stated that there is no difference between us and the Ceylon Government about implementation and there is no difficulty in regard to that. I am sorry to point out that it is quite misleading in the sense that the whole question was hamstrung and the implementation has been delayed because the Government of India and the Government of Ceylon were not able to agree between themselves.

MR. SPEAKER : This is not a point of order.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : The whole House knows that under the agreement so many persons are to be repatriated to India and so many have to be given Ceylonese citizenship. It is a serious point that I am making. The hon. Minister said that their is no difference. I submit that there is a difference. There is no point in misguiding the House. He is hiding certain facts which is not going to help us in strengthening the friendship of the two countries.

MR. SPEAKER : What are you aiming at? Since you have not given your name, you cannot ask any question.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : I am raising a point of order and I appeal to you to give me a minute to explain my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : It is not a point of order.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : My point of order is that the information given by the Minister is misleading.

MR. SPEAKER : There is a procedure laid down for that. May I invite his attention to certain directions regarding misleading answers? He will have to follow them. There is no point of order.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : I will finish in two sentences. The period fixed for the implementation of the agreement is already over. Then why is it not implemented? How can the hon. Minister claim that everything is smooth-sailing?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is not over.

SHRI N. K. SOMANI (Nagaur) : Mr. Speaker, the frequency of these unfortunate occurrences where Indians have to leave their homes where they have stayed for such a long time, whether it be the case of Burma, or the case of various African countries or U. K., and now Ceylon, shows total failure of our external policies. I would like to remind the House that last year about this time this particular news hit the headlines when it said that India agrees

[Shri N. K. Somani]

to give Rs. 5 crores of credit to the Ceylon Government for purchase of capital goods and said that the "agreement is signed with the spirit of extreme cordiality, mutual understanding and friendship". These three items have now taken a full circle, the hon. Minister would kindly note, after the heralding of the installation of the present government. In the background of the complaints that unfortunate people of Indian origin are being harassed there is this news item that Ceylon will squeeze out 15,000 Indian shortly. This is the result of our "Cordial" relationship with Ceylon during the last one year.

The argument adduced by the Ceylon Government is that these 15,000 people do not come within the purview of the Sirimavo-Shastri Agreement. That government now intends to bring these people within the immigration laws by an amendment of the immigration laws so that these people can be ushered out of Ceylon absolutely unceremoniously and without any further notice. In spite of this proposed amendment of the immigration laws, which will become a positive threat to these people, I am surprised to see that the hon. Minister does not think that it is non-discriminatory and thinks that it is in the interest of Indian citizens.

Another disturbing factor that has come to notice is that the present Prime Minister of Ceylon is reported to have said that she will not stand by past commitments or agreements that have been signed by other people. I hope, the Government of India will also take notice of this development.

I would, therefore, like to know that as far as these 15,000 citizens, who are threatened by an amendment of the immigration laws, are concerned, what special steps the Government of India would like to take under this cordial relationship between the two countries; and, secondly, in the unfortunate event of these people having to come to India he has generally described that we will give them all help but our previous experience is entirely to the contrary in the matter of helping them to rehabilitate themselves speedily in this country, would the Government constitute a special rehabilitation fund under one ministry or

another so that these people can be given enough financial incentives and other opportunities for settlement in the country.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I was unable to find out as to what was meant by the hon. Member when he said that the present Government of Ceylon was going back upon agreements signed by others. So far as the agreement with the Government of India is concerned, it is an agreement signed in 1964 by the two Prime Ministers and the present as well as the previous Government of Ceylon have consistently adhered to the resolve to implement this agreement. A certain follow-up action has to be taken at the national level in both countries to implement the agreement. So far as the Government of Ceylon is concerned, it is their duty and responsibility to undertake action in Ceylon so that the 1964 agreement, which is international in character, is implemented, and it is our responsibility to look after those who have to come over to India under that agreement. So, you have to separate the national action from the international responsibility. This agreement is being implemented and the two governments have reaffirmed their adherence to the original agreement.

I would like to take this opportunity of pointing out to the hon. Member, who is naturally concerned because he belongs to Tamil Nadu where most of these people are going to be rehabilitated, the duration of the period of the agreement. This is to be implemented within 15 years. So, it is not correct to say that the period of the agreement has already expired. The two governments will meet at official and diplomatic levels, even at ministerial level if necessary, to straighten out any difficulties that might arise in the implementation of this agreement.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री (बाप्रपत) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अफ्रीका में भारतीयों के साथ जो दुर्व्यवहार होता है तो वह कुछ समझ में आता है कि गोरे साम्राज्यवादी करते रहे, पाँछे जो लोग आए वह भी दूसरी बहूनात से ऐसा करते रहे। लेकिन हमारे बिल्कुल पड़ोसी देश बर्मा और लंका में भी भारतीयों के साथ ऐसा व्यवहार हो तो यह बहुत शोचनीय बन जाता है और

देश में बड़ी सनसनी फैलाता है। अभी मंत्री महोदय ने यह कहा कि लंका सरकार ने जितने भी यह नये पग ध्यापार के सम्बन्ध में या दूसरे उठाए हैं यह बिलकुल नान-डिस्क्रिमिनेटरी हैं, यानी इस में कोई भेदभाव नहीं बरता गया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह बताएंगे कि यह जो नये पग उठाए गये हैं इन का जो प्रभाव पड़ा है यह कितना भारतीयों पर पड़ा है, कितना अभारतीयों पर पड़ा है ?

इस तरह से भ्रम दूर हो जायगा कि भारतीयों के साथ क्या हो रहा है। वास्तविकता यह है कि नाम तो लिया जाता है कि सामान्य तौर पर सब के लिए किया गया है, लेकिन इस का प्रभाव केवल भारतीयों पर पड़ा है। इस लिए मंत्री महोदय आंकड़े दे कर बतायें कि उन्होंने जो पग उठाए हैं, उन का भारतीयों पर क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा, उस का अनुपात क्या है तथा उन की संख्या क्या है ?

मैं यह भी पूछना चाहता हूँ—सन् 1964 में श्रीलंका सरकार से हमारा एक समझौता हुआ था, उस समझौते के अन्तर्गत यह तय हुआ था कि सम्भवतः 50 हजार आदमी प्रतिवर्ष लंका से हमारे देश में आया करेंगे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि श्रीलंका में कुल कितने भारतीय हैं, उन में से कितनों को वहाँ स्थायी निवास की आज्ञा मिली है और कितनों को अस्थायी निवास की आज्ञा मिली है, कितने भारतवर्ष आ चुके हैं और जो भारतवर्ष आ चुके हैं, क्या उन के सम्बन्ध में मंत्री महोदय सन्तुष्ट हैं कि उन के आवास, रोजगारी रिहैबिलिटेशन का जो व्यवस्था की गई है वह सन्तोषजनक है ?

क्या मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान श्रीलंका के वित्त मंत्री श्री पिरैरा के उस बयान की ओर गया है, जो उन्होंने 26 अक्टूबर की पार्लियामेंट में अपना बजट भाषण देते हुए कहा था कि उन्होंने वहाँ के भारतीयों पर प्रति व्यक्ति

500 रु० सालाना का एक नया टैक्स लगाया है ? क्या मंत्री महोदय बता सकते हैं कि 500 रुपये सालाना का जो नया टैक्स लगाया गया है, उस का जस्टीफिकेशन क्या है ? क्या मंत्री महोदय इस को ठीक समझते हैं, अगर ठीक नहीं समझते हैं तो क्या भारत सरकार ने इस का कोई नोटिस लिया है या भारत सरकार कोई नोटिस लेने जा रही है ?

उसी बजट भाषण में श्री पिरैरा ने जो सब से घातक बात कही वह यह थी कि यह टैक्स इस लिये लगाया गया है कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोग जल्दी से जल्दी लंका छोड़ कर जा सकें, यह इस बात का इन्सेंटिव है कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोग लंका छोड़ कर बाहर चले जायें। इस टैक्स का भारतीयों पर क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा, क्या भारत सरकार श्रीलंका सरकार से इस भाषण के विरुद्ध प्रोटेस्ट करेगी ? मैं चाहूँगा कि मंत्री महोदय इन सारे तथ्यों के सम्बन्ध में हमें ठीक ठीक बात बतलायें, जिस से इस हाउस और देश की जनता को सही स्थिति का पता चल सके और सन्तोष हो सके ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : With regard to the first question, my reply would be that it would be incorrect for us to take this view that the nationalisation of trade or nationalisation of certain business and industrial establishments by the Government of Ceylon is directed principally against India. That will be a wrong assessment and we should not take that view.

To recall to the memory of this hon House, I would like to mention that the Government of Ceylon sometime back nationalised oil companies in which India was not at all concerned. All foreign capital of serval important and big countries was involved and they took that decision and took the foreign oil companies and foreign oil establishments under their control. That is a step in which you cannot say that they had embarked upon that policy because they wanted to hit Indians. It will be wrong for us to take this view.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

Even the measures that I have now mentioned I which have reproduced or stated in my own words from the policy statement issued by the present Government of Ceylon, it would be noticed that several concrete steps in several directions have been taken. There for instance, they want to reduce the quota of imports in the food import trade while preferential treatment has been given to Ceylon Corporation Wholesale Establishment. Secondly, instead of Open General License there is now a quota system in in several cases where there was OGL. Thirdly, the State Trading Corporation has been announced to be set up to take over import and export trade. Fourthly, it has not extended the residence permits of a number of Indian nationals working in the gem trade. These are the precise steps that have been taken. I have not got the figures as to how many Indians would be affected and how many Ceylonese would be affected. But, obviously, to imagine that all this import and export-trade and other things are predominantly in the hands of Indians will be a wrong assessment. Predominantly the Ceylonese nationals themselves will be affected because a large number of Ceylonese businessmen are there in this type of business. If there is any other general point that we have to urge, by all means, we should urge; but simply to say in a sweeping manner that the nationalisation project upon which the Government of Ceylon, in the best interests of their own country have embarked, is directed against India will not be fair.

On the second question, about the number of people of Indian origin in Ceylon, detailed information has been given from time to time already. Even in the 1964 agreement, these figures are given as to the number to whom Ceylonese citizenship will be granted and the number who will be repatriated to India. The number will be about 3 lakhs to whom they will give the Ceylonese citizenship and the other figure will be about 5 lakhs or a little more than that, who will have to come over to India. Still there will be some residue left about which once this main point is settled, there can be further talks between the two Governments.

I agree that the matter of rehabilitation and resettlement of those who come over to India is an important matter and we should do everything possible to see that they are properly rehabilitated.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : पांच लाख में से कितने आ चुके हैं ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I cannot give the figure. I have not got the figure. Some thing has been mentioned about the statement of the Finance Minister of Ceylon. That has got nothing to do with this.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप की सहायता चाहूंगा। जब 50 हजार आदमी हर साल आने हैं और सब मिला कर पांच लाख आने हैं तो मंत्री महोदय यह भी बतायें कि कितने आदमी वहां से निकाले जा चुके हैं ?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : अगर आप को ज्यादा पता है तो मैं आप की इत्तिला ले लेता हूँ। I am wiser by the information that he gives.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : आप लागे चल कर बता दीजियेगा।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I will look into it. If he is interested in the figure, I will get it. I will give it to him.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह अपनी इत्तिला दे रहे हैं। He is giving the official figure. The Member might have got from other sources. But the Minister cannot speak without responsibility; he is quoting his official figures.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Certain problems have been created by the imposition of the new tax on persons of Indian immigrating into Ceylon and all that. That is a matter which we are taking up separately with the Government of Ceylon.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : 500 ह० के टैक्स की बात आप ने नहीं बताया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप को क्या हो गया है ? जो इन्फर्मेशन उन्होंने दी है वह माननी पड़ेगी।

सरकार ने यह रिपोर्ट नहीं बी है और वह मैक्सवेल साहब के हाथ में चली गई है, इस लिये इस को कान्स्ट्रक्टिव रेस्पॉन्सिबिल्टी मंत्री महोदय की है, चाहे किसी भी अफसर ने दी हो।

12.38 hrs.

RE : QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI NATA PAI (Rajapur) : Mr. Speaker, I want your guidance with regard to my Privilege Motion.

MR. SPEAKER : I am keeping it pending, till I get a reply from the Minister.

SHRI NATH PAI : appeal to them through you, Sir, under the Rules of Procedure.

MR. SPEAKER : I said, I am keeping it pending till I have a report from the Minister about the results of the enquiry.

SHRI NATH PAI : One submission, Sir. I had a meeting with the leaders of opposition groups and all are in favour of your being pleased to accept my Privilege Motion. But you have not directed them.

MR. SPEAKER : I have not accepted it or rejected it yet ; I am keeping it pending.

SHRI NATH PAI : I am not arguing ; I just wanted to strengthen your hands in taking a proper decision. May I say this, Sir ? I did not hear your directing the Minister that he should complete his enquiry within a certain period of time. Have you directed, Sir ?

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : क्या आपने मंत्री महोदय को जानकारी देने के लिए डाइरेक्ट किया है ?

MR. SPEAKER : I am going to write to him.

श्री मधु लिये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस पर मेरा प्वाइन्ट ऑफ आर्डर है। सुरक्षा मंत्री के द्वारा जांच कराने की और उस की रिपोर्ट आने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है।

MR. SPEAKER : In that case I have no information. On the point whether the Government authorised or not, I must have some information. Merely because something is said, I will not accept it. When that information comes, I shall take a decision.

SHRI NATH PAI : May I make a submission ? When the hon. Minister in reply to my repeated plea to him to give a copy of the report to the House, impertinently said 'I would not give it to you'. If you want a solid proof of the contempt of the House, it was done in your presence. I do not think it requires any information.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : Something has gone out to somebody or some foreigner, and the hon. Minister has refused to disclose that document on the floor of the House. That is the question of privilege.

SHRI NATH PAI : Here is a *prima facie* case.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : It is not a question of inquiry. Let them hold the inquiry and do whatever they like, but the question of privilege is there.

MR. SPEAKER : If something goes out, then action is taken against the officer under the Official Secrets Act.

श्री रवि राय : अध्यक्ष जी, यह सर्मायण नहीं है, यह तो बहुत महत्वपूर्ण मामला है।

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member had used the word 'something' and I have only repeated it.

I have kept it pending till I get some information. I am not rejecting it. Do hon. Members want me to reject it ?