

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): (a) to (c). Pakistan-occupied Kashmir has been shown as part of India except for a portion of Hunza which is shown as part of China. The correct alignment of India's boundary with China has been brought to the notice of the U.S.S.R. Government.

12.25 hrs.

RE: CALLING ATTENTION NOTICES

(Procedure)

MR. SPEAKER: Before taking up the calling-attention notice, I would like to explain the procedure which I have been following.

At times there arises some problem when calling-attention notices are given on a particular day. Sometimes I get 30 to 40 calling-attention notices. Out of those 30 notices I have to reject 29 and can only accept one, not because the other 29 are bad and that one alone is good.

श्री मधु लिमये: (मुंनेर) : नियमों में दो का इंतजाम है । आप दो एक्सेप्ट कर सकते हैं । लेकिन आप करते ही नहीं हैं ।

MR. SPEAKER: Even then, out of 30 you cannot have 29, and, if not 29, 28 will have to be rejected. It is not a question of one or two.

At times important calling-attention notices are held over for a day or two. But you cannot hold them over for a long time. So, what happens is that 8 or 10 days later, after some calling-attention notices have been rejected, similar type of calling-attention notices may come up again and if they are important they may be included. It has been brought to my notice that some calling-attention notice was rejected earlier but the same thing came up eight days later. Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha brought it to my notice and I entirely agreed with her.... (Interruption). Now I have

made it clear that if a calling-attention was not admitted on a particular day and was admitted a few days after, even names of those hon. Members, whose calling-attention notice was rejected earlier, will be clubbed with others and then the names will be balloted. Therefore there will be no discrimination now. It is only a ballot and it does not matter for me whether it is of three names or of ten names. But if the calling-attention notices are different in concept—if it is only different in language, it does not matter—if the subject itself is a little different you, will have to leave it to the office to decide. For instance, Shri Madhok brought to my notice a case. I called for it. There is some possibility of the office taking a different view. You will have to tolerate a little discrepancy that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: rose—

MR. SPEAKER: No discussion please Shri Samar Guha.....absent Shri Daschowdhury.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Sir, your decision is welcome, but there is one snag in it

MR. SPEAKER: Now a discussion will start.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Suppose, Shri Bal Raj Madhok, S. M. Banerjee or anybody else has given a calling-attention notice on the same subject and it is admitted after three or four days, then my submission is that preference should be given to the earlier names.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no question of preference. All names are balloted. It makes no difference.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam): It is a question of procedure only but I am sorry to draw your attention to this. You need not bring in the office in this manner in the House. Whatever you may ask the office to do, it is the Speaker.... (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER: You must not complain. After all it is not intentional.

[Mr. Speaker].

Nobody's name is eliminated. Therefore you do not bring in any complaint or anything like that. Ultimately, I am responsible, whoever does it. Nobody's name is eliminated on any ground. We would like to be as impartial as possible.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South DELHI): Today there are only three names. Are you giving us a chance?

श्री प० सा० बाबूपाल : (गंगानगर) :
 आपने अध्यक्ष महोदय कहा है कि महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्नों को प्राथमिकता दी जानी है । मैं समझ नहीं पा रहा हूँ कि महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न का अर्थ क्या है ? मैंने एक कार्लिंग एटेंशन नोटिस दिया था । वह राजस्थान के घनदर बीकानेर जिले में हुई मृत्युओं के बारे में था । एक सप्ताह पहले वहाँ बाईस घादमियों की मृत्यु हो गई थी उन शिविरों में जहाँ उनको रखा गया । क्या यह महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न नहीं है मैंने इसके बारे में कटिंग भी दिया था और तार भी भेरे पास आया है । मुझे अफसोस है कि हमारे विरोधी भाई जब छोटी छोटी चीजों के बारे में चिल्लाते हैं तो आप उन से डर जाते हैं और भयभीत हो कर उनकी बात को स्वीकार कर लेते हैं । हम जो कुछ कहते हैं उसकी आप परवाह ही नहीं करते हैं

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: Sir, it is an aspersion on the Chair. We resent it; we object to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Some hon. Members do not mean what they say. There is no point in our getting irritated. He does not mean it at all. Rajasthan famine is very important. It is not a question of Call Attention notice. I have allowed a discussion for two hours. Today evening, we are discussing it. It is not that it is not important. The hon. Member does not mean it. He is a good man. We now take up Call Attention Notice.

Shri B. K. Daschowdhury.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

AUCTION OF PROPERTIES OF EAST PAKISTAN DISPLACED PERSONS

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Cooch-Behar): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

Reported auction sale of the properties of the Indian citizens who migrated to India from East Pakistan after partition by the East Pakistan Government as Enemy Properties and taking over by Pakistan of the assets of the Premier Insurance Company of India.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): During and soon after the 1965 conflict, the Government of Pakistan took over Indian properties in East Pakistan including the properties of persons who had migrated from East Pakistan to India earlier, and declared these to be enemy property.

Under Article VIII of the Tashkent Declaration signed in January 1966, the two sides had agreed:

"to discuss the return of the property and assets taken over by either side in connection with the conflict."

India immediately thereafter expressed its readiness to discuss the subject of the return of properties and assets taken over by either side. But Pakistan did not respond. Subsequently in 1967, Pakistan forcibly seized several properties belonging to resident minorities in East Pakistan and declared these also to be enemy properties.

In October 1968, it was confirmed that the Government of Pakistan were