

(b) the border which has not so far been demarcated; and

(c) when the entire border with Pakistan is expected to be fully demarcated?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Demarcation by the placement of boundary pillars has been completed on the:—

(i) 184 miles out of 550 miles of the Tripura-East Pakistan boundary; and

(ii) 1079 miles out of 1349 miles of West Bengal-East Pakistan boundary.

(b) Demarcation has not yet been completed on the Tripura-East Pakistan border at:—

(i) The Tripura-Sylhet Sub-sector.

(ii) The Tripura-Chittagong/Chittagong Hill Tract Sub-sector

(iii) The Tripura-Noakhali Sub-sector for about 22 miles.

(c) West Bengal-East Pakistan boundary at:

(i) Berubari

(ii) Hili

(iii) Boundary along the rivers Mahannanda, Boroung and Karatoa

(iv) Boundary along the rivers Hankar Khal and Baikhari Khal.

It is difficult to predict a firm date for the completion of the demarcation of the entire border but work is progressing.

12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

THREATENED AGITATION FOR PUNJABI SUBA

Shri Surendra Pal Singh (Bulandshahr): I call the attention of the

Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

“Master Tara Singh’s threatened agitation for Punjabi Suba and the Prime Minister’s meeting with Sant Fateh Singh.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): Sir, I made a request to you that at this juncture, I may be just allowed to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the record—note of the Prime Minister’s talks with Sant Fateh Singh on August 7th and 8th. Any further question may be deferred at this stage.

Mr. Speaker: Should I hold it over?

Shri Nanda: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: How long would he require? Would he intimate to me?

Shri Nanda: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The calling attention notice is held over.

RE. MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT AND CALLING ATTENTION NOTICES

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion by Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Madhu Limaye, Shri Warior...

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuruzha): I am sorry to interrupt you, Sir. We had given a calling attention notice about a matter which is entirely in the hands of the Central Government and there is no technical ground on which you can reject it. I am referring to the indefinite fast by Shri A. K. Gopalan and others in the Kerala Jail. May I say, Sir, that acceptance of a short notice question depends on the minister.

Mr. Speaker: There is one trouble, firstly, I would ask the hon. member to remember that I have requested so many times and he ought not to have

raised it in this manner. Of course, I have great regard for Mr. A. K. Gopalan and for others also. I paid my attention to it. If I allow this calling attention notice on these matters, it would become difficult for me. Therefore, I have said that this information can be got through a question. We can only get information and not discuss the merits of it. I will see that this question is answered in a day or two.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: The Kerala detenus are directly under the charge of the Central Government, unlike detenus in other States.

Mr. Speaker: I realise that. That is why I have advised him that he might put a short notice question and I will get the information that he wants.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): You can admit a notice for calling attention, but they will not admit a short notice question.

Mr. Speaker: When I have promised that I will get the answer, he should be satisfied.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I seek a clarification on your ruling? You rightly said that information must be sought on this matter. But is not calling attention notice one of the means by which we can elicit information?

Mr. Speaker: Everything is like that, but that can be better clarified in question. Some matters may be so urgent that a calling attention notice may be admitted on them; some may be still more urgent that an adjournment motion may be admitted on them. There are various aspects that are to be considered. Again, I might take this opportunity to bring to the notice of this House that today I have received 60 calling attention notices. Is it possible for me to admit all the 60 of them? Then, even in the matter of questions, because of the limitation of time, not more than

three questions by the same member would be put on the list. Yet, one member gives notice of 10 or 15 questions or calling attention notices. Perhaps he cannot decide for himself which should be given more importance. Therefore, I would request hon. Members to exercise some discretion in this matter themselves. They should give notice of only one, or at the most two, if they feel that the other one is more likely to be admitted. Some limitation ought to be placed. If we receive 60 notices, it becomes rather ridiculous. It will rather become a joke. I hope hon. Members will just bear this in mind while giving notices.

I have received notices from Shri Warrior, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, Shri Daji and others. Perhaps the name of Shri Kachhavalaya is also there. I cannot read his name because he writes in such a manner. Of course, the name of Shri Banerjee is there. I am sorry that it is not admissible. First of all, we are taking up the no-confidence motion and discussing it today. The food situation is also being discussed separately. So, opportunities for expressing their views are provided by those discussions.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Food would be discussed separately?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, food would also be discussed. A statement has been made by the Food Minister. I am thinking of giving some time for that discussion because the people are feeling very very acutely on that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me why I have given notice of this motion for adjournment even though I knew that the motion of no-confidence is coming up for discussion today.

Mr. Speaker: He must sit down when I am on my legs.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am doing it.

Mr. Speaker: He has not been observing it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Only sometimes.

Mr. Speaker: If it had been only "Sometimes" I would not have minded it. But if it is done always then it becomes difficult. Now he might say what he wants to say.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I know that the no-confidence motion is going to be discussed today and that food scarcity, famine conditions and high prices are going to be some of the aspects which will be mentioned during the course of the discussion. But what compelled me to table this motion for adjournment was the unprovoked firing in Kolhapur, resulting in the death of six persons. Not only that, today 32 persons have been arrested, 6 in Calcutta. I wanted an immediate discussion of this subject for two reasons. First of all, the food situation is deteriorating day by day; it will not wait for our no-confidence motion. Secondly, firing has been resorted to by this government on the hungry people and many have been shot dead. So, we want to censure this government for firing on hungry men.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard him. He will kindly sit down. It is really a surprise to me that Shri Banerjee wants to censure this government. Which is the bigger motion—the censure motion or the no-confidence motion? Then, it refers to something which happened in a State where, unfortunately, there was some firing resulting in the death of some persons. It is only a State subject. If an opportunity is required to refer to that subject, an opportunity is being given immediately, for we are taking up the no-confidence motion today. Over and above that, I have said that I am thinking of giving some time for the discussion on food. So, I cannot allow this.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, unless we know the facts how can we participate in the discussion? Could the Home Minister or the Food Minister enlighten us as to what is the position in Kolhapur? I know that the Kolhapur firing cannot be a subject-matter for discussion here. Yet, it finds a place in the statement which has been circulated to us. It gives all wrong statistics. This firing was resorted on hungry marchers . . . (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He cannot make a speech like that. Now that he has made the speech, he will sit down. I have disallowed it. When I am taking up the No-Confidence Motion, no other adjournment motion can be taken up. Every opportunity is provided there to raise the points that the hon. Members want to raise. Mr. Banerjee can take it up . . . (Interruptions).

श्री मधु लिवडे (मुंजर) : मेरी प्राप से यह प्रार्थना है कि इन दिनों जो विभिन्न राज्यों में गोली कांड हो रहा है, उनके बारे में गृह मंत्री सदन के सामने एक प्रतिवेदन रखें।

श्री ज० ब० सिंह (घोसी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा यह निवेदन है कि अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव के बाद खाद्य स्थिति के सवाल को फौरान ले लिया जाए।

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा : (कोटा) : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि राजस्थान के अन्दर हालत बहुत बिगड़ रहा है। अगर राज्य सरकार उसकी परवाह नहीं करती तो केन्द्र सरकार उसकी परवाह करे। एक एक दिन में दो दो-सौ आदमी मर रहे हैं।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. That is not the method to raise it. Order, order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is the House to understand that a separate discussion on food will follow the No-Confidence Motion?

Shri Daji (Indore): I had given notice of an adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: I have not considered that. I will consider that. Papers to be laid.

12.10 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

AUDIT REPORT, 1964, ISSUED BY THE VICE-PRESIDENT DISCHARGING THE FUNCTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT, IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF KERALA, ETC.

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers in respect of the State of Kerala:—

- (1) Audit Report, 1964, under article 151(2) of the Constitution read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 24th March, 1965, issued by the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President, in relation to the State of Kerala. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4576/65].
- (2) Appropriation Accounts, 1962-63. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5577/65].
- (3) Finance Accounts, 1962-63. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4578/65].

RULES UNDER SECTION 8 OF DOCK WORKERS (REGULATION OF EMPLOYMENT) ACT, 1948

The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Rules under sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948:—

- (1) The Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 1689 dated the 29th May, 1965.

- (2) The Dock Workers (Advisory Committee) Amendment Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 2103 dated the 3rd July, 1965.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-4579/65].

ORDERS UNDER SECTION 13 OF REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1950

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Law (Shri Jaganatha Rao): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Orders under sub-section (3) of section 13 of the Representation of the People Act, 1950:—

- (1) The Delimitation of Council Constituencies (Andhra Pradesh) Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1057 dated the 22nd July, 1965.
- (2) The Delimitation of Council Constituencies (Bihar) Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1058 dated the 22nd July, 1965.
- (3) The Delimitation of Council Constituencies (Bombay) Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1059 dated the 22nd July, 1965.
- (4) The Delimitation of Council Constituencies (Bombay) Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1060 dated the 22nd July, 1965.
- (5) The Delimitation of Council Constituencies (Madras) Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1061 dated the 22nd July, 1965.
- (6) The Delimitation of Council Constituencies (Punjab) Amendment Order, 1965, published in Notification No.