

on their behalf; that might or might not be correct.

Shri Nath Pai: Let them not be sycophants.

Mr. Speaker: Shri R. G. Dubey might put the question directly.

Shri R. G. Dubey: Shri Nath Pai may be a wise man, but I have the right to ask my question.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai may have patience.

Shri Nath Pai: How can we have patience when he says like that?

Shri R. G. Dubey: May I know whether our *Charge d'affaires* in Peking has had any personal meeting with the Prime Minister of China and other dignitaries and tried to find out how exactly their mind is working towards the offer made by the late Prime Minister?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: No.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): May I know the implications of this new move and how it affects our original stand?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Materially, nothing has happened so far. As the hon. Member has just heard, the New China News Agency has completely ruled out the consideration of any such suggestion from our side.

So far as the implications are concerned, I think we need not discuss them. But in any case, what our late Prime Minister had suggested was to make the position more or less the same both for China as well as for India. If the seven check-posts are withdrawn by the Chinese and we have no check-posts there, it will bring us to an equal level. That is perhaps the implication of the proposal.

Shri Jashvant Mehta (Bhavnagar): The late Prime Minister had given a broad hint at the AICC meeting at

Bombay. The hon. Minister has stated just now that there is no further development. May I know whether there is any change in the original stand of the Government or whether they continue to keep their original stand or original policy as before?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: This is no major or substantial change. Our stand remains the same, that is, the original stand.

—
12.07 hrs.

RE. LEADERSHIP OF COMMUNIST GROUP IN LOK SABHA

Mr. Speaker: Now, Papers to be Laid on the Table.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): Before you proceed to the next item, I would request you to clarify the position on a procedural matter.

On the 29th May, 1964, when respectful homages were paid to the late Prime Minister, you, Sir, had called the Deputy Leader of the Communist Group, when the leader Shri A. K. Gopalan was present in his seat. This created a misapprehension in the minds of all as to whether you had withdrawn the recognition given to Shri A. K. Gopalan as the leader of the Communist Group here. We would like to know the real position.

Mr. Speaker: Has not the Speaker the right to call anybody he likes? That is one thing.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Anybody who catches the eye?

Mr. Speaker: I am coming to that.

The difficulty has arisen because I have been receiving some contradictory communications from the Communists. It seems that there are two factions just at this moment.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Factions?

Mr. Speaker: Factions inside the group itself.

[Mr. Speaker]

But both are agreed that the Communist Party remains the same as a whole. They are not prepared to concede the reality that there is difference and there are two groups; they do not say that. But they say that the Communist Party remains just as one. They are also agreed that Shri Vasudevan Nair is the secretary and Shri Nambiar the Whip.

But the difficulty arises that Shri Vasudevan Nair writes to me that there has been a regular meeting and Shri A. K. Gopalan has been replaced by Shri H. N. Mukerjee, but Shri Nambiar writes to me that the meeting was unconstitutional, improper and invalid, and, therefore, the position remains the same as before. So far as the meetings are concerned, the Speaker cannot be expected to go into the validity of the meetings; it is for the courts to decide whether it was a valid or a good meeting or not. I am not concerned with that.

I have written to the hon. Members and to both the Whip and the secretary that they should clarify the position. But instead of clarifying the position, they have added more confusion. The greater the number of communications that I receive, the greater is the confusion created thereby. I rather desired that the Whip and the secretary might ascertain the views of the individual Members and communicate to me so that the position might be finalised. But they have not done that; instead, I am being pressed that I should find out the views of the individual Members. If this position continues, certainly, there would be no option to me except to find out the wishes of the individual Members in this regard. Therefore, I am having further enquiries made, and I shall announce my final decision when these enquiries are completed.

12.10 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER CUSTOMS
ACT ETC.

The Minister of Planning (Shri B. R. Bhagat): I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) a copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:—

- (i) G.S.R. 545 dated the 4th April, 1964.
- (ii) G.S.R. 596 dated the 11th April, 1964 containing the Manufacture in Customs Bonds (General) Amendment Rules, 1964.
- (iii) G.S.R. 600 dated the 11th April, 1964.
- (iv) G.S.R. 637 dated the 17th April, 1964.
- (v) G.S.R. 693 dated the 2nd May, 1964.
- (vi) G.S.R. 694 dated the 2nd May, 1964.
- (vii) G.S.R. 695 dated the 2nd May, 1964.
- (viii) G.S.R. 696 dated the 2nd May, 1964.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2896/64].

(2) a copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 and section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, making certain further amendments to the Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) Rules, 1960:—

- (i) G.S.R. 491 dated the 21st March, 1964.
- (ii) G.S.R. 597 dated the 11th April, 1964.
- (iii) G.S.R. 598 dated the 11th April, 1964.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2897/64].