

12.15 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCEATTACK ON INDIAN BORDER POLICE PATROL
BY EAST PAKISTANIS

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi (Ferozabad): Sir, 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:

"Attack on Indian border police patrol by East Pakistanis on 9th April, 1966."

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (**Shri Hathi**): Sir, according to the reports received from the West Bengal Government, on 9th April, 1966 at about 12-30 hrs. 3 constables of Sedhai B.O.P., P.S. Hill District West Dinajpur, while on patrol duty at Gossaipur, a border village, noticed one Pak national entering Indian territory. He was chased by the patrol party and was arrested on the extreme border of village Gossaipur. The arrested Pak national then raised an alarm and hearing his cries, about 50 to 60 Pak nationals of village Ushni under Pak B.O.P. Hathkola, P.S. Panchbibi, district Bogra, suddenly entered into Indian territory, assaulted the constable, took away his rifle and rescued the Pak national. One of the constables sustained simple injuries on his person during the scuffle.

The Commandant of the concerned Armed Police Battalion has lodged a protest with his Pakistani counterpart. The West Bengal Government have also requested the Ministry of External Affairs to lodge protest with the Government of Pakistan on this incident.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: May I know whether the Government has tried to ascertain how an armed police patrol came to be overpowered without any effective resistance by persons who

are said to have been only armed with lathies, leading to the rescue of the captured intruder and the loss of a fire-arm? In particular, may I know, whether they were handicapped in offering any resistance because of the existence of any orders to the effect that our patrol should not fire on the Pakistanis until they are fired upon?

Shri Hathi: The facts, as we have ascertained are, that these three constables were patrolling. One was in advance of the other two, and when he saw a Pakistani national entering into our territory or crossing to our side, he chased him. As I said, he was ahead of the other two. When this man was arrested he raised an alarm. Hearing his cries about 50 or 60 people from the village which is just near came and our constable was caught. In the meantime the other two constables also rushed there. In the scuffle that followed one constable was injured and those people fled away taking a rifle.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: The point is whether any fire was opened?

Shri Hathi: No orders have been issued from our side that there should be no firing.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I would like to know whether it is a fact that after the Tashkent agreement and especially after the meeting of the army officers of Pakistan and India, certain agreements were reached with regard to the eastern sector, especially the Bengal border, that all the bunkers and trenches dug by Pakistan were to be demolished and this sort of pinpricks would be avoided in future; if so, may I know what has happened to those agreements, whether those agreements still hold good and, if so, what steps the Government of India has taken to protest against Pakistan and bring this matter to the notice of Pakistan? May I also know, if this matter has been brought to their notice, what is their reaction?

Shri Hath: So far as this particular place is concerned, they have no bunkers in this particular place, as far as I know, and the persons who came were villagers themselves. Therefore, the question of any bunkers in this particular place does not arise.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Tomorrow this may be from other places. My question is of a general nature.

Mr. Speaker: When these pinpricks are still going on, he wants to know whether any protest has been made and, if so, what is their reaction.

Shri Hath: This kind of cases, namely, either theft of cattle or clashes, do occur.

श्री बिश्वनाथ पाण्डेय (सलेमपुर) : मंत्री महोदय ने सदन के सामने जो वक्तव्य प्रस्तुत किया है उस में प्रकृत किया है कि पश्चिमी बंगाल की सरकार ने विदेश मंत्री से भी प्रार्थना की है कि वह पाकिस्तान की सरकार के सामने इसके सम्बन्ध में विरोध प्रकट करे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या विदेश मंत्री ने इस वाक्य के सम्बन्ध में विरोध प्रकट किया है, यदि हाँ तो पाकिस्तान सरकार की इस सम्बन्ध में क्या प्रतिक्रिया हुई है ?

श्री हाथी : विरोध पत्र एप्रिल में भेजा है लेकिन जवाब अभी नहीं आया है।

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : सरकार ने क्या इस तरह से भी कोई दस्तखत ताशकंद में किये थे कि यह एप्रिल में विदेश में हुआ है और विदेश में ही टूटेगा ? पाकिस्तान रोजाना हमले करता है, रोजाना वायोनैशज करता है। इन अतिक्रमणों को कब तक सरकार बरदाश्त करेगी ? सरकार के पास क्या उपाय है कि वह पाकिस्तान को इस समझौते को मनवा सके ?

श्री हाथी : अभी जो बिना है वह बिना तो दो-तीन बार पहले भी जनवरी फरवरी में बन चुकी है। ऐसे जो लोग आते हैं उनको

रोकना होता है और उन को न आने देने के लिए बोर्डर आउटपोस्ट को भी मजबूत करना चाहिये। ऐसी बिना न बने इसके लिए पाकिस्तान को एक्सटर्नल एफ़ेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री ने लिखा है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछबाय (देवास) : ऐसा लगता है कि यह जगह काफी कमजोर है। इसको ध्यान में रखते हुए इस जगह को अधिक बलशाली बनाने के लिए क्या आप ने सेना को यहाँ रखने की कोई व्यवस्था की है या कोई अन्य दूसरी व्यवस्था की है ? क्या आप ने अपने गश्ती दलों को इस प्रकार की हिदायतें दी हैं कि जब कभी ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा हो तो वे तुरन्त गोली का उपयोग करें ?

श्री हाथी : ऐसा भी उनको कहा गया है कि जब ऐसी कोई बिना बने तो पोलीबार कर सकते हैं। एक और बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। प्रागे हम ने सोचा है कि तीन आदमियों का पेट्रोल कम है और कम से कम पांच दस आदमी पेट्रोल पर जाने चाहियें।

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): It is a clear case of violation of the Tashkent Declaration by Pakistan. In view of the fact that the hon. Prime Minister told us on 7th April in this House that Soviet Russia has sent somebody to Pakistan, to Rawalpindi, to appraise the Pakistani authorities of the violation of the Tashkent Declaration by Pakistan, may I know whether she is in a position to tell us the response or reactions of Pakistan to this emissary of Soviet Russia?

Shri Hath: So far as this question is concerned, I do not think we should take it as a breach of the Tashkent Agreement, because Pakistan has done so many other things, more serious than this, and we have to take them, if at all we have to take them. I would not like this particular incident to be taken up because there are

[Shri Hathi]

more serious issues which we can take up.

Mr. Speaker: Shri R. S. Pandey:

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, in reply to my question on 7th April the hon. Prime Minister said on the floor of this House that the Soviet Union has sent somebody to Rawalpindi to appraise the Pakistani authorities of the violation of the Tashkent Declaration by Pakistan. I just want to know from the hon. Prime Minister what reaction or response she has got or whether she is in a position to tell us the reaction and response of Pakistan to this emissary of Soviet Russia to Rawalpindi.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): It is seen that no emissary has actually gone. I was told that this matter would be taken up by somebody from the Soviet side. Now, who that person would be or when he would be sent was not told to me; neither did I ask for it.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): इसी के सम्बन्ध में मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

आपके पास मैंने प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ एक विशेषाधिकार का सवाल भेजा था। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस सदन में एक बयान दिया था कि सोवियत सरकार ने अपना एक दूत पाकिस्तान भेजा है। इस बयान को दे कर उन्होंने सदन को गुमराह किया था, उन्होंने गलत बात बताई थी। पाकिस्तान ने अब कहा है कि ऐसा कोई प्रतिनिधि नहीं आया। इसलिए मैं मामले को जबकि प्रधान मंत्री स्वयं—(इंटरपुंजस) आप मुझे अपनी बात खत्म कर देने दीजिये। अध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसा होता है कि बिना सुने हुए ही जब आप फैसला दे देते हैं तो नतीजा यह होता है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय: मेरी बात आप सुन लीजिये। आप इलजाम तो लगा देते हैं। लेकिन जितने शब्द आप ने कहे अगर उतने ही शब्दों पर फैसला हो सके तो मैं क्यों न फैसला दे दूँ और आप को बन्द कर दूँ . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: आप के हाथ में है

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आखिर बात तो इतनी है कि एक स्टेटमेंट प्रधान मंत्री ने दिया और वह मालूम होता है कि बिल्कुल दुरुस्त नहीं था, उस में गलती थी। लेकिन इम में विशेषाधिकार कोई पैदा नहीं होता है . . .

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार): गलती थी या जानबूझ कर दिया था? अध्यक्ष महोदय, पहले आप उनको सुन तो लें कि वे आगे क्या कहना चाहते हैं। पता नहीं आगे कौन सी बात आये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: जरूरत नहीं है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: दो मिनट आप को सुन लेना चाहिये। इस तरह से रोक कर आप सदन का समय मत बिगाड़िये। मैं खाली यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि या तो रूस झूठ बोलता है या पाकिस्तान झूठ बोलता है या प्रधान मंत्री झूठ बोलती हैं। तीनों में से किसी एक ने जरूर झूठ बात कही है। इसलिए यह विशेषाधिकार का सवाल हो जाता है। अगर प्रधान मंत्री यहां पर सफाई दे दें कि नहीं यह झूठ जानबूझ कर रूस बोलता है या यह झूठ जानबूझ कर पाकिस्तान बोलता है तो मामला खत्म हो जाता है। वरना यह सदन यह मान कर चलेगा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जानबूझ कर के यह झूठ कही, सदन को गुमराह करने के लिए या इसलिए कि वह एक दिक्कत से बचना चाहती थीं। उस वक्त सवाल उठा था। पेचीदा था। झट से उन्होंने कह दिया कि सांविध्य रूस ने पाकिस्तान अपना आरम्भ भेजा है। यह हो सकता था कि शायद

सोवियट रूस पाकिस्तान अपना आदमी भेजता या भारत को भी भेजता। तब भी यह झूठ साबित होता था।

इस लिये मैं विनय करता हूँ कि या तो इस सवाल को इसी वक्त सदन में साफ करवाइये वरना इस सवाल को विशेषाधिकार समिति का सौंप दीजिये जिस में सदन को पता चल सके कि आखिर ऐसे बयान क्यों हो जाया करते हैं और कैसे हो जाया करते हैं। सिर्फ इतना ही मुझे कहना है।

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit that I have already submitted a privilege motion on this? On the 7th April in reply to a question by me the hon. Prime Minister said this much:—

"This was discussed with Chairman Kosygin, and as the hon. Member has himself stated, they have sent somebody there to talk this over. I do not know the result of it."

This was in banner headlines in newspapers because this is an important announcement made by the hon. Prime Minister. After that, there was a banner headline in the newspapers which said that Pakistan has refused to have any emissary from the Soviet Union because Pakistan thinks that Pakistan has not violated the Tashkent Declaration and it is India who has violated it. Whatever that might be, just now the hon. Prime Minister has admitted that that emissary has not gone. The other day, on the 7th April, she said that the emissary has already gone to Rawalpindi. There is a discrepancy between these two statements. Therefore, May I say with all respect to you and to the Prime Minister that on the 7th April the Prime Minister was trying to mislead this House and the country at large? I think, it will be very difficult for you to dislodge me from my contention.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I do not know how the question of privilege

comes in just at this stage because we do not know all the facts. I am thankful to Shri Hem Barua for having given this very valuable information. Off and on we ask the Prime Minister when she is ready to volunteer information to us and it is natural for anyone in that position, when papers are not available, to make certain mistakes. It is also their right as well as duty to correct themselves and if the Prime Minister is willing and ready to correct herself in regard to the statement that has been made, no question of privilege arises.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : शाबाश, रंगा साहब। मालूम होता है कि उप प्रधान मंत्री रंगा साहब ही बनने वाले हैं।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I do not understand how it is that the Prime Minister has not of her own volition come before the House to correct the statement which she had earlier made. Today, she did correct herself, but she had to be goaded into answering a supplementary which you at one point of time naturally were considering whether you would allow or not, but you did allow it and it was only at that point of time that she came forward to make a sort of a correction in a qualified kind of a way. I do not blame her for it; but the point is that we expect of Government particularly from the head of the Government, when they make important statements relative to other States, if a certain inaccuracy had crept into a statement by the Prime Minister or any other responsible minister, the earliest opportunity should be taken by the minister concerned to come to the House and correct it. But today what has happened is that even after the matter was brought up, there was unwillingness on the part of the Minister. Shri Hathi, naturally, was hesitating. I do not blame him; he knew nothing about it. He is not in the know of anything. He just says something. The Prime Minister was

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

there and no effort was made. This is something wrong.

Shri Hem Barua rose—

Mr. Speaker: Not twice. I have heard Shri Hem Barua.

Shri Hem Barua: I have something else to say.

Mr. Speaker: Now something else cannot come. I agree with Shri Mukerjee that when any minister, including the Prime Minister, makes a statement and comes to know that there has been some inaccuracy, then of his or her own accord the minister should come up and correct himself or herself.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): *Suo motu*.

Mr. Speaker: There I agree.

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने भी यह बात कही है, आप की जवान से भी यह बात आई है, सिर्फ प्रधान मंत्री ने नहीं कहा है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वास्ते क्या मेरे खिलाफ भी प्रिविलेज मोशन है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप को गुमराह किया है प्रधान मंत्री जी ने ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सवाल गुमराह करने का नहीं है। अगर कोई डिस्टिक्वेन्सी आ जाये, स्टेटमेंट गलत हो जाये तो जब तक यह साबित न हो जाये कि असलियत को जानते हुए जान बूझ कर गलत स्टेटमेंट किया गया है, तब तक किसी प्रिविलेज मोशन का सवाल पैदा नहीं होता। इस वक्त भी यह प्रिज्यूम कर लेना कि उन को असलियत का पता था और उन्होंने जान बूझ कर वह गलत बयान दिया है, यह गलत है और हम कोई ऐसा कयास नहीं कर सकते।

उन्होंने कहा कि उन को यह इम्प्रेशन दिया गया था कि वह उस पर कुछ कदम उठावेंगे। उन्होंने उस का तर्जुमा यह दिया था कि वह आदमी भेजेंगे (ध्वजघान)

Shri Hem Barua: No, Sir. The words are very clear. She has said,

"...they have sent somebody there to talk this over."

That means somebody has been already sent from Moscow to Rawalpindi to talk over this matter.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : खाली यह नहीं, अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने खुद कहा था, जब श्री बरुआ ने यह सवाल पूछा और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जवाब दिया तब आप ने इस बात को दोहराया था कि प्रधान मंत्री जी कह रही हैं कि रूस से एक आदमी चला गया है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तो जो उन्होंने कहा था मैं ने वही दोहराया था, मैं ने अपनी नालेज से कुछ नहीं कहा था। मेरे दोहराने से क्या हुआ . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप मेहरबानी कर के मंत्री को बचाया मत कीजिये जिस तरह से आप वचाते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरे कहने से क्या हुआ। जल्दी से अपने नतीजे पर पहुंच जाते हैं। आप ने कहा कि मैं हाउस का वक्त जाया करता हूं। कहा गया कि मैं दखल देता हूं और दोहराया न करूं। जब पूछा जाता है और कोई स्टेटमेंट आता है तो उसी को मैं दोहरा देता हूं वजाय इस के मैं और वक्त लगाऊं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस में मैं ने क्या गुनाह किया। अगर स्टेटमेंट आया और मैं ने दोहरा दिया तो मेरी जिम्मेदारी नहीं आ गई।

Police by
Pakistanis (C.A.)

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप ने कोई बयान नहीं दिया था, आप को गुमराह किया गया ।

Shri Hem Barua: Let the Prime Minister tender apology to the House. That will end the matter.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : माफी मांगो तो ठीक तरह से मांगना । खाली माफी कह देने से काम नहीं चलेगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रार्डर, प्रार्डर । बहस का सवाल नहीं है । मुझे प्राइम मिनिस्टर को सुनने दीजिये कि वह क्या कहती है ।

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I submit very respectfully that no point of privilege is involved in the extract read out by the hon. Member of this House either against you or against the Prime Minister. I think, all the statements that are made on the floor of this House, whether by you or by the Prime Minister or by any Minister, are related to a particular context in time and in place. You have to read the statement in the light of a particular context, the time and the place.

श्री बागड़ी : शाबाश ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप दूसरे को बोलने भी नहीं देंगे । अब क्या मैं उन्हें इजाजत न दूँ कि वह बोल सकें ।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठेंगे भी या बोलते ही चले जायेंगे ।

Shri D. C. Sharma: Now, when you read the extract which has been read out by the hon. Member, you will find that the Prime Minister made that statement in the most sincere way....

श्री बागड़ी : यह मिसिफरिटी है ।

Shri D. C. Sharma: That was her information. There was no question of misleading the House. She made that statement in a particular context and the context of international affairs goes on changing from moment to moment, from hour to hour, and I, therefore, think that there is no point of privilege involved. She has not misled the House in any way.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Prof. Sharma is quite correct in saying that I did not have any intention of misleading the House nor did I, in fact, mislead the House. Soon after the Tashkent Declaration—I do not like the word 'violation'—anyhow things have happened on the Pakistani side which we have felt have not been fully in the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration. Now we have been bringing these things to the attention of the Soviet Government throughout and they have been taking up these matters—at least they have so told us—with the Pakistani authorities. Similarly, if Pakistan says something against us, presumably they take it up with our authorities.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: They perhaps promised to send . .

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Certainly they have so mentioned to me that the Pakistani side also have complained. It was in this connection, it was in this context, that the Soviet Prime Minister said that he would take this up. In regard to the question of sending a person, he said that some one would be sent. It was not made clear, as I said earlier, as to who it would be, whether it would be a special emissary or whether it would be just an Ambassador—the Ambassador to Pakistan was at that time in Moscow. So it could also be a question of his going to take up this matter . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He said that he would send, but did he actually send?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: That, I do not know.

Police by

Pakistanis (C.A.)

Shri Hem Barua: She was misled by the Soviet Prime Minister.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I was not misled. Nobody has misled anybody.

Shri Ranga: She has not corrected herself.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी इन्होंने कहा है कि सोवियत रूस ने न सिर्फ पाकिस्तान से ताशकन्द करार के सम्बन्ध में बातें कही हैं बल्कि इनको भी यानी भारत को भी कहा है कि उन्होंने ताशकन्द समझौते के करार को तोड़ा है। प्रधान मंत्री जी का यह कहना बिल्कुल नहीं था। प्रधान मंत्री ने पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में कहा था कि पाकिस्तान जो करार तोड़ रहा है उसको लेकर के रूस ने मामला बढ़ाया है। अगर इनका कहना है कि दोनों से बातचीत की गई थी तब तो भारत और पाकिस्तान एक तराजू के ऊपर आ जाते हैं लेकिन उस वक्त जो बयान दिया था उस वक्त एक तराजू पर न आकर के भारत के खिलाफ पाकिस्तान की बदनीयत और बद-रास्ते की बात आ जाती थी। तो इस वक्त ऐसा आप देख रहे हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री ने जो कुछ कहा है वह पहले के कहे हुए से बिल्कुल भ्रमलग बात है। इसलिए मैं विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सब सुनने के बाद भी जो मैंने पहले कहा था कि प्रिविलेज मोशन नहीं आता, वही अब भी कहता हूँ। अब सब कुछ सुनने के बाद भी यह नहीं आता कि उन्होंने डेलीबरेटली इस हाउस को मिसलीड करने का प्रयत्न किया है और ब्रीच आफ प्रिविलेज का कोई प्रश्न नहीं उठता।

Shri Ranga: She had said one thing. She evidently thought that she was within her rights to say that. She need not have said that, but she volunteered that information. But this morning she has contradicted that statement by saying that nobody has

been sent. Therefore, it is a matter of any Member, more so the Prime Minister, to be ready to say to the House that it was a mistake on her part to have made that earlier statement, in the light of what has happened. Today she says that nobody has been sent. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: This is not a question of subjective feeling; it is a question of fact. Nothing precludes the Prime Minister from gracefully telling the House that what she said on the 7th April—the words are there on record—what she said at that point of time, was said under a kind of misapprehension; she has, since then got to know that somebody might have gone or might not have gone; this is not a subjective matter at all. Nobody wishes of the extract from the Prime Minister of the country an apology to the House unless it is absolutely necessary and I do not see why the Prime Minister aggravates the position by taking an attitude which means neither this nor that. Why does she not say that she had made a mistake?

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit . . .

Mr. Speaker: I cannot allow the same Member again and again.

Shri Hem Barua: Mr. D. C. Sharma said that it should be read in the context. . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Mr. D. C. Sharma might have said anything.

Shri Hem Barua: May I read that context now. . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not allowing. (*Interruptions*)*.

This is not the way. I am asking him not to speak. This should not be recorded. (*Interruptions.*)*

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Nath Pal.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Just now you said that you did not want to call the same member twice. I very much respect that.

I get a feeling sometimes and correctly that, from Spencer's rule of survival of the fittest, here the rule is survival of the loudest because we fail to catch your eye.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Is guarding the privilege of the House the monopoly of the Opposition? Have I no right to say anything (*Interruptions*) After your ruling, they are challenging that ruling.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): No; we are not challenging... (*Interruptions*)

Shri Hem Barua: We have given the formal notice for raising the privilege motion. He should also have given that notice.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: My colleague was on his legs and he cannot butt in here like this.

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear Mr. Nath Pal.

Shri Nath Pal: Mr. Khadilkar's very noisy interruption was only a confirmation of my fear that survival of the loudest is the rule of the House. I hope that, with your guidance, this will be changing slowly.

I am partly satisfied but not fully satisfied with what the Prime Minister has said. My anxiety arises by the statement which was made by you on that day. You have underlined the whole thing by saying that:

"She has said that they have sent somebody." (*Interruptions*). It is very likely that, in the very long, intricate and complicated conversation which the Prime Minister had with the Soviet leaders, she might have been given the impression that they were contemplating and it would have been very appropriate if she had

told us that this was the impression "that I got". But the statement here was that "they have sent". Later on we have received clarifications, I think, emanating from Karachi and also from Moscow, that nobody has been sent. So it should have been fair for the Prime Minister to come and tell the House that "I had an impression that somebody was being sent but it is not so". That would have clarified the position. Let this not be misunderstood; this is our plea.

Mr. Speaker: Now Mr. Khadilkar also may speak.

Shri Khadilkar: My first submission is that, on very flimsy grounds, this privilege motion has been brought forward and you are right in giving your ruling... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nath Pal: This is all nonsense.

Shri Hem Barua: Who is he to say that? (*Interruptions*)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Arrant nonsense.

Shri Nath Pal: His voice will be drowned in ours if he is going to say something. (*Interruptions*)

Shri Hem Barua: It should be settled once and for all. (*Interruptions*). We have been trying to discharge the duties as Members of Parliament and that is why we submitted a privilege motion to you day before yesterday—I submitted that. This morning I was told by somebody from your office that you were writing about it to the Prime Minister and that is why I put that question definitely.

Shri Ranga: Mr. Khadilkar must sit down.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Why should he sit down? (*Interruptions*.) The Speaker has called him. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: If Members do not co-operate, I have no authority to enforce discipline. I have nothing in my hands that I can enforce with. It should be the responsibility of the Members.

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय

Mr. Speaker: I am standing; there is a Member who has stood up and has begun to speak. (*Interruptions*)

I had not called Mr. Hem Barua but he stood up and began to speak.

Shri Hem Barua: He called my motion a frivolous thing. I am not going to tolerate this. When we honestly table a motion, another Member says that it is a frivolous motion. I am not prepared to tolerate it.

Shri Khadilkar: I shall repeat it ten times.

Shri Nath Pal: He dare not. Let me see how he would repeat.

Shri Hem Barua:**

Mr. Speaker: This observation would not go on record.

An hon. Member: Let him withdraw the word 'frivolous'.

Shri Khadilkar: I want to submit one thing for your consideration and for the consideration of this House.

When the hon. Prime Minister made that statement, she wanted to convey an impression that she had gathered in her talk with a foreign dignitary, that dignitary being a witness to our solemn declaration at Tashkent; that dignitary was equally anxious about what was happening on the one side as well as on the other side; and if an impression is given to this House, then it is a very delicate matter. If we like to pick out a particular word and try to pin

down the hon. Prime Minister on that and say that she wanted to say positively this and that. I think that we are damaging the cause instead of serving it. At this juncture, when I used the word 'frivolous'....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Asad: It is not unparliamentary.

Shri Khadilkar: ..I meant it. It is not unparliamentary. I said it because this House including the Opposition must be very cautious in using words, because it is a very delicate matter. There was a talk in an informal way and a certain impression was conveyed to our Prime Minister, and in taking the House into confidence, she used certain words. Would you like, and would the hon. Members also like to say that she made this statement and it was a positive assertion. For, a foreign dignitary would make approaches in a diplomatic way; in what way, one cannot say. So, I would say again that on such matters, to raise a privilege issue....

Shri Nath Pal: We do not want homilies on procedure.

Shri Khadilkar: ... taking that statement to be a positive assertion is wrong and, in my opinion, frivolous.

Shri Nath Pal: Stupid, just nonsense and rubbish.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I have just been looking at the proceedings and I find that what I had really done was that I had reiterated something which Shri Hem Barua had said.

Shri Hem Barua: Let the hon. Prime Minister please read my words also.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I know; I have read it. That was about the *Pravda* report. Therefore, the two things got a little mixed up. It was about what they had done in the past,

that they had been taking up these issues with the Pakistan Government; about what they would do, if I spoke, it was a future action, and I said that somebody would be sent; whether that person was an Ambassador or who else, of course, I did not clarify. So, because of that, both these things came up, you could say. That tense perhaps created that confusion. There were two separate things in my mind at least it was that way, and I can assure the House that I did not wish to mislead it in anyway.

12.52 hrs.

RE. CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE
(Query)

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

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कोलिंग ग्रैटेशन नोटिस बीच में से कहां चला गया ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ग्रांडर, ग्रांडर ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप उस ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव को खत्म कर रहे हैं उस के ऊपर मेरा विरोध है लेकिन उसी के साथ मैं ने उस में एक मुद्दे को उठाया है, ताशकंद में प्रधान मंत्री शास्त्री की मौत को लेकर . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उस बारे में सदन को गुमराह किया गया है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जाइये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं बाद में बैठ जाऊंगा लेकिन पहले मेरी बात तो सुन लीजिये . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ग्रांडर, ग्रांडर ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं ने हर तरीके का इस्तेमाल कर लिया । प्रधान मंत्री श्री शास्त्री की ताशकंद में मौत को लेकर यहां विदेश मंत्री झूठ बोले हैं . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Papers to be laid on the Table.

12.53 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER BOMBAY RE-ORGANISATION ACT, INCOME-TAX ACT, KERALA STAMP ACT

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri L. N. Mishra): On behalf of Shri B. R. Bhagat, I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) A copy of the Bombay Reorganisation (Apportionment of Losses of Reconstituted Corporations) Rules, 1966 published in Notification No. SO. 1038 in Gazette of India dated the 29th March, 1966, under sub-section (2) of section 96 of the Bombay Reorganisation Act, 1960. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6060/66.]

(2) A copy of the Tax Credit Certificate (Excise Duty on Excess clearance) Amendment Scheme, 1966 published in Notification No. GSR. 489 in Gazette of India dated the 1st April, 1966, under sub-section (4) of section 280ZE of the Income Tax Act, 1961. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6061/66].

(3) A copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (2) of section 9 of the Kerala Stamp Act, 1959, read with clause (e) (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:—

(i) SRO No. 426/65 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 7th December, 1965.

(ii) SRO No. 9/66 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 11th January, 1966. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6062/66.]

(4) A copy of Notification No. GO Ms. 927/65]RD published in Kerala Gazette dated the 28th December, 1965, under sub-section (3) of section 69 of the Kerala Stamp Act, 1959, read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 24th March, 1965,