

hon. Member wants information with regard to any particular place, I would like to have notice.

Deposit in Foreign Bank

+

*433 { Shri Supakar:
Shri Ram Krishan Gupta:
Shri P. K. Deo:
Shri Chintamani Panigrahi:
Shri Aurobindo Ghosal:
Shri Nath Pai:

Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have searched and seized some documents from a firm in Calcutta, recently;

(b) if so, whether it is a fact that these documents reveal facts regarding deposit of money of a prominent person of Orissa in some foreign Bank;

(c) if so, whether it is also a fact that correspondence is going on between that person and certain foreign mission in this regard;

(d) if so, the nature and details of the matter; and

(e) action taken against the person concerned?

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No, Sir. They do not show deposit of any money by any person in a foreign bank. Certain documents seized during the search seemed to indicate that in one transaction the price agreed to be paid for certain goods was higher than the price indicated in earlier negotiations referred to in the documents. The transaction concerns a firm operating in Orissa.

(c) No, Sir. There is nothing to this effect in the documents seized.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) The matter is under investigation.

Shri Supakar: May I know whether the Calcutta firm concerned, where these documents were found, is Messrs Stahlunion and whether the difference in price related to the steel supplied to the Kalinga Tubes of Orissa?

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): As long as the enquiry is going on, it is impossible to say anything in the matter.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, I beg your guidance. This is a vital matter. Only the other day I wanted to ask a supplementary and in my anxiety to abide by your ruling, I refrained from doing so.

The Finance Minister was pleased to say that the matter is pending an enquiry. May I point out to you, Sir, that we tried to raise this matter with the Prime Minister and he has said that the enquiry has already been held and the matter clarified. Which is true?

Mr. Speaker: I passed orders on the letter that was written to me by Mr. Nath Pai in which he had brought to my notice a letter that had been written by the hon. Prime Minister to Mr. S. N. Dwivedy wherein he refers to one payment which has been cleared up. Mr. Nath Pai perhaps feels that whereas the Prime Minister has written that there was an enquiry and payment was made, the Finance Minister says that it is still under enquiry. Mr. Nath Pai thinks that there is a contradiction in the statements of the two Ministers. What the hon. the Prime Minister said refers only to a single payment, whereas these questions relate to the accounts in general in foreign banks of the Chief Minister of Orissa. Therefore, I am satisfied that there is no contradiction.

Shri Nath Pai: Unfortunately the letter is with you and not with me at the moment....

Shri Nath Pai: In that it is said that certain transactions have been gone into, an enquiry has been held and the matter has been cleared. The enquiry envisages all the transactions.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I say that what the Prime Minister has said about one transaction has no relation to this; that is quite a different thing, altogether and therefore that was cleared up. That is a different matter.

An Hon. Member: Were there several transactions?

Shri Morarji Desai: Whether there were several or one or two transactions, I am not prepared to say just now. As long as an enquiry is going on, it is not possible for me to say anything.

Shri Nath Pai: When an enquiry was pending it was the same Finance Minister who on two previous occasions gave the names and some details about the case; they related to Mr. S. P. Jain and Mr. Dange. Why this particular intiguing reluctance to give anything to us? I can produce from the records that information of a limited nature was given. Now, here, the name even is not mentioned. Why this special sanctity about the name? We do not want to drag in names. I am in your hands.

Shri Morarji Desai: The name has been mentioned by hon. Members; I have not contradicted it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I will certainly allow all relevant questions to be put. What happened was, as soon as this matter was raised it was I who said that we do not generally...

Shri Nath Pai: On his plea.

Mr. Speaker: Having regard to the nature of the question I myself said "This question does not admit of going into details about individuals; generally the answer has been given".

But the hon. the Finance Minister was willing to disclose the name of the individual. He gave out the name and he said that there is an enquiry against him.

Shri Nath Pai: When was it?

Mr. Speaker: Even contrary to what I said he was willing to give information regarding the name. Let us not go into it. The name is clear. Whether further details we should allow or not when the matter is pending enquiry is the question. The enquiry may not be held at this stage. When will the enquiry be completed, is there any information?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The facts in the possession of the hon. Minister should be given.

Shri Morarji Desai: This is an enquiry which has relation in England. Therefore it is impossible for me to say when I will receive replies.

Shri Nath Pai: Is it true that an officer of the Special Police Establishment was sent to England?

Shri Morarji Desai: There is correspondence going on. Therefore it will take some time. But I do not think it will take more than a month in any case.

Shri Nath Pai: Is it a fact that an officer of the Special Police Establishment—I do not want to give the name, but later on I will, with your permission—was sent; and, if so, what has been his report to the hon. Minister?

Mr. Speaker: Has he already sent a report to the hon. Minister?

Shri Morarji Desai: I have sent nobody.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It is the Home Ministry that has sent.

Shri Hem Barua: A police officer by name De Souza was sent to Europe for enquiry by the Special Police Estab-

ishment and he was recalled by the Home Ministry: that is our information. May we have some enlightenment on this? (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Why should there be such confusion? Shri Hem Barua says that a police officer was sent by the Home Ministry. The hon. Minister says that he did not send anyone. Both are correct.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I say that this has no relation to the Home Ministry, as far as I know? Apparently something more is known to hon. Members. That is all that I can say.

Shri Nath Pai: My last question is based on Shri Bhagat's answer that a strange voucher was made showing an amount higher than what was actually due. Is this a common practice with this firm, or with many firms in India, that vouchers are made showing a higher amount? And what happens to the difference between the amount paid and the amount shown? What happens to the higher exchange they obtain by such falsification?

Shri Morarji Desai: All this question is based, again, on presumption. I do not know these things.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: This information was given by the Deputy Minister.

Shri Morarji Desai: I do not accept whatever has been said by anybody else.

Shri Nath Pai: Not even his own Deputy!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Morarji Desai: This is all going round about certain things and making an attempt to get information on which I cannot give information. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is rather unfortunate. Let us not be highly sensitive in this matter on either side. The hon. the Deputy

Minister said that there are receipts passed for larger amounts than the amounts that are shown or receipts passed other than the amounts which are due or some such thing. Why should these questions of a general nature be asked? If a person exports some articles from here and the articles are worth a lakh of rupees and a bill is sent for fifty thousand rupees, the balance of fifty thousand rupees will be in the bank in the foreign country! What is the good of asking the hon. Minister about it? I can give the information.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I say that the reply that is given is an attempt to give as much information as can be given. These are all allegations and there is nothing beyond it. On the contrary it is said that there is nothing to this effect in the document. Therefore, on what basis do they want to say this? I do not find any material so far.

Shri Nath Pai: In reply to part (a) of the question the hon. the Deputy Finance Minister stated what you, Sir, have been good enough to refer to just now, and then I asked, "In itself, is it not an illegal transaction? This is a falsification of accounts. What happens to the ill-gotten foreign exchange?" How is it a general question? It is a specific question.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: When did I state it? ?

Shri Nath Pai: Will the hon. the Deputy Minister kindly read his reply given to the House to part (a) of the question?

Shri Morarji Desai: The reply is very clear.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: This is the reply I gave.

"(a) Yes, Sir.

(b). No, Sir. They do not show deposit of any money by any person in a foreign bank. Certain documents seized during the

search seemed to indicate that in one transaction the price agreed to be paid for certain goods was higher than the price indicated in earlier negotiations referred to in the documents. The transaction concerns a firm operating in Orissa."

Shri Nath Pai: This is a specific instance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member wants to know if this is the only case which has come to his notice or there are several other such cases.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I submit that this is jumping to a conclusion. Here what is said is that certain documents seized during the search seemed to indicate that in one transaction the price agreed to be paid for certain goods was higher than the price indicated in the earlier negotiations referred to in the documents. There is a perfect explanation for this. When the quality changes, certainly the price also changes afterwards. And that is the explanation there. I am trying to satisfy myself that this is completely clear, and that process is going on.

Shri Goray: So many things are being said here and outside in the press. Don't you think, Sir, it is advisable that the Finance Minister clears up the whole thing, so that one of his colleagues, the Chief Minister of Orissa also gets a certificate of clearance? Otherwise this thing will go on.

Shri Morarji Desai: I do not think that is possible in this country as long as this sort of attitude persists. *(Interruptions)*

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, should the Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, give us sermons or information? Certainly he is not a priest here.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There is no order in this House.

Shri Hem Barua: Our information is this, that some of the letters that were produced to the Prime Minister by Shri Patnaik were not genuine. The letter-heads have been procured from abroad, and those letters were written from here. That is our information.

Mr. Speaker: Very well, that is also under investigation. Next question.

Shri Nath Pai: Where do we stand, Sir? We have not asked supplementaries at your instance.

Mr. Speaker: There is no meaning in pursuing this matter. When a matter is under enquiry—leave this alone—when a matter is under enquiry, what is the meaning of giving anything in advance? Whatever hon. Members have got in their possession they will kindly pass on that information to the hon. the Finance Minister. And he will certainly forward the same to the enquiring officer, so that the enquiring officer may have all these relevant facts before him. There is no good asking the Minister. The hon. Minister is not making the enquiry himself. He has sent it to somebody whose duty it is to enquire.

Shri Morarji Desai: It is the Director of Enforcement who under the law is entitled to do all this and also pass orders. It is not referred to Government at all. I only get information from him, which I ask for.

Shri Tangamani: It was indicated that the price agreed to and the price indicated in one particular transaction showed a marked difference. . .

Mr. Speaker: Appeared to show.

Shri Tangamani: What is the difference in terms of money?

Shri Morarji Desai: I refuse to give any reply to this because this is under enquiry.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, on a point of order ..

Shri A. K. Sen: Sir, may I rise on a point of order. The Finance Minister is perfectly right, because otherwise he will be liable under the law.

Some Hon. Members: What law?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri A. K. Sen: I raise this point of order because this point arises so many times. And we have considered this matter. Pending an enquiry and adjudication every document produced, every evidence taken, where an officer is enquiring under the statute, is completely made confidential by the application of section 54 of the Income-tax Act and by section 19(4) of this Act also. And section 54 of the Income-tax Act, if I may read it out, is quite clear. It says:

"All particulars contained in any statement made, return furnished or accounts or documents produced under the provisions of this Act, or in any evidence given or affidavit or deposition made, in the course of any proceedings under this Act other than proceedings under this Chapter, or in any record of any assessment proceeding, or any proceeding relating to the recovery of a demand, prepared for the purposes of this Act, shall be treated as confidential, and notwithstanding anything contained in the Indian Evidence Act no Court shall, save as provided in this Act, be entitled to require any public servant to produce before it any such return, accounts, documents or record or any part of any such record."

If that is prohibited, how can he give oral evidence??

Shri Braj Raj Singh: What is prohibited?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What is this? Do not hon. Members want to observe decorum in the House?

Shri Raghunath Singh: Yes, that is the point.

Mr. Speaker: Again and again, one hon. Member after another get up, and as they catch my eye, I allow them an opportunity. What is the meaning of shouting before I call upon any hon. Member? I am rather surprised at this behaviour. This has happened once, twice and thrice. It is open to an hon. Minister, particularly the hon. Law Minister, to point out that it is not open to me to allow any further question on this matter. I am considering that matter. It is a point of order that has been raised.

Does the hon. Law Minister want to say anything else?

Shri A. K. Sen: Shri Braj Raj Singh always tries to substitute his voice for logic. I am very sorry that it is so.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Could I be given a chance to reply? ?

Shri A. K. Sen: I am prepared to meet argument, but certainly not a voice.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I am prepared to advance arguments.

✓ **Shri A. K. Sen:** First of all, the Act prohibits the production of any document produced in evidence before such officer by reason of the application of section 54 of the Income-tax Act, You, Sir, know the application very well. Anyone who does it is liable to prosecution under the Act.

Further, if we look at the Act itself, the entire, duty of inquiry and adjudication has been given by Parliament itself in statute to an officer called the Director of Enforcement who acts judicially after ascertaining evidence giving a chance

to show cause and so on. It has been ascertained by us from the highest legal advice available to Government that even the Government are not entitled to make their views known to the Director of Enforcement in such matters. Otherwise, it will be interfering with the judicial discretion vested by statute in an officer.

Therefore, in all such cases the advice of the Law Ministry to the Finance Ministry has been that the Government should have nothing to do with these matters, except to give effect, if any, to the adjudication proceedings held properly; and if there is any interference, there is an appellate procedure prescribed and then appeal to the Supreme Court.

Shri Nath Pai: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. **Shri Braj Raj Singh:** I cannot allow Shri Nath Pai to rise again and again and ask questions.

Shri Nath Pai: I am rising on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I am calling upon Shri Braj Raj Singh:

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The hon. Law Minister has said that I substitute my voice for argument.

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear his argument.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The point that has been made by the Law Minister is about the evidence adduced. So far as the Finance Minister himself has said, no evidence has been adduced in this case. There are only certain charges. The charges, after evidence has been led, may be proved false or may be proved true. What the House wants is only what the charges are. We are not asking for the evidence. Therefore, the point of order raised by the hon. Law Minister is not in order. The only question asked is, what is the difference between the negotiated

price and the price which was afterwards paid. It is not a piece of evidence.

Shri Nath Pai: I am sorry I rise more than necessary, but it is only to do my duty.

Mr. Speaker: No hon. Member should get up and ask a question unless he is called.

Shri Nath Pai: Thank you very much. You know that I always abide by your ruling.

May I point out that the point of order raised by the hon. Law Minister is absolutely irrelevant? We are not dealing with a case here under the Income-tax Act, unless there is also a case under that Act. I do not know if there is a case against the party concerned here under the Income-tax Act also. The provisions that are attracted are those of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act dealing with regulation of foreign exchange transactions. So I do not see the relevancy of what he said. Under the provisions of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, this has come up. It has nothing to do with the Income-tax Act. He knows better. Perhaps it is also concerned with it. I do not know. We have based our case on the provisions of the Reserve Bank regulations. Our question was: has there been any violation of those regulations? The hon. Minister does not reply to that. The only question that arose just now was about the sum involved. Why not indicate that sum, and say what was the difference? I fail to understand what is the secret in it which cannot be divulged.

Shri Hem Barua: When I raised a point of order, it was on the question asked by Shri Tangamani on the basis of the information that the Deputy Minister gave. The Deputy Minister stated that there was a difference between the price indicated later on and the price that was agreed upon. On the basis of the

reply given, I think it is a legitimate question to ask. But the hon. Minister says that he refuses to give the answer to that question put by Shri Tangamani.

My point of order is this: how can the Finance Minister withhold reply to a question that was put on the basis of the Deputy Minister's reply?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: The point of order which the hon. Law Minister has raised has a very wide significance. In effect what he seeks to do is to draw a blanket of secrecy over many questions which can be legitimately put in this House. Section 54 of the Income-tax Act, which he cited, has absolutely no application, unless the hon. Finance Minister says that this is part of assessment inquiry before the Income-tax Officer.

Secondly, he should also say that the information is contained in a document which has been produced before the Income-tax Officer. Anything and everything cannot be shut out. So section 54 is not applicable here.

With regard to the other observations of the hon. Law Minister regarding secrecy, only one part of his argument is correct, namely, that the Government cannot interfere with the discretion of the officer who has to examine the case under the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act. That is true. But here again, what is secret? If an inquiry is held, the Minister may make it clear to the House that the information sought by the House is relevant to the inquiry. That is one thing. Secondly, he should say it is contained in a document produced in the court. Just because an inquiry is pending, it does not mean that anything and everything relating to it can be shut out.

My submission is that the ruling which you will give will be made applicable and cited in numerous cases. Therefore, it is not enough to

say that the inquiry is in progress. What are the issues raised in the inquiry? What are the documents produced? If the information sought does not relate to the issues raised before the inquiry and if it is not contained in the documents produced already, it is open to the House, subject to other provisions of the law, to ask for it (*Interruption*).

There is one more point. A distinction should be made between what is *sub judice* and an inquiry before a police officer. Inquiry before a police officer or any such authority does not make it a *sub judice* matter.

I therefore submit that there is no point of order and, as my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, said, we are entitled to ask for such information which is not contained in the documents submitted.

Shri Morarji Desai: Members always argue without looking at the provisions of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act.

Shri Nath Pai: He never cited that.

Shri Morarji Desai: He did.

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha): Yes, in the latter part of the answer.

Shri Morarji Desai: Section 19(4) of that Act lays down:

"The provisions of sub-sections (1), (2) and (3) of section 54 of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, shall apply in relation to information obtained under sub-section (2) of this section as they apply to the particulars referred to in that section, and for the purposes of such application—

"(a) the said sub-section (3) shall be construed as if in clause (a) thereof there was included reference to a prosecution for an offence under section 23 of this Act, and

"(b) persons to whom any information is required to be furnished under an order made

under sub-section (2) of this section shall be deemed to be public servants within the meaning of that section".

That is, section 54 has been applied to these things. That is why it is quoted. My hon. friend, poses to be a great lawyer. But unfortunately all his points of order are always out of order (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: Let him reserve his opinion.

Shri Morarji Desai: Passion is no argument. That is all I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: Let him kindly read section 19.

Shri Morarji Desai: I read from section 19(4). I have not got the Act with me here. I have got only extracts. I did not know that the whole Act would have to be referred to.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to have this cleared up. The point will be obvious to any Law Minister and the hon. Minister himself who was in charge of a department dealing with crimes and so on. Now, a charge-sheet is laid. Therefore, when it is in the court, no discussion can take place. But now is it not open to anybody to know what exactly the charge is? In this case, Members are naturally agitated that a wrong person may be apprehended. What are the charges against him? Cannot even those charges be given to us? Is it so under the rules?

If it is said: "This is what we found, somebody was caught, these are the charges, we have sent them for enquiry", I will not allow any more questions. What are the documents produced, what are the contents of the documents—all that will be decided there. But the very charge itself is not given.

One man was apprehended. Is it right to apprehend him? What is the charge against him? *Prima facie* you must have come to the conclusion that this is the charge and you have sent it for further enquiry. And then, as to why you have come to this conclusion and so on, I will not allow any question. But at least, is it not right for them to ask that they must know what it is that you have come to know, what the charge is? If that is also prevented by the rules, I have no objection. I only want to know what exactly the position is.

Shri Morarji Desai: There is no charge framed. If the charge is framed, certainly I would give that charge, because that cannot be a secret. But the charge is not framed. An enquiry is being held.

Mr. Speaker: What they want to know is if the Director has the power to act himself, *suo motu*, without any communication from the Government.

Shri Morarji Desai: Yes, he has. Government cannot interfere with him. He is clothed with these powers, which are independent.

Mr. Speaker: I agree with him, but does he act *suo motu*, without the initiative from the Government? Who caught this man?

Shri Morarji Desai: Government may write to him, that is possible.

Mr. Speaker: In what circumstances did they write?

Shri Morarji Desai: This is a matter which has been found by himself, in which he is holding an enquiry. When this came to my notice, I tried to know what the facts were. I found it at this stage. Government may help him to conduct the enquiry. If it is to be done in England, it has got to be done through Government only. Therefore, that enquiry can go on through Government.

Now, what is asked for here is: what is the price which was first paid, what is the price which was charged, what is the quantum of all this? All these things are very relevant matters of enquiry. The reply very clearly states. . .

Mr. Speaker: I think the reply has brought about all this trouble.

Shri Morarji Desai: I shall try to be more careful in future and not be very enthusiastic to give everything that I can to the hon. House. I will try to see that the implications are seen beforehand. I shall take a lesson from this, so that hon. Members themselves afterwards will not have anything to complain.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order, Sir. I am afraid the hon. Finance Minister is challenging your powers.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid I ought to allow hon. Members to speak at all. There is no point of order.

Shri Nath Pai: How do you know there is no point of order without hearing it?

Mr. Speaker: Shall I go on? It is something like a motor car moving only with brakes and never with an engine. Hon. Members are raising points of order before anything is given out. I am really surprised at this. Let us observe greater decorum in the House.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Half an hour has passed on two questions.

Shri Morarji Desai: Here it is said:

"Certain documents seized during the search seemed to indicate that in one transaction the price agreed to be paid for certain goods was higher than the price indicated in earlier negotiations referred to in the documents."

When that is said, I have to disclose all the documents before I give out any figures. I cannot do that under section 54 of the Indian Income--tax Act. It is not possible for me. I will be committing a breach of law which I am not prepared to do under any circumstances.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: You do not know the law then.

Shri Morarji Desai: I know the law better than my hon. friends.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Question.

Shri Morarji Desai: They do not know the law at all, those who are raising points of order.

Mr. Speaker: If somebody says something, he replies. It is not to Shri Bharucha.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I am merely questioning it.

Shri Morarji Desai: He has already questioned many times during the last ten or twelve years, and he has always failed in his questions. That is what has happened to his law.

Shri Nath Pai: Do you consider that this is relevant?

Mr. Speaker: Even the leaders of groups sometimes lose themselves. I have always counted Shri Nath Pai as a leader representing his group. Someone says: you do not know the law. Naturally he says he does not know the law. Why should Shri Bharucha come in?

Shri Nath Pai: How are we concerned with it?

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai is not all the Members of this House. If some Member interjects, naturally the hon. Minister says it is wrong. Why should Shri Nath Pai take everything upon himself?

I have heard this matter sufficiently. So far as the point of order is concerned, I entirely agree that there is no good ignoring the law. So far as section 19 of the Foreign Exchange Regulations Act is concerned, subsections 1 to 4 of section 54 of the Income-Tax Act have been incorporated in it, and all those regulations under section 54 will apply. Now, the only question is whether, so far as this question is concerned, they can be made applicable or not. It is unfortunate that the answer has been wide. Even at the answer stage they must have said: this is all under enquiry. He gave out that there appeared to be a difference. This has created an apparent conflict. There is no conflict at all. I entirely agree that in public interests' these sections should apply. It is not open to the hon. Members here to ask on what grounds they referred the matter to the court. It is for the Government to come to a conclusion, or the Director to take charge of this investigation. From that stage until the report is placed, I do not think it is desirable to allow any questions on this.

Hereafter, as the hon. Minister says, let him be a little more careful in giving answers.

Shri P. K. Deo: One supplementary, Sir.

Shri Tangamani: On a previous occasion, in the case of Shri S. A. Dange and Shri S. P. Jain, these details concerning various transactions were given.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: They belong to the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: I do not remember now.

Shri Tangamani: That is the point I wanted to bring out.

Mr. Speaker: Possibly that may be wrong.

पाकिस्तानी विमानों द्वारा भारतीय सीमा का
अतिक्रमण

+

*४३४. { श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :
श्री हेम बरूआ :

क्या प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की
कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) गत तीन मासों में कितनी बार
पाकिस्तानी विमानों ने भारतीय सीमा का
उल्लंघन किया; और

(ख) यह उल्लंघन विशेष रूप से किन
भागों में हुआ ?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): (a) Four times, Sir.

(b) Three were in the J. & K. area and one in East Punjab area.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know the depth of penetration attained by these Pakistani aircraft, and the altitude at which they came?

Mr. Speaker: Both vertically and laterally.

Shri Hem Barua: And then, Sir,...

Mr. Speaker: How many questions.

Shri Hem Barua: It is the same question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What is the extent to which they penetrated?