

and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of West Bengal for the services of the Financial year 1968-69, be taken into consideration."

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of West Bengal for the services of the financial year 1968-69, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That Clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Schedule, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI K. C. PANT : I move :

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted

— — —

17.14 hrs.

RE-MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

MR. SPEAKER : Is the Prime Minister making any statement ?

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : I do not know under what rule I am supposed to make a statement.

MR. SPEAKER : I think, we are taking up tomorrow at 6 O'Clock or so. Naturally all statements, all the things will come before the House tomorrow evening... (*Interruptions*) It is not a question of statement. About the Kutch situation, we have already admitted it for tomorrow. Naturally we will take up that question tomorrow. Mr. Vajpayee has

given notice already—some arrests about Kutch, discrepancies about statements and all that. This was specifically given by Mr. Vajpayee... (*Interruptions*)

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबेर) : आप विचार कर रहे हैं प्रिविलेज मोशन पर ?

MR. SPEAKER : The specific notice was given by Mr. Vajpayee. He was not here this morning; otherwise, I would have told him that tomorrow we are taking it up and he could speak about Kutch... (*Interruptions*) This is being taken up tomorrow. About what shape, what will be the motion. I will consider again; I have two or three motions—Mr. Vajpayee's is there, Mr. Madhu Limaye's is there, and some others are also there before me. The discussion on Kutch matter, whether it is the Supreme Court evidence or something else, will be taken up tomorrow. That is what we have decided earlier.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL) : Is it that we have received any motion which we will discuss or will the Prime Minister make a statement ? What is the motion ?

MR. SPEAKER : There are two motions—separate discussion—given notice of by Mr. Vajpayee and Mr. Madhu Limaye about the evidence given in the Supreme Court or something. The motions are there before me. Earlier the Home Minister had made a statement about some arrests and discrepancies in the statements—arrests or restraints; 'detention' was the word used in the telegram and 'restraint' was the word used in the communication later on in writing. Therefore, I have told them that that discrepancy was there. Again it has been brought to my notice yesterday by Shri Vajpayee about some affidavit being given by some official in the Supreme Court.

Whatever it is, as I said, both the matters could be discussed tomorrow. I will give sufficient notice to Government also so that they may be ready to discuss the matter.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, चूंकि यह विषय बहुत महत्व का था इसलिए मैंने 340 नियम के अन्तर्गत स्थगन प्रस्ताव रखना मुनासिब समझा। हल्फ-नामे में जो वाक्य ऐसे कहे गये थे, सरकार के द्वारा इसके बारे में इस सदन में धाजतक जो कहा गया था, उसके बिल्कुल विरुद्ध जाते हैं तो चेयरमैन साहब ने इजाजत दी कि हल्फ-नामे के बारे में प्रधान मन्त्री, बंगाल बजट के बाद बयान दें। हम इतना ही चाहते हैं कि जो हल्फ-नामा दिया गया है उसकी कापियां बाटें क्योंकि फिर कल बहस कैसे होगी—मेरे हाथ में तो कापी आ गई है लेकिन बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों के पास नहीं है। हम इतना ही बयान चाहते हैं कि क्या हल्फ-नामा दिया गया है दिल्ली हाईकोर्ट में और क्या उसकी प्रतियां सदन के सामने रखी जायेंगी।

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : Sir, Mr. Hem Barua, when he was in the Chair, gave a specific ruling.

MR. SPEAKER : I know, I have heard it also myself. I was hearing from my Chamber.

SHRI. S. KUNDU : I did not dispute the fact that you heard it though you were absent.

MR. SPEAKER : I know, I know the ruling also that immediately after the West Bengal Budget somebody will make a statement. The ruling is given and that stands. My only suggestion now is that the ruling which he gave stands. But, at times, when a short notice is given, the Government want a little more time. That also has to be considered by the Chair. Suppose I say, 'Tomorrow morning something will be done' and the Government is not ready, naturally it will be postponed. I concur with Mr. Hem Barua about the importance of the matter and I also heard Mr. Madhok. I do not disagree with what Mr. Hem Barua said. I entirely agree with the importance and all that. But the Government want a little more time. So I would only say, let us give them a little more time and take it up tomorrow.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal) : Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee has given a motion. We do not know whether it is an adjournment motion or privilege motion—it is for you to decide.

श्री मधु लिमये : सब किस्म के प्रस्ताव दिये हैं।

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH : Here just it is a point whether with regard to an affidavit filed before a court by the Government there are certain discrepancies. I wanted to know from you whether this House can take note of an affidavit that has been filed before a court. Will it be *sub-judice* wherein it is for the Court to decide whether the affidavit filed by the Government whether there are any discrepancies or not? And in what manner this House can take cognizance of that affidavit filed by the Government in a court? That is the only point I wanted to know.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : The earlier motion that was given was simply about certain things that happened about the *Satyagrahis*.

MR. SPEAKER : No, No.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Now with the coming of this, it is a very grave matter.

MR. SPEAKER : That is what I said.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I do not think it is a matter *sub-judice*. It is a question that when the Under Secretary filed it, did he give it on behalf of the Government.

AN HON. MEMBER : On behalf of the External Affairs Ministry.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Yes, on behalf of the External Affairs Ministry which is a part of the Government? Now, we have taken a stand about Kutch being an Indian territory and the Tribunal also has said it. The whole proceedings are there. Now when the Government says something before the Court which goes

quite contrary to what the facts are and what stand the House has also taken, it is not only an insult of the House but also is a grave betrayal of the trust that the people have put in this Government. There are two things. One is that the Government must supply a copy of affidavit filed before the Court and secondly whether the affidavit is filed on behalf of the Government or by some individual in his individual capacity.

SHRI HEM BARUA rose—

AN HON. MEMBER : Sir he gave the ruling.

MR. SPEAKER : He was the Chairman; so he gave the ruling.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : This affidavit contradicts what our previous Prime Minister has been saying all about the Kutch. Therefore a statement should be made.

MR. SPEAKER : That is what I have heard. Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri raised some points. You were in the Chair. It was said that they should be discussed on the floor of the House when it was contrary to what was said in the house by the then Prime Minister. Naturally it can be raised. It is not a matter of questioning of what is being done in the Court. It is only questioning the view of the Government that is stated here. Any way all the things are put together. Tomorrow, if it is not a privilege motion or something, we shall see how we shall discuss. I will formulate something tomorrow. I have allowed it. Not at present now, tomorrow evening we shall discuss this.

श्री मधु लिमये : हल्फ-नामा तो सुकुलेट कर दीजिये ।

MR. SPEAKER : Let me see. We shall decide.

SHRI S. KUNDU : Have you seen the lines. ? For your information, may I read it out, Sir ?

MR. SPEAKER : Not now.

SHRI S. KUNDU : I think Government will circulate this paper. How can there be a discussion in this House unless they circulate copies of this ?

MR. SPEAKER : Let me see. I am not going to decide here and now. Let me see. **Shri Y. B. Chavan**.

17.21 hrs.

CIVIL DEFENCE BILL

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY) : Sir, on behalf of **Shri Y. B. Chavan** I beg to move*

“That the Bill to make provision for Civil Defence and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration.”

The Civil Defence Bill was introduced in this House last December. The Civil defence organisation was set up under the provisions of the Defence of India Act and Rules, 1962. With the revocation of the emergency the Defence of India Act will cease to be operative from July next. To continue the organisation and administration of this Civil Defence organisation we need some statutory provision and hence we have come forward with this Bill. Sir, I need not emphasise the necessity for such an organisation, especially after we had an experience of the Chinese invasion and involved in a war with Pakistan.

Civil Defence aims at saving life, minimising damage to property and maintaining continuity of production and civic services of the country.

Sir, Civil Defence is mainly a voluntary effort. The members of this organisation Join this on voluntary basis and it gives them a feeling of involvement in national participation and also they have got a satisfaction for contributing their mite for protecting the country during the times of emergency. There are about twelve services to be organised under this organisation and they need long training and so this need for a permanent set up under this Civil Defence system. A lot of equipment has to be

* Moved with the recommendation of the President.