

[Shri Sezhiyan]

Then, it was accepted in the agreement of 1964 that the repatriates should be permitted to take with them a minimum of Rs. 4,000 per person and a maximum of Rs. 75,000 per family. This amount is to be given in foreign exchange. But the Ceylon Government is not readily giving to the repatriates the minimum and maximum put in the agreement. Even on a conservative estimate, if 35,000 people have to be repatriated per annum, it will come to Rs. 16 million to 17 million per year. The officials of Ceylon say that they find it difficult to manage such a huge sum. That may be one reason for slowing down the repatriation to India.

Therefore, before accepting the amendment of the Act, which seeks to link the grant of Ceylon citizenship with actual repatriation, the Government of India should see whether facilities have been given to those people who have opted for repatriation and whether the Ceylonese Government are fulfilling the obligations they have undertaken under the 1964 Agreement.

Then, there is an apprehension in the minds of those people who are working in the plantations, who are there for the last three generations, that they will be uprooted and thrown out of their jobs so that they will repatriate to India. If they are repatriated suddenly it will put them in a very difficult situation. So, repatriation has to be done in an orderly and human way.

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : The hon. Member has asked a number of questions. His main anxiety appears to be that since the amendment has been adopted by the House of Representatives some change has come over which is likely to affect adversely the interests of the people of Indian origin. May I assure him once again that as far as this amendment is concerned it will not make the slightest difference to the agreement? Both India and Ceylon stand by their commitment. As the House knows, over a period of 15 years 5,25,000 people of Indian origin are to come to India and Ceylon will give citizenship to 3 lakhs people. It is true that there is short-fall on both sides. We have not been able to confer Indian citizenship and repatriate as many as we should have done, nor has Ceylon been able to honour her part of the commitment fully, because there have been

a number of difficulties in the way. It is a very difficult scheme to implement because human beings are involved. All these difficulties are now being overcome, procedures are being streamlined and a whole machinery has been set up in order to accelerate the pace of implementation of the agreement to the desired pitch.

As far as the question of providing these people with the necessary facilities is concerned, the House has been kept fully informed in the past that we on our part are providing adequate arrangements to bring these people over here, rehabilitate them and provide all kinds of facilities to them. There is no doubt about that.

So far as the other side is concerned, there should be no apprehension in the minds of the hon. Members that difficulties will be placed in their way by Ceylon itself. The Ceylon Government, specially the present Ceylon Government, is very keen that the scheme should be implemented expeditiously and all those people who have got Indian citizenship should leave Ceylon as early as possible; that is to say, once a person has opted for Indian citizenship then they would like him to go back to India as quickly as possible. There is no difficulty on our side either in taking them back. To that extent we cannot really quarrel with the Ceylonese Government. In regard to facilities for the repatriation of the assets and other things, I can assure the hon. Member that there is complete co-operation from the other side and there is complete understanding between our two governments and nothing is being done which will create difficulties for the people over there.

12.18 hrs.

RE : VISIT OF MINISTER OF
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS TO
CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM
(Tiruchirappalli) : Sir, the Minister of External Affairs has returned home after a global tour on a difficult mission. There should be a statement on that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : Yes, on the outcome of his tour abroad we want a statement. Then there is the question of arms shipment.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior) : The Minister of External Affairs should make a statement and the House should be given an opportunity to discuss it. Sir, if you allow it under rule 377, then he will make a statement and we will not be in a position to ask for any clarification.

MR. SPEAKER : If a calling attention is given notice of, it can be considered. So far as the shipment of arms is concerned, the calling attention has been admitted and it will be taken up tomorrow.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : We want a call attention inviting the hon. Minister to make a statement on the outcome of his long tour abroad for the cause of Bangladesh.

MR. SPEAKER : I can very well understand the difficulty of some of the newcomers and their making some novel suggestions. But have you ever heard of a calling attention motion inviting a Minister to make a statement ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Whenever during session the Minister goes abroad and returns he should make a statement *suo motu*.

MR. SPEAKER : He must have some patience. Perhaps, he will do it himself.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक तरीका यह हो सकता है कि कल जो कार्लिंग एटेन्शन नोटिस आ रहा है, आप इस बात की इजाजत दीजिए कि हम उसमें इधर उधर के सवाल भी पूछ सकें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य पहले जो ऐसा करते हैं, क्या वह मेरी इजाजत से करते हैं ?

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : मेरा निवेदन है कि मन्त्री महोदय एक तूफानी दौरा करके आये

हैं। वहां पर किसी जगह उनका स्वागत हुआ है, किसी जगह नहीं; किसी जगह उनकी बात सुनी गई है, किसी जगह नहीं। इसलिए मन्त्री महोदय इस बारे में जो स्टेटमेंट करेंगे, या तो उसके बाद हमें सवालात पूछने का मौका दिया जाये और या इस विषय पर कार्लिंग एटेन्शन नोटिस मन्जूर कर लीजिए।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Sir, I am entirely at the disposal of the House. If there is a general desire, I will make a statement. I have learnt that call attention notice on the specific question of the reported supply of Arms has already been admitted. While dealing with that if anything is left then I can make a statement myself.

MR. SPEAKER : I have already allowed a call attention motion on the shipment of arms from U.S.A. So far as the matters relating to that subject are concerned, you are at liberty to ask as many questions and I would not come in the way. Secondly, we have already fixed discussion on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs fixed and that will provide you enough opportunity to discuss all matters concerning foreign affairs.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, it is regarding Bangla Desh—a specific subject.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Sir, I do not want to give an impression that I am avoiding making a statement. If, Mr. Speaker, you think that I should make a statement in view of this, I am prepared to make a statement. It can be day after tomorrow, if you like. Tomorrow let the arms supply thing be dealt with and then, if anything is left, I will make a statement the day after.

MR. SPEAKER : We will have a little departure from the accepted practice. I will allow a few questions, not many but only a few concise, precise and very short questions.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : One from each party.

MR. SPEAKER : One for each.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Why not have a short duration discussion under rule 193 ?

MR. SPEAKER : The Rules are, when you anticipate a discussion, we cannot allow another one on it. You have already fixed a debate on foreign affairs.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul) : Will the Members, to whom questions will be allowed, be those who disturb you or who do not ? Who will be the Members who will be privileged to ask questions ?

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandi-wash) : It should be expunged.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : We are not disturbing you ; we are very cooperative.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Salve is a lawyer.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : My sincere submission is, kindly give it to those who are perennially troubling you.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : It is a very, very cruel joke.

MR. SPEAKER : I thought, by placing him in the Chair I will make him learn certain lessons. But I am sorry that he has not learnt them.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : He is jealous because we have come nearer to you.

12.32 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST
THE EDITOR OF *U. KYRWOH
KA RILUM*, SHILLONG

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) : Sir, under rule 222 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I have given notice to raise a question of privilege against the Editor, Printer and Publisher of the paper called *U. Kyrwoh Ka Rilum (Hill Messenger)*, which has in its issue dated

June 12, 1971, published a news item which in English reads as follows :—

“Rs. 750 per month for Refugees Chairman.

It is learnt that Mr. G. G. Swell has been appointed Chairman of Bangla Desh Refugees on a salary of Rs. 750/- per month. Friends, how do you feel about it ? It is because of this that the A.P.H.L.C. world is not quiet ? This is the real patriot, is he not ?”

I asked Shri G. G. Swell, the Deputy-Speaker, about it and he refuted the news item *in toto*. We know that the Deputy-Speaker is debarred from accepting any other office of profit. But the Deputy-Speaker felt very helpless as he himself could not raise a question here, because he occupies the Chair sometimes. It is not only against an individual but is against the very office of the Deputy-Speaker and the dignity of the House. This very patently false and defamatory imputation casts a reflection not only on the character of Shri G. G. Swell, but on the office and conduct of the Deputy-Speaker of the Lok Sabha and brings that high office in to disrepute and is a gross breach of privilege and contempt of the House. Therefore, I propose and move that the matter may kindly be referred to the Privileges Committee of the House.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I fully support this.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM (Tiruchirapalli) : We support this.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (स्वालिंयर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इसके खिलाफ हूँ। मेरा निवेदन है कि यह मामला पहले आप सम्पादक को लिखें कि क्या उसने इस तरह की खबर छापी है और क्या वह इस पर खेद प्रकट करने के लिए तैयार हैं ? अगर वह तैयार न हों, बैसे तो प्रोफेसर स्वेल भी खण्डन भेज सकते हैं और अगर वह खण्डन प्रकाशित न करें तो फिर प्रिविलेज का मामला बन सकता है। मुझे ताज्जुब है इस खबर का नाम तो पहली दफा मैंने सुना है। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि इस प्रिविलेज मोशन के द्वारा उस खबर का प्रचार और