

Shri M. C. Chagla: No.

Shri Baburao Patel (Shajapur): It was said by the External Affairs Minister that Svetlana was not the wife of an Indian citizen. This matter has now taken a very romantic and colourful complexion. She was the sweetheart of an Indian and therefore the matter becomes very emotional in that case. If this lady, whose husband died in Soviet Russia, came to India, she naturally became our guest and she was treated as a guest. She probably wanted an asylum in the country and she approached the first persons whom she knew, namely, Mr. Dinesh Singh and the Prime Minister. It was our duty to give her some sort of an asylum because we know what are the conditions in Soviet Russia. If some one comes to us, out of sheer humanity we often give the person an asylum and protection. It is quite obvious from the discussion that took place in this House that this protection was denied. It is also quite obvious that our Government became panicky; our Government is very much concerned about what Soviet Russia thinks of us. But I want to know one thing. What is the reaction of the Government to this attempted kidnapping done by the Americans in India? Do we allow people who come to our country as guests, or even as tourists, to be kidnapped by Americans? If the Americans are here in this country for this purpose, then this is a shameful business. This is a case of kidnapping and not of mere elopement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may conclude now.

Shri Baburao Patel: This is a case of kidnapping, somebody who has been taken away from our country right in the presence of our officers. So, I want this question to be answered.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is not correct that she was the guest of the Government or an official guest. She came on a private visit, on a private affair which concerned herself and

had nothing to do with Government. She applied for a visa in the ordinary course in our Embassy in Moscow. The visa was granted and she came here as any Russian or a foreigner would do. Therefore, Government had no responsibility whatever towards her.

Secondly, it is entirely incorrect to say that she was kidnapped by U.S. Embassy or by American authorities. As I said, she held a valid passport, she went to the Embassy and she got the visa as any other person having a valid passport could have gone and obtained a visa. If you kidnap a person, you do not take a person to the Airport and let her be there for one hour.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): Money was supplied.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is perfectly true that the United States Embassy or officer paid for her ticket. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia has given . . .

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On a point of propriety:

A question has been asked which you, in your wisdom, have permitted, namely, something which amounted virtually to kidnapping has taken place on the part of a foreign embassy operating in this country. The hon. Minister says that a foreign embassy had offered money to a foreign national who happened to be our guest, at least the guest of a Minister of Government, for a considerable length of time. Is it open to any guest or any Indian national for that matter to be taken away in that manner by foreign embassies operating under our damn nose?

12.39 hrs.

RE. MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia has moved a privilege motion and that is about some statement made

[Mr. Speaker]

by the Prime Minister, about dates and all that. That is about the present of a necklace, dates and all that. It will be difficult for the Prime Minister to give that here and now because the incident happened ten years ago; therefore, she would take a little time to give details about that, i.e., when it was presented and all that; she will do it in due course.

Now papers to be laid on the Table.

12.40 hrs.

श्री मधु लिम्बे (मुंबई) : उनकी पेश तो करने दीजिए।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): If it is a privilege motion....

Mr. Speaker: That is why I have said that it is not a privilege motion. The dates will be given. It is not a privilege motion. I do not accept it as a privilege motion.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I want to understand it. As you have stated....

Mr. Speaker: It is not a privilege motion at all.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You had stated that Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia had given notice of a motion of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: It is not . . .

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Then, what is it?

Mr. Speaker: I do not accept it as a privilege notice. But I have given the information to the House.

श्री हुकम चन्द कडवाय (उज्जैन) :
मासूम तो पड़े कि क्या चीज है।

Shri A. B. Vajpayee (Balrampur): Either it is a privilege motion or it is not.

Mr. Speaker: It is not. I have only been saying that if some inaccuracies or any such things are there, the details will be given after verification because this incident occurred about ten years ago.

Now, Papers to be Laid on the Table.

डॉ० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कनौज) :
तारीखों की गलती की बात नहीं है। यह
धीर कोई बात है।

श्री मधु लिम्बे : पेश तो करने दीजिए।

12.41 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

AUDIT REPORT, APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS, ETC.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers:—

- (1) Audit Report, Railways, 1967, under article 151(1) of the Constitution. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-14/67].
- (2) Appropriation Accounts, Railways, for 1965-66, Part I—Review. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-15/67].
- (3) Appropriation Accounts, Railways, for 1965-66, Part II—Detailed Appropriation Accounts. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-16/67].
- (4) Block Accounts (including Capital Statements comprising the Loan Accounts), Balance Sheets and Profits and Loss Accounts, Railways, for 1965-66. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-17/67].

MINIMUM WAGES (CENTRAL) AMENDMENT RULES, ETC.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N. Mishra): On behalf of Shri Jai Sukh Lal Hathi, I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy of the Minimum Wages (Central) Amendment Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 255 in Gazette of India dated the 25th February, 1967, under