

will be served by comparing the amount released in individual cases.

आगरा विश्वविद्यालय के अग्रणी कालेज

२११४. श्री ओंकार सिंह : क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताना की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) आगरा विश्वविद्यालय में सम्बद्ध इन समय तिब्बत डिप्टी कनिष्ठ क्या रहे हैं ;

(ख) इस विश्वविद्यालय के कार्य-क्षेत्र में कौन-कौन से जिले आते हैं ; और

(ग) क्या विश्वविद्यालय में सम्बद्ध सभी डिप्टी कनिष्ठों के नामों की एक सूची जिनका समा-पटल पर रखा जायेगा ?

शिक्षा मंत्री (डा० का० ला० श्रीमानी) :

(क) ११० ।

(ख) और (ग). विवरण समा पटल पर रखा गया है [देखिये पृ० ३६३ व. अनुसूचक संख्या ३७] ।

Pakistani Nationals Sent Back to Pakistan

2115. **Shri Raghunath Singh:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) how many Pakistani nationals who entered India illegally were sent back during 1952-1962; and

(b) their number from the States of Rajasthan, Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir; Assam and Tripura and Manipur?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House, as soon as it is available.

12 hrs.

RE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: Now, we take up the Call attention notice; Shri Hem Barua.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): What about my adjournment motion, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: I have made enquiries. Probably, Government would be having all the information by tomorrow.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In this connection, I would like to make a submission. This report is circulated by the PTI from New York on the 24th May. Sir, as far as we know, no contradiction of the report has been issued by our Embassy in Washington or its branch in New York. I cannot imagine that our Embassy is hibernating over the week-end. Television like photograph does not lie. And, therefore, my feeling is that since this report has appeared and has gone uncontradicted for the space of at least 4 or 5 days, all that we require to establish in this House for your satisfaction is that a *prima facie* case has been established so that you should give your permission for the discussion of this matter by way of adjournment motion. It is not, at this point of time, our intention to go into the merits of the matter. We are only asking your permission for the adjournment of the House for this discussion. I can quite understand the Government trying to see that the Prime Minister comes to its rescue. I welcome it also. But, let us have it tomorrow. You can fix some time tomorrow so that we can have this discussion, if as I submit we have set up a *prima facie* case here. As a is, here is a report which has been uncontradicted and it is to be discussed by the House.

Mr. Speaker: I said the other day also that the facts that were being marshalled by the hon. Member were only received from newspaper reports. Unless the Government also has received that information, we cannot proceed. An adjournment motion can only be discussed when the facts are either admitted or established. Without the facts no adjournment motion can be taken up and discussed, because, if the Government only say

that they have no information, no discussion can take place. Only the newspaper reports are there.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The whole world knows but the Government does not know. Is it the implication?

Mr. Speaker: That is a different point for another censure of the Government. But, so far as I am concerned, I am taking up only the previous one for the present. And, we had said that by today the Government would receive the information. We had expected that all the information would be received by Government by today. But, this morning I was told that, probably, Government wanted another day. They have not received. . . .

An Hon. Member: Nothing to be received.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What is it to be received?

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): They are only awaiting the arrival of the Prime Minister. That is the fact.

Mr. Speaker: Even if it is so, where is the harm?

Shri Prabhat Kar: It is a question of fact. It is not that they have not got the information. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Even if it be taken that whatever the hon. Member says is correct, I think it would be to his interest that the facts are given and the Prime Minister arrives. I have not asked the Government whether that is the position or not. I cannot say that. It was expected that the Government would have full information by today.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (**Shrimati Lakshmi Menon**): The Ministry has received the information. But, I think we should wait for the Prime Minister to arrive (*Interruptions*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: By implication, the hon. Minister cannot say

'No' to the reports that have already appeared. Therefore, since a *prima facie* case has been established—I am not going into the merits of the case now and I cannot vouch for the absolute authenticity of the P.T.I. reports; it is only a newspaper report which I have to presume is fairly accurate—therefore, I beg you to give us permission so that tomorrow when the Prime Minister is here, in his presence we shall have a discussion of this very serious matter.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I have no objection to this, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: She has not objection to a discussion?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Not for the discussion; but the motion may be dealt with.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshanabad): On a point of clarification, Sir, is tomorrow the absolute deadline or is it to be adjourned further?

Mr. Speaker: No further adjournment. But for the present, I am not clear when Shri Mukerjee says that he is not going into the facts but that he only wants my approval or my leave. I am surprised at it. What leave can I give him? First I have to give my consent; then the leave of the House has to be sought. Then the third stage comes when the first two ingredients are fulfilled. We wanted some information because no adjournment motion can be taken up, as I have said earlier, unless the facts are there. Now, the facts are there. Only they want to have some more time so that the Prime Minister will be here by tomorrow. We should have to agree to that.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): Are we to understand that the Government has no objection to the admissibility of the motion?

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): May I submit that it would be irregular procedure if, on account of the absence of the Prime Minister or for that

[Shri Tyagi]

matter any other Minister, an adjournment motion is postponed to accommodate some person. Some other Minister must as a rule officiate; if the Prime Minister is not here someone else must reply. The adjournment motions cannot wait for a Minister to come. It is for the first time that I am seeing this in this House. All the facts are there but because the Prime Minister is not there they say it could not be discussed. That is something derogatory to the procedure.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, the House knows that the Prime Minister is also the Minister of External Affairs. Secondly, the name of a Cabinet Minister is also involved in it. So, it is only fit and proper that we should wait for the Minister of External Affairs to be here.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In that case, what I am asking of you, Sir, is that you, as the previous Speakers have done, fix a time, a definite time when we can have this discussed because Government can possibly have no conceivable objection to a discussion of this matter. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Tomorrow we are having it. What else does he want?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You can fix a discussion for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: That is at a later stage. He presumes that the first two stages have already been gone through. Shri Mukerjee presumes that I have given my consent and the House also has given its leave and he wants 4 O'clock to be fixed when this adjournment motion would be discussed. But we have not passed those two stages. Therefore, I told him that I would take it up again tomorrow and it would not suffer for want of urgency because it had been postponed to another date. The other day I said that we would take it up today, i.e. Monday. Really it does not give much credit to the ruling

party that they should advance this argument that because the Prime Minister is not here, it should not be taken up. At least it should not be given as the excuse and expressed like that. That is my opinion. This should not have been said in that manner at least, if even that was the excuse. I think we should now stop here and proceed with the other business. I will take it up tomorrow. It will not suffer for want of urgency because it has been postponed.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Sir, on a point of order. You are the supreme custodian of the privileges of this House. Is it due to the non availability of the facts that this matter has been postponed or is it due to the absence of the Prime Minister? If it is due to the absence of the Prime Minister, I beg to say that the question of admissibility of the adjournment motion may be postponed till tomorrow but the facts should be revealed. Why should the facts be withheld?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There is nothing new in what he says; I have already dealt with whatever he has stated.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, this adjournment motion was tabled and Mr. Mukerjee brought this fact to your notice. At that time Shrimati Lashmi Menon, the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs said that she had no facts. Now, fortunately or unfortunately, we have known the reasons, that is because the Prime Minister is not here. My point is whether they had those facts with them but still concealed them from this House. If so, it is very serious.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. A definite statement had been made that the facts were not available. It was only on that score that we had postponed it. Today I thought that was a continuation of the same excuse and I had, therefore, said that the facts

were not available and the Government will have the facts by tomorrow. I had not known—now the explanation given is a different one.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: When this matter was brought up before the House we did not have the facts, and I did state that we are trying to get the transcript of the interview from New York. Since then, perhaps this morning or last night—I do not know—the facts did come. Since the Prime Minister is already here—he has arrived—I thought it is only fit and proper that he, as Minister of External Affairs, should deal with the subject inasmuch as the name of a Cabinet Minister of the Government of India is involved in it.

Shri Tyagi: May I make a suggestion on procedure? You were good enough that day to postpone your ruling in regard to the relevance of this Adjournment Motion—whether it should be permitted or not,—for the reasons that facts were not available. Now, the facts are available and you might take your own time to see the facts, because, it is for you to know what the facts are and then only you will give your ruling in favour or against the motion. So, you might obtain the facts and give your ruling tomorrow, and then the Prime Minister also will be available here.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think there is any use hammering it further. The facts are clear now. Everyone knows what the actual situation is, I will certainly take it up tomorrow after the Question Hour. That is decided now. Why should there be further points made about it?

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Sir, I rise to a point of order. Unfortunately you were good enough to administer a very mild rebuke to Shri H. N. Mukerjee for having presumed that the first two stages have passed. But the mistake was originally committed by the Deputy Minister—(Interruption.)

Mr. Speaker, Order, order.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Inasmuch as she asserted that the discussion would be taken up tomorrow when the Prime Minister arrives here. It is presumed too, and it is clear that the powers are vested in you and the House, for saying that a discussion will be taking place on such and such a date. So, I think it is a question of privilege,—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I just immediately asked her whether she had agreed to the discussion. She said, "No". That was made clear there and then. So, where is the point of order? I do not understand how a point of order arises.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee (Nabadwip): Sir, I rise to point of order. The facts are there. She admits that all the facts can be placed before you, and you can give your decision. This question of the absence of the Prime Minister should not be brought in here. That is what Shri Tyagi said and that is what we also say.

Mr. Speaker: Shri H. P. Chatterjee must have heard me also. I had repeatedly said that the facts are clear. Now, we will take it up tomorrow. The House will now proceed to the next item of business. Shri Hem Barua.

12.14 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

(i) REPORTED CHINESE INTRUSION INTO GORAKHPUR AND BASTI DISTRICTS

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Under Rule 197, I call the attention of the Minister of Defence to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

The reported entry of some Chinese into Gorakhpur and Basti Districts of Uttar Pra-