

(c) Decision is taken on the merits of each case.

12.04 hrs.

RE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

ALLEGED CONTRADICTION IN DEFENCE MINISTER'S STATEMENTS ON AIR-SPACE VIOLATIONS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Hem Barua. I have disallowed that motion and conveyed that information to him. I would ask the hon. Defence Minister if he wants to explain the position. (*Interruptions*). Would the hon. Members help me in carrying out the decisions of the hon. Speaker or in flouting them? The hon. Speaker has ruled so many times that when notice of an adjournment motion is given to him and he disallows it in his chamber, he conveys the information to the hon. Member and for that time at least it should be accepted. If any grievance is there, that can be conveyed to the Speaker and he will consider whether it should be brought again.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I do not have any grievance at all, but....

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): On a point of order, Sir. You have been pleased to rule that the adjournment motion of which notice was given by Shri Hem Barua has been rejected by you as out of order. That being so, I wonder how the Defence Minister can make a statement about a thing which is not a subject before the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I might read the order on the adjournment motion:

"If the statement made by the Minister is not correct, there are ways to confront him with that. No justification for an adjournment motion. It is disallowed. But the Minister might be asked

if he wants to make the position clear."

An hon. Member: What is the subject?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members want to know the subject and in which connection he has to make the statement. I will read it out:

"The situation of grave concern arising out of the Defence Minister's interview with *The New York Post* (the New Delhi despatch of the interview was published in its issue of March 29th, 1960) in which he is reported to have said:

'About the violation on the other border (Himalayan) it was clear that he never doubted that they were Chinese Planes'.

and the repeated denials in Parliament made by him and by the hon. Prime Minister that there was no air-space violation by Chinese aircrafts, and that too made in the strongest of language."

Shri Hem Barua: Ma I make a humble submission on what you have said? You have suggested there are other channels. I want to enlighten you on certain things. On this question of air-space violation, I tabled a short notice question sometime back, because I found certain inherent contradictions in the statements made by the Defence Minister and also in the statements made by the hon. Prime Minister. I had pointed out that when there is a naked admission of this in the *White Paper III* in the protest note to China of the 5th December, in the statement made by the Defence Minister on 18th December and in the Statements made by the Prime Minister on the 18th December, 21st December and 22nd February, there is a blatant denial that there was any air-space violation. I just want to know how the Government of India reconcile the two things

[Shri Hem Barua]

—the blatant denials made on these occasions and the naked admission made in the *White Paper III*. That short notice question was disallowed. The Defence Minister made a statement on his own volition on 18th March. I wanted some clarification and I was not given an opportunity. I was told, there are other channels of redress. This has been repeatedly said by the hon. Speaker. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order, I have followed him. I cannot allow him to make a speech for half an hour. He says that there are certain discrepancies and certain contradictions in the statements that have been made. He wants my guidance as to how he can get them rectified, explained and made clear. When I want to give him that guidance, if really that is guidance and I am worth it, if he refuses me also that opportunity, what can be done? Whenever a Minister of the Government has made a statement and any hon. Member thinks that it is not correct or he has contradicted an earlier statement or another statement, the remedy is that he may write to the Speaker that such and such a statement has been made on the floor of the House; it is not correct according to the facts or he is contradicting himself or any other Minister.

That request would be sent to the Minister for him to explain. The Minister shall give his explanation and send it on to the Speaker. The Speaker would consider it and if he finds that there is really a contradiction, he would ask the Minister to explain it on the floor of the House. If he feels that there is none and still the hon. Member thinks that he ought to make a statement, he might allow the hon. Member to make a statement giving his own position. That is exactly the procedure—and that has to be followed.

Shri Hem Barua: Often no reasons are given. No reason was given as

to why my short notice question was disallowed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): The subject-matter of this motion does not relate to this contradiction. That was cleared up at least so far as we could, in the statement that was made a few days ago. The same objections were raised and the Speaker did not take much notice of it. The Prime Minister's statements referred to the previous violations before the 18th December and we were dealing with the subsequent period.

With regard to the *New York Post*, I gave no interview to the *New York Post*.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): The correspondent interviewed him; he did not give the interview.

Shri Krishna Menon: The gentleman who represents the *New York Post* is a person I know for several years. He came to tea. If I did not see him, that would also be discourteous. We had a talk together for an hour on various subjects under the Sun and this matter came up.

I did not say to him anything more than what was contained in the statement made in the House. That is all I can say.

Shri Hem Barua: May I point out....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What more can he say now? I have advised him that if he still feels dissatisfied,—because, the hon. Minister says that the statement that was made by the Prime Minister related to quite a different affair—and feels that a contradiction exists, he might write to me in detail. I will pass it on to the hon. Minister and the hon. Minister will give his own version. Then, if I feel that the hon. Member should make a

statement. I will allow the hon. Member to make a statement, clarifying the position.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): What is the difference between giving an interview and talking over a cup of tea?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not deciding that question. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order. It has been always stated that the statement made by the Defence Minister on the 18th of March clarifies the situation and it concerns a particular period, that is, from 6th February to 23rd February. This statement might be correct or incorrect; it might be correct I suppose. But, on the other hand, there were air space violations by Chinese aircrafts, and they have been detailed in White Paper No. 3 and then there was a denial made.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have advised him that he might put his version in a note and send it on to me. But then he insists that he must make it just now. Should I succumb to him or will he agree with me for the present at least? I will pass on to the next item—Papers to be laid on the Table.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): May I seek a clarification? I have also given notice.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I request him to resume his seat now.

12.22 hrs.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

AMENDMENT TO EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS SCHEME

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 7 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1951, a copy of Notifica-

tion No. GSR 362 dated the 26th March, 1960 making certain further amendment to the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2063/60].

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

CRASH OF NAVAL TRAINEE AIRCRAFT

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Under rule 197, I beg to 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 crash of a naval trainee aircraft into the sea off the Cochin Port on the 22nd March, 1960.'

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): The Government of India regret to report that Naval Amphibious Sea land Aircraft No. 104 met with an accident on Tuesday, the 22nd March, 1960, while on a training flight. The aircraft took off from the Naval Air Station, Cochin, on that day and was reported overdue at 09.50 hrs. It was later established that the aircraft had crashed into the sea approximately ten miles south of Cochin and about one mile off shore approximately at 09.30 hrs.

Two naval pilot officers were on board the aircraft. One of them, Sub-Lt. A. K. Mehra is seriously injured but was rescued by local fishermen. He was admitted to the Naval hospital at Cochin and is reported to be making satisfactory progress. The second officer, Sub-Ltd., A. K. D. Gupte, went down with the aircraft. His body was washed ashore and found on the beach about four miles from the site of the accident. The body was cremated with full military honours on the 26th March, 1960. The next of kin were kept informed.

The wreckage of the aircraft has been located and salvage operations