

repeated what he has stated in the statement. My question is whether they would conduct some investigations and find out whether the chemical content in the Surma or Kajal is really injurious. The health officer of Bradford has conducted some investigations in Pakistan and has come to this conclusion.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Will you conduct any investigation ?

SHRI A. K. KISKU : I can only say that we will keep an eye on this and if sufficient number of cases come up, surely investigation will be conducted.

SHRI A. D. MANI : I am surprised at the Minister's answer because the statement says that there were some articles published in the British Medical Journal of cases of lead poisoning caused by the use of Surma. The British Medical Journal is a reputed journal and it has given a finding on this subject that it leads to lead poisoning. Let our ophthalmic hospitals conduct a fresh study on this because we do not want our people to ruin their eyesight by the use of Surma. I know of one case....

SHRI A. K. KISKU : Thousands of our women are using Surma in our country and almost no case has so far been referred to us. As far as the report in the British Journal is concerned, in one case only three have been quoted and in another case only one has been cited.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Kulkarni, will you put this question or some other question ?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I will put a very interesting question....(Interruptions)

I want to know from the Government why the Government is hesitating in straightway rejecting the suggestion, because, Sir, for thousands of years in the history of this country it is stated even by Kalidasa—that this 'Surma' and 'Kajal' have been used by beautiful ladies for improving their eyes ? So, Sir, the Government must say that this is the tradition of this country. Sir, even small children are applied 'Kajal'. It beautifies the ladies' eyes....(Interruption). Why does the Government not reject this demand ?

SHRI A. K. KISKU : Sir, This 'Surma' or 'Kajal', apart from its being used for beautifying eyes, has a great Ayurvedic effect. It has been given to us by the Ayurvedic specialists. It is being used all over the country. Any ban will certainly disappoint our people.

SHRI B. K. KAUL : Sir, I only want a clarification....

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, please....

(Interruptions)

Next question.

COMPENSATION FOR THE HIJACKED PLANE DEMANDED BY INDIA FROM PAKISTAN

*62. SHRI M. K. MOHTA : †

SHRI SUNDER MANI PATEL :

SHRI KRISHAN KANT :

SHRI R. P. SINHA :

DR. SALIG RAM :

SHRI ARJUN ARORA :

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI :

SHRI N. P. CHAUDHARI :

SHRI T. G. DESHMUKH :

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) the extent of compensation which Government have claimed from Pakistan for the Indian Airlines Fokker Friendship plane blown up by the hijackers in Lahore and for the damage caused to the Indian High Commission in Dacca by the Pakistani rioters on the hijacking issue :

(b) whether the Government of Pakistan have agreed to surrender the two hijackers and to pay the compensation as claimed by the Government of India : and

(c) if not, what is the latest position regarding the handing over of the two hijackers by Pakistan to India and what steps have been taken or are proposed to be taken by Government in the matter ?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH) :

(a) The Government of India have demanded

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri M. K. Mohta.

compensation for the loss of the aircraft, baggage, cargo and mail and the damage caused by the detention of the hijacked plane in Lahore. There were no riots or demonstrations against the Indian Mission at Dacca on the hijacking issue.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) The Government of India are continuing to press the Government of Pakistan to take suitable action against the two hijackers, pay compensation, and give assurances for the future.

SHRI M. K. MOHTA : Sir, may I ask the hon. Minister whether is it correct as reported in the press that the Prime Minister, while speaking in Kolhapur on or about February 10th, had said that further measures would be taken against Pakistan, apart from the stoppage of overflights across India ? If so, what are such measures that are being contemplated against Pakistan ? Secondly, Sir, it is reported in the press that Pakistan is willing to discuss this matter ? Are there any pre-conditions for the discussion as may have been suggested by Pakistan ? What are those pre-conditions, and whether India has agreed to such pre-conditions or not ? And lastly, Sir, has the Government of India taken this matter or is thinking to take this matter to the United Nations ? If so, what is the the present position in this regard ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : About the first question, I have not seen the Prime Minister's speech at Kolhapur. I was too busy—as all other Members were—during Elections, and I do not know what she said at Kolhapur. Moreover, a question cannot be based merely on a press report on the Prime Minister's statement.

About the second question, for discussion there can be no pre-conditions. We are always prepared to discuss without any pre-conditions because in the course of discussion each side is entitled to put across its viewpoint.

About the third question, we have no intention to take the matter to the United Nations. We have taken corrective action and Pakistan is thinking of taking it to an international

organization known as ICAO. We have no intention to take it....

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Sir, on a point of order....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mohta.

SHRI M. K. MOHTA : Sir, my question has not been fully answered. Whether or not the Prime Minister said anything was not my question. My question was whether the Government of India would take any further measures, apart from the stoppage of overflights. If so, what are those further measures ? That is my question.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : At the present moment, Sir, the action that we have taken is adequate.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Sir, on a point of order. The reply to part (c) of the question is, in my opinion, not quite relevant, because part (c) says : "If not, what is the latest position regarding the handing over of the two hijackers by Pakistan to India...."

This has been avoided. The Minister said that suitable action is being taken. The point of order is, the reply should be whether the Government has demanded the handing over of the hijackers. That must be precisely replied to.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It will be elaborated.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : We have asked for the handing over of the hijackers.

SHRI M. K. MOHTA : May I know whether any friendly foreign Powers have offered to act as mediators or conciliators in this dispute and, if so, which are those Powers and whether India has agreed to such conciliation ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I would not say that anyone has offered to mediate but some Powers did suggest to us if their good offices could be utilised for discussing this matter with Pakistan or for resolving this but we made it clear that this is a matter which should be settled bilaterally between India and Pakistan.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : May I know if Pakistan has given asylum to these two hijackers and if it is not against international conventions ? May I know whether actually the Government wanted extradition of these two hijackers and later on the note of the Government showed that they have resiled from that position and now they want only suitable action to be taken and not return of the two hijackers ? Is this not going back on the Government of India's own clear stand and if this is so, why is it so ? Thirdly, I want to know whether the Government had prior intimation before the departure of the plane from Srinagar that such and such plane is going to be hijacked and is it not a fact that the Government at once did not take precautionary measures and what further precautions are now being taken ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : For the first question, the answer is in the affirmative. They have granted asylum and this is one of the grounds which we feel is against the international conventions and the general consensus that is obtaining at present in the international community. About the second question, we have not resiled from any position and the return of the hijackers we have demanded from the very beginning. About suitable action, this also is a suitable action—the return of the hijackers—but the House would no doubt be aware that the Government of Pakistan have appointed a commission to go into this whole question and they have started action. Some have commented on this, that it might be an attempt to whitewash the whole affairs but there is no change in our attitude in this respect. About the third point, we had no prior intimation that it is going to be hijacked and if we had prior information, we would not have undertaken the flight at all. About the fourth, the Member and the House would no doubt be aware that several precautions are now being taken to scrutinise and screen the passengers travelling by air because we do want to assure the safety of air travel.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : The Minister's statement about there being no pre-condition to talks is not as clear as it should have been. There are two issues involved, first is the compensation and the return of the hijackers.

The second issue is the resumption of over-

flights of Pakistani aircraft over our territory. May I know if the stand of the Government of India is that full payment of compensation and the return of the hijackers is a pre-condition to any talks about the resumption of overflights ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is very clear.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Secondly, I want to know whether any damage was done to our Missions and their property at Karachi, Islamabad or Lahore during the riots which were sparked off in West Pakistan. Demonstrations and riots were sparked off in West Pakistan by the blowing up of the plane.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : The hon. Member should have a distinction in his mind between discussion and discussion of a particular subject. When I made the earlier statement I was careful to say that we are prepared to discuss any matter and we are not prepared to say that we will not discuss unless a particular pre-condition is fulfilled. That is a complaint which Pakistan has made that India is laying a pre-condition, which is incorrect. We are prepared to talk bilaterally any matter, but the hon. Member is now trying to get information about our attitude relating to the resumption of flights. That is not the point at all at the present moment, because you should clearly distinguish between our willingness to discuss from our willingness to take action as a result of that discussion. So far as the substantive question is concerned, we have made a very clear statement to Pakistan calling upon them to pay compensation and also to return the hijackers and also to take appropriate action against them. Secondly, about the resumption of flights that question does not arise and at the present moment there is no question of discussing that matter at all. About the third question it is a fact that damage was caused to our buildings in Islamabad. It is a fact that damage was caused.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : May I know, Sir, whether it is a fact that one of the hijackers, Mr. Mohammad Hashim Qureshi, was not allowed to be interrogated by the State Police by the Central Government...

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Which Central Government ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Kulkarni, your question is not clear.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I will ask it again. It is as reported in the Press. I am depending on the Press for this. Mr. Mohammad Hashim Qureshi was not allowed to be interrogated by the Kashmir State Police. May I know whether it is a fact? When he was appointed, there was a certain amount of suspicion about his appointment and that is what I am asking. Due to this the Government of India has now appointed a committee which will go into the various aspects. The CBI and the State Police investigation department should have co-ordination between them. So, I wanted to check up whether he was not allowed by the State Government to be interrogated before he was appointed to the Border Security Force. Secondly, may I know whether it is also a fact that Mr. Mohammad Hashim Qureshi was found to have armaments and some ammunition of Pakistani origin? How did he happen to have Pakistani ammunition with him while he was in the Border Security Force. What was the reason? May I know whether the Government of India has enquired into it?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : None of these matters concerns me and the hon. Member should ask a question of the Home Ministry.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : On a point of order. I raised the question. I have given the question earlier like this. It was the duty of the Secretariat to have sent it to the Home Ministry. I do not mind it. But when I am asking the Foreign Minister, he must see that he has got the information. He cannot casually ask me to go to the Home Ministry. It is not proper on the part of the Foreign Minister to say that I should go to the Home Ministry. It is none of my duty. I am a Member of Parliament and I will exercise my right here.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I am also entitled to certain rights and also the protection of the House. The point is that this question does not arise out of the present question. As to what happened to an individual who was involved in hijacking, what enquiries at the time of his appointment or otherwise were made, this is certainly not a matter which concerns me. So, for two reasons,

firstly, that it does not arise out of this question, and, secondly, if he is interested to pursue this, this is the normal way of pointing out in Parliament that this is a question which should be directed to the Home Ministry, and they are the appropriate Ministry to answer it. I do not see why he takes umbrage on this.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Sir, on a point of order. He has raised a relevant matter concerning the Home Ministry. He says that he was in possession of arms made in Pakistan. That at least concerns his Ministry. He should be in a position to answer this question.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Sir, my submission to you is I listened to what the Foreign Minister has stated. I put a question. He said my question had no relevance to the present question. I am asking about one Mr. Qureshi who is a hijacker and I am asking certain information about that hijacker having in his possession some ammunition of Pakistani origin. I seek your protection to the extent that if this does not concern the Foreign Affairs Ministry it was for your Secretariat to put my question to the Home Ministry. I do not mind. I would have asked them. There is nothing between me and the Foreign Minister. The point is you must say that this question is quite relevant. I am asking quite a relevant question whether this Hashim Qureshi was not allowed to be interrogated, whether he had ammunition of Pakistani origin. This must be clear. He cannot deny that it is not a relevant question. He is no authority to deny that. You are the authority to say that it is not relevant. I will accept your version.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I do not know if the hon. Member has been carrying on some correspondence with the Secretariat of which I am not aware; but the Question that is directed to me has got nothing to do with the interrogation of the hijacker or the framing of his question. The question as is framed is directed to me and I have attempted to answer all the points. The hon. Member is a senior Member of this House and I do not want to enter into any argument with him. But if a supplementary question arises, it may be relevant but if it is not within the purview of the Minister who is answering, it is quite normal to point out that this question

should be directed to another Ministry. I do not see any objection at all. I stick to the view; what I submit for the consideration of the Chair is that the attitude which I have always taken and will continue to take, is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I shall give my ruling. The question relates to the extent of compensation which Government has claimed from Pakistan and also to the question whether the Government of Pakistan has agreed to surrender the two hijackers. The question does not relate to what the police or the Government might have done at the airport before, or whether there was any negligence on the part of the Government or what was the position. I rule that this question does not arise out of this.

SHRI M. SRINIVASA REDDY: He is only eliciting farther information on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Verma.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा: क्या सरकार को यह मालूम है और सरकार से इस बात की जांच की कि बहुत से प्रेस में ऐसा निकला कि जो अपना प्लेन था उसका इंजन तो अलग कर दिया गया और उसकी जगह कोई दूसरा इंजन जला दिया गया? क्या इस बात की भी आपने कोई जानकारी ली है या जांच करवाई है?

दूसरी बात यह है कि ये जो दो व्यक्ति वहां पर शहीद बन करके निकले और जगह जगह घूमे और उनका स्वागत किया गया उस स्वागत करने में पाकिस्तान सरकार ने कोई पाबन्दी लगाई थी या उनका सहयोग किया था जनता के साथ में?

तीसरी बात यह है कि क्या यह बात भी सही है कि जब ये दोनों व्यक्ति अपने प्लेन में उस वक्त बन्द थे तो भुट्टो साहब वहां पर उनसे मिलने के लिये आये।

इन तीनों बातों की जानकारी आपने ली है क्या?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: About the first question, there was some report but I have no means of checking as to whether from the plane they removed anything or not or what they burnt. But the Government of Pakistan have told us officially that the plane was blown up by the hijackers.

About the second question, the reply is in the affirmative and as a matter of fact, this is the gravamen of the charge. The Government of West Pakistan acted in such a manner and the authorities behaved in such a manner that their conduct amounted to both encouragement and assistance to the hijackers. And in this connection I would like to supplement by giving further facts:

(1) The Government of Pakistan gave asylum to the self-confessed criminals. This was done on the 31st January while the two hijackers were still occupying the plane and could only have had the effect of encouraging them.

(2) The Government of Pakistan publicly expressed their sympathy and solidarity with these criminals and their associates. They allowed the two hijackers to telephone and to meet their accomplices in Pakistan, provided them with food and other amenities, and permitted them to move and act freely in spite of adequate forces being available to apprehend them.

(3) They refused to disarm the hijackers and take them into custody in spite of the fact that martial law prevailed and they could have done so if they had cared to.

(4) They failed to take adequate measures to protect the aircraft which was blown up in full view of the airport authority.

(5) Subsequently, the two hijackers were permitted by the Pakistan Government to be lionised. Processions organised by several West Pakistan political parties were taken out to acclaim the hijackers and they themselves were paraded in Lahore.

All this clearly shows that the Pakistan Government was abetting, aiding and encouraging these hijackers.

About his third question, we have also seen

Press reports according to which Mr. Bhutto did go and meet these people, and this also naturally must have encouraged the hijackers.

✓
SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU : The hon. Minister referred to some international convention or agreement, whatever it is. I want to know whether Pakistan is a party to that convention or agreement, and what are the obligations of such a signatory to that convention. Secondly, Sir, I want to know whether the Fugitive Offenders Act and the Extradition Act apply in this case.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, Pakistan is a member of that international convention against hijacking. It is a public document and if the hon. Member is interested to study its contents, if he approaches me, I can give him a copy of that agreement.

About the second question, extradition, as must be known to all hon. Members, is a matter of treaty between two countries. When we demanded their return, it was much more than extradition. We said that the offences are so glaring that there is no question of initiating formal extradition proceedings, they should be handed over to us for dealing with them in a suitable manner.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : Sir, the claims that the Government of India have made on the Government of Pakistan in this matter have not been met or even properly responded to. It is also seen that the steps that have so far been taken for the purpose of prevention of a repetition of such incidents, even though the hon. Minister stated that they are adequate, do not appear to be adequate or in any way successful. Yet, he was pleased to state that India does not propose to take up the matter before the U.N. May I know from him whether it is because the Government of India is confident that this matter would be settled otherwise with Pakistan or that there are other reasons as to why the Government of India is not taking up the matter before the United Nations or even the World Court ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, the operative part that, I presume, the hon. Member is wanting to know is why we did not take it to the U. N.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : Exactly.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : The main reason is that they have hijacked a plane. The plane is no longer in existence. Now it is only a question of getting compensation, that they should pay compensation and return the hijackers. We have to ensure the safety of air travel. Therefore, in the interest of safety and for other reasons we have stopped overflights. Pakistan, as you know, has been approaching several other countries that India might be persuaded to remove this ban on overflights. So this is a matter which can best be discussed and ultimately settled between the two countries. With our experience of U. N. merely taking it up or raising it there might result in making speeches but nothing will come out of it. So to deal with it effectively is to insist on bilateral approach.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : You have become wiser.

✓
SHRI GULAM NABI UNTOO : May I know from the hon'ble Minister whether one of the two hijackers was Mr. Hashim Qureshi and whether Mr. Hashim Qureshi at the time of the incident was a member of the Border Security Force ? May I further know whether Mr. Hashim Qureshi had reported to his department that some hijacking might take place and for that reason he was posted at the Srinagar airport to check hijacking ? Was there a controversy between the State Police Department and the Central Intelligence Bureau over this gentleman's *bona fides* ? Had the State Police asked the Border Security Police to hand him over to the State Police ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : How does this supplementary arise out of this question ?

SHRI GULAM NABI UNTOO : Did the B. S. F. refuse to hand over Mr. Hashim Qureshi to the State Police Intelligence ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : My reply to the first, second and the third question is in the negative. About the fourth I have no information.

✓
SHRI C. D. PANDE : This question of hijacking has been going on for a long time. There have been so many cases of hijacking in

the Middle East. And whenever a hijacking takes place the Government of India's attitude has been one of indifference. This is how they behaved when there was hijacking of a plane by the Arabs. It is a matter of shame that when such things happen in other parts of the world our voice was, in fact, not only not against such hijackings, we sided with the hijackers. When Miss Laila Khalid of the Al Fatah hijacked a plane and when the question arose in the United Nations, our Representative at the United Nations was instructed to be absolutely neutral. Apart from that, when people who conduct hijacking or create some disruption in the Middle East and when their delegation comes here, they are feted and taken to Kashmir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Put your question.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Please. That requires to be dealt with. I want to know whether it is not a fact that your attitude towards these disruptionists, destroyers has been one of admiration. ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of order.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Let me finish my question. When the Al Fatah people came here they were given all sorts of liberties. They went to Kashmir under your umbrella and there, again, they preached this cult of hijacking. This whole thing was done under your inspiration. Let the Minister know that this hijacking our plane is the outcome of your attitude. When it came to some other country, you were very happy and feted the hijackers, the destroyers. Now when it has come to you, you are complaining.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : How much propaganda is allowed to a supplementary ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What is his point of order ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have already checked him.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : It is not correct that we have at any time supported hijacking. We have always been totally opposed to it. Therefore, the rest of the questions do not arise.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : You were not opposed to it. You kept neutral.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Puri.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Sir, Mr. Pande asked whether they have condemned the previous hijacking. Let him say "Yes" or "No". Being opposed to it is no answer.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI : Having regard to what has happened subsequently in "Bangla Desh", will the Government make it perfectly clear that even if Pakistan were to pay the equivalent of not one, but ten planes as compensation, there is no question of permitting any overflights ? Secondly, has the Government considered that the real number of hijackers was certainly more than two and at least they include the name of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, with regard to the first question, my reply is simple. It is a hypothetical question and I would not like to indulge in answering a hypothetical question. About the second question, you can have this grievance that Mr. Bhutto entered the plane and talked to them and, therefore, encouraged them and lionised them, but it will be too much, even if one is angry with Mr. Bhutto to say that he was responsible for the actual hijacking. This was done by two other people.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Dr. Antani. Last question. We have already taken about 35 minutes on this.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : I am always last. I shall be very brief. In the first place, I congratulate the hon. Minister for having given us some facts for which we were waiting and I am sure he is in possession of some more facts which he is still hiding.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is not hijacking.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : Let him come out with them one day. Now, while appreciating the caution on the part of the External Affairs Minister in such matters, may I ask whether this caution in this particular case has not gone to the extent of hesitancy ? In spite of that, if this has been the attitude of Pakistan, what prevents the Government from thinking of measures to cut off all diplomatic relations with it ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, with regard to the first question, I can do no better than refer back to the statement made by a leader with whom he has great affinity and comes from the same State as he does. Shri Morarji Desai made a statement that the action that we took was the best action and that he would like to congratulate Shrimati Indira Gandhi for the action that she has taken in this respect. If he does not accept my word, he may better accept Shri Morarji Desai's word on this. About the second question, it is a separate issue....

DR. B. N. ANTANI : Does caution mean hesitancy ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Caution never means hesitancy nor does hesitancy mean caution. These are just two words. It is absolutely a wrong attitude to suggest that breaking off of diplomatic relations will solve everything. That, I think, is a very short-sighted approach and one should be extremely cautious, should be hesitant at any rate, to make such suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Next question.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : श्रीमन्, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि मैंने सोचा था कि आप मुझे इस प्रश्न पर पूछने का मौका देंगे इसलिए मैं इस प्रश्न को नहीं उठाऊंगा। मेरा प्रश्न भी इसी बात के सम्बन्ध में था जो अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 125 में रख दिया गया है जब कि उसको तारांकित प्रश्न में आना चाहिये था। जब इस प्रश्न पर बहस हुई तो मुझे आशा थी कि आप मुझे बोलने का मौका देंगे, लेकिन अब आप दूसरे प्रश्न को ले रहे हैं और मुझे इस पर प्रश्न करने का मौका

नहीं दे रहे हैं जब कि इसी सम्बन्ध में मैंने भी प्रश्न दिया था जिसको अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 125 में रख दिया गया है।

श्री सभापति : मैंने इस प्रश्न के सम्बन्ध में काफी सदस्यों को बुला लिया है और इस पर करीब 35 मिनट लग गये हैं। This is not a discussion.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : Sir, I am, being called short-sighted. But he wears spectacles whereas I do not wear it even at the age of 80.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : श्रीमन्, मैंने जैसा कहा कि मैंने भी इसी बात के सम्बन्ध में एक प्रश्न दिया था जिसको अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 125 में रख दिया गया है। मैंने सोचा था कि आप मुझे इस प्रश्न को पूछने के सम्बन्ध में मौका देंगे और फिर मैं इस अपने प्रश्न को अतारांकित प्रश्न में डालने के सम्बन्ध में सवाल नहीं उठाऊंगा। यह आपके सेक्रेटेरियट की अव्यवस्था है और उसके कारण हम पूछने से वंचित किए जायें।

श्री सभापति : आप बैठ जाइए।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

श्री सभापति : आप सवाल पूछना चाहते थे।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : सवाल पूछने का मेरा अधिकार है। आप दे या न दें, यह बात गलत है। जब सवाल हमने पूछा है, तारांकित करके पूछा है, वह सवाल 125 अतारांकित में कर दिया गया। आपके सचिवालय द्वारा, मेरे राइट का इस तरह से अपहरण किया गया है, आपसे कहता हूँ तो आप मुझे मौका नहीं देते हैं।

श्री सभापति : मैंने दोनों तरफ के लोगों को मौका दिया है, यह प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर नहीं है।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : श्रीमन्, मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप व्यवस्था करें।

श्री सभापति : यह प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर नहीं है।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : इससे वेलिड प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर क्या होगा ? मेरा प्रश्न भी इसमें आ सकता है। मेरा प्रश्न न होने का क्या कारण है ? हमारा प्रश्न पढ़ लीजिए।

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, Mr. Yadav, please sit down.

SHRI J. P. YADAV : Who will decide this?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I cannot discuss these things in the House. I will explain to you when you come to me in my Chamber.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : डिस्कस नहीं हो सकता तो इसे हम छोड़ कैसे देंगे ? जो राइट मेम्बर को मिला हुआ है....

श्री सभापति : आप चेम्बर में आकर डिस्कस कर सकते हैं।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : यह चेम्बर का सवाल नहीं है, मेम्बर का सवाल है। इन्होंने कहा कि मैंने भी यह प्रश्न पूछा था, इनका तारांकित में न आया, अतारांकित में न आया, आपने इनको मौका दिया, हमारा तारांकित प्रश्न अतारांकित में आया है 125 पर, इसको भी इसमें जोड़ा जा सकता था, मुझे समय मिल सकता था। आपसे मैं यह व्यवस्था का प्रश्न पूछ रहा हूँ। यह सेक्रेटेरियट की गलती है, उसे हम क्यों भुगतें ?

श्री सभापति : इस समय आप बैठ जाइए।

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : यह क्या तरीका है।

MR. CHAIRMAN : This is not a point of order.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : श्रीमन्, पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर का सवाल नहीं है, यह आपके सेक्रेटेरियट की गलती का सवाल है।

श्री सभापति : सेक्रेटेरियट की गलती है तो चेम्बर में आकर कहिए।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : चेम्बर में जाने का क्या सवाल है, आप इसको देखते क्यों नहीं है।

MR. CHAIRMAN : I overrule this point.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : आप मौका नहीं देंगे और प्रश्न आया तो आप देखेंगे भी नहीं।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Yadav, please sit down. I do not want all this. If there is anything against the Secretariat, the convention of this House is that it has to be discussed with me in the Chamber. The time of the House has not to be taken for that.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : श्रीमन्, हम चेम्बर में जाकर सिफारिश नहीं करना चाहते।

श्री सभापति : सिफारिश का सवाल नहीं है।

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : Not only it is a question of taking the time of the House, Sir. It is only appropriate that such matters are discussed only in the Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Yadav, please sit down. I have given my ruling.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Sir, may I make a little submission? I only want to clear up this.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, no more please. I will not allow anything more on this.

Now Mr. Mathur, next question.

बर्मा स्थित भारतीय नागरिकों की मांगें

*63. श्री जंगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि बर्मा में रहने