

at reasonable rates. Thrifts is being encouraged among the coalminers. As for drinking habits, the Field Staff of the Fund carry on propaganda against the evil among the coalminers, through lectures, documentary films and dramatic performance. Healthy recreational activities are also organised in the Multi-purpose Institutes of the Fund.

†DIFFERENCE OF OPINION OVER NOMINATION TO WAQF BOARD

514. SARDAR RAM SINGH: Will the Minister of LAW be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there was some difference of opinion between the Executive Councillor of Delhi and the Central Government over the choice of names of persons to be nominated to the Waqf Board; and

(b) if so, to what extent the nominations made by the Executive Councillor could be retained on the present Board?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED): (a) There is some difference of opinion between the Lt. Governor and the Chief Executive Councillor. The Lt. Governor has referred the matter for decision of the President.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ANNUAL REPORT (1965-66) OF THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KHARAGPUR AND RELATED PAPERS

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI JAI-SUKHLAL HATHI): Sir, on behalf

†Transferred from the 28th February, 1968.

of Dr. Triguna Sen I lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers:—

(i) Annual Report of the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, for the year 1965-66.

(ii) Statement explaining the reasons for the delay in placing the Report mentioned at (i) above on the Table of the House.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-272/68 for (i) and (ii).]

THE COAL MINES BONUS (SECOND AMENDMENT) SCHEME, 1968

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION (SHRI S. C. JAMIR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under section 7-A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Bonus Schemes Act, 1948, a copy of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) Notification G.S.R. No. 314 dated the 7th February, 1968, publishing the Coal Mines Bonus (Second Amendment) Scheme, 1968. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-449/68.]

NINETEENTH REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (1967-68)

SHRI OM MEHTA (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, on behalf of Shri B. K. P. Sinha, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Nineteenth Report of the Public Accounts Committee (1967-68) on Appropriation Accounts (Defence Services), 1965-66 and Audit Report (Defence Services), 1967.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXPENDITURE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HARYANA FOR THE YEAR 1967-68

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C. PANT): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants for

expenditure of the Government of Haryana for the year 1967-68.

THE BUDGET (HARYANA), 1968-69

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C. PANT): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the State of Haryana for the year 1968-69.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER RE DETENTION OF A POLICE CONSTABLE BY THE PERSONNEL OF THE CHINESE EMBASSY AT NEW DELHI

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): Sir, We have been informed by the Delhi Administration that on March 6, 1968 constables Ghanisham Parshad and Ram Richpal Singh of 24th Btn. of the C.R.P. were returning at about 15-15 hrs. from beat duty in Railway Colony at Sardar Patel Marg to Police Station Chanakyapuri. They were in uniform. They took a short cut through the Chinese Embassy premises by entering from one of the gates on Nyaya Marg and emerged on the main gate on Shanti Path. When the two constables had come out of the main gate of the Embassy, they were called back by the gate-keeper Bir Bahadur of the Chinese Embassy. One of them, namely, Ghanisham Parshad complied and entered the gate. Bir Bahadur caught hold of him and took him inside the room meant for the gate-keeper and forcibly detained him. Soon after this some Chinese and others came from the main Embassy building and took Ghanisham Parshad inside the main building.

2. At about 17.15 hours the Station House Officer told another Chowkidar of the Embassy, Suraj Bahadur, to inform the Chinese inside the main

building that the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Sub-Divisional Police Officer would like to talk to them about the detained constable. After sometime he returned and intimated that the Chinese would not talk to the local authorities but would deal only with the Ministry of External Affairs. After about 15 minutes the Sub-Divisional Magistrate spoke on telephone to the Chinese authorities in the Embassy and requested them to release the constable. His request was turned down and he was told that they would deal only with the Ministry of External Affairs.

3. Around 5-30 P.M. the Chinese Embassy informed the Protocol Department of the Ministry of External Affairs alleging that an intruder into the Embassy premises had been apprehended by them and that they would like to hand him over before Protocol Officer known to them. The Ministry of External Affairs, Protocol Department, advised the Chinese Embassy to release the Constable to the security personnel stationed outside the Embassy building. But on the insistence of the Chinese Embassy that they would hand over the person concerned only to an official of the Ministry of External Affairs who is known to them, two Protocol officers of the Ministry of External Affairs proceeded to the Chinese Embassy around 6 P.M. Since by 7 P.M. neither two Protocol Officers nor the detained Constable emerged from the Chinese premises, the Ministry of External Affairs put through a telephone call to the Chinese Embassy demanding that the police Constable should be allowed to leave the Embassy immediately. Since the Chinese Embassy personnel prevaricated, the Ministry of External Affairs summoned the Chinese CDA to come to the Ministry forthwith. Thereupon the Chinese Embassy informed the Ministry that the Constable had left their premises.

4. The two constables have stated that they did not know that it was improper to go through the Embassy premises. Constable Ghanisham Par-