

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : We are sitting they were not. They had adjourned and we were sitting and we adjourned.

श्री राजनारायण : हमारे भाई ओम का पद बढ़ जाय लेकिन उन्होंने गलत बात कह दी कि एक बार एडजर्न हो गया तो आगे एडजर्न न हो ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : दो दफे एडजर्न नहीं होता ।

श्री राजनारायण : आज हम मर जाएं तो आप एडजर्न करें और आप मर जायें तो एडजर्न न करें ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I am not going to accept this proposition that you are going to die. No, Mr. Gupta.

श्री राजनारायण : मैंने अपनी बात कही । अगर आप नहीं समझते तो हम अपने सेन्स को डिमारेलाइज नहीं होने देंगे । अगर ऐसी बात है . . . . . (Interruption)

हमारा पाइन्ट यह है कि लोकसभा स्थगित हो गई, हम लोग भी सबेरे तीन-चार आदि-मियों के निधन के समाचार पढ़ खड़े हुए थे । हम किसी के निधन पर एडजर्न होते हैं तो समवेदना, सहानुभूति प्रगट करते हैं, एक प्रकार से रेस्पेक्ट प्रगट करते हैं । राज्य-सभा के लोगों में यह सेन्स डेवलप होना चाहिए । एक साथ इतने लोग मर जायें, लोकसभा स्थगित हो, हम स्थगित न हों । हम समझते थे कि एक पाइन्ट है कि हमारे सदन के मेम्बर नहीं थे । हमको अब जानकारी हुई मेहरचन्द खन्ना हमारे सदन के सदस्य थे । यह जानकारी हमारे मित्र श्री शीलभद्र याजी ने कराई । उन्होंने यह बड़ा काम किया । आज उनके काम की हम तारीफ करेंगे । इन्होंने हमने यह सवाल उठाया कि इससे दुनिया में, देश में राज्यसभा की हंसाई होगी, लोग कहेंगे कि लोकसभा एडजर्न हुई और राज्यसभा के लोग बैठे रहे ।

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : इस पर क्या कहना है ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : जवाब दिया जा चुका है ।

श्री महावीर त्यागी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : रिवाज यह है कि किसी कन्टीन्यूइंग मेम्बर की डेथ हो और दिल्ली में हो तब तो एडजर्न होता है, नहीं तो एडजर्न नहीं होता है ।

श्री राजनारायण : लोकसभा स्थगित हुई । हम अपने सेन्स को डिमारेलाइज नहीं होने देंगे और इसलिए हम आगे की प्रोसी-डिंग्स में भाग नहीं लेंगे ।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : जब आप मरोगे तो एडजर्न करा देंगे ।

श्री राजनारायण : हम नहीं मरेंगे, हम श्रीमती फीरोज गांधी की सरकार को मार कर मरेंगे ।

श्री नेकीराम (हरियाणा) : ठीक से बोलना है तो बोलो, यह क्या बात है ?

श्री राजनारायण : क्या श्रीमती फीरोज गांधी कहना अनुचित है । (Interruption)  
आप अपने मेम्बरों को रोकिए ।

[At this stage, the hon. Member, Shri Rajnarain left the House.]

MOTION RE. INFLUX OF REFUGEES FROM EAST PAKISTAN IN RECENT MONTHS AND THE STEPS TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT TO REHABILITATION THEM—contd.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We are starting at 10 minutes past 2.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You have already taken some time. I would request you to finish in 5 minutes.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Whatever the minutes, you note the time. Everybody knows that whoever is in the Chair, he is tempted to exercise his authority and you are not immune from that malaise. The time is half an hour. For fifteen minutes I have spoken and for another fifteen minutes I am going to speak now. And you remember we started this time.

As I said, the problem is one of rehabilitation now, and I wish to stress on that aspect of the problem. West Bengal has already got many refugees. Even according to the Government, they say that there are still 7,07,000 refugees, not counting those who have come recently this year and who have to be rehabilitated. Actually, the number is much higher—those who have to be rehabilitated in West Bengal—not taking into account the new influx. Their number is much higher than 7,07,000. The Government claims that in West Bengal, since partition, 24,43,932 displaced persons, agriculturists and non-agriculturists, have been rehabilitated. You see how exactly the number ends up with 32, the last two digits. It is tomfoolery with the public that this Government, which does not know how many Ministers are sitting on the Council of Ministers, will be in a position to calculate the number of persons rehabilitated to the point of 24,43,932 and so on. Are we to believe it? This kind of figure is given with a view to bamboozle the public. But I can tell you this that of those, who are supposed to have been rehabilitated, many are not rehabilitated at all. Some of them have not even got the *pattas* or the deeds of rights for their land. The colonies have not been regularized, and in many cases moneys were granted for business by the refugees which business did not come up at all. All the same they are taken into account as if the rehabilitation has taken place.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) :** What was the total number of refugees you said? What was the grand total of all the refugees?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** According to them, they say that in West Bengal they have so far rehabilitated 7,46,000 agricultural refugees and 16,40,000 non-agriculturists.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** They don't say that.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** What is the total number of refugees?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** The total according to them is three million. You can make it out. Seven lakhs are yet to be rehabilitated. Therefore, according to them the total number in West Bengal is three millions. According to them it is three millions, but according to us it is much more than three millions. And of those, who are regarded as having been rehabilitated, many of them have not been rehabilitated at all, as I said. The number which has been given of those who are not at all rehabilitated, I mean the official figure, well that probably is not seven lakhs, but much higher, will be higher by 50 per cent if not more, that is to say, would not be less than a million, if not more. And among the others, the number is much higher, of those partially rehabilitated. The problem has not been yet solved, and that shows the utter incompetence of this Government over the last twenty-three or twenty-four years of its rule. A human problem, which they were duty bound to solve with all the attention and care and by mobilising all the resources at their command, they have not been able to solve, and the problem is haunting West Bengal's economy and West Bengal's social life ever since independence. On top of it, now we are getting 2,000 refugees every day, and according to them, already 1,50,000 have arrived. What are they doing about them? The same inhuman treatment is being meted out to them. Now we find that accommodation is made for officials and others. Whenever the Government thinks that accommodation is to be found, it is immediately found. But those who are living in the Basirhat or Bongaon or Hasanabad area, they are put under tents, and they can accom-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]  
modate only 250 of them, as I said before. Can't they make proper arrangements, even for reception purposes? Even that is not done by this Government. What about the Railways? Can't they provide more railway trains to take them to other areas? They are not doing even that. One train is not enough at all. Can't they provide more medical amenities and so on? Can't they make better hygienic arrangements and so on? Nothing of the kind is being done. Somehow or other the problem is on hand and it has to be tackled somehow. And this is what they are doing. There is no trace of human compassion in handling so human a problem as the refugee problem of West Bengal. Now this is under the Centre, what are they doing? We are told that moneys will be there but moneys are not being adequately given. On the contrary there is bureaucratic red tape in many matters. I think here is an occasion when a Central Minister should be deputed to West Bengal especially when West Bengal is under President's rule, when the West Bengal Assembly is not functioning where the grievances, the demands, the agonies and the sufferings of the people can be voiced. Why should they not depute a Minister to go there and settle permanently until this influx problem is tackled in an efficient and humane manner? Now these are my suggestions.

It has been said that they will be dispersed to Madhya Pradesh and other areas but these are not got ready yet. If they are not ready then remove them to other areas. Birbhum, Purulia are the places which can be thought of in this connection for dispersing the refugees instead of keeping them concentrated on the border. That is very essential from every point of view, otherwise you are heading for communal and social explosion which can be easily avoided by a little imagination and prompt action on the part of the Government.

Now let me deal with the other bigger aspects of the question; I believe that also will be discussed. Now my friends of the Jana Sangh have found a solution. What is their solution? Refugees are

coming from East Bengal, therefore claim Rajshahi District from East Bengal and also Khulna and Jessore; in fact claim one-third of East Pakistan to be annexed to West Bengal. What a solution? If it were not for Jana Sangh, I would have called it madness, lunacy but Jana Sangh is not a party of mad men whatever else it may be. Therefore that demand has to be taken seriously.

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan) : Mr. Gupta, it is a repetition of Sardar Patel's demand.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now you have taken a liking for Sardar Patel; and little Sardars of the Jana Sangh, may I tell them in all humility that Sardar Patel is dead and forgotten?

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA) : Not forgotten.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Let us not revive his ghost. I can tell you, you will not get Rajshahi, Khulna and Jessore, if you know the topography and the political situation there. Certainly I do not think that my friend, Mr. Sunder Singh Bhandari, a very intelligent man, abounding in commonsense—misplaced judgment and misplaced commonsense but all the same he is not lacking in commonsense—does not understand this. Am I to understand that my friend, Mr. Bhandari, does not understand that the three Districts of East Pakistan cannot be annexed by passing a Resolution or by asking Shrimati Indira Gandhi or Sardarji or somebody else to annex them? It is not possible. If you make such a demand, feelings are roused and communal tension develops on both sides of the border. The result is, more refugees come. If you, by your behaviour and demands, create tension here it has repercussions on the other side of the border which results in greater influx of refugees and that is precisely what we want to prevent. That is why I say that this kind of demand should not be there. The problem is not one of conquest or annexation of each other's territory, the problem, internationally speaking, is one of still trying to normalise relations between the two countries. The

Government's policy towards Pakistan on the whole is a correct policy. It is guided by the Tashkent Declaration, a policy of friendship. We fully support it, and we would like more initiative to be taken in this direction so that this policy creates sympathetic vibrations in the mind of the people of Pakistan, both in the West and in the East. Our task here is not to assail the Government on the ground of its foreign policy in regard to Pakistan because the policy in regard to Pakistan has been one of friendship so far as we are concerned. If the other side is not reciprocating in the Tashkent spirit or in a worthy manner, it does not mean that we should take to the sword and solve the problem by the sword. It is not possible to do so, nor desirable to do so. In any case, it will be going against what we are preaching and on no account we should think in this term. Again, therefore, we should try—whatever be the hurdles and whatever be the difficulties—to reinforce the bonds of friendship and amity and normalise the relations between the two countries, especially the two Bengals, viz., East Bengal and West Bengal. I think initiative should be taken in this direction. I would invite your attention to the presence in this country of an illustrious freedom-fighter of undivided Bengal, Shri Trailokyanath Chakravarti, one of the leaders born in the anti-partition days of the undivided Bengal and in the earlier part of the century. He has spent thirty years in jail in the Andamans and so on. When the country was divided, he remained with his people saying: "I shall remain with my people. I will remain where I was born." People rewarded him, both Muslims and Hindus, by electing him to the Pakistan Assembly, but even there he was arrested. Today due to our efforts he is here on a visit. He is on a visit to meet his old revolutionary colleagues and friends. Trailokyanath Chakravarti, otherwise known as Maharaj, is a very poor man. That is his revolutionary pseudonym of that time. He is a man widely respected in both parts of Bengal today. He has been telling every Bengali audience he has met that

there is no communalism as such in East Pakistan today. There is insecurity and there are other things, but the communal menace and the communal propaganda or communal incitement that used to be there in the earlier years of independence is no longer there. He is paying a wholesome tribute to the student community belonging to the majority community in East Pakistan who are coming forward in defence of the rights and liberties of the people—he told me and he told Calcutta audiences—who are organising them—all students—in the name of Indian martyrs like Bhagat Singh, Surjya Sen, Khudiram Bose and others. Such are the new trends which are coming more and more into play and becoming more and more active in East Pakistan's political life. We should hail these forces of secularism and friendship and forces of democracy. We should not say or do anything which gives a handle to the communal forces either here or there in Pakistan. The people of Pakistan have gone through a great deal of suffering and sorrow under two successive military regimes. Now, they are rising, especially in East Pakistan, for having a broadly democratic order and many are fighting. Therefore, I think, that also we should take note of, because my friends of the Jan Sangh may demand a reversal of the policy towards Pakistan on the part of the Government of India, even though they would not make territorial claims in the style of Hitler, Goebbels or Goering, and say that our foreign policy should be one of hostility and bellicosity towards Pakistan. That is no answer at all. Our answer is secularism here. The more we are secular, the more we practise it in our life, the more we curb communalism on this side of the border, the greater will be the positive impact of this development on East Pakistan and also on its political life and the lesser will be the possibility of influx of refugees from that side to this side. That is how we should approach the problem. I need not go into it. You will be surprised, my friends here and may I tell them in all humility? I hope my friend, Mr. Bhandari, will not become needless.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

ly angry. Anyhow he is an old man compared to many people. He should not get angry. I tell you Jan Sangh people are carrying on propaganda causing incitement. Anand Marg has gone there to carry on incitement and to fish in troubled waters. And you will be knowing that smugglers on this side and that side are interested in smuggling people...

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Do not mix up issues.

Whom are you quoting?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not have any name, but I think Jan Sangh is a big party...

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Do not mix up issues.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If Jan Sangh will publish a gazette of its members, I will pick it up. Now, everybody knows it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Now you must finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Do not get angry. If you look angry, it is very bad. Now the Anand Marg has also gone there. Anand Marg and other communal organisations have gone there. They think it is a God-sent chance to trade on the suffering of the people, build up tension, create difficulties and help the jotedars there. The West Bengal administration which is using the Police, the Central Reserve Police and the Industrial Security Force, which had let loose the Central Reserve Police on the Jadavpur University campus only last Friday are not in a position to do anything about this kind of thing, this atrocious communal propaganda which is going on. I say shame on the part of this Government. I think communal propaganda should be stopped, and I am sure hon. Members will soon hear—because Shri Trilokyanath Chakravarty will be visiting Delhi before he goes back to East Pakistan in order to meet his old friends and others—you will hear from him the situation obtaining in Pakistan today. Let us take note not merely of the negative aspects of the situation in East Pakistan. Pakistan's

situation specially in East Pakistan is not static. It is also a developing situation today and people are more and more realising that friendship between Pakistan and India is a precondition for their prosperity and our prosperity. It is being realised. No refugees even according to the Government statement circulated to us are coming because of any communal tension. They are coming for other reasons. It is corroborated by the refugees who are coming themselves. Nobody is saying that they are coming because of communal riots or any such thing. They have a sense of insecurity. Certain things are happening and there are reactionaries who want these people to go away. Do you know that some of the extremist reactionaries, bigoted politicians in East Pakistan are interested in seeing that many of these members of the minority community cross the border before the general election takes place? Otherwise East Pakistan will claim a better share in the federal set-up because their population is higher. Therefore, these reactionaries are interested in creating provocations so that a large-scale migration of the minority community from that country takes place in order to make East Pakistan in population at least equal to, if not less than, that of the western wing of Pakistan. Politics are involved here, but our answer to that is not to excite communal passion, is not to foment communal tension, is not to speak in the language of bellicosity towards the people of Pakistan. We shall take them who are coming. This is our problem. We shall render them all possible material and moral assistance that we are capable of rendering, and at the same time we shall reiterate time and again our fervent desire for friendship and co-operation between Pakistan and India, specially between East Pakistan and West Bengal. Why should not we take the initiative for restoring trade and commerce between the two Bengals? I do not understand. Why should not we have greater travel facilities? These are the things to be discussed.

Once again I would urge upon the Government of India finally, before I

sit, that they should call a conference of all parties represented in Parliament immediately and discuss this problem as a human, national problem, a problem that concerns not only the unfortunate people who are crossing the border and trekking into this country, into an uncertain and dark future, but a problem concerning the nation as a whole. I think if all parties together sit and discuss this from a broad human angle, we can certainly work out a solution, set up a machinery for the enforcement of whatever good decisions we take. That is why I would like the House to make a constructive approach to a problem so national in its dimensions, so human in its appeal and so solemn and grave in its moral stature. I would therefore ask the Government to proceed to act rather than continue to dilly dally and display their tardiness in the matter of solution of the problem. These refugees are coming. They should not be treated in the queer manner in which they are being treated. We are in a better position today because part of the problem at least we have solved. We should take them in a kindly manner, give them all possible material help, rehabilitate them and make it possible for them to earn a livelihood. Gainful employment for the refugees is the crux of the matter. It is not a question of mere distribution of doles or relief occasionally. We must see that they become a part of our social structure and that they are rehabilitated in gainful employment in our society.

I would once again appeal to Members on both sides of the House. Let us at least not try to capitalise on this problem, the refugee problem. I would appeal to my friend here—with his great erudition and wisdom, he will bring a human approach to bear upon this subject. To my friend Mr. Sundar Singh Bhandari also I would appeal—politics let us keep away for a while. After all, we are human beings living in this part of the country. Here they are coming. Let us forget our differences on purely party lines for the time being. Let us approach this problem in a human manner as human beings, as man to man, as

brother to brother, as sister to sister. After all, those who are crossing into the frontier, they are not coming with political motives, they are not coming with the aim of supporting this or that party or of opposing this party or that party, they are coming here because of certain fears and apprehensions there, they are coming here in quest of life, in order to get settlement and rehabilitation. Let us treat them in a spirit of brother and sister taking brother and sister. Well, that is how, with a common national and human approach, we can correctly tackle and solve this problem.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, I move :

2. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :—

"and having considered the same, this House regrets the failure of the Government of India to take effective measures to compel Pakistan to honour the several Indo-Pak agreements regarding protection of minority interests, and also its failure to arrange adequately for the rehabilitation of the displaced persons."

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal) : Sir, I move :

3. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :—

"and having considered the same, this House urges upon the Government to take all necessary steps for the quick disposal and proper rehabilitation of the refugees and also to take every possible initiative in carrying forward, India's correct policy of Indo-Pakistan friendship in the Tashkent spirit."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, I move :

4. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :—

"and having considered the same, this House recommends to the Government that a Conference of the representatives of parties and groups in Parliament be held to discuss the question of the rehabilitation of the refugees and work out concrete effective steps."

*The questions were proposed.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Sundar Singh Bhandari.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह विषय जिस पर सभापति महोदय ने कालिंग अटेंशन के बाद एक विवाद के रूप में चर्चा करने का अवसर दिया, एक ऐसा विषय है जिसके बारे में इस समय सारे देश में चिन्ता है। पाकिस्तान से विशेषकर पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के क्षेत्र से जब से देश का विभाजन हुआ लगभग डेढ़ करोड़ हिन्दु बन्धु इधर आ चुके हैं। दोनों सरकारों की यह जिम्मेदारी थी कि वे अपने-अपने क्षेत्र में रहने वाले सभी नागरिकों, चाहे उनका धर्म कुछ भी हो देखभाल करेंगी। पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान के इतिहास के बारे में जाने की मुझे आवश्यकता नहीं है। पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में तत्काल कुछ ऐसी घटनाएं हुई हैं जिसके कारण वहां से हिन्दुओं को इधर आना पड़ रहा है।

मन् 1950 में वहां पर एक बड़ा हत्या-काण्ड हुआ था जिसमें 50 हजार हिन्दु मारे गये थे और उस समय भी पांच लाख हिन्दुओं को भारत में आकर शरण लेनी पड़ी थी। मन् 1964 में श्रीनगर में हजरतबल कांड हुआ था जिसमें बाल चुगये गये थे और उनकी प्रतिक्रिया के रूप में पूर्वी बंगाल के हिन्दुओं को उमका वजन उठाना पड़ा और तीस हजार हिन्दुओं को इस एवजाने में कत्ल कर दिया गया। मन् 1969 में फिर से यह क्रम चालू हो गया है। मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार कम से कम उन तथ्यों को न छिपाये कि वास्तव में कितने हिन्दु इस इलाके में आ गये हैं। यह जो आंकड़े इधर-उधर के दे दिये जाते हैं उनको छोटा करने में समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा और मैं इस पर एक बहुत बड़ा विवाद खड़ा करना नहीं चाहता हूं कि यह संख्या डेढ़ लाख के नीचे है या दो लाख तक पहुंच गई है लेकिन बंगाल और त्रिपुरा में ये लोग

आये हैं। अगर 1947 की आबादी के मुताबिक हम हिमाव लगायें तो इस समय उनकी आबादी करीब ढाई करोड़ से ऊपर होनी चाहिये थी। 1960 के सेंसस में मुश्किल से 90 लाख हिन्दु पाकिस्तान की जनगणना में दिखलाये गये हैं। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि जो बाकी हिन्दु रह गये हैं वे या तो इधर आ गये हैं या वहां पर कत्ल कर दिये गये हैं अथवा आज वे इस स्थिति में हैं कि वे अपने आप को हिन्दु नहीं कह सकते।

मैं यह मान सकता हूं कि आज अपने देश की राजनीति एक विशिष्ट रंग से दबी हुई है और जानबूझ कर हमें कई प्रश्नों को उनके वास्तविक रंग में लोगों के सामने उपस्थित करने में डर लगता है। आज हम इस हद तक चले जायें जैसा हमारे मित्र श्री भूपेश गुप्त कह रहे थे कि आज वहां से जो हिन्दु आ रहे हैं वह पाकिस्तान के किसी साम्प्रदायिक मनोवृत्ति का परिणाम नहीं है। अगर हम इस हद तक चले जायें तो हम एक विचार का पोषण करेंगे। मैं समझता हूं कि वहां के हिन्दुओं ने कोई गुनाह नहीं किया। उनका यही एक मात्र गुनाह है कि वे हिन्दु हैं और इसके अतिरिक्त कोई गुनाह नहीं है जिसकी वजह से वे भारत में खदेड़े जा रहे हैं। जो लोग वहां से खदेड़े जा रहे हैं उनमें खेतिहर मजदूर, दर्जी और छोटे दुकान करने वाले लोग हैं। आज वहां पर इस तरह की परिस्थिति पैदा कर दी गई है कि हिन्दुओं का इकोनॉमिक बायकाट है। उनकी दुकान में कोई सामान नहीं खरीदता है और अगर कोई खरीदने के लिए पहुंच जाय तो पैसा चुकाने की उसको जरूरत महसूस नहीं होती है। पैसा मांगने पर उसे धक्का देकर निकाल दिये जाने की भी नौबत आ जाती है। वहां पर हिन्दुओं की बहु बेटियों की कोई सुरक्षा नहीं है। अगर आज हिन्दु वहां से आ रहे हैं तो अपनी इज्जत बचाने के लिए और अपने को हिन्दु बनाये रखने के लिए ही पाकिस्तान से हिन्दुस्तान

में आ रहे हैं। अगर वे इज्जत लुटाने के लिए तैयार हैं, अगर वे अपना हिन्दुपन छोड़ने के लिए तैयार हैं तो वहां के लोग उन्हें खदेड़ने की चिन्ता नहीं करना चाहते हैं। तो यह जो प्रश्न है कि वे भगाये जा रहे हैं महज इस वजह से कि वे हिन्दु रहना चाहते हैं, अगर इस एक सत्य को हम यह अपने पोलिटिकल कंसिडरेशन के कारण इस तथ्य को भी सत्य के रूप में रखने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं तो मैं नहीं जानता कि इस सवाल को हम किस प्रकार से हल करेंगे।

मैं मानता हूं कि पाकिस्तान में चुनाव आने वाले हैं। वहां पर पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के नेता श्री मजीबुर्हमान, ये सरकारी पक्ष के विरोध में हैं और आज प्रचार चल रहा है क्योंकि हिन्दू वड़ा की सरकार की नीतियों से दुखी हैं, उसमें परिवर्तन चाहते हैं और ये सब श्री मजीबुर्हमान के समर्थक हो जायेंगे इसलिए इन्हें तिकाला जाय। मैं समझता हूं कि यह तो शायद उसी प्रकार की बात हुई कि जैसे यहां कांग्रेस सरकार ने मुसलमानों को कई बार कहा कि अगर तुम कांग्रेस की मदद नहीं करोगे तो तुम को पाकिस्तान भेज दिया जायेगा। मुझे इस बात की हैरानी है कि अगर यह कसौटी लागू हो समस्या के विचार करने के लिए और इन कसौटियों पर हम परिस्थितियों का विश्लेषण करना चाहते हैं तब तो हम अभी भी समस्या के तह में नहीं पहुंच सकेंगे। मैं समझता हूं कि इसके पीछे कोई राजनीतिक कारण नहीं है। यह एक सीधा सादा कारण है और वह यह है कि पाकिस्तान अपने मुल्क में हिन्दुओं को वर्दाश करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। कांस्टीट्यूशनली उन्हें सेक्न्ड रेड सिटीजन का दर्जा दे दिया गया है, और अब उन्हें सारे पाकिस्तान से समाप्त करना चाहते हैं और यही कारण है कि वहां के हिन्दुओं को खदेड़ा जा रहा है।

वहां पर हिन्दू किसी इलैक्ट्रेड पोस्ट के लिए कांटेस्ट नहीं कर सकता है कांस्टीट्यूशनली उनके लिए बार लगा रखा है। अगर कांस्टी-

ट्यूशनली इस तरह की बात है तो निश्चित है कि वहां की सिटीजनशिप समान नहीं है हिन्दुओं के लिए और मुसलमानों के लिए। मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के विधान में भी या अपने देश में भी पाकिस्तान की मिसाल के जवाब में कुछ कार्यवाही करें या जैसा उसने किया है वैसा हम भी करें। लेकिन हमारी एक जिम्मेदारी है अपने इन हिन्दू बन्धुओं के प्रति जो पाकिस्तान में रह गये हैं और देश के बंटवारे के बाद जो हमने एक राजनीतिक व्यवस्था की थी, उसके विवाद में मैं जाना नहीं चाहता हूं और न ही उसके इतिहास में जाना चाहता हूं, लेकिन यह जिम्मेदारी स्वीकार की गई थी कि इन लोगों के लिए भारत सरकार की जिम्मेदारी है कि पाकिस्तान में जो हिन्दू रह गये हैं उनकी जान माल और इज्जत के लिए वह कदम उठायेगी।

हम को मालूम है कि सन् 1950 में जब स्वर्गीय डा० श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी मंत्रिमंडल में थे तो उस समय पाकिस्तान में हिन्दू बन्धुओं के ऊपर जो अत्याचार हो रहा था उसके लिए उन्होंने सरकार से कहा था कि अपनी जिम्मेदारी निभाने के लिए उस कदम उठाना चाहिये। लेकिन पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ऐसा कदम उठाने के लिए तैयार नहीं हुए।

इस राष्ट्रीय महत्व के प्रश्न पर उन्होंने मंत्रिमंडल से अलग होने का फैसला किया। आज इस देश में इस प्रकार के उदाहरणों की बहुत कमी हो गई है कि राष्ट्रीय महत्व के प्रश्नों पर कोई व्यक्ति अपने सिद्धांतों के आधार पर कूर्सी को लात मार कर सदा के लिये उससे अलग हो जाय। डा० मुखर्जी इस सवाल पर अलग हुये थे तबन्तु इसके बाद भी वहां से हिन्दुओं के आने वाली जो लम्बी कतार है वह बन्द नहीं हुई है और वह इस तादाद पर पहुंची है कि इस बार भी दो लाख के करीब देश में आ गये। आज इस सवाल को हमें साफ तौर पर तय करना पड़ेगा कि केवल रिहैबिलिटेशन का ही यह सवाल न बन जाय। वैसे



हिन्दुस्तान में इस से पहले जितने पूर्वी पाकिस्तान से शरणार्थी बन्धु आये उनकी भी कोई बहुत अच्छी व्यवस्था नहीं हुई है। भूपेश बाबू भी इसको स्वीकार करेंगे कि 1964 में जो आये उनमें ज्यादातर हरिजन बन्धु थे और आज भी उनके रिहैबिलिटेशन की किसी प्रकार की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं हो पाई है। यहां आ कर उनकी आर्थिक स्थिति सुधर जायेगी, वहां उनके पास जमीन नहीं है और यहां आ कर उनको जमीन मिल आयगी या नौकरियां मिल जायेंगी, ऐसा कोई मोह उनको नहीं है जिस के कारण वे यहां आ रहे हैं। वे यह जानते हैं कि पांच या दस साल पहले आए हुए उनके बन्धुओं की भी हालत बदतर है। इस समय भी जिन रेफ्यूजी कैम्प में उनको रखा जा रहा है, उनमें हम लोग गये हैं और हमने यह देखा है कि उन कैम्प में घुटनों तक पानी भरा है। जहां उनको ठहराया गया है वहां हमने देखा है कि खुले आसमान के नीचे बरसात में, गर्मी में हजारों लोग बैठे हैं, उनके लिये कोई छाया नहीं है, किसी प्रकार का कोई इन्तजाम नहीं है। कलकत्ता और सियालदाह रेलवे स्टेशनों के मुसाफिरखानों में जा कर उनकी हालत का अन्दाजा लगाइये। पशुओं से बदतर हालत में वे आज वहां पर ठहरे हुए हैं। इस लिए कोई यहां बड़ा अच्छा इन्तजाम है, हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने कोई उनके लिये बहुत अच्छे स्वागत केन्द्र खोल रखे हैं, इनकी चर्चा जितनी कम की जाये उतना अच्छा है। मैं केवल इतना ही निवेदन करूंगा कि ऐसे रिसेप्शन सेंटर्स खोलने की बजाये व्यवस्थित रूप से ट्रांजिट कैम्प बनाने की आवश्यकता है। जब तक कि उनके लिये पर्मानेंट सेटिलमेंट का कोई इंतजाम न हो जाये तब तक उन्हें ठाक प्रकार से रखा जाये। लेकिन जैसा कि रिहैबिलिटेशन का सवाल है, केवल इस प्रश्न पर ही जोर दे कर इस समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा।

सवाल यह खड़ा होता है कि आज भी जो 80, 90 लाख हिन्दू पाकिस्तान में हैं, उनको इज्जत के साथ अपनी नागरिकता के नियमों के अंतर्गत रहने का अधिकार मिले, इसके लिये क्या हमारी सरकार या हमारा हिन्दुस्तान देश कोई व्यवस्था कराना चाहता है या नहीं कराना चाहता है? सरदार पटेल ने उस परिस्थिति में क्या किया था, भूपेश बाबू ने सुझाव के तौर पर उसका उल्लेख किया। आखिर वे भी इसी कांग्रेस सरकार के एक जिम्मेदार मंत्री थे। पाकिस्तान की नीतियों से यह देश परेशान है। पार्टिशन एग्रीमेंट के बाद ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट कुछ भी रहा हो, नेहरू-नून समझौता कुछ भी रहा हो, नेहरू-लियाकत समझौता कुछ भी रहा हो, पाकिस्तान जिस भाषा को समझ सकता है, उस प्रकार की भाषा का उपयोग सरदार पटेल ने किया था कि अगर पाकिस्तान अपनी जिम्मेदारी को नहीं समझता, तो हमें भी कोई इस प्रकार की बात करनी होगी। फिर जो पाकिस्तान बात करने के लिये तैयार नहीं था, सरदार पटेल के इस सुझाव के बाद कांग्रेस टेबिल पर बैठा था इस सवाल को हल करने के लिये और किसी न किसी प्रकार से हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के प्रतिनिधियों में बातचीत हुई, प्राइम मिनिस्टर्स लेबिल पर समझौता किया गया, जिसके कारण जां इंप्लेक्स उस समय जारी हुआ था, उसको रोकने में हमें कामियाबी हासिल हुई।

आज ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार यह मान कर बैठी है कि हम इस सम्बन्ध में कोई बातचीत नहीं कर सकते। आज तर्क यह दिया जाता है कि हम टाकिंग टर्म्स पर नहीं हैं, हम एक दूसरे से बात नहीं करते हैं। क्योंकि पाकिस्तान हमेशा काश्मीर का प्रश्न खड़ा कर देता है कि जब तक काश्मीर के प्रश्न को हल नहीं करोगे हम दूसरे विषय पर बैठ कर बातचीत करने के लिये तैयार नहीं होते हैं। लेकिन हमें हैरानी है कि पाकिस्तान ने

काश्मीर के प्रश्न को छोड़ कर फ़रक्का के बारे में बातचीत करना कैसे शुरू कर दिया। हम लोग फ़रक्का पर बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार हैं। उसके लिये दोनों देशों के प्रतिनिधि यहां दिल्ली में बैठ कर बातचीत कर सकते हैं, लेकिन हम उस समय भी यह चीज उठाने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं कि तुम्हारे लिये फ़रक्का का सवाल टाप प्रयत्ति का होगा, किन्तु तुम जिस प्रकार इन लोगों को खदेड़ कर यहां भेज रहे हो, पहले तुम इस सवाल को हल करो तब हम किसी दूसरे प्रश्न पर विचार करेंगे। हमें पाकिस्तान से कहना चाहिये कि कम से कम वह हमन प्राउंड्स पर इस प्रश्न पर विचार करने के लिये तैयार हो। हम उससे कहें कि जब तक तुम ईस्ट पाकिस्तान के हिन्दुओं के सवाल पर विचार करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हो, तब तक हम फ़रक्का पर भी कोई बातचीत नहीं करेंगे और यह हम पर निर्भर होगा कि हम किस प्रश्न को प्राथमिकता देना चाहते हैं।

आज जिन विषयों में पाकिस्तान का इंट्रेस्ट है, उन्हीं पर बातचीत होती है और हमसे कह दिया जाता है कि जिन विषयों में पाकिस्तान की रुचि नहीं है, उनको हम न उठायें, इसलिये कि उसमें हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध बिगड़ जायेंगे। हम भी नहीं चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध बिगड़े, लेकिन संबंध न बिगड़ें इस दृष्टिकोण में तो सवाल पाकिस्तान के इंट्रेस्ट के हैं, जिनके लिये कोई प्राइम फ़ेसी केस नहीं है, जिनको डिसकस करने को वह तैयार नहीं है, उन पर हम बातचीत चलाना चाहते हैं, आगे चलने को तैयार हैं और यह इम्प्रेसन दे रहे हैं कि हमने कोई सक्सेसफुल बातचीत कर ली है। कोई न कोई रास्ता निकाल लिया है। आज सरकार को यह एक्सप्लेन करने को ज़रूरत है कि सारा प्रेस स्टेटमेंट जो दोनों देशों से जारी हुआ है, उसके पीछे कौनसा रहस्य है। यह सवाल खड़ा

होगा। लेकिन पाकिस्तान किसी भी प्रकार से एक इम्प्रेसन क्रिएट करवाने में कामियाब हो जाता है। अब अगर डायलाग नहीं होते दोनों देशों के बीच में तो फ़रक्का पर डायलाग क्यों हो रहा है? और अगर डायलाग होता है तो ईस्ट पाकिस्तान के रेफ्यूजीज के सवाल को इस सारी बातचीत में पहला स्थान क्यों नहीं प्राप्त हुआ? क्या भारत सरकार इस समस्या पर विचार नहीं करना चाहती? इस समस्या को हल करने की जिम्मेदारी नहीं समझती? ये लाखों लोग हिन्दुस्तान में रिफ्यूजीज बन कर आते चले जा रहे हैं, उनके रिहबिलिटेशन का उत्तरदायित्व भारत सरकार का है या वे पाकिस्तान में बने रहें और उनके घर मकान और उनकी इज्जत वहां सुरक्षित रहे, क्या इसकी जिम्मेदारी हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की नहीं है और अगर भारत सरकार इस सवाल को उठाना नहीं चाहती तो हमें इस सरकार पर यह इल्जाम लगाना पड़ेगा कि उसने उनके प्रति अपने कर्तव्य को भुलाने का प्रयत्न किया है और वह भी केवल यहां की राजनीतिक परिस्थिति में एक विशेष प्रकार की अवस्था पैदा करने के लिये और अपने राजनैतिक स्वार्थों की पूर्ति करने के लिये। सरकारी कांग्रेस का जो अधिवेशन हुआ हिन्दु साम्प्रदायिकता का उस में उन्होंने एक दूसरा हौवा खड़ा करने की कोशिश की, लेकिन जो लोग पूर्वी पाकिस्तान से आ रहे हैं उन को तो कोई दूसरा नाम नहीं दिया जा सकता सिवाय हिन्दू के और पाकिस्तान उनको केवल हिन्दू होने के नाते ही भगा रहा है। उनके बारे में विचार करने से उन के कम्युनलिज्म रूपी छाछ में जो उन्होंने पैदा किया था कुछ खटाई पड़ती इसलिये अधिवेशन में पाकिस्तान से आ रहे इन रिफ्यूजीज के बारे में विचार करने की आवश्यकता नहीं महसूस की गई। हम लोगों ने मई के सेशन में इस सवाल को उठाया था और लेबर-मिनिस्टर ने इस संबंध में एक स्टेटमेंट भी दिया था। लेकिन सरकारी कांग्रेस ने केवल

## [श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

एक पैकट फार्डिङ्ग कमेटी के वहां जाने की बात उस सारे सेशन में कही। पता नहीं कौन-सी बासी घड़ी में उस की याद आ गई कि कहीं अगले सेशन में यह बात कहने को न हो जाये इस लिए वह टीम वहां जा कर एक चक्कर लगा आयी। मेरा यह कहना है कि जिस कैलसनेस का परिचय सरकार ने इस सवाल पर दिया है वह निन्दनीय है। सरकार ने इस जिम्मेदारी के प्रति अपने कर्तव्य को नहीं निभाया। सरकार को इस के लिए वर्ल्ड ओपीनियन त्रियेट करने में पहल करनी चाहिए। आखिरकार इंटरनेशनल फोरम किस लिए होते हैं? इस प्रकार का रिफ्यूजीज का प्रश्न केवल भारत तक ही सीमित नहीं है। अगर अन्य देश इन रिफ्यूजीज के प्रश्नों पर वर्ल्ड ओपीनियन मोबिलाइज कर सकते हैं तो भारत सरकार यूनाइटेड नेशन्स के फोरम का उपयोग क्यों नहीं कर सकती? अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जनमत जागरण के लिए सभी प्रयत्न क्यों नहीं कर सकती कि पाकिस्तान इस संबंध में क्या कर रहा है, क्या नीति अपना रहा है और किस नीति से कार्य कर रहा है और किस प्रकार के अमानवीय अत्याचार वहां के निवासियों पर किये जा रहे हैं। इस संबंध में भारत सरकार कोई वर्ल्ड ओपीनियन बनाने में अभी तक असफल रही है। सरकार को इस के लिए पब्लिक ओपीनियन बनानी चाहिए। पाकिस्तान किस नीयत से यह काम कर रहा है यह बात लोगों के सामने उपस्थित करने की आवश्यकता है और किसी न किसी प्रकार वहां के हिन्दू फिर से इज्जत के साथ पाकिस्तान में रह सकें इस बात को पुरःस्थापित करने की जिम्मेदारी भारत सरकार की है। हाथ पर हाथ रख कर, बैठे रह कर हम क्या कर सकते हैं, वे तो पाकिस्तान में रहने वा हैं। हम उनके बारे में क्या कदम उठा रहे हैं अगर वह इधर आयें तो?

आज के स्टेटमेंट में रिहैबिलिटेशन मिनिस्टर साहब ने फिर कहा कि वे विदआऊट प्रापर पेपर्स आ रहे हैं। उस दिन भी मैं ने यह सवाल उठाया था कि इस प्रकार से धकेल दिये जाने वाले व्यक्तियों के पास, जिन के शरीर पर कपड़ा तक सुरक्षित नहीं है, जो रास्ते में लूट लिए जाते हैं, उन के पास आप प्रापर पेपर्स की अपेक्षा करते हैं, तो उन्होंने कहा था कि हम ने इसलिए उसकी जरूरत नहीं समझी। मैं जानना चाहता चाहूंगा कि इस बात के बाद आज के स्टेटमेंट में उस बात को फिर रिपीट क्यों किया गया है कि वे विदआऊट प्रापर पेपर्स हिन्दुस्तान में आ रहे हैं। तो मैं चाहूंगा कि अपनी प्रोसीडिंग्स और अपने रेकार्ड्स यह सरकार फिर से देखे और आज के स्टेटमेंट में जो प्रापर पेपर्स की बात कही गयी है उस पर सरकार फिर विचार करे। अगर यही रवैया है तो मैं ऐसा समझता हूं कि यह सरकार अपने कर्तव्य को ठीक प्रकार से निभाने के लिए तैयार नहीं। यहां पर वे पाकिस्तान के नागरिक माने जाते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा में प्रवेश करने के बाद जो कुछ भी बचा खुचा उन के पास रह गया था, कई बार वह भी उन से लूटा गया है। उन की वेटियां उन से छीनी जाती हैं और उन पर अत्याचार हुए हैं और इस के लिए डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट और एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन यह प्ली ले रहा है कि वे इंडियन सिटीजन नहीं हैं। हम उन के लिए कुछ नहीं कर सकते। यह एक ऐसी परिस्थिति है कि जिस पर हम को क्लर्म आनी चाहिए। आज वे वहां से पीड़ित होकर परेशान हो कर आये हैं और यहां आ कर वे हमारी राजनीतिक सौदेबाजी का शिकार हों यह ठीक बात नहीं है। वहां से वे अपने घर से, अपनी जमीन से, अपने व्यवसाय से उजड़ कर यहां आये हैं और हम इस प्ली पर कि वे इंडियन सिटीजन नहीं हैं उन की जान माल की रक्षा न करें, हमारा एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन उन की रक्षा की जिम्मेदारी लेने को तैयार

न हो, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जर्म की बात है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस संबंध में तुरन्त आदेश दे कि एक भी हिन्दू बन्धु अगर देश की सीमा कास कर के इधर आ जाता है, अपनी जान बचा कर आ जाता है तो भारत सरकार को उस के प्रति अपनी जिम्मेदारी को महसूस करना चाहिए। सारे ला आफ दि लैंड को उस को प्रोटेक्शन देना चाहिए। उस को सेफ्टी देना चाहिए, और जिस तरह से आज यदि क्वार्टर्स में, जहाँ आज घुटनों तक पानी भरा हुआ है उस जगह उन के तम्बू बनाने से बार्ड लाभ नहीं होगा। उन का इंतजाम किसी अच्छी जगह पर करना चाहिए, उन की बीमारी के लिए, उन के रहने के लिए, उन के सेटलमेंट के लिए हम को पूरी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए।

मुझे इस बात की ख़ुशी है कि आज राम कृष्ण मिशन वहाँ सेवा कार्य कर रहा है। हम लोग भी वहाँ इसी के लिए गये। हमारे भूपेश बाबू ने कहा कि पोलिटिकल कंसीडरेशन्स से इस सवाल को नहीं देखा जाना चाहिए। हम उनके लिए कपड़े ले कर गये, दवाईया ले कर गये पर हम लोगों को वहाँ से हटा दिया गया यह कह कर कि तुम लोग जनसंघ पार्टी के लोग हो, तुम कम्युनल हो, तुम यहाँ अनाज और वपड़ा बांटोगे तो सांप्रदायिकता का प्रचार करोगे इस लिए इन तंबूओं में से रिलीफ कैंप्स से निकल जाओ क्या यह आप के नान-पोलिटिकल करेक्टर का नमूना है? मैं चाहूँगा कि भूपेश बाबू इस बात की इक्वारी करें कि अगर यही तरीका है बंगाल सरकार का, तो किस मुंह से वह इस सवाल को नान-पोलिटिकल और नेशनल सवाल बना कर सब के सहयोग लेने की बात करते हैं। वह अपना मुँह जरा जीधे में देखें कि वह किस नीयत से यह सब बातें करना चाहते हैं।

श्री महाबोर त्यागी : कपड़ा बंटवाने से उन्होंने रोक दिया ?

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : I do not say anything without facts. हमारे लोग गये और लौट आये और उन्होंने शिकायत की है कि उन को कहा गया कि तुम लोग तंबू में से निकल जाओ। मैं चाहूँगा कि रिहैबिलिटेशन निमिस्टर इस को देखें। अगर वह समझते हैं कि यह ह्यूमन प्राब्लम है और ह्यूमैनिटेरियन अप्रोच उन के रिहैबिलिटेशन में आना चाहिए तो उन को, और इस सवाल को पोलिटिकल दृष्टि से न देखा जाये। दूसरा कोई मदद न करे और हम करना चाहते हैं तो कह दे कि तुम तो सांप्रदायिक हो, तो अगर सरकार का यही रवैया रहा तो फिर यही कहना पड़ेगा कि उन को इस बदतर हालत में इस लिए आप रखना चाहते हैं कि यह नक्सलवादियों के लिए सूखी घास फूस बन कर रहें जिस में जब चाहे चिन्गारी पैदा की जा सके। अगर वे इसी हालत में रहेंगे तो किसी भी फसाद पैदा करने वाले व्यक्ति के लिए बड़ा आसान होगा कि वे ऐसे भूखे मानव में जब चाहे चिन्गारी पैदा कर सके और ऐसा होने पर बंगाल को जलाना बड़ा सरल हो जाएगा। अगर हम परोक्ष रूप से इस प्रकार की परिस्थिति को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तब तो सरकार को इस नीति के संबंध में मुझे कुछ कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं लेकिन अगर हम बंगाल की स्थिति में मुद्धार देखना चाहते हैं, अगर हम इन शरणार्थी बंधुओं की परिस्थिति को वास्तव में हल करना चाहते हैं तो हम को चाहिए कि हम उन के रिहैबिलिटेशन का इंतजाम करें और पाकिस्तान के साथ इस संबंध में कैसे बात शुरू की जा सकती है इस पर विचार करें। यह असंभव है कि रास्ता न निकले। पाकिस्तान को भी दमियों बातों के संबंध में हम से बात करनी होती है। हम कुछ चीजों को ले कर कोशिश करें, कुछ अनिवार्य प्रश्न ऐसे हो सकते हैं दोनों देशों के बीच में कि जिन पर हम डिप्लोमैटिक लेवल पर बात कर सकते हैं, उन में यह भी आ सकता

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

है। लेकिन अगर हम ही अपनी जिम्मेदारी को निभाना नहीं चाहते तब तो भगवान भी हमारी सहायता नहीं कर सकता और फिर उन बंधुओं को जो हिन्दू हैं पाकिस्तान में उन को परमात्मा के भरोसे छोड़ने के अति-रिक्त और कोई दूसरा चारा नहीं रह जायेगा। इस सरकार को मैं चार्ज करूंगा कि वह इस दिशा में अपनी जिम्मेदारी निभाने में असफल रही है और उस को इस के लिए प्रायश्चित्त करना चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : May I request the coming speakers to limit themselves to 10 minutes ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : It is not possible.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Mysore) : It is not possible.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta spoke for one hour. Mr. Bhandari spoke for half an hour. Why are you making this limitation? Why should good sense dawn upon the Chair at a late stage? I would like to know this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Shri Bhupesh Gupta was the Mover. And, if you see the list, half a dozen people have given their names in the Calling Attention Notice. Now, if the House wants everybody should have half an hour each, I have no objection.

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : If you are doing it party-wise, then every party must have a say. Why say '10 minutes' then? You leave that to our good sense.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is in the fitness of things that we are debating this important issue today, the first day of

this Session, and it is proper that the House should debate a problem which has wider dimensions, important 3 P.M. implications. It has got a moral aspect, a humanitarian aspect, as my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, said, it has also got a political aspect and also an international aspect. Sir, apart from this, it has got a historical aspect. If you are students of history, you know that there are very exceptional periods where you have seen such a tragic phenomenon occurring on a large scale. After Christ, in those days when Christianity was spreading, we have heard there was a great exodus, we have heard there was a great movement of humanity from one area to another area. Such instances are rare in history. There have been interprovincial migrations and inter-State migrations of a sort confined to a period. But this problem which we are facing here is without parallel in history. And I want to highlight this aspect. My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, soft-pedalled the whole question and talked at a very low key but you look at the whole problem in its perspective, you will see the ghastliness, the gravity and the seriousness of the problem. The tragic drama of all this exodus from East Pakistan to India has been going on since the days of partition. This adds to the gravity of the situation: it has been going on year after year and it looks as if Pakistan has to supply refugees and we have to receive them at this end and in this process all the policies and all the measures are brushed away on the ground that we cannot provide an answer to this question.

Sir, it is in the year 1950 that the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact came into existence and that Pact has visualised this problem in a nutshell. What does that Pact say?

The Pact begins with this statement :

"The Governments of India and Pakistan solemnly agree that each shall ensure to the minorities throughout its territory complete equality of citizenship, irrespective of religion, and

full sense of security in respect of life, culture, property and personal honour, freedom of movement within each country and freedom of occupation, speech and worship, subject to law and morality. Members of the minorities shall have equal opportunity with members of the majority community to participate in the public life of their country, to hold political or other office and to serve in their country's civil and Armed Forces. Both Governments declare these rights to be fundamental."

Mark these words :

"...and undertake to enforce them effectively".

This is how the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan in 1950 looked at this problem.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** By which Minister it was agreed to ?

**SHRI M. S. SURUPADASWAMY :** Jawaharlal Nehru on our side and Liaquat Ali Khan on the other side. This was the attitude, this was the perspective and this was the appreciation of the facts at that time in 1950. May I ask my hon. friend Sardar Swaran Singh, whether there is now any shift or change in the appreciation of the facts since 1950 ? May I know whether there has been a transformation in the attitude of the Government of India in the matter of dealing with the refugees ? The most important aspect of the whole problem is our attitude, the attitude of the Government, the approach of the Government, the policy of the Government in this matter. May I know whether we adhere to the enunciation made in the Agreement in 1950 or has there been a change ? Have we forgotten it or has it been consigned to the vaults of the Secretariat or do we adhere or believe that that should be the perspective which should guide us in all our dealings with Pakistan ? I said that the situation has no parallel in history and this drama of exodus, the influx of refugees, is going on from year to year, for more than two decades since the

very days of partition. Even in the seventies, the tragedy is, we are in the same place as we were in 1950. There is no change. The only change seems to be the change in the attitude of the Government in dealing with this question. That seems to be the only change that I see. In 1970, twenty-five years after partition, we witness a great exodus from East Pakistan. People have come not in tens or hundreds. They have come in thousands. The population of the refugees is swelling day by day and apart from the fact that we are to make adequate arrangements for taking care of the refugees, what is the political attitude of the Government ? We have been hearing for some time past that we should settle the Farakka issue. We have been listening that we have to settle the water dispute but what has happened to this refugee problem ? If Mr. Gupta thinks it is a human problem, is it not a human problem for Pakistan ? If it is a human problem for us, it is also to be a human problem to the Pakistan Government.

Sir, in that historic Agreement, which has been buried, destroyed, mauled and thrown away into the dust-bin of history, there are the provisions, if such situations are repeated, how the respective Governments have got to deal with the situations. For instance, Sir, if the refugees come in large numbers leaving behind their properties in their respective areas, the arrangements have been suggested there how this problem has got to be tackled, how these movable and immovable properties have got to be taken care of. And there are various other provisions which suggest the ways and means to establish normalcy. Sir, special fines have been provided for or have been contemplated in the arrangement. But nothing is being done. At least this Government is fond of repeating itself. Why should not this Government repeat what has been agreed to in 1950, what has been agreed to by the Government of India and by the Government of Pakistan ? And are we to be always at the receptive or the receiving end, and should East Pakistan be

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.]  
the land to supply refugees to us? Is it the kind of inter-relationship, or the relationship to be built between Pakistan and India? Sir, I would beg of you and the House not only to look at this problem from the human point of view, from the humanitarian point of view, but also from the political point of view. And the Government of India has got to see this problem in the correct perspective; this is very important. Let me tell you; there will be more refugees coming from East Pakistan; it is not going to stop. And let me tell you we have got to make more and more arrangements to take care of these refugees. I am sure my Jana Sangh friends will always find fault with your rehabilitation arrangements. I am also sure that the Government machinery is not adequate to provide quick and prompt assistance to these refugees, the jobs, the land or any other facilities that are required for these refugees. But how do we deal with this question? Have we to say only that we are helpless and that just on humanitarian considerations we only go on receiving these refugees, that the passports should not operate, the visas should not operate, the permit system should not operate, that the refugees can come and we are prepared to take them? We have got to take them no doubt. But should we not, as a responsible Government, think of some measures, some effective steps? Sir, instead of going to the negotiating table to discuss the Farakka issue, can't we say, "No Farakka unless this problem is solved"? Why don't you say this? I am making this suggestion with a full sense of responsibility. The Farraka issue is a minor issue. It is not a major issue, and compared to this issue, Sir, it pales into insignificance. Can't we say as a Government, "No Farakka unless you solve this issue"? Can you do that? Are there no instances in history where embargoes are applied on minor issue? Take South Africa. My friend Swaran Singh is very familiar with South Africa. I don't impute motives to him. I only impute ineffectiveness to him. Now what has happened in South Africa? In South Africa

the worst kind of racialism was practised. And there was only discrimination; there was no suffering of this nature, of this magnitude. And what has the world done?

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN, (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH) in the Chair]

There the United Nations has applied sanctions, it has applied embargo against South Africa.

Take the case of Berlin. What has happened? What is Berlin before this problem? In Berlin the Soviet Union threatened blockade. When the Soviet Union threatened blockade and applied physical blockade, the blockade was broken by airlift by the western countries to save the population from starvation and misery. May I ask whether this problem is less important? May I ask whether this problem is less serious, less grave than those problems? I think everybody will agree with me that the problem of the Berliner, that the problem of the Negroes and the coloured people of South Africa, is far less in magnitude and seriousness than the problem of these refugees here. And what have we done? Can't we at least say to Pakistan? You have the military strength; I do not want you to use it. Atom bomb has been produced by China but it cannot use it. America has produced atom bomb but it won't use it. So are we not in a position to say firmly, are we not in a position to use the language that is understood by the Pakistan? And we are not communalists; everybody in this country is an equal citizen with everybody else. We are secular, we are democratic but at the same time when you are dealing with an ultra-reactionary State in our neighbourhood what is the attitude you have to take? My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has been saying, "no communalism". But where is communalism in this? If it is also humanitarian problem, it is a humanitarian problem; if it is a political problem, it is a political problem and it has got to be tackled on that basis. This is a problem which touches thousands and thousands of refugees here and if we do not want to make West Bengal and its

I would like Shri Swaran Singh to

Finally, I beg of the Government to be more effective. It comes to that ultimately. That is the most important thing. It has got to be effective and when the Government calls a meeting of the political parties, I would like the



[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.]

Minister to unravel, to divulge or to tell the political parties what are the steps that are being contemplated by the Government and in the light of the suggestions made by them they may be modified.

With these words, I once again express my appreciation of the fact that this problem has been taken up on the very first day of the Session and the whole House is very much anxious and concerned about this question. I hope the importance of this debate will not be lost and I am sure the Government will be earnest to pay heed to the suggestions made on the floor of the House.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this problem of refugees from East Pakistan has been with us for the last twenty years and I suppose we have debated in this House this question more than half-a-dozen times without coming to any decision. The last time we talked about this question we thought that the flow of refugees would stop and it would be possible for us to rehabilitate them to the best of our ability. Now, we find, after two months, that the flow instead of stopping has increased and it is not possible for anybody, the Government Benches included to say when this flow will stop.

I have no doubt, Sir, that so far as Pakistan is concerned there is a deliberate design behind this problem. The design seems to be that the Pakistan Government would like to squeeze out the minority people and see to it that no Hindu remains on the soil of Pakistan. So far as West Pakistan is concerned it can be said that they have almost succeeded. It is only in East Pakistan that we find about 1 crore of Hindus still living. Sir, I was told by a man who knows that during the last twenty years nearly 1.50 crores of them have come. Just look at this problem from the logistic point of view and you will find that it is really a stupendous task to rehabilitate 1.50 crores of people. It was not only the refugees from

East Pakistan but the refugees from West Pakistan also who had to be rehabilitated. But this flow continues, and only this afternoon we were told by the Minister in charge of Labour and Rehabilitation that almost every day 1,000 refugees or 1,500 refugees are coming in. So far as the humanitarian aspect of this question is concerned I wholeheartedly agree with what has been suggested so far, that they should be treated with respect, with affection. They are coming, leaving behind their lands, their property, their kith and kin, in the high hope that once they cross the border they will be amongst friends. This hope should not be destroyed. Let the Central Government come before the House and say that they want to spend ten or fifteen or twenty crores of rupees or whatever the sum might be, and I am confident that this House will not hesitate even for a moment to sanction this amount, because whatever our difficulties, these refugees will have to be provided for. The pathetic tale about the sorrows and sufferings of these people need not be recounted here, which we can very well imagine, but, Sir, the most important problem that I want to place before this House is the sort of tensions that this constant flow of refugees is likely to create and is creating in India. Why Pakistan is doing this has been made very plain by some of the leaders in East Pakistan. Mr. Majhi-bur Rahman, for instance, is on record as having said that because the Pakistan Government fears that the votes of these Hindus will be cast in favour of the progressive forces, the Pakistan Government and the parties who are afraid of their voting are trying to send them out of Pakistan as soon as possible; at least before the elections they want to see that more and more Hindus cross the border. But let us try to understand the tensions that are being created here. I call myself a secularist and I think India should be proud of the fact that it has adopted secularism as its main tenet, main principle of administration. But just imagine what effect these refugees are creating here. They are coming from a land which is a theo-

cratic State and no sympathy is shown towards them in spite of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact to which my friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, just now referred. The clauses are there. It has been said emphatically that minorities will enjoy all the rights which are available to the majority. The Ministers will meet whenever a contingency arise and there will be a sort of permanent Commission which will go into these problems.

The pact says, if they cross the border, they must carry so much gold, so much cash, that their property will be safe in the hands of the Custodian. We have got the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact here. But is it worth more than a scrap of paper? Pakistan does not want to honour it.

Therefore we are really faced with this problem; all of us, whether we belong to the ruling party or we sit in the Opposition, we are saying that this problem is stupendous, that this problem should be met immediately. But how? And there we come to a hurdle, which all of us seem unable to cross. What do we do? Just now, my friend, Shri Bhandari, quoted Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. And if I may refer to my own speech last time, I suggested that the Government of India should say that if this sort of constant flow continues, Pakistan will have to give India a piece of land where they can be rehabilitated.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : It is very legitimate.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : It is legitimate. There is no chauvinism in it, there is no communalism in it. If they go on pushing across the borders hundreds and thousands and lakhs of people, one crore and fifty lakhs, what do you do with them? How can you accommodate them? You are spreading them throughout India. Sir, only a few days back I met a Minister of Maharashtra who said, "Look at the tension that is being created" here. We are bringing the refugees and settling them here in the land of Maharashtra. When we provide for them cottages, when we give

them land, when we give them bullocks, when we try to find out some other facilities for them, then the Adivasis who are staying there say, 'Why are you not doing it for us? They have come only yesterday. We have been here for hundreds of years. You have done nothing for us. And you say that you do not have the necessary funds. But here you bring them and they are treated like this and we are neglected. Centuries after centuries we have been neglected. There is no answer to this.'

Another tension that is likely to be created is this. I am really glad that in West Bengal there is no communal trouble so far. But I do not think that anybody can guarantee, when lakhs of Hindus are crossing the borders, that there will not be any communal tension. When our young people, when so many people see that the Hindus are being pushed across, that they are being treated like this, that their condition is worse than cattle or slaves, do you mean to say that they will remain quiet? What is the use of our saying that we must be secular, this, that, etc., when the other nation, our neighbour, is not ready to observe the rules of the game? I am really surprised that the Prime Minister is not here. I wanted the Prime Minister to be here. She was in Calcutta. The PSP led a demonstration and they requested her to visit some of the camps and she said that she was sorry that she had not got the time, that she would visit the camps some time afterwards. She did not visit the camps. I do not blame her. But she could have at least attended this debate; she could have defined her attitude; she could have defined the attitude of her Government. I am sure that Swaran Singhji will do it. But I would also say that it is the Prime Minister who is primarily concerned with this because it is the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact that forms the basis of this problem. As she is the Prime Minister now it is her responsibility to see that this Pact is implemented. If it is not implemented, it is her responsibility to see that something else is done.

Sir, therefore, I am saying that I am sorry that she is not here. I am also sorry—let me be very frank because I consider myself a secularist; I can afford to be frank because I have condemned the Hindus when riots occurred in Ahmedabad; I have condemned them when riots occurred in Bhiwandi; I have condemned them when riots occurred in Jalgaon. I am ashamed that those riots occurred, I am ashamed that the minority community had to suffer. But I am equally ashamed to find that when this constant flow of refugees is coming from Pakistan, no responsible Muslim in India is speaking in clear terms. Why does it happen? Why should they not arise their voice and say that they condemn it? Why are they keeping quiet? For me it is not easy to condemn the Hindu population in Bhiwandi and Jalgaon. I am living in Maharashtra. I am living in a locality which is predominantly and exclusively Hindu. Do you mean to say I am not running a risk? Tomorrow you will have to run the risk. I would like my Muslim friend to stand up and say that this is un-Islamic, that this is not humanitarian and that they condemn Pakistan for this sort of thing.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : I have done that.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : The voice must be raised so that the whole world can hear it. I expect at least this sort of thing from the people who sit here in Parliament. I do not think even after the elections in Pakistan there is going to be a single Hindu in the Parliament of Pakistan. We have Muslims all over here. We find them occupying honourable posts in every sphere of life. They are prominent citizens who belong to the Islamic faith. Whenever they are discriminated against, we raise our voice. But here is a tragedy that is happening for the last 25 years and nobody is taking note of it. What is this?

Sir somebody should wake up the Government. What about the mass media? Here I would like to point out to

you an advertisement in the New York Times that was published by many Muslim organisations. If you like, you may look up the 12th July issue of the New York Times quoting the Prime Minister, quoting Mr. Khushwant Singh and quoting Mr. Chavan, the then Home Minister. This appeal has been sponsored by the Muslim Students Association of United States and Canada, International Islamic Federation of Student Organisations, Federation of Islamic Associations in the United States and Canada, Dar-ul-Islam, America, Islamic Mission of America, New York, Islamic Service Organization, New Jersey, Muslim Youth Committee, New York, The Mosque of Islamic Brotherhood, Inc. Brooklyn and Manhattan, and the Islamic Cultural Center of New York. This is how the advertisement begins. They are referring to the riots in Ahmedabad and other places.

A HON. MEMBER : What is the headline?

SHRI N. G. GORAY : The headline is :

"Should human beings be killed for their religion?"

This has appeared in the New York Times. About Rs. 75,000 must have been spent over it. What do they say?

श्री शेरखा : कौन से मुस्लिम आर्गेनाईजेशन हैं ?

श्री एन० जी० गोरे : बहुत से मुस्लिम आर्गेनाइजेशन उधर के हैं ।

"The question is appalling.

And the answer emphatic :

'No, not in this day and age.'

Yet the fact is that human beings are being killed, by the hundreds, sometimes by the thousands, for their religion in India. By whom? By the same Hindu militant organizations which were responsible for the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi.

Massacres of Muslims occur in India every year. In 1969, there was one murderous riot a day. The well-known Indian author, Khushwant Singh, in an editorial, writes :—

It goes on quoting the Prime Minister and the then Home Minister, Mr. Chavan and all these people.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : How have they referred to it ?

SHRI N. G. GORAY : It goes on to say :—

“Communal riots have become ugly facts of our daily lives. We know that nine out of ten killed are Muslims. Nine out of ten homes and business establishments destroyed are Muslim homes or enterprises. To add to the tyranny and injustice, the vast majority of those apprehended and victimized by the administration are also Muslims.” (*Illustrated Weekly of India*, May 31, 1970).

“India's Home Minister, speaking in the Indian Parliament on the carnage that occurred in May this year near Bombay, confirmed that :

“An entire wedding-party of 19 Muslims was burnt alive by a Hindu mob. (*The Times London* : May 13, 1970).

“Another mob set fire to a Muslim widow's hut when her four children, aged 9, 7, 5 and 3, were inside...

Said the Indian Home Minister, “I have seen this mother's face and it will haunt me for the rest of my life.” (*The Sun, Baltimore* : May 17, 1970).

India's Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, compared these killings perpetrated by extremist Hindus with murders carried out in Nazi Germany. (*Daily Telegraph, London*, June 15, 1970).

And it goes on in the same vein. I am one with the then Home Minister, Mr. Chavan, that the face of that unfortunate woman will haunt him. But will not the face of these people from East

Pakistan haunt him ? The faces of these unfortunate refugees will haunt me. I do not know whether they haunt those on the treasury benches.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) : These statements were meant for home consumption, not for foreign consumption.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Whatever it is.

श्री शेरखां : गोरे साहब, इनको उन से कम्पेयर करने की क्या जरूरत है ?

श्री एन० जी० गोरे : मैं जो कह रहा हूँ, उस को सुनिए, उस से पता चलेगा ।

What I wanted to say is that this sort of propaganda is being carried on in America and the world over. They are trying to create a world opinion against India. In spite of our best efforts these unfortunate things have happened and we are fully awake to them. We are trying our best to stop them. We are trying to compensate for them. All these things we are doing. There is a very strong popular voice, right from the Prime Minister down to a political worker, which is raised against these atrocities. Is there anything like that happening in Pakistan ? And what are our Ambassadors doing abroad ? Should they not tell the world “Well, these things have happened in India; we are ashamed of them. We are trying to see that such things do not occur again. But what about these 25 years in which this flow of refugees from East Pakistan has never abated ? Can't you publish pictures of them ? Can't you give eye-witness accounts ? Can't you invite a photographer to go and take pictures ? Why should we not allow Mr. Kushwant Singh to go there and describe the plight of the refugees in these camps ? So, I think that the question that was raised by my friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy is a very important question. It is the cardinal question : What is the attitude of the Government of India towards these people ? Have they revised their attitude ? Or, do they feel

[श्री एन० जी० गोरे]

that they are so helpless that all that they can do is to stay at the receiving end and allow the refugees to come and treat them as they best can? Is that the attitude? If that is the attitude, well, let us be very clear in our minds that in five or ten years there will not be a single Hindu left in Pakistan, and we shall have to accommodate all of them here. If that is so, again in every year's Budget, let us make some provision for them, say, Rs. 10 crores for refugees, because they are bound to come every year till there is no Hindu left there. And if that is the attitude, if that is our calculation, if that is the basis on which we are going to function, then, Sir, it will be very difficult to keep our secular stance; let me warn you. These refugees are now going to spread all over India. Refugees are going to Maharashtra; they are going to Madhya Pradesh; they are going to Madras; they are going to Mysore. Everywhere these refugees are going. And they will carry tales. It is not that they will keep mum. "Where have you come from?" "From East Pakistan." "Why?" "Because we were Hindus." Therefore, Sir, I am warning Shri Swaran Singh and the Prime Minister also—Shri K. K. Shah is here; I hope he will carry this to the Prime Minister—that we feel very much agitated over this issue. You must be able to talk to Pakistan in the terms which it understands. The Farakka Barrage issue was raised. It is absolutely correct. You should say that no discussion on any major problem can take place unless this cardinal problem is solved. Are we going to stay as friendly neighbours, or are we going to be hostile to each other for ever? Let that be solved once and for all, and then we will define our attitude.

Therefore, every time this issue comes before us, we talk something about it and then forget all about it. This should not happen. Let us try to understand Pakistan's attitude, the role we have to play, the role that these refugees will inevitably play in our

politics, and the question whether our secular stance can remain intact in spite of this tremendous flow of refugees into India. So, these are very vital issues not only from the point of view of refugees, but from the point of view of ourselves, our policy and the sovereignty of our State. Thank you.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir, I stand here to take part in this debate to which the House has very rightly given precedence, adjourning all other work. Let me tell my friend, Mr. Goray, that as a Muslim, I feel ashamed of the things that are happening in the name of a Muslim State.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : You are more of a Hindustani than of a Muslim.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Sir, Mr. Bhandari and others have correctly connected this matter with Hindus and Muslims. When the treatment of a State which calls itself a Muslim State is such that thousands of its citizens are leaving its borders and that Government does not feel ashamed of it, I feel—I say this not only here in Parliament, I say this on behalf of all the people of my faith—that this attitude of the Government of Pakistan which has been continuing for the last twenty years, is most disgraceful. And if in spite of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, in spite of the principles of international law, in spite of the principles that govern modern and civilised living, the people of that country are going outside, I think it cannot be excused. So I take this opportunity to condemn that Government in unequivocal terms.

Now, Sir, I will submit my views so far as the rehabilitation part of it is concerned, and also so far as the political or international part of it is concerned. It is our duty to rehabilitate those refugees. In fact I want to remind Mr. Goray—probably Mr. Goray was not here at that time—that I said I am prepared if you want to lay some tax only on the Muslims and I am prepared to help my brethren who are coming from that State. I will go to

any length in helping them because I feel I am responsible to contribute to its expenses because in the name of Muslims and in the name of Islam this thing is being done...

**SHRI N. G. GORAY :** Very kind of you, but we shall not do that.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN :** Whatever measures the Government wants to take for improving the conditions of those brethren who are human beings who have left their homes and hearths, who have been suffering so much, I am prepared to cooperate with the Government in such measures. Nobody leaves his country, nobody leaves his village, nobody leaves his home, and comes out unless the circumstances, whatever those may be, are so intolerable. It is only in situations which become intolerable that the people leave their country. So far as that aspect is concerned, all measures to make them happy, to make them comfortable, to give them all facilities, should be taken. And it is the sacred duty of the Parliament and the Government to see that all those measures are taken.

Now, so far as political and international principles are concerned, I entirely agree with Mr. Goray that we have to take up this matter very firmly with the Government of Pakistan. I am in full agreement with Mr. Goray that if the Pakistan Government considers the Kashmir matter serious and refuses to talk to us, we too consider this matter of influx of refugees equally and more serious and we would not like to talk to them on any other matter without first settling this matter. Not only that, I will be prepared to support the move that if this influx goes on, certainly we are entitled to demand a portion of territory so that we can rehabilitate these refugees because, after all, these are days when every country is having its economic tension. In spite of our best endeavours we are not able to make our own people live happily; as it has been said, we have people like Adivasis and others. And if people from outside also come here, then, we will be faced with a big economic question. And if

that cannot be settled in the ordinary way, then, we would have to demand that a portion of territory belonging to that part of the country should be ceded to us in order to rehabilitate these refugees. I fully agree and I must pay a tribute to my people that notwithstanding the recent influx of refugees, things have remained calm. Naturally, when a person is afflicted, when a person has suffered and comes out, he carries a tale of his afflictions. So, from that point of view also it is a very dangerous situation. It is a very difficult situation. In spite of the best efforts we are making, it might become a very unpleasant situation.

Further, I say that we are going to have the United Nations meeting in September. Let us take up this matter there. I say that this matter should be taken up in all seriousness. Shri Goray referred to some organisations and I know that there is a lot of propaganda going on and I know that it is all bunkum and they are doing it in the name of religion. Can we not go to the United Nations or from university to university and place to place and tell the people that this propaganda is all wrong and the Government is taking all steps? Tell them what Shri Chavan has said or the Prime Minister has said. What about these thousands of people coming in this miserable and pitiable condition? What has the Pakistan Government done for them? I am sure we have got a moral case and a reasonable case. We have got a strong case and we should influence public opinion in other countries also. I agree with Shri Goray that we are not doing as much as we should do. So, I think, we cannot take this lying down. After all, I believe that every human being deserves every affection and every regard and much more so when people belong to one country originally. With due respect, some mistake was made and there was partition of the country. I am not going against this decision of my elders. But today, in this modern age, in 1970, this mentality of looking at things from the religious point of view, sectarian point of view and

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]  
narrow communal point of view is wrong. It is high time that it is stopped. We should take all measures, economic as well as political, even at the international place. When we stand up and say that there should be no communalism, we should also be able to say that the communalism of Pakistan should also come to an end so that people should enjoy equal rights, equal pleasure and equal comforts and equal happiness. Whether it is Tashkent or the United Nations this should be our attitude. We have to tell the Soviet Union : "Look here, you have to take up this responsibility because it was you who brought about some agreement between us. Don't you see people are still coming from the other side?" Similarly, we have to tell the United Nations also. I feel that this is a matter on which there can be no two opinions. So, I would like the Government to take up this matter very seriously and devise ways and means so that this exodus can be effectively stopped. If at some higher level some adjustment is made or agreement is reached, I think in future this exodus will not be there. In the interests of the good name of Pakistan also, it is necessary that this kind of thing should not continue in this age. I am in full agreement with the spirit of the Motion and with some of the suggestions offered. I would appeal to the Government that they should take a firm and bold stand in this matter. With these words, I conclude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH) : Hon. Members will appreciate the difficulty of the Chair in conducting the proceedings within the limited time and I am afraid the House shall have to sit a little longer.

I see that Shri Balkrishna Gupta is not here. Before I call upon the next speaker, Shri A. P. Chatterjee, I would request the hon. Members to be as brief as possible in order to enable other Members to participate.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Mr.

Vice-Chairman, Sir, when I look back upon the speeches that have been delivered on the floor of the House in regard to the refugees that are coming from East Pakistan, ... Well, I have to say with regret that in some of the speeches, the over-tones of communalism were emphatically there. As a matter of fact, we gave our own names to this question, in this Calling Attention Motion, well, we looked at it from the point of view of the thousands and lacks of refugees that are coming and we looked at it purely from the humanitarian point of view, from the point of view of rehabilitation. But, then, what is happening is this : In the name of rehabilitation of the refugees, in the name of sympathy for them, with tears in their eyes some of the honourable members have given frank incitement to communal passions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH) : Can you name them ?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I know, you know, to whom I am making the reference. I do not understand, Mr. Vice-Chairman, this question of the thesis that has now been propounded, the thesis of lebensraum. Now, this is a thesis which has worn thin and which the Fascists used as a cloak for their dagger policy, their rowdy policy, their hoodlum policy, when then said : "We are more than Germany can look after and therefore, we want living space." I find curiously a family kinship between their lebensraum and the claim or the demand for districts from Pakistan. That is, first of all, an impossible problem. It is a thing which is not countenanced by international law and when the persons who make this demand, who made this demand, know—well, I give credit to their intelligence—that it is not countenanced by international law. Why do they then raise this question? You raise this question certainly with a motive and I am such a person who is out to condemn that motive and that motive is nothing but to rouse passions, the worst communal passions. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the question is not a question

of lebensraum or of living space or of districts from Pakistan.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH) :** It is better if the honourable Member does not impute motives to another honourable Member.

**SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE :** I am not imputing motives.

**DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi) :** What Pakistan is doing is according to the international law ?

**SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE :** I am not one of those who are here to apologise for a particular State or condemn a particular State. I am here on my legs in order to submit before this House my own views on the question of rehabilitation of the refugees. Now, Sir, as far as the question of the rehabilitation of the refugee is concerned. I can tell you, Sir, that it is true that lakhs of refugees have come—42 lakhs, thereafter 9 lakhs and in the last few months more than 1 lakh or one lakh and fifty thousand—well they have come. Now, how is this problem of the refugees tackled by the Government of India ? If we look at the past, we find that 90% of the refugees who have come from East Pakistan had to be settled in West Bengal. Could not they be sent elsewhere ? Sir, as far as the 10% refugees are concerned, well, in regard to them, even on the floor of the House, we had to hear all Adivasi complaints and other complaints about settling of the refugees there. I am asking those honourable members who are shedding tears for the refugees who are coming from East Pakistan whether they will do their bit to see that in their own constituencies, in their own States, the refugees from East Pakistan do get a foot-hold. If they do that, then much of the problems of Lebensraum, much of the problem of living space for the refugees will be solved.

**Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir,** I went some months ago to the Andaman Islands and I was surprised to hear from Mr. Butalia, who was the Chief Commissioner of the Andamans, that as far as

Car Nicobar Island is concerned, that island will not be given to the refugees. I asked why. They thought that it is a strategic island.

**[THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN in the Chair]**  
4 P.M.

I put a question to Mr. Butalia : Do you think that the East Pakistan refugees are a security risk that they cannot be settled on the Great Nicobar Island ? He could not answer that question. But I have to say with some amount of regret that Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee who was the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee agreed with Mr. Butalia that the refugees from East Pakistan should not be settled on the Great Nicobar Island because it was a strategically important island. Now, Sir, these persons are shedding tears. I am not talking of Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. But certain persons are shedding tears for the refugees from East Pakistan. *(Interruption)* Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was a little flabbergasted that Mr. Butalia should say this.

I put a question on the floor of the House; that question of course was Unstarred; it was No. 230, dated 1-5-1970. Our questions are generally Unstarred in respect of these matters I put this question :

“Will the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation be pleased to refer to the reply to Unstarred Question No. 1363 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 20th March, 1970 and state :

(a) What is the basis for the conclusion of the Government of India to the effect that ex-servicemen would provide a ‘stable and sturdy element’ in the Island of Great Nicobar;

(b) whether Government have decided that the East Pakistan refugees would not provide a ‘stable and sturdy element’; and

(c) what is the special importance of the Island of Great Nicobar referred to in the aforesaid answer ?”



[Shri A. P. Chatterjee.]

Sir, the reply given by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad was :

“Ex-servicemen, because of their well trained and disciplined personal background and good physical fitness generally, have actually proved themselves to be a ‘stable and sturdy element’ in other difficult and far-off places also wherever they have been settled. However, refugees from East Pakistan who had volunteered themselves from the relief camps to go to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, have been sent to suitable places there. No further volunteers in camps are available for being sent to these Islands.

Resettlement of 100 ex-service-men's families in the Great Nicobar Island is only a pilot project, etc. . . ."

Mr. Azad on behalf of the Ministry of Labour said that they were not going to take refugees into the Great Nicobar Island because they would not provide a stable and sturdy element. Before the Public Accounts Committee itself this was reiterated that they would not be taken there because the Great Nicobar Island is a strategically important island. I am saying this on the floor of the House with a full sense of responsibility, Sir. This is the way in which the refugees are being treated.

I can point out another fact also. As far as the refugees from West Pakistan are concerned, I have no grudge against them. It is good that they have been settled. Sir, 5,07,000 applications for compensation were received and almost all of them were granted. Sir, Rs. 192 crores have been distributed among them. Will the hon. Minister for Labour enlighten us as to what amount has been given by way of compensation to the refugees who have come from East Pakistan? It is pitifully small and it is done on the deplorable ground that under the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact the Hindus in East Pakistan are supposed to be able to transfer their properties and therefore they would not be given any compensation here. You know that the

Indo-Pakistan conflict took place in 1965 and all the displaced persons from Jammu and Kashmir and the Punjab have been resettled by now but as far as the 45 plus 9 plus 2 lakhs of refugees who have come from East Pakistan are concerned, the Government of India have compelled them to remain in West Bengal. I ask the Government of India to point out to the Members what is the amount they have given to them. Whenever we talk of rehabilitation of the refugees, the Government knows that as far as the question of refugees is concerned, that question is a question peculiar to West Bengal. After all it is Bengal and Punjab that have suffered the most from partition. Who does not know it? We do not want to go into that now. Who does not know that partition became inevitable because Nehru was too eager to be the Prime Minister? Punjab has suffered the most and Bengal has suffered the most and yet the Central Government is not giving the necessary funds and wherewithal to settle the refugees and when the question of refugees is raised, you find crocodile tears and incitement to communal passions. Lebensraum, Khulna and other things are raised. Why not the entire sub-continent of South East Asia? I do not know whether our Jan Sangh friends will project another thesis for that. Let us wait for that. The question of refugees is a question not of charity, not of communalism. It is a question which has to be settled by the Government of India and it is the responsibility of the Government of India and they must give looms for their rehabilitation, and they must give the wherewithal so that they may be settled. Everybody has gone to see the refugees there who are coming in streams from East Pakistan but you know in what conditions they are living. Not even a proper transit camp has been set up by the Indian Government and yet the Government will try to think of the political aspect of it. I cannot understand what that has to do with this question. The political aspect we leave to them for their confabulations. We know how

actually a particular section in a particular country works so that there may be bad relations and some countries may never have friendly relations. Who does not know that as far as East Pakistan is concerned, some progressive forces are raising their heads and are on the march and that is why, so that they may be defeated, there are communal forces coming up. It is my earnest request to the saner section of this House, not the insane section, not to inflame the communal passions and not obstruct the path of the progressive forces in Pakistan. That is another question. The question before us is a question of rehabilitation and of giving them proper amenities and comforts and of treating them like human beings and that has to be done. I do not understand the emotional speech of Mr. Akbar Ali Khan. He said that the Muslims, as Muslims, have a special contribution to make. It is not a question of a Muslim making a special contribution for the refugees coming from Pakistan. That will be giving a non-secular character to the whole thing. A particular ruling clique has been ruling in India since 1947 and it had independence and partition under its elbow for reasons obvious to all. It is that ruling clique which is still ruling here and it is their responsibility to see that the refugees are rehabilitated. If they do not rehabilitate the refugees, I can assure the House that we, Bengalis in Bengal will not inflame the communal passions but we shall agitate for the rightful privileges that are guaranteed under the Constitution and for the other rights which the refugees who have come to India are entitled to get. For that we shall agitate, and we shall see; we are warning the communal elements also and we shall see, our party will see and the other leftist parties will see that they do not allow any communal party or any pseudocommunal party to raise communal passions there. We shall stand watch over them and we shall see that they are not allowed to muddle the political waters there.

SHRI MAHITOSH PURKAYASTHA (Assam) : Mr. Deputy Chair-

man, Sir, the continuous influx of refugees into India is causing concern to all. It has become a national problem.

(Interruptions)

Now, Sir, in India many communal riots have taken place during the last five years, but during the last five years no communal riots have taken place in East Pakistan. There have been no communal riots in East Pakistan but still the Hindus are coming in large numbers from East Pakistan. What is the reason? The reason is mainly economic and partly political. Because of the economic hardships they are suffering in East Pakistan they are gradually coming out of Pakistan. Not only Hindus, but Muslims also in small numbers are coming from East Pakistan and infiltrating into Assam during the last twenty years. So those who think that the influx of refugees is a communal problem, they are looking at the problem from a wrong point of view. It has been said by some speakers that in India the secular-minded Hindus are raising their voice against communalism but in East Pakistan nobody is raising his voice against this communalism. Now, Sir, I come from a district which has border with Pakistan, and many of my close relatives are still living in Pakistan. So I can claim intimate knowledge about Pakistan and I can say for their information that those are secular-minded Muslims in East Pakistan and they are also raising their voice against this exodus of refugees. Also many newspapers in East Pakistan have come out with their editorials condemning this attitude towards the Hindus in Pakistan. So, those who say that in East Pakistan all are communal and all are trying to squeeze out the Hindus are not right. There are the political parties who want that the Hindus should come out gradually from Pakistan because that will give them an advantage during the elections. But who are coming from East Pakistan? Not the politically-conscious people, not the middle-class people. Those professional people who are earning their livelihood there, the doctors or the pleaders or other people practising other professions, they

[Shri Mahitosh Purkayastha.]

are not coming now. Only the poorer sections of the people, mainly belonging to the Scheduled Castes, are coming to India. So those who say that only we are secular and in East Pakistan there are no secular-minded people, they are wrong. We should view this problem from a national point of view. We should see how this problem can be best solved. Twenty-three years have elapsed but our Government has not done enough to solve the problem of the refugees coming from East Pakistan. There are large numbers of refugees who have come to Assam and settled there. Yet their problems have remained unsolved. Also there are many thousands and lakhs of refugees in West Bengal. The speaker, who spoke before me, said that the Central Government has forced them to live in West Bengal. It is not the Central Government; it is the leftist parties in West Bengal who have been obstructing the movement of refugees from West Bengal to other parts of India since 1951. Dr. B. C. Roy, the then Chief Minister of West Bengal, tried to send the refugees from West Bengal to other parts of India, but then, the leftist parties, the Left CPI, the CPI and the other parties—I have seen it with my own eyes—brought out processions in Calcutta. They said that they wanted them to remain in West Bengal, they did not want them to go out of West Bengal. When they came to power in 1967, when they had to face this problem, they had to change their attitude and now they are saying of sending them to Andamans, to Dandakaranya and other places. But up to 1967 they were not saying so.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Cachar also.

SHRI MAHITOSH PURKAYASTHA : Cachar is a Bengali-speaking district and 50 per cent of the people are refugees. There is no need for new refugees to come there. So when you blame the Central Government you should share the blame yourself also. But I am not satisfied with the rehabilitation work that has been done up to

this date. According to the statement made by the Minister more than 10,000 refugees have come to Assam during the last 6½ months but not a single transit camp has been set up there, not a single reception centre has been set up in spite of the representations given by the Municipal Boards. Refugee Associations, Congress and M.Ps. In Tripura a reception centre has been set up only in name because there is no sanitary arrangement, no arrangement for supplying drinking water. Similar is the case in West Bengal. The refugees who are housed in the border of West Bengal are given 300 grames of rice a day. With this can one man take two meals a day? So I want the Central Government to do something real to solve the problem. Though I differ with my friend, Mr. A. P. Chatterjee, about the dispersal of the refugees from West Bengal I fully agree with him when he says that whereas a large amount of compensation has been given to West Pakistan refugees no compensation has been paid to East Bengal refugees. Why this discrimination between the refugees coming from West Pakistan and East Pakistan? They should be treated on equal footing. Only in name by this Nehru-Liaquat Agreement the Hindus have got right to own land there but they cannot dispose of their land and that is one reason why many refugees are coming into India. So I want that this discrimination between West Pakistan and East Pakistan refugees must end, and the Government must pay more attention for solving this problem. I say that this problem has assumed a national dimension and with the influx of refugees communal passions are being tried to be roused in the country. If this problem is not solved speedily then I think the communal parties which are utilising this refugee influx for their political gains will bring disaster to this country.

I fully agree with the suggestions made by Mr. Gurupadaswamy that a conference of all political parties should be convened by the Prime Minister. All the political parties should be taken into

confidence and in consultation with them a formula should be evolved for solving this problem of refugees coming from East Pak stan.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU** (West Bengal) : Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, on the last occasion I had the opportunity to dwell upon the international aspect of this problem, particularly arising out of the massive influx of minorities from East Pakistan. Today that aspect has been dwelt upon by certain hon. Member of this House and I shall not discuss it in detail because some more important aspects have not been touched by many Members who have taken part in this debate. First of all, I would urge upon the House, through you, to really evaluate the size and the magnitude of the problem that has been posed by the influx of East Pakistan refugees. From the Government documents that have been made available to me, it is found that up to 27th June, 1970, 1,11,026 persons are reported to have come to West Bengal. In Assam during this period the number is 6,000 and in Tripura more than 2046. The total is 1,19,771. This is the figure which has been given by the Government. I had an opportunity to visit the three places where there has been a conglomeration of these unfortunate human masses and according to my estimate the figure is much more than that. It is not 1,19,000 as stated by the Government in their documents. Even today the migration continues and the document itself suggests that the average influx of refugees or the average arrival of East Bengal minorities to West Bengal is 2,000 per day. If you calculate it you will find that it is more than two lakhs by this time, even on the basis of the calculations given by the Government of India in this respect. What has been their dispersal? You will be astonished to learn that even today more than a lakh of people are being forced to remain in the open without any roof under their head, without even a morsel of food, without a single drop of milk for the babies and what can I say? I cannot describe the distress and miseries of these unfortunate human

masses whom I have seen in this part of my country. I shall discuss it later. Up till now, as the Minister's statement claims, only 59,000 have been dispersed to different centres, both in West Bengal and outside West Bengal. There remain still one lakh people, a huge mass of people in Hasnabad, Basirhat, Bongaon and other places. They have got no roof over their head. As I told you, there is no minimum human sanitation for them, not to speak of their distress and miseries. The rate of disposal is low. I have discussed the matter with the railway officials who are in charge of Hasnabad. Never has been the occasion when more than 300 persons were dispersed. Now, you can calculate it. One lakh people are still remaining there without any roof, without any shelter, without any accommodation. At this rate you will require one year to disperse them. For one lakh of people it will take more than 300 days even at the present rate of dispersal, provided there is no further new influx. Now, I am astonished and shocked to see the callous behaviour of the Government of India. The place where these unfortunate people are forced to live is not even congenial for stay for one hour, for one minute. If the dispersal is at the present rate, these unfortunate people would be forced to live there for more than a year. My question is first of all about them. Now, the question of relief measures that have so far been taken comes. I have personally visited these people at Hasnabad where there are more than 60,000 of them. Rations are being supplied to only 13,000 people. What about the rest? Rations are being supplied to only 13,000 people through the Ramakrishna Mission Ashram. What is the ration? It consists of 300 grams of rice, per each adult, 200 grams of pulses with vegetables and some pinches of salt and nothing else. There is no fuel, nothing of the sort. No utensils, nothing. I have seen it with my own eyes. The babies are being denied of milk or any kind of baby food. Up till now I have heard that more than fifty persons died of epidemic, mostly children. There was

[Shri Chitta Basu.]

Therefore, without mentioning any other thing I would suggest that the Government should without discussing other implications of the problem assure this House here and now that everybody would be assured accommodation, everybody there would be assured of a roof over his head, that they would not be allowed to remain drenched in the rains or parched in the sun. That assurance should be made by the Government of India. Everybody should be assured of some adequate quantum of ration by which he can live. They should be assured of arrangement for the sanitation and other minimum necessities of human beings, needs. Am I to repeat it here that they are our brethren? It was said by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that those who are being left in East Pakistan are the flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone. Is this the way to show that they are all the flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone? My personal experience shows that this is not the way how we can prove that we take them to be our relatives, that they are our brethren, that we consider them as one of ours. If you have got that feeling really at heart, you should assure them the minimum necessities a human being requires for him to live. Therefore, I want that these things should be assured on the floor of the House.

come out in the open as they are not properly clothed. It is a shame on our part, it is a shame on the part of the Government, it is a shame on the part of Parliament, it is a shame to the spirit of nationalism of our country of which all of us are so proud. Therefore, unless the Government makes these minimum arrangements for these unfortunate human masses, I think we shall be guilty of dereliction of our duty to our own men, to our own brethren, to whom we are pledged to do something.

Sir, the question now arises as to a permanent solution of the problem. Even the Government document says that only Rs. 20 lakhs and again Rs. 19 lakhs, that is only Rs. 39 lakhs have so far been sanctioned for the Government of West Bengal to make the necessary arrangements. What a paltry sum has been sanctioned. More than 2 lakhs of people are to be rehabilitated, are to be rendered necessary relief, and only Rs. 39 lakhs have so far been sanctioned to the Government of West Bengal for the necessary arrangements. My demand is that proper funds are to be released so that these minimum necessities of life can be assured for these people. Sir, so far as the rehabilitation problem is concerned, I know that even today 8 lakhs of old migrants, those who have come to India after 1964, yet remain to be rehabilitated. Now there are these 2 lakhs. But up till now we have found that only 150 families are going to be rehabilitated in Madan Industries in Hastinapur, 103 families in U.P., 800 families in Andhra Pradesh. What about the rest? Where is the Master Plan for the rehabilitation of these 2 lakhs of people? The Government is silent. There is sympathy. These are all lip sympathies. This lip sympathy is not going to do anything to these unfortunate masses. The question is one of permanent political solution. As I have said earlier, the Nehru-Liaquat Pact becomes the cornerstone of the relations between the Government of Pakistan and the Government of India. I simply want to draw the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to

paragraph 8 of that Agreement wherein they say—

"In order to assist in the implementation of this Agreement, the two Governments have decided, apart from the deputation of their Ministers referred to in B, to set up Minority Commissions, one for East Bengal, one for West Bengal and one for Assam. These Commissions will be constituted and will have the functions described below.

(i) Each Commission will consist of one Minister of the Provincial or State Governments concerned, who will be Chairman, and one representative each of the majority and minority communities from East Bengal, West Bengal and Assam, etc.

(ii) The two Ministers of the Governments of India and Pakistan may attend and participate in any meeting of any Commission."

And lastly there is an important provision—

"(ix) The Government of India and Pakistan, and the State and Provincial Governments, will normally give effect to recommendations that concern them when such recommendations are supported by both the Central Ministers."

May I know from the Minister of External Affairs whether the Minority Commission as visualised in this Agreement has been set up in Pakistan, whether any Minister of the Government of India has ever attended the meetings of the Minority Commission in Pakistan, whether there has been any joint discussion at Ministerial level between Pakistan and India on the question of minorities and whether an attempt has ever been made to thrash out the problem of the minorities of Pakistan and India, because the responsibility of protecting and defending the interests of the minorities rests entirely upon the government and the majority community of that country. Sir, the minority communities in Pakistan could

be protected and defended only by the democratic masses of Pakistan. And I am very proud to say that the democratic movement in Pakistan has risen up and has come forward to defend the interests of the minorities, that is the Hindus, there. Equally, the majority community's duty here is to defend and protect the minorities here. Therefore, unless the majority communities and the mass democratic, progressive and socialist movements in these two countries are determined to defend and protect the rights, liberties and freedom of the minorities, their interests cannot be protected. Therefore what I want to ask the Minister of External Affairs is whether any action in that regard has been taken.

There was another Agreement, the Pant Mirza Agreement, in which it was stated that the Home Ministers of both the countries should occasionally meet and thrash out the problems arising out of the minorities' difficulties in both the countries. May I know from the hon. Minister—now the Prime Minister is also here—whether any attempt has ever been made to give effect to the Pant-Mirza Agreement in relation to the rights and privileges of the minorities? Again, may I know whether any attempt has been made by the Government of India to have direct talks with the Government of Pakistan to force it to discuss this issue of the influx of refugees from East Pakistan and whether the Government has taken any step to take up this problem in any international forum.

I do not agree with those who feel that the solution lies in an exchange of population. I am dead against this because this will merely fan communal passion in both countries. I am dead against those who feel that a portion of Pakistan's territory can be claimed as solution of the problem. I equally feel that this is also calculated, designed to fan communal passion in both the countries. The solution does not lie in communalism, the solution does not lie in spreading communalism or in an exchange of population or in asking for

[Shri Chitta Basu.]

some territory from Pakistan. The solution lies in building up a democratic movement both in Pakistan and India which can protect the minorities in both the countries and the Government of India should mobilise international opinion to make the Pakistan Government implement the Pact which was arrived at in 1950 under the joint signatures of Nehru and Liaquat Ali Khan.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA (West Bengal) : His name was after mine.

SHRI A. D. MANI : My name is there and I have been called.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : His name is earlier in the list and I have called him.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Yes, I have been called.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mani, please. I have called Mr. Mani.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA : Then call me after him.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, who initiated the debate and my friend, Mr. Chitta Basu, dealt with, in detail, the problem of rehabilitation and the daily flow of 2,000 refugees who are coming from East Pakistan. I must assure both of them as one who represents the State of Madhya Pradesh which has resettled quite a number of East Bengal refugees in the Dandakaranya project that all of us are alive to the gravity of the situation on the Pakistan border. I would like to mention here that what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said has been more or less corroborated by impartial observers. The times of India in a despatch of 11-7-70 says :—

“...Nearly 40,000 of them are said to be living on open railway platforms or under trees in the two towns; none has enough to eat. The lack of minimum sanitation and even

clean drinking water has led to frequent outbreaks of cholera among them. Hundreds are reported to have died already from disease or slow starvation...”

And the Times of India goes on to blame the Central Government. It is too slow in giving relief.

I would like to say that there is no point in taking a very serious view of the shortcomings of the Ministry of Rehabilitation. We have already spent as much as Rs. 532 crores after 1947 on the rehabilitation of refugees both from West Pakistan and East Pakistan. We have not got a permanent machinery to cope with a problem of this kind. But this is more or less a sore on the eastern border of India and we cannot blame anybody in the Rehabilitation Ministry if they do not have the apparatus to settle the problem more or less on a war footing.

Mr. Gurupadaswamy and Mr. Goray have touched the live wire of this problem when they said that this is largely a political problem which my hon'ble friend, Sardar Swaran Singh, will have to handle. Now, it is quite clear that whatever might have been written in the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact, that Pact is dead, is buried and is forgotten by Pakistan. Let us forget it. What is the point in making frequent and laudatory references to it when the other side is not prepared to accept it. I think the time has come when the Minister of External Affairs should take what I consider a bold decision and tell Pakistan that in view of what is happening in East Pakistan that Pact does not hold good and that we should have fresh Ministerial discussions about our future relations between India and Pakistan. We will have to tell Pakistan in this language because we cannot allow that Pact to be defied in that manner. In the course of the repudiation of the Pact we do not want a communal situation of any magnitude to arise here. We are already ashamed of many things that have happened in our country, what has happened in Bhiwandi and in

Jalgaon or in Ahmedabad. But as one belonging to the so-called majority community I want to say that whatever might have been the excesses in moments of frenzy and madness our country has got a much better record of tolerance towards minorities than Pakistan has shown. It is not that we are not ashamed of these excesses. It is not that we are not a secular nation. We, by and large, are a secular nation and we admit that there have been excesses.

I do not want these things to be reopened again. We have good ground for telling Pakistan that we are not bound by the Nehru-Liaquat Pact now and we would like to discuss the matter afresh. I would like to refer to an observation made by my hon. friend, Mr. Goray, who quoted a *New York Times* advertisement which had mentioned a speech of the Prime Minister in the other House regarding condemnation of what happened in Jalgaon and Bhiwandi. We are living in a free democratic country and it is our duty to condemn openly any communal excess whether it is committed by this community or that community, and I am glad that the Prime Minister and the Home Minister condemned the excesses in Bhiwandi and Jalgaon in unreserved terms. We need not be ashamed of it at all. But unfortunately our External Affairs publicity is lagging very much behind.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** They were busy with Madame Binh, where she should stay in Ashoka Road or Ashoka Hotel or Hyderabad House.

**SHRI A. D. MANI :** I would like to say that our External Affairs publicity has been lagging very much behind and we have created an impression abroad that the minorities in this country are not getting a square deal. I would like to ask my hon. friend, the Minister for External Affairs, since Pakistan raises the question of genocide at every session of the U.N. General Assembly, why we cannot raise this question of daily flow of 2,000 refugees from East

Pakistan, at the forthcoming meeting of the U.N. General Assembly. We may not get a solution. The U.N. does not produce a solution for any country at the present time. But we must be in a position to put our case in the international forum because we are allowing our case to go by default.

Sir, the question about settlement of refugees in the Nicobar islands was raised by Mr. A. P. Chatterjee. If it is true that Mr. Bhutalia has made a statement to the Public Accounts Committee that refugees from East Pakistan cannot be settled in the Nicobar islands because there is a security area there, it is a reflection on the patriotism of the East Bengal people. If he had made that statement, that statement should be checked by the Prime Minister because it is a gross reflection on the members of a community of Bengal, that they cannot be relied upon to be settled in the Nicobar islands. I would like to raise this question : Why can't we open up NEFA. A good part of NEFA is underpopulated. I have gone to NEFA. I have gone to the Subansiri Division and the Lohit Division. I know that a good part of NEFA is underpopulated. The surroundings there are ideal for receiving East Bengal refugees and people of West Pakistan origin too. Why can't you settle them there.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** What about your State? You started by saying that you come from Madhya Pradesh and many refugees have been settled there. Have you asked Mr. Shukla that instead of trying to beat up the peasants in their land-occupation movement, he should look after the rehabilitation of the refugees.

**SHRI A. D. MANI :** We are prepared to settle the East Pakistan refugees.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** You please continue your speech, Mr. Mani. You need not reply to him.

**SHRI A. D. MANI :** An offer has been made to settle these refugees in the Chambal ravines. Why can't they



[Shri A. D. Mani.]

go and settle down there? Why should they want to settle on a particular area?

My last point is regarding the information media. The Minister for Information and Broadcasting is not here. So much propaganda has been done by Radio Pakistan against the majority community in India, against the Indian Government, and so many horror stories are being put out. We have signally failed in putting out our case. We somehow feel ashamed even to publicly say that we are unfortunately, from the point of view of communal composition, a majority Hindu nation, but we are at heart a secular country. Why should we be ashamed of that fact? Why can't we say that we are a majority Hindu nation, but we are a secular country...

### SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : A Hindu nation ?

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** I mean technically. You cannot forget the fact that certain persons are born Hindus; but we are at heart a secular nation.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** How do you say we are a Hindu nation? Sir, he is propounding a theory that we are a Hindu nation.

**SHRI A. D. MANI :** We are not a Hindu nation. We are technically a majority Hindu nation. Why should we be ashamed of that fact? Why should we not put down the case that we have treated the minorities much better than any other Asian country in the Middle-East?

**SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA :** Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is a very serious problem and certainly very delicate too. Nothing should be done or said that might rouse communal passion in this country. We should certainly feel for those unfortunate refugees of East Bengal and at the same time deliberate in a manner that their problems can be solved without creating new ones. Their problems have got to be seen from the point of view of

rehabilitation, prompt and speedy rehabilitation. That is one thing. But that will not do. We should stop the influx of new refugees and the matter should be immediately taken up with the Pakistan Government. I do not find anything wrong in Mr. Mani's suggestion for taking up this matter with the UNO also because we all know that the New York Times is publishing on various pages of its issue, that there is genocide going on here in India. It is creating a war of hatred against India. Why should we not take up this rightful cause of the East Bengal minorities to the UNO. We must shed our own blood to save the minorities here. We must look at the problem of the minorities as a human problem. We must look at it with the same sense of responsibility for the minorities here and in East Bengal. We must put an end to this problem by some positive steps. We should take this matter to the international forum only for that purpose. If we cannot do anything there, at least we shall have the satisfaction that we have put the matter before the United Nations forum, at the bar of world opinion...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What will come out of it?

**SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA :** This is the human aspect of it. The Nehru-Liaquat Pact has been a forbidden fruit. So what next? Can we not stop people from coming here? I have definite information from an eminent man like Shri Trailokya Chakravarty (Maharaj) he has told me and he has told everybody—that there is no communal passion in Pakistan. The people of the new generation in Pakistan are exceptionally good. They have no communal feelings in them. But till people are coming out. Why? This is a big question. So I can draw a demarcation and say that are Pakistan Government is squeezing out the Hindu minorities from East Pakistan and the people of Pakistan are not sufficiently organised to resist it. That does not mean that all the people there have communal feelings. There are many people asking

us, "Well, has not the whole of Calcutta gone Naxalite?" No, it does not mean that. Then the question is asked : Why does not anybody come and resist it? If there is no resistance, it is not because that the people of Calcutta have gone Naxalite cent per cent. Similarly, there might be 1 per cent of the people of Pakistan who are forcing them out. And that can be stopped only by the Government because nobody, on the eve of elections, would like to lose the Muslim votes by siding with the Hindu minority. The Jan Sangh says that three districts of East Pakistan should be ceded to us. We should consider it. It is not making an impractical suggestion. We should also consider their suggestions if any. What is the suggestion of Mr. Chatterjee to stop this influx of refugees? Unless you have a constructive and practical suggestion, please do not condemn anybody with a motive. Everybody is honourable. Everybody has a decent way of thinking, an honest way of thinking. I do not want to accuse anybody. All that I say is, let us be honest, let us all face this human problem and see how we can stop influx, how we can send them back safely and expeditiously and how these refugees can be rehabilitated here. We have not done enough. Government always make comparisons of West Pakistan refugees with the East Pakistan refugees to find fault with the latter. This is unfair. You have given West Pakistan refugees a certain percentage of jobs at the Central Government. Then you have given them compensation in abundance. You have given them sufficient money for rehabilitation. But for East Bengal refugees nothing like that. You are giving them money in instalments. After the first instalment is over, the second instalment is of no use. You must give them all at a time in one lump sum. These East Bengal refugees are living in a state of under-nourishment. They are dying. They are being looked after by Ramakrishna Mission. That is their position. Government should have taken it up on a war footing. Then only this problem can be solved. But nothing like that has been done so far. Unless we

take it at the political level as a human problem, we will only be perpetuating new problems which remain unabated since partition in 1947.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I will try to give very briefly...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Is it the foreign affairs aspect?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I will give my views on the political aspect. With regard to the rehabilitation problem, my colleague here will inform the House of the various steps that are being taken.

The international aspect of this problem is obvious and I am in broad agreement with the observations that have been made by almost all sections of the House that our objective should be to create conditions in which this influx of refugees is stopped or is greatly diminished. That is the objective which is obvious and desirable and we should do everything possible internally, bilaterally and internationally to achieve this objective.

In order to understand the whole problem, it is first necessary for us to be clear about the causes of this influx. As the time at our disposal is short, I will try to say something on this issue in a very short and precise manner. Several hon. Members have touched upon this problem. Let us be quite clear that the basic reason is that the Pakistan Government have not been doing their duty. The duty of any Government is to protect all its citizens. They are not doing it and that is the basic reason for this influx of refugees.

The second reason perhaps is the non-implementation of various pacts. There is the Nehru-Liaquat Pact; there is the Mirza-Pant Pact and there is the Tashkent declaration. These are all good documents and contain sound principles. But it is the consistent failure of the Pakistan Government to

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

discharge their obligations under these various agreements that has resulted in a sense of insecurity amongst the minority communities and this has resulted in migration. This is the hard reality of the situation.

So far as the recent influx of refugees is concerned, we have been giving very careful consideration to the various causes that have brought about the situation. It is necessary for us to know the causes and only then we can think of proper remedies. What are these causes? The main reasons for the increased influx of refugees this year are as follows :

(1) A heightened sense of insecurity bred by increasing incidence of crimes against person and property and almost total inaction of law and order machinery on the complaints of non-Muslims;

(2) Increasing incidence, in particular, of crimes against women which go unpunished;

(3) General harassment against which there is hardly any remedy; and

(4) Insidious communal propaganda in certain areas by a certain political party.

(5) Propaganda by parties interested in migration to the effect that migrants to West Bengal would be allotted agricultural land. And I am sorry to give another cause—it is my duty to inform the House—there has been an unfortunate activity on the part of certain touts and agents who have also encouraged or facilitated this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Who are they ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : It is very difficult to name them. There are some anti-social elements, unfortunately on both sides.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We will be very glad to know who they are. We are not satisfied. Who are they ?

They have got the Intelligence machinery. We know them.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : It is a hard reality that some people have indulged in this nefarious activity.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not denying. But why are you declining to tell the names ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I have not got the names with me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Be patient.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Several honourable Members have asked whether we have done enough in this respect or what more we can do. This is an important matter and the rest only becomes academic. We have repeatedly drawn the attention of the Pakistan Government to this disturbing rise in migration. But it is a matter of profound regret that the Government of Pakistan have chosen to deny in the face of concrete evidence this fact of migration. It is necessary for me to mention this because in several notes that have been exchanged between the two Governments, Pakistan has gone to the length of even denying the fact of migration. Instead, they have attempted to insinuate that encouragement from this side, with some unidentified ulterior purpose, has been the cause of this movement. This is the attitude that they have taken in their discussions and also in some of their notes. To our mind, it is an attitude of utter callousness. When they suggested that we should physically turn back these destitutes—this is one of the suggestions that they have made—they forget that first, it is their duty to give protection to their citizens and prevent them from leaving their own country. It is easy for anybody to say that you can prevent them from coming in. Obviously, you cannot be inhuman in this respect and we know that when they leave East Pakistan in distress, whatever may be the rules or whatever may be the conventions or travel documents which have been mentioned, that was only to

indicate that this is really the migration of those persons who have been pushed out and I do not see why an objection should have been taken by the hon. Member opposite when he stated that it has been mentioned by my colleague, Shri Sanjivayya in that manner. I regret to say that we have not been able to persuade Pakistan to take any effective action in the matter. This is the factual position. How are we dealing with this problem? Several suggestions have been made and without entering into any controversy, I would like to examine the practical aspect of it. Broadly, the suggestions can be divided into two parts: One can be grouped under a heading to this effect: "Try to internationalise this problem in the sense that you bring in another country into it, go to UN, go to newspapers, carry on propaganda offensive and the like." I would like this honourable House, in their wisdom, to seriously ponder over this problem. One is the 'badnami' aspect. On this question, we should, in a single-minded manner, try to achieve our real objective. The objective cannot be achieved by 'badnami karo' or the type of things which Mr. Mani said. The objective is that this movement should be stopped and no amount of international propaganda will stop it. Let us remember that it can be stopped only if we can persuade, if we can compel or if we can create a situation in which Pakistan comes to this deliberate conclusion that it is in their interest also that they should really stop it. So, I would like this question to be very carefully weighed by this House. There can be a very strong temptation to hurl abuse against abuse. Advertisements have appeared in the newspapers. I am aware of that. I have got the original cuttings and some quotations have been actually mentioned on the floor of the House. My esteemed colleague, 5 P.M. Shri Goray, made a special reference to it and in that connection he also referred to those parts where our Prime Minister and our Home Minister had been quoted as saying that we steadfastly want protection to be given to the minorities. I do not know what was their

objective in putting across this thing. But I have to be quite candid that every individual should be proud of this fact that our Prime Minister and our Home Minister have given full assurance to the minorities of this country. Why should we be apologetic about it? And what is the effect of those advertisements? Though they may cost thousands and thousands of dollars, it will be wrong for us to imagine.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I suggest you instruct your All India Radio to broadcast the atrocities the American are committing in Vietnam every day.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :** There will be an occasion for discussing Vietnam also. But at the moment we are discussing the question of migration. I would like all those people who issue advertisements and all those who appear to be superficially influenced by these advertisements to ponder over the actual conditions. Notwithstanding all these things, has there been any migration of any Muslim from India to Pakistan? This is the best answer and this is the best advertisement that we should appreciate. Of course there have been some lapses but we have strongly put down those lapses and have succeeded in creating a situation where this thought of migration does not occur to a member of any minority community in India. I have got some experience of both the U.N. and this attempted internationalisation and I would very strongly urge this hon. House and its Members to think over it. If you look at the recent performance in the UN, I would subscribe to the argument given by Shri Mani that we have not found any satisfactory solution of some of the burning problems of the day. Can we imagine that a sort of dormant problem can be resolved by the U.N. as it is constituted today? What will they do? Except that speeches and counter-speeches will be made and adjectives and strong adjectives will be used, nothing else will come out of it.

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]

So, Sir, this is a problem which is essentially a bilateral problem and it has been our approach that India and Pakistan have to live side by side and facts of geography have to be accepted and we have steadfastly to adhere to this principle that the problems between India and Pakistan can only be resolved by bilateral means. It is only by pursuing that policy that we can really make a dent and some impact and to a certain extent break the stalemate also in the relations between India and Pakistan.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : What are the practical steps you are taking ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I am coming to that. I have first to explain that if this argument is acceptable, which I appeal should be acceptable from a purely practical angle, it is in our own interests to keep off the parties who can always be very strongly tempted to have a hand in bringing about some sort of understanding between the two countries. We should try to appreciate their desire but we should strongly tell them that these are bilateral matters which we have to decide as between ourselves. In fact others should really have their hands off this question. Then only the whole thing will fall into a proper perspective and we should be able to resolve our differences step by step, though may be not in one step.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : Why not bring the population of East Bengal into India ? That is the only solution you are thinking of.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I can understand the excitement of Mr. Reddy and when the excitement is recently acquired, it can be very exciting.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore) : There is the statement of the Prime Minister ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. I am standing. Do not in-

terrupt the hon. Minister. Let him continue.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I appreciate his desire although one may not agree with his satirical approach. I was mentioning this aspect as to whether bringing in the UN or carrying on propaganda will have any effect. Any effect that can be produced will be by bilateral action.

(Interruptions)

You have first to be converted before I convert the world. Therefore we have to concentrate in a very steadfast manner in pursuit of this policy and this is our intention. We have told everybody—those who may be friendly or even those who may be neutral—that so far as differences between India and Pakistan are concerned, these are essentially bilateral matters in which we would be prepared to discuss with them, we will be prepared to find solutions but any attempt either to hustle us into positions or to criticise us or to do anything which might create a feeling among us that we are being pressurised in this respect, will not be tolerated by India. That is the clear position that we should adopt and we should pursue that policy.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : What are the practical steps ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : The practical steps in this respect have also to be bilateral. Several suggestions have been made in this respect, some are positive and some are negative. The negative was : 'Do not talk about anything unless we settle this'. That was one of the suggestions made and Mr. Gurupadaswamy was himself probably in a pensive mood, saying : 'I fully realise that it is a negative suggestion but sometimes even negative suggestions may have some effect.' It may or may not have. Other suggestions were made. It was said that I should get in touch with the Pakistan Minister and I should call him for a discussion. Another was that I should issue an invitation. Someone had suggested that I should even be prepared to go. These are constructive approaches and I have no doubt that

this is the only way in which we can, in a progressive manner, try to approach this problem with the objective of finding a satisfactory solution. I would like to take the House into confidence that actually action in this respect has already been initiated. I have already been in touch through diplomatic channels with the Minister who is in charge of law and order in the Pakistan Government and at the same time some message I have received, some assurances. I have still to see how far those assurances will be honoured but I would appeal to this House that the whole approach to this problem has to be such that it does not create more problems for us in our internal condition also. I would appeal also to ensure that the approach does not create more problems for the unfortunate people who are already suffering there and who are under considerable pressure on that side.

Then another suggestion has been made, probably in the context of rehabilitation, that there should be discussion with the other political parties to find out as to how we should approach this problem. I am prepared to extend that even to consultations to chalk out the steps that could be initiated at the international level, and I will be very happy...

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Well, that has not been done.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :** So I would be ...

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I know the Prime Minister met some leaders in Calcutta, but here in Delhi nothing has been done. And yet, your bureaucrats in Calcutta, the superannuated officials or the advisers are drawing up plans, which they do not propose to implement properly, and the plans are inadequate, inhuman and totally inadequate for the purpose. Therefore I say that at least in this matter show some goodness and consult all others. We want a solution.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :** Well. I was not touching upon that aspect of the rehabilitation, but what I was saying

at this stage was that I was prepared to have discussions with the other political leaders of the parties represented in this House, even to discuss about the attitudes that we have to take or about the actions that we should initiate and then ensure that the steps taken bring about the stoppage of the movement of refugees. This is a complex and difficult problem and this is a matter in which primarily the Pakistan Government has to be pushed to the position where they realise their responsibilities not only under the Pact but under any other provision also, any other civilised conduct of any Government. And for this, bilateralism, talks with them, discussions with them, as has been suggested by several hon. friends, are necessary and we should ask them to create proper conditions in their country, so that their responsibility to persons who are Pakistani citizens is discharged by them. That is the only way how we can approach this difficult and complex problem.

About the other matters my colleague, Mr. Sanjivayya, will give the reply.

Thank you very much.

**THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA) :** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this question relating to the sudden influx of refugees from East Pakistan is a very difficult question and a very important question, not merely an important question but a human question as well. If somebody thinks that it is the responsibility of the West Bengal Government or the Government of Assam or the Government of Tripura to these migrants who are in distress, probably he is mistaken. It is a national problem and it should be tackled by everybody concerned, the Central and the State Governments, not merely the State Governments of West Bengal, Assam and Tripura, but all the other State Governments. Therefore, this question has got to be viewed at the national level and the solution should be found. And before we go to the

[Shri D. Sanjivayya.]

solution, Sir, the immediate problem will have to be tackled, the immediate problem being their coming in such large numbers at one time. The daily rate was 2,500 to 3,000. Now it has of course come down; it is 1,200 per day. Even then, if we take into consideration the number of migrants who have come into this country during the last six months, as I stated this morning, it is 145,000. Of these, in January there were only 3,256 who came, in February 4,000 odd, in March it became 11,000, in April 19,000, in May 30,000, in June 54,000 and in July 21,000, up to 17th of July of course. So the total is 145,000 and the influx has been mostly into West Bengal in the three areas of Basirhat, Hasanabad and Bongaon. Of these 145,000 people 84,000 people have already been shifted. Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Andhra Pradesh were good enough to take immediately 84,573 people who have been moved for giving relief. So this question of giving them relief and rehabilitation is very important but the immediate question is dispersal from the border areas. These border areas of Basirhat, Hasanabad and Bongaon are low-lying areas, I had the opportunity to see them and nowadays rains have started and they are torrential rains. There is so much of waterlogging. Therefore the immediate problem, as I have stated a little while ago, is to disperse them to various other States so that they may be given relief first and later on rehabilitation. This question was tackled at the highest level. The Prime Minister was good enough to speak to some of the Chief Ministers. Later on she sent six Joint Secretaries of the Home, Defence and Finance Ministries to various States and as a result of that Orissa has agreed to take 6500 more, Bihar 25,000, U.P. 10,000, Maharashtra 35,000, Madhya Pradesh 13,750 but as stated by my friend, Mr. Mani, who is not here, the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh has given only the ravines of Chambal which are decoit infested. So we are hesitating to accept

the proposal but we are pressing him to give better sites. Then Mysore has agreed to take 3,500 and Andhra Pradesh 6250. So it will be about a lakh. Apart from this we want to shift them to Mana camp. Mana was a camp where at one time we had about one lakh of people but at the moment there are about 90,000 people. It can take immediately ten thousand. Then we have the Dandakaranya area. Dandakaranya is a well-settled colony of refugees where about 14,000 families or about 50,000 odd people have been rehabilitated. They are given houses, they are given land, and they are well-settled. Our only fear is by sending new migrants the well-settled system there might probably be unsettled. Anyway, there is no other go. We have to send some people to Dandakaranya also. The Chairman of the Dandakaranya Authority, the Chief Administrator and everybody have accepted to take 50,000 of these refugees and keep them in two camps. Therefore we are trying to find places where these people can be shifted from the border area for immediate relief but that does not solve the problem. More are coming in. Probably on account of the rains the rate has fallen down; from 3,000 it has come down to 1200. Immediately after the rains the rate may increase. I am told more than a lakh, a lakh and eighty thousand people, are just waiting to across the border. That is the information. Many more may be there willing to come because the situation as explained by my senior colleague is such that they cannot stay there. Therefore we have to make arrangements not merely for these immediate requirements but for future requirements also.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** The hon. Minister should not suffer from inferiority complex. You are also a member of the Cabinet. He is not your senior colleague; he is just your colleague.

**SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA :** He is senior to me in many respects.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** Under these circumstances I think the hon. Minister might see the reasonableness of

the demand for extra land from Pakistan.

**SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA :** That question was dealt with by Shri Swaran Singhji.

Now, with regard to immediate relief, some arrangements have been made. It is the responsibility of the West Bengal Government and we have told the West Bengal Government, the Assam Government and the Tripura Government that the entire cost incurred on account of giving immediate relief, providing sanitary and other arrangements, will be reimbursed by the Government of India. Some hon. Member made the remark that only Rs. 39 lakhs have been given and this meagre amount will not be enough. This has been given only as an 'on account' advance. We have asked them to incur any amount of expenditure on giving utensils on providing clothing, sanitary arrangements giving shelter, food, etc. In this connection, I must acknowledge with gratitude the yeoman service being rendered by the Ramakrishna Mission people and the Bharat Seva-ashram Sangh people. The Ramakrishna Mission are distributing foodgrains whereas the Bharat Sevasram Sangh people are distributing cooked food. Some assistance is being given, but more assistance will be made available to them. In this connection, I would like to make an open appeal to all other social welfare organisations to render service to these refugees and any help that they require will be made available to them.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU :** What about the quantum of ration ?

**SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA :** It is 300 grams rice, about 50 grams Dal, some salt, some onion, etc. When I went there, they made representations ...

**SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh) :** How many calories ?

**SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA :** I will not be able to tell you. In fact, when

I went there they made a representation that it should be increased to 500 grams. We have asked the West Bengal Government Food Ministry to consider it and they are considering the question.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS :** Another problem is there ...

**SHRI CHITTA BASU :** All these people are not being given rations ...

**SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA :** Whom shall I hear ?

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS :** Whomsoever you please.

**SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA :** I would like to hear you.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Order please.

**SHRI PITAMBER DAS :** Is it a fact that some organisations wanted to distribute clothes and other necessary articles to the refugees and the Government did not allow them to do it ? Rather they prevented them from doing it. Is it a fact ?

**SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA :** This is just made on the floor of the House. This is the first time I hear it. I take the information from the hon. Member and I will make enquiries. In fact, I have made an open invitation to any social welfare organisation to come forward to give relief, because it is needed there. Therefore, I will make enquiries.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU :** I have visited the place and it is alleged that all the people are not being provided with rations.

**SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA :** I have also visited the place. Let me give the figure. At the moment there are 49,272 persons waiting at the border area and everyone who crosses the border is given a certificate after inoculation and on production of the certificate enough ration is given. The other day I had occasion to go there. I saw it with my own eyes.



SHRI CHITTA BASU : On other days it is not given.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA : If it has not happened on other days, let me enquire.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : You please enquire. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Do not interrupt please.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA : Let me have one more minute. This is only initial reception and giving relief. The larger question is rather important, namely, rehabilitation. Most of them are agriculturists. They are small agriculturists having one or two acres and landless agricultural labour. Most of them, curiously enough—in fact about 95 per cent of them—are Namasudras belonging to the Scheduled Caste. Most of them came under distressing conditions. They had no belongings or anything with them. What little they were carrying, at the border on the other side the security people and others had robbed them of those belongings. They have come here in a very helpless condition. Therefore, immediate relief is being given. As I said, the larger question is providing rehabilitation. It depends on the co-operation that we get from the various State Governments. They are generous enough to promise us to give land. We also made certain concessions. As one hon. Member, I think it was Mr. Goray, said, if you take the East Pakistan refugees to a particular area and give them land, bullocks and all other facilities like schooling for their children and medical benefits, all those people who are settled there, the local tribals or the local Harijans or the local landless labourers become very unhappy about it and they protest. Therefore, we have said that after reclaiming the land, after making the land fit for cultivation, 25 per cent will be kept at the disposal of the local Government and they can

distribute it to the local landless poor, so that there may not be any heart-burning on the part of the local landless poor. This concession we have given and I hope the State Governments would give full co-operation and with their co-operation we will be able to settle them.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR (Rajasthan) : I would like to know from the Minister of Rehabilitation what arrangement, if any, was made for milk supply for children or even powdered milk or any other type of nutritious food in whatever form for the children who needed nourishment. I would like to know also this from the Minister of External Affairs. He has stated that it is a bilateral problem. Of course it is, and it is no use taking it to the international forum because it will only create tensions between the two countries. As mentioned by the hon. Minister of Rehabilitation, 180,000 people are ready to come according to his information, and may more are ready to come. I have not spoken at all. I would like to ask a clarification. What positive steps, what definite steps have the Government taken to stop this influx of refugees which is creating problems for our overpopulated country? We are controlling our population and this is adding to our problems. What steps are they thinking of taking or have they taken? Only relying on talks with friendly countries will not do. I would like to have a definite answer.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA : With regard to milk, I forgot to mention this. About four or five days ago Shrimati Renuka Ray and other social workers have started milk distribution. We have also asked other organisations who have promised to go there and distribute vitamin tablets.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : (Uttar Pradesh) : I would like to know how many refugees came between January and May. I would like to know the exact number.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA : I read the figures. I will read them again :

January	3,256
February	4,236
March	11,038
April	19,561
May	30,995

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am grateful to my friend for having asked this question. According to the figures he has given, more than 60,000, nearly 65,000, have come. This is the statement given by the hon. Minister on the floor of the House. Here I have got the document supplied to us, Members of the Consultative Committee on West Bengal, by the West Bengal authorities and of course by the Home Ministry of the Union Government; Mr. Chavan at that time was the Home Minister. From January 1970 to the 25th of May 10,971 families consisting of 45,000 persons arrived in West Bengal. During the above period 8,301 families consisting of 37,464 persons have been dispersed by special train. One set of figures of the Government says it is about 45,000. Another set of figures of the same Government says it is 67,000. I should like to know from Mr. Sanjivayya...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have to reply to the debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am replying.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You need not ask questions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Questions are to be replied. Who says questions are not to be replied? Twenty thousand is the gap, credibility gap of this Government. Now, this is how they are dealing with this problem; they do not even know how many people are coming. The same Government is giving two sets of figures on different occasions to the Members of Parliament. Well, I need not comment

upon it. It only shows that they know very little about what is actually happening there. I have got here papers given by the Central Government. I got them on the 15th July, this month, and we discussed it. We wanted to discuss it in the Consultative Committee. Now, I expected that some more encouraging suggestions or decisions will be made by the Government and more importantly, a decision will be announced by the Government. Nothing of the kind has been done. Our esteemed friend, Sardar Swaran Singh, has given his reply mainly on the points raised with regard to the foreign policy. I am in broad agreement with him...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Naturally.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Not naturally, unnaturally. I tell you, I am in broad agreement with him on those points. Why should you grudge it? You have been sitting with him all your life. And if I agree on one or two points, why should you grudge it? That is all that I say.

I agree, we cannot get anywhere by internationalising the problem. Hon. Members have suggested that we go to the United Nations. I could have understood it if it implied the hon. Members' visiting America on that occasion. But nothing of the kind. These Ministers will go. They will make speeches; they themselves will not follow what they say. And Pakistan will also be making speeches. And there will be a debate more or less on the lines we have, between us a controversy in the debate. Pakistan will give out all kinds of things. You will say all kinds of things. And the Americans, as you know, will have their own say; the Latin American countries are there. Confusion will be worse confounded. International public opinion, instead of being enlightened, will be highly confused after the speeches are complete. After that, of course, there will be a dinner given by the Americans. All of them will go and Sardar Swaran Singh will be shaking hands with his

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

counterpart there and the matter will end. Nothing will come out that way. And besides, internationalisation of this problem is wrong in principle. And we have yet another experience of the United Nations in so far as the Indo-Pakistan relations are concerned. Record of the past several years, more than two decades, is there. They will only create more difficulties and complications instead of helping a way out for us or for Pakistan to the satisfaction of both the countries. Therefore, I would beseech hon. Members here not think in terms of internationalisation. Some people may have that fancy for the United Nations Organisation or Lake Success, whatever you call it. But nothing comes out of that so far as this problem is concerned. We have had enough of it. And the one good thing that has happened over the past years is that the Tashkent Declaration has taken that problem out of the ambit of the United Nations and the Security Council and placed it on a bilateral plane. Well, we have to settle this problem on a bilateral basis. And that can be done only in a spirit of mutual cooperation. If we advance in this respect, we hope that tomorrow Pakistan, due to the political changes that may come there, will also follow the same path and sooner or later we, as neighbours, will be able to settle the problem that has been troubling us and troubling them also somewhat all these years. Therefore we should try that.

Now, with regard to the other suggestion, my friend, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, became excited, he spoke like a warrior. He wanted to grab from Pakistan some territory—"All right. Give me. Otherwise, I will take it." Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, you are a weak man, not a very healthy man, not of a martial type, I mean. Why do you speak in the language of a veteran fighter of the old time when you know very well that nothing will come out of that. On the contrary, the forces that are responsible for creating insecurity and tension in Pakistan will get a talking point from your speeches in order to justify their belli-

cose behaviour on the other side of the border. And I hope men like Mr. Akbar Ali Khan—who is otherwise an affable and nice man, although he is always contradicting himself—will not provide such a weapon to Pakistan in such matters. I was a little surprised by some of my hon. friends here. I do not know what they want. Bilateral relations are not war-like relations. Bilateral relations for solving a human problem, or an international problem, if you like, between two countries, imply that there should be a friendly approach. And it goes to our credit that we are having that friendly approach so far as Pakistan is concerned, despite provocations coming from them despite their straying away in some respects from the Tashkent Declaration. And we shall keep on to that tradition which is ours and which certainly will be helpful. That tradition ultimately is going to make a break-through in the situation, so that bilateral avenues are opened for a solution of the problem. I think we should think in these terms. The Indo-Pakistan problem is one of the many international problems in the world which have got to be taken bilaterally and settled bilaterally. It may be tortuous; it may take time; it may cause us agony and worry along the way. But all the same, there is no road open to us other than the path of bilateral talks and negotiations. That path had been opened. Unfortunately it has again been blocked because of some attitude on the part of the Pakistani authorities. We in Parliament should not prod the Government in the other direction, the wrong direction. On the contrary, we should help them to carry forward this approach, which is the correct approach in this matter.

A reference was made to the Nehru-Liaquat Pact. Well, there have been many pacts and they have been violated—everybody knows it—and that is why problems are with us. But does it mean that we should abandon the policy of talks and negotiations? Some hon. Members here got up and said "Unless talk on Farakka." It may sound very talk on Farakka." It may sound very

brave, but there will not be any talk at all. Then Pakistan will say "Unless you talk on Kashmir, we will not talk on this." They are already saying it. Therefore, we will be in a vicious circle. But we have said we are prepared to talk on any problem.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My friend, Mr. Sri Rama Reddy, is asking "What shall we do?" I can tell him we should not in any case go to the Supreme Court. That is quite clear.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Most irrelevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have said what we should not do. Now what else can you do? Your main strength is the strength of your secularism, the source of strength of all your arguments and posture that you may take with regard to Pakistan. Any other thing will be entirely wrong. So I say, let us abandon those ideas. Let us concentrate on the problem which is before us, the problem of relief and rehabilitation.

Now, Mr. Swaran Singh wanted to make a speech. He has made a speech. After his return to the Foreign Ministry, this is his first speech, I believe. He has made his speech and we have heard it. But we are more concerned with what Mr. D. Sanjivayya, the junior colleague of Mr. Swaran Singh, is doing. May I know what he is doing? According to him, there are 1,50,000 men, women and children who have come and to whom we have to give relief immediately, and we should also rehabilitate them mostly on land. What do we see here? Mr. Shukla—not this one, the elder one, the senior one, not the junior one—of Madhya Pradesh says that they will be rehabilitated in the Chambal valley. What do they mean by it? Will they be sent there for having a taste of the dacoits there or to educate the dacoits? You want to send the refugees to the Chambal valley where Mr. Shukla's

police men cannot easily go. Madhya Pradesh has got enough dacoits. Therefore, Sir, Mr. Bhanu Prakash Singh who is a Minister from Madhya Pradesh, who is a Maharaja of Nasirgarh or some such thing, would like certain elements to be expelled from the Congress Party, but would himself want to remain untouched. He occupies such a position in the Council of Ministers that even Prime Minister Indira Gandhi does not have the guts to tell him politely, "Mr. Bhanu Prakash Singh, it is time you got yourself expelled from the Congress Party". He has got plenty of land. Everybody knows it...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should only refer to the refugee problem.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Bhanu Prakash Singh in Madhya Pradesh still maintains huge extents of land *benami* lands, surplus lands, in one or another name...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you please continue your speech on rehabilitation of refugees.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why does he not make some of his lands available for the rehabilitation of the refugees? Mr. Shukla, the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh, can provide enough land. Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh are the two States which have got enough land to offer to the Government for the rehabilitation of the refugees. And what is Mr. Shukla doing? Whatever may be his progressive pretensions, Mr. Shukla, the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh, is coming out as a lackey, as an agent, of the landlords and the feudal elements, threatening and attacking the peasant population. Are we to expect that these persons who are coming from East Bengal will be satisfactorily rehabilitated by Mr. S. C. Shukla, the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh, who does not know how to behave with the peasants who are living there? Therefore, I say we have our doubts. The same applies to Mr. Shukhadia. In the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Canal area and other areas there is plenty of land. Rajasthan can offer plenty of land. And enough land should be got. Am I to understand that the leaders of the Congress Party at the Centre are so weak within their party today that they cannot compel Mr. Sukhadia and Mr. Shukla to make enough land available for the rehabilitation of the refugees who are coming from East Bengal? Let these things be stated ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please come to your point. Please answer only the relevant points. You have already taken twenty minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But I have to answer all the points. You seem to think that Mr. Bhanu Prakash Singh is irrelevant. There I agree with you. He is utterly irrelevant...

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Then, what is left for your land-grab movement?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I will then ask for Rajmata's land. There is no difficulty.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : So we were expecting some concrete answer from him Mr. Sanjivayya gave some answer. He told the Press Club of Calcutta what the State Government has exactly done. But the question is : How long will they take? This is the most important question. Is there a time-schedule for them? Have they concretised their plans? They are only saying, "We shall give lands". Where are they giving? When are they giving? How much are they giving? All these questions are high in the sky and we are told that rehabilitation will take place. Therefore, we do not believe in this kind of kite-flying stories about land being obtained. Mr. Chandra Shekhar, you are giving a party to Mr. Om Mehta because he has been made a Minister of State ...

(Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please finish now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All right. Now about the other thing. So, land is available. Then, what about the dispersal? The honourable Minister himself said that dispersal is an important task today. In the statement given by the Government, it is said that special trains have been provided. I have given you the figures already. Only one train was there; some times two were there. They are far, far inadequate even to take refugees that come every day. Then, the backlog is there. Therefore, more trains are needed. Then, people should be dispersed as quickly as possible. This should be done on a war footing. It is extremely dangerous to keep these refugees in a concentrated way, especially in the border areas. I have already told you how serious and dangerous it is. It has a social aspect; it is a communal aspect; and public health considerations are also involved here. All the medical men think that this will lead to serious hygienic hazards. But Government are not taking adequate steps to remove them quickly. Is it not possible for Shri Gulzarilal Nanda to provide a few more special trains which can carry them to distant places where proper arrangements could be made? The whole thing should be dealt with on a war footing. But you are not doing anything at all. I am asking only for the minimum. Even that is not being done. I think it is a serious failure on the part of the Government. It shows utter callousness; it shows lack of imagination; and it shows loyalty to the red tape. It is the Ramakrishna Mission which is distributing relief and food. You are giving them some money, of course. You can give them more money. I have no quarrel. According to the statement, Government have given them Rs. 50,000. You can give more. What we need is adequate food, milk for the children, clothes and proper shelter. If you do not provide these things, there will be troubles and more problems. We have enough problems in West Bengal. Do not add to them any more by your negligence and

callousness. That is what I am suggesting. We have given you some amendments. You might consider them. I would suggest that one of the Ministers—either Shri D. S. Sanjivayya or Shri Bhagwat Sahu Azad—should go there ...

**SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA :** Why not you also ?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** What can I do ? If necessary, I am prepared to go. That is not the point. But I do not hold the key to the solution of the problem. One of the two Ministers should go and stay there in West Bengal because now the problem is being handled by bureaucrats there. We have got three retired ICS officers who are ruling the destiny of West Bengal. I do not know where they should live—heaven or hell. But certainly they are utter misfits for the kind of job they are expected to do. Therefore, I say that better arrangements should be made and the problem should be vigorously tackled. These people have passed out of administration and they are not the people who can tackle this problem. I protest against the manner in which the Central Government is handling this problem of the new influx of refugees. I think this is contrary to good conscience—I am not talking of the policy. I say it is contrary to good conscience. You do not pay any human consideration to this problem which deserves all the human sympathy and human compassion. Therefore, I protest against it. I still demand that the matter should be reconsidered in consultation with the representatives of all the parties here with a view to working out feasible and practical solutions and then we should create some better machinery for speedy implementation because today the position is that whatever you decide is not being implemented. Now, whatever you decide is not being implemented. Therefore, a machinery has also to be created for speedy implementation of the correct decision that may be taken by the government after consultation and by others. Thank you.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Three amendments have been moved with the Motion. I do not know whether you are pressing it. Mr. Mishra, you are pressing it ?

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** Yes, Sir.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** The amendment moved by Shri S. N. Mishra is before the House.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Three amendments are there. We should like to know what the attitude of the government is.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** You have raised a point of order. When the motion was moved, all the three amendments were moved and all the amendments and the motions were before the House and they were discussed. It is not necessary for the honourable Member to raise it now.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Am I not entitled to ask what the attitude of the government is ?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :** Sir, I would say we oppose the first amendment and so far as the third amendment is concerned, that is by Shri Kalayan Roy, we will accept it.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** What about the fourth one ?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :** That also we oppose. It is not necessary I have already said.

*(Interruptions)*

**SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Delhi) :** The Government is not then following the Tashkent Agreement ?

**SHRI S. N. Mishra :** Since the government has been pleased to communicate its reaction to one of the amendments that shows the attitude of the government to this problem. Now, before placing this amendment for vote in this House, I must say; therefore, that in the light of the reaction that has been conveyed by the Honourable Minister of the Government to one of the amendments, I feel all the more reinforced in my view that this amendment

must be placed before the House. (*Interruptions*). With this kind of thing that is going on the vital interests of the refugees from East Pakistan are going to be side-tracked.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, Order. Please.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I must make it clear while seeking your indulgence for putting it to the vote of the House that we would not have asked for the vote had there been a satisfactory reply from the government for some effective action to protect the interests of the minority. In fact, there has been no reply. There has been only confusion. We have got some idea of the confusion in the minds of the government. We have been utterly disappointed. Therefore, we are constrained to put this.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Sir, on a point of order. The Motion is in the name of Shri Bhupesh Gupta and I do not know why Shri Swaran Singh gets up and says that he accepts the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not a question of accepting. I understand your point of order. Please sit down.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I have not yet finished, Sir. Secondly, if Shri Swaran Singh, the External Affairs Minister, thinks that by saying from that bench that he accepts the amendment—does he use that position of issuing whip to Congress benches?—he can...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. Your point of order is over now.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : My point of order exactly is this : What exactly is going to be the procedure in regard to this amendment ? Does Mr. Bhupesh Gupta accept it or Mr. Swaran Singh ? Let me know the procedure.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, Order. Please sit down. Once a Motion is moved in the House, amendments are moved by the hon. Members and it does not depend on the Mover of the Motion to say whether it should be accepted or not. When any amendment is moved, it is for the whole House to accept it or reject it, not for any individual Member. The hon. Minister has only given his reaction to the amendments. He has expressed the views of the Government on the different amendments and that he has done on the desire of an hon. Member. Therefore there is no point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please sit down. (*Interruptions*) Order, Order.

I am now putting to vote the amendment moved by Shri S. N. Mishra.

The question is :

2. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'and having considered the same, this House regrets the failure of the Government of India to take effective measures to compel Pakistan to honour the several Indo-Pak agreements regarding protection of minority interests, and also its failure to arrange adequately for the rehabilitation of the displaced persons'."

*The House divided*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

Ayes	..	38
Noes	..	87

AYES 38

Advani, Shri Lal K.

Alva, Dr. K. Nagappa

Ange, Shri S. C.

Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh.

Bindumati Devi, Shrimati.

Chavda, Shri K. S.

Chinai, Shri Babubhai M.

Deo Sharan, Shri Vijay Bhushan

Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.  
Jain, Shri Rattan Lal.  
Kaul, Shri B. K.  
Kemparaj, Shri B. T.  
Mallikarjunudu, Shri K. P.  
Mathur, Shri Jagdish Prasad  
Mishra, Shri S. N.  
Misra, Shri S. D.  
Mohammad, Chaudhary A.  
Murahari, Shri Godey  
Murthy, Shri B. P. Nagaraja  
Narayanappa, Shri Sanda  
Nawal Kishore, Shri  
Pande, Shri C. D.  
Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.  
Pitamber Das, Shri  
Prem Manohar, Shri  
Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta, Shrimati  
Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda  
Reddy, Shri M. Sri Rama  
Reddy Shri J. C. Nagi  
Sahai, Shri Ram  
Shahi, Shri Nagesawar Prasad  
Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.  
Sherkhan, Shri  
Singh, Shri Sitaram  
Tyagi, Shri Mahavir  
Varma, Shri Man Singh  
Varma, Shri Niranjan  
Yadav, Shri J. P.

## NOES 87

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.  
Ansari, Shri Hayatullah  
Appan, Shri G. A.  
Arora, Shri Arjun  
Bachchan, Dr. H. R.  
Baharul Islam, Shri  
Basu, Shri Chitta  
Bhadram, Shri M. V.  
Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore  
Brar, Sardar Narindar Singh  
Chandra Shekhar, Shri  
Chatterjee, Shri A. P.  
Chattopadhyaya, Dr. Debiprasad  
Das, Shri Ba ram

Das, Shri Bipinpal  
Dass, Shri Mahabir  
Dharia, Shri M. M.  
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar  
Ghosh, Shri Niren  
Goswami, Shri Sirman Prafulla  
Gujral, Shri I. K.  
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh  
Hassan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul  
Jain, Shri Dharam Chand  
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri  
Kalyan Chand, Shri  
Kaul, Shri M. N.  
Khaitan, Shri R. P.  
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali  
Kollur, Shri M. L.  
Koya, Shri B. V. Abdulla  
Krishan Kant, Shri  
Kulkarni, Shri A. G.  
Madani, Shri M. Asad  
Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.)  
Maragatham Chandrasekhar, Shrimati  
Mathew Kurian, Dr. K.  
Mehta, Shri Om  
Menon, Shri Balachandra  
Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania  
Mishra, Shri L. N.  
Mohamod Usman, Shri  
Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja  
Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar  
Nagpure, Shri V. T.  
Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati  
Narayanappa, Shri Sanda  
Neki Ram, Shri  
Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh  
Patil, Shri P. S.  
Purabi Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati  
Purakayastha, Shri Mahitosh  
Puri, Shri Dev Datt  
Raju, Shri V. B.  
Ramiah, Dr. K.  
Redy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha  
Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa  
Roshan Lal, Shri  
Roy, Shri Kalyan



Roy, Shri Monoranjan  
 Salig Ram, Dr.  
 Samuel, Shri M. H.  
 Sangma, Shri E. M.  
 Sanjivayya, Shri D.  
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati  
 Sen, Dr. Triguna  
 Shah, Shri K. K.  
 Shervani, Shri M. R.  
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani  
 Shukla, Shri M. P.  
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder  
 Singh, Shri Dalpat  
 Singh, Shri Jogendra  
 Singh, Shri Phool  
 Singh, Shri Sultan  
 Singh, Shri Triloki  
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad  
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap  
 Sivaprakasam, Shri S.  
 Srinivasan, Shri T. K.  
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad  
 Tohra, Sardar Gurcharan Singh  
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi  
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati  
 Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati  
 Yadav, Shri Shyam Lal  
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

6 P.M.

*The motion was negatived.*

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : The country must have noted the parties which have voted for this amendment. The SSP, the PSP, the Cong(O), the Jan Sangh and the Swatantra have all voted. The Communist Parties have not voted ...

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I now take up the second amendment in the name of Mr. Kalyan Roy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I heartily accept this amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

3. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'and having considered the same, this House urges upon the Government to take all necessary steps for the quick dispersal and proper rehabilitation of the refugees and also to take every possible initiative in carrying forward India's correct policy of Indo-Pakistan friendship in the Tashkent spirit."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What about Mr. Gupta's amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : In view of the fact that Mr. Kalyan Roy's amendment has been accepted by the House, I withdraw my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Is it the pleasure of the House to give permission to Mr. Gupta to withdraw his amendment ?

*(After seeing the sense of the House)*

The amendment is withdrawn.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : On a point of order. If he could say that the amendment is acceptable to him I could understand but if the main motion has been withdrawn, how can an amendment be withdrawn ?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : One word.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He has raised a point of order and I must dispose it of. Mr. Gupta has not withdrawn his motion. He has withdrawn his amendment.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : He said so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My first amendment was, in the event of the first one not being accepted, the last one would have come. If Mr. Ghosh wants to adopt it, let him do so.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I move that amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I do not permit him to withdraw his amendment. It is the property of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. There should not be any dialogue in the House.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I am on a point of order.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : He must seek the permission of the House.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I am on a point of order and my point of order is exactly this that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has moved a motion that the situation be taken into consideration. Now, after moving the motion, he also moved an amendment to that motion. Now, as soon as he moves an amendment to his motion which he moves himself, the entire thing becomes his, that is to say, he cannot leave the tail and go among the Treasury Benches. So the tail also must attach to him. This is my point of order. Therefore, Sir, he cannot get up and say that he can forgo a part of it. He has moved the motion and thereafter he has moved the amendment. Therefore, the entire thing, the motion with the amendment, is his, and he cannot now get up and say that part of it he does not move. And if he says that, it would be withdrawing the entire motion. This is my point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of order, Sir. I think Mr. Niren Ghosh was quite right on the point of procedure. He says that if I want to withdraw my amendment I must have the permission of the House, and a politician is always better than a lawyer in such matters. But my lawyer friend has taken up his case and he was said that this has become part of the motion. No motion is amended here, but if my hon. friend, Mr. Niren Ghosh, has such liking for me, I should like to press it also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right. Please sit down. There is no point of order. *(Interruptions)* Please sit down, Mr. Niren Ghosh. Now I am putting before the House the motion as amended.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : No, Sir, it cannot be.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : On a point of order.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Unless that leave is granted, you cannot do that. Unless the House grants leave to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to withdraw his amendment, his amendment cannot be taken as withdrawn.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Mr. Niren Ghosh has already said that he does not permit Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to withdraw his amendment. Therefore, whether the House grants him permission to withdraw his amendment, let that matter be taken into consideration by the House now. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Tyagi, please sit down. Mr. Monoranjan Roy, please sit down. Order, order. When Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had indicated his desire to withdraw his amendment, I had asked the House whether it was the pleasure of the House to give him permission to withdraw his amendment.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : No, no.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes, yes, I had said so. It is a matter of proceedings and you can go through the proceedings. I had said at that time that nobody had any objection to his withdrawing the same.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Yes, you did ask the House on the amendment...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : No.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu) : On a point of order.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Permission of the House was not asked for.

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY (West Bengal) : I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order please. There is no point of order. Please sit down.

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY : I am raising a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now I am on my legs. Please sit down.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is a matter of proceedings. I had asked : is it the pleasure of the House to give him permission to withdraw ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Why don't you look at the proceedings ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : This is most unfair. You should not say like that. (Interruptions) Order, order; please sit down.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : You did ask the House and one Member, Mr. Niren Ghosh, said no and if he wants to put it to a division you must take a division on it. If one man says no, you must put it to the House.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : My submission is that we are unnecessarily creating difficulties. If there has been a confusion on this point, you can seek the opinion of the House once again on that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is not confusion.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : There has been a confusion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is no confusion : I definitely remember. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why are you becoming technical ? I have made it very clear that. . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : When the question was put I raised the voice of objection that I do not allow him to withdraw it. Having done so the Chair is duty bound to take the opinion of the House on that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, you yourself said that I had indicated. You were quite right that I had indicated but since one or two Members—and now I find many Members—think that it is a very good motion—and it is very flattering to me—therefore what I had indicated need not be taken as my indication and it should be put to the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you know that whenever we want to put anything before the House for the decision of the House, we say those in favour may say aye and those against no. After that if there is no objection raised, if there is no pressing for division, it is taken as accepted.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I did object at that time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please listen now. After I had said, is it the pleasure of the House that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta be allowed to withdraw the amendment—perhaps one feeble voice might have been there—nobody raised any objection at that time. Only now you are opposing it and saying that you are not allowing Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to withdraw the amendment.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Sir, you are . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please sit down; I am on my legs.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : You are saying wrong things; that is why I want to correct you before you proceed further.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have not said anything wrong.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : You are giving a wrong version of the proceedings.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Whatever I have felt I have felt. Now that you have not disposed of this, at any stage I can ask for a revision of my stand and I say now I press that amendment. I am not withdrawing it. That is a very reasonable amendment and the Government should accept it.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nominated) : Having once ruled that the House has agreed to the withdrawal, you cannot...

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : You asked the House and some Members said no. And there was confusion.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : This is all wrong.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why are you unnecessarily prolonging ?

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu) : Sir, on a point of order.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM : I have not finished my point of order. I was interrupted. Having asked for withdrawal it is not now open to the Member to say that he wants to press it to vote. The matter must stand with your announcement that the House has agreed to the withdrawal of that amendment.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : There can be no such announcement; when it was raised I raised the objection simultaneously.

SHRI MAHABIR TYAGI : This is only a technical thing.

(Interruptions)

SHRI G. A. APPAN : Sir, I am on a point of order, a very valid point of order. When Mr. Bhupesh Gupta wanted to withdraw his amendment it was the duty of the Chair to seek the consensus of the House but unfortunately

the Chair did not ask the concurrence of the House. But now the Chair feels or thinks that the concurrence of the House had been asked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : He did it.

SHRI G. A. APPAN : No; he did not. It will not be there in the records.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Please sit down. It is most unfair for any Member to cast such aspersions on the Chair. Any Member can go through the record. I have asked the House whether it is the pleasure of the House to give permission to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to withdraw his amendment. You should not say like this, casting aspersions on the Chair. (Interruptions). This can never be tolerated. Please sit down now.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No, aspersion. No aspersion need be cast on you or anybody else. One thing is quite clear that you never said it. Under the rules you are supposed to say or press the amendment. (Interruption). Let me finish. You never said that the amendment is lost. Unless that pronouncement comes from you and the proceedings will bear me out, you cannot say that the matter has been irrevocably closed. It is not at all that, but then, Sir, confusion arose with regard to whether the House would like it or not. It is quite clear that a section of the House would like to support my amendment. Therefore, I have no apprehension on that score. Therefore, I say, since you have not closed it, why are you going by technicalities of that part ? You had not pronounced your judgment or verdict on that amendment. Having taken the clear opinion of the House, than you would have said that the amendment is lost or Bhupesh Gupta has been allowed to withdraw it. Nothing of this kind.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have said that the amendment is withdrawn. You can go through the record. I did say that the amendment is withdrawn.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Whatever you have said, you should have asked for the permission of the House : "Has Bhupesh Gupta leave of the House to withdraw the amendment ?" You never asked that thing. Therefore, I am not casting any aspersion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Why do you not read the proceedings and see whether I have asked it or not ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Even if you have asked it or you have said it, simultaneously opinion comes from the House that this amendment should be pressed. We know, if this amendment is pressed, it will be passed, but I was under the impression that the earlier amendment would serve the purpose anyhow of this amendment also. Therefore, you can take the opinion. What is wrong there ? What is wrong there, when the Mover himself is pleading for that ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Dharia, you want to say something ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was patiently listening in the House and I should say that the Chair had asked the House whether the House gives its permission to the Mover to withdraw his amendment. At that time, most of the Members said 'Yes', but I think also Mr. Niren Ghosh in his seat said 'No'. Of course, it is for the Chair. If the Chair has not heard the voice, naturally the Chair can say and I also heard the Chair saying that the amendment is withdrawn. I have heard that also from the Chair. Under these circumstances I think the verdict of the Chair should prevail. When the Chair is all the while saying that you can refer to the record, when the hon. Deputy Chairman is all the while saying that you can refer to the record, under these circumstances, to challenge the Chair itself will not be fair. (Interruptions). I am on my legs and I am not going to yield.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : What is the use of dramatics here ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I would like to appeal to the House that when the Chair has been insisting that you can refer to the record, I think that much privilege and allowance should be given to the Chair. I would like to appeal to the House when the amendment has been allowed to be withdrawn and when the Chair has declared accordingly, it will not be fair on the part of any Member to say now : "I am not withdrawing my amendment and I would like to insist on that." Under these circumstances, let us not go back. If we want to keep this issue open, let us adjourn at this stage...

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Let me have my say. I am going to have my say. How can you say 'No' ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please continue.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : My submission to the House would be this. If the Members are of the opinion that you have not said and in case they want to see the record you can give your ruling just now. If you are convinced that it is not there in the record, the Chair can come before the House and say that this is the situation and the Chair can ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why don't you agree on this amendment ? We have asked that the Government should consult all parties. What is wrong in it ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, it would be always open for the Chair to say to the House that this was the situation. Let us finish the business as the Chair said and let us respect the Chair. That is my humble submission to the House.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala) : Mr. Deputy Chairman...

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : I got up and I want to have my say.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** You will get it. I say you will get it. You have spoken a number of times. But Mr. Chandrasekharan rose a number of times and he could not speak once.

**SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN :** Mr. Deputy Chairman, rather a very intriguing situation faces this House just at this juncture. The hon. Member, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has clearly told this House that he has withdrawn his amendment. On that basis you accepted his statement and put the question before this hon. House. Whatever be the difficulties that we are facing now I should submit, Sir, that it will be the creation of a very bad parliamentary precedent if the hon. Member, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is to be allowed to state, on the basis that no technicality should prevail, that he should be allowed to revise his statement that the question be put once again before this hon. House on the basis that he presses his amendment. I am clearly of the view that Shri Bhupesh Gupta should not be allowed to press the question before the House on the basis of his revised thinking, on the basis of his confusion. But that is one aspect. So far as the other aspect is concerned it is absolutely correct that so far as the records are concerned I believe that you have put the question clearly before this House, and this House had divided itself with voice "aye" and "no". It is also correct that so far as the record goes and so far as you are concerned you have expressed that the amendment is withdrawn with the leave of the House. But a small thing that had happened immediately subsequently probably did not catch the ear of the reporters and probably did not catch you, Sir. I had clearly noticed the hon. Member, Mr. Niren Ghosh, standing up and saying that he questions that, and if he questioned that and if you had noticed that and if the reporters had noticed that, certainly you, Sir, in the ordinary course would have gone into a division. The only question therefore is whether the hon. Member, Mr. Niren Ghosh, did actually say that, in which case a small correction, subject to what you may

ultimately think on this point, could be made, but certainly not on the basis of the revised thinking of the hon. Member, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. Thank you.

**SHRI GODEY MURAHARI :** I also would exactly repeat what Mr. Chandrasekharan said. That is exactly the position. I had heard you ask whether the House gives leave to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to withdraw his amendment. At that time there was such a lot of confusion because some Members had got up from this side and they had raised some points of order. Mr. Niren Ghosh was on his legs saying he should not be allowed to withdraw. If you had heard, you would certainly have asked for a division of the House. Therefore, I would request at this stage that you divide the House on the question whether leave be granted to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to withdraw his amendment.

**SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM :** May I take the House back to what happened? It was only when somebody from the opposition raised a difficulty that if the amendment of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta stands withdrawn, it means the motion gets withdrawn, what remains—that means the opposition at that time accepted the position that the amendment is withdrawn—then the curious position as to what happens to his motion arose. Therefore, the position at that time was...

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH :** Before that I raised my objection on a point of correction. I raised before that.

**SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM :** Later on.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH :** Not later on, but before.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** My submission is that if you insist that you have given a ruling, the right decision would be to abide by your ruling. But I must make some humble submission—if in the light of the facts that have been brought to your notice you think it fit to revise your opinion to reconsider this, then I would plead with you that you should reconsider your decision about this.

[Shri S. N. Mishra.]

Then with regard to the two issues which have been sought to be made out, I should say that there is in fact only one issue. There is no question of the hon. Shri Bhupesh Gupta being allowed to revise his opinion. There can be no question of that, and this would be quite unprecedented in parliamentary procedure that he would be allowed to revise his opinion. There can be no question of that. The only question for the consideration of the House would be whether Shri Bhupesh Gupta should be granted leave to withdraw his amendment or not. That is the only issue. Now, we leave it to you. If you insist that you have given a ruling, we will abide by your ruling. But if you do not, then we shall...

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : The clear position is that with regard to the withdrawal of amendment and the sequence of events, there are conflicting versions, and every time you say that the record can be seen. What I suggest is this. Why don't you see the record and read it and then we can come to a conclusion. Otherwise, the discussion will never end. Read the record and we will abide by it.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : I am sorry. Mr. Niren Ghosh would not have been reported in the record because there was so much...

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : In order to assist the Reporters to correctly record the proceedings of the Houses, there is also a system in both the Houses whereby the proceedings are tape-recorded. Let the tape-record be played and let us see what exactly was the position.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : May I plead with the House not to go into details and to leave the matter entirely in your hands ? It might be most gracious of the House not to go into details.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : One word of submission. Since it has been questioned, I state before the House with full responsibility that at the time when the

question was put whether leave be granted, I said 'No', it is the property of the House. If the Reporters have not recorded it, that should not be taken as correct because these proceedings are sent to all Members for correction. The Reporters may not record the proceedings of the House correctly, there might be mistakes. In this case, the record shows that my objection has not been recorded. I say that the report is incorrect and wide of the mark.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : May I point out to Shri Niren Ghosh ? Assuming that you had said 'No', even then if by a majority the Chair has come to the conclusion that leave is granted, there is no case.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Please.

Now, suppose I asked the House whether it is the pleasure of the House to allow Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to withdraw his amendment, a number of Members are saying 'Yes' and one Member says 'No'. It means that we have decided that question by a voice vote. (Interruptions) No, no. Just listen.

When all the Members have said 'Yes', Mr. Niren Ghosh has only said, 'No'. He never said so far that he had asked for a division and no other Member has said, when Mr. Niren Ghosh said 'No', that they had asked for a division. Therefore, when a number of Members were saying 'Yes' and only one Member was saying 'No', it means that the House has decided to grant leave.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : That is not correct according to the rules. Any Member is entitled to call for a division.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Apart from that the proceedings of the House continued further. Points of order were raised. Somebody raised the question

that as the motion has been withdrawn, how can the amendment be put to vote. It means that the House was taking that something had been withdrawn, whether it was the amendment or the motion. And, therefore, the question was raised; if the motion is withdrawn, how can the amendment be put to vote? What I mean is, a number of such questions were raised. So, if somebody says "Well, I raised my voice that it should not be allowed to be withdrawn", it is not a correct position. So far as I understand, the House had granted permission and on that basis, the other proceedings of the House continued. And only after some time, this question has been raised, that no leave has been granted.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : No.

SHRI GODEV MURAHARI : He never got a chance to press for a division.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I contend that these altercations were going on and in the midst of the altercations, I said "That is not the position, the sense of the House has got to be taken."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : As I have already said, so far as I followed the proceedings of the House...

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : I would like to suggest one thing before you read out the proceedings. What you have said just now carries conviction. What you said was that even if formally it was not announced that the amendment was withdrawn, when it was argued that if a portion is withdrawn, the whole is considered to be withdrawn, it meant that the House took it for granted that a portion had been withdrawn. And the moment we were under the impression that it had been withdrawn, the matter ended. Even if the formalities were not observed, we were discussing the legal position on the assumption that it had been withdrawn. So, what you have said carries conviction and the proceedings may not be read.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I said "Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's amendment." L29RS(C)/70—37—22-2-71—GIPF.

Everything was clear. The amendments have been circulated to you. And now to say that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta did not ask for withdrawal of the amendment but he wanted to withdraw the motion, is not correct.

Now I am putting the motion as amended before the House.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I protest against your refusal to put my contention before the House—because I said "No and I wanted the sense of the House to be taken—we walk out."

(At this stage, Shri Niren Ghosh and Shri A. P. Chatterjee left the House.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That the influx of refugees from East Pakistan in recent months and the steps taken by Government to rehabilitate them be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House urges upon the Government to take all necessary steps for the quick dispersal and proper rehabilitation of the refugees and also to take every possible initiative in carrying forward India's correct policy of Indo-Pakistan friendship in the Tashkent spirit."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### RE CERTAIN ALLEGATION AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : Sir, Mr. Rajnarain in the afternoon made an allegation that some money was paid to the P.M. or the Government when the licence to the Tatas was granted. I hereby emphatically say that the allegation is baseless.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-five minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 28th July, 1970.