

[Shri P. T. Leuva.] in every case where a party wants to file an appeal before the Supreme Court, the High Court will have to give a certificate that the case is a fit case for taking it in appeal to the Supreme Court. Now, Sir . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is five of the clock and we have to take up some other subject that is on the agenda.

5 P.M.

**HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSIONARISING
OUT OF ANSWERS GIVEN IN REPLY
TO STARRED QUESTION
NO. 101**

**SETTLEMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS IN
WEST BENGAL**

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise again today to speak for a cause which is eminently human and, I think, a cause that does not deserve to be vitiated by introducing any heated political controversy. I hope the hon. Minister will conform to this rule, and I shall on my part try to do that.

Sir, I am here to speak, on behalf of refugees, about certain aspects of the Government's rehabilitation policy. As you know, Sir, there are about 35 lakh displaced persons in West Bengal today from East Bengal. Out of them only 16 lakhs or so, according to the official figure, have got some kind of assistance, and a majority of them have not at all been resettled in life. Even in his statement, Dr. B. C. Roy informed us that many of those who received rehabilitation assistance had only been partially settled. I would like to read out a portion of that statement. It says:

"In this connection, a very important point to be taken note of is that 50 per cent, of the displaced person families who have been given financial assistance so far have been

only partially rehabilitated, with a very substantial proportion of them requiring employment for an adequate living . . .

Sir, half of them have not got any assistance whatsoever. About 16 lakhs or so who received some financial assistance have only partially been rehabilitated. According to the statement of the Chief Minister, an overwhelming majority of those people are not rehabilitated today. Sir, this only explains and underlines the failure on the part of the Government and the failure of its rehabilitation policies. However, I need not go into that question, because my subject is not that. Here I am mostly- concerned with the urgent problem of rehabilitation of 52 thousand (refugee families who are today living in what is called 'camps'. This is my problem. Out of them, Sir, 33 thousand families are agriculturists and the rest are non-agriculturists. Now, Sir, the question that has arisen is as to how these families in the camps, living in conditions of unaccountable misery and suffering, should be speedily rehabilitated. Over that question some controversy has arisen between the Government on the one hand and the Opposition and other refugee organisations on the other. I should like to dispassionately place before the House the merits of both these points of view. I would not like to be carried away by the fact that Government has been taking a particular step. It is easy to support the Government, but that may not always be wise. After all, Sir, the entire Opposition in Bengal today, which accounts for 100 members in an Assembly of 252, and which also has got behind it the backing of the refugee organisations, is something to be reckoned with. Let us therefore examine this position on its merits.

Now, Sir, the Government has taken the stand that these camps must be closed by the end of July next year and the refugees have been told "Until and unless you go to Dandakaranya or accept our proposals, you shall not be given any assistance, and

the camps shall be closed after giving you six months' dole, which means Rs. 300 or so." In other words, Sir, the Government will wash its hands clean of all its responsibility in respect of the camp refugees who do not, for whatever reasons they might have, like to go to Dandakaranya. I am, Sir, very clear that we are not as such opposed to refugees going outside the State and we are not at all opposed to any refugee voluntarily going there. If the Government can take the entire lot of refugees there by example and by persuasion, they are welcome to do it. But what we are opposed to in this connection is that this should not be done by using force. You will ask as to where that force comes in. That force comes in in this way, Sir. You have given them an ultimatum by telling them that until and unless they toe your line or follow your dictate, they cannot expect any kind of assistance from the Government, and in a matter of six months or so, they will be left completely helpless, without even being given this little assistance that they were receiving today. If this is not coercion, if this is not force, then what is it? This is definitely a method of browbeating them. And I do not know how we can reconcile this thing with the statement made by Dr. B. C. Roy in April this year that it was not the Government's policy to force anybody to go to Dandakaranya. I am not saying that the Government is using batons and bullets in this case. But this is definitely a kind of pressure and a kind of blackmail which should not be taken recourse to in solving a problem which is human and which requires compassion and sympathy on the part of the Government.

Now, Sir, our position with regard to this problem is this. I have made it quite clear that as far as Dandakaranya is concerned, it is for the Government to persuade them and take them there by example, if they like instead of using any kind of force. Am I to understand that if several thousand refugee families do not go there for whatever reasons they might be having, the Government of India

would be giving up all their responsibilities in regard to them and Parliament would just be looking on? Well, I cannot think of Parliament in such terms. You may have a quarrel with them, if they do not like to go, but why should you shirk all your responsibilities in this matter? This is the point which I wish to make. If you think that you will not do that thing, then why this declaration in terms of an ultimatum that either they must go or they must face starvation and death? Why should that ultimatum be there? As far as the Dandakaranya scheme is concerned, Sir, we can discuss it on its merits.

Sir, I have got with me here the Dandakaranya Supplement of the *Amrit Bazar Patrika* of 10th December. There is an article written by Sir S. V. Ramamurty, who is the Chairman of the Dandakaranya Development Authority. This is what he says:

"An area as big as most States in India will be developed and made available for the progressive realisation of a good life by Indians who have become a surplus population in existing areas".

So, Sir, the Dandakaranya scheme is meant merely for absorbing that surplus population, not from one State, but from various other States. And he looks upon it as a development scheme in the context of our entire economy. Then he says:

"We know how surplus population in Europe found a way of progressive good life in America."

That is how he looks at this problem. Further on, Sir, he says:

"I felt that it was a fit task for free India to develop this long neglected area and make it available for increasing national wealth and the meeting of national needs."

Now, Sir, this is how he speaks of the Dandakaranya scheme. Therefore, Sir, if it is only the question of development of that particular area, or

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] for that matter any area, we are all agreed that undeveloped areas have got to be developed. But, Sir, this area of 80,000 square miles directly involves three States, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Andhra Pradesh. This is not the way in which you should develop such areas. Well, let there be some consultation among those States and let there be some discussions in Parliament as to how the resources of India could be husbanded for some speedy development of that Danda-karanya area. If that is done, we shall all be in favour of it. Therefore, Sir, on that score there is no quarrel with the Government.

Then, Sir, I would only point out one more thing. It has been pointed out by many economists that in Orissa, the agricultural labour population constitutes 43 per cent. In Madhya Pradesh, it is 40 per cent.—those who have no land or very little land. This is the position. Now whenever we think in terms of developing that area, we have to take into account the agricultural labourers who do not have enough jobs and who are living in those areas acclimatised to certain economic conditions there and who would be able to function better for economic development in that area.

Nothing of this sort. In the Orissa Assembly, in fact, I understand that when discussing this question, various controversies have arisen. Let us not confuse the broad question of development of under-developed areas with the specific question of rehabilitation of the displaced persons who are now living in West Bengal camps. We are concerned in this proposition here with the problem of rehabilitation of the displaced persons in West Bengal camps today. I join issue with the attitude the Government has taken. They may have their own case but we too have our own case. There should be discussion, there should be consultation, there should not be coercion, there should not be intervention by a proclamation on the part of the Rehabilitation Ministry of the Govern-

ment of India 'Either do this thing or be prepared to die'. This does not speak well of a Government which should deal with this problem with human compassion. Our point is this. Our case against them is that according to us, there are still possibilities for rehabilitating a large number of families in West Bengal itself. The Government case is that there is no such possibility, that the point of saturation has been reached. We have made all kinds of calculations and only the other day, last Sunday, Dr. B. C. Roy, at long last admitted—and I have got his speech sent to me by Shri Jyoti Basu and it came in the press also—that at least 10,000 families could be resettled, agricultural families, in West Bengal itself. He has that much land. Dr. Roy himself said that. The question now arises with regard to the other 25,000 families. I think it is possible if we explore the possibilities. Before I touch on that point, I should only like to draw your attention to what Dr. Roy himself said as a matter of policy in his statement which was read before the House in November:

"The desire of the Bengalee to live in West Bengal is appreciated and it is understandable."

This is what he said but then he went on to the economic considerations. He understands it and he says that it is desirable also. Now our contention is this that if it is appreciated, if it is desirable, why not explore the possibility? According to us, we find that there would be easily available at least 2 lakh acres of land for rehabilitating the entire families of the agriculturists in the camps today. That is to say, for the 33,000 or so, you require only 1,32,000 acres of land roughly. If we get 1,50,000 acres of land it is possible for us to rehabilitate these camp refugees, agriculturists, in West Bengal itself. If that does not come, by all means we can understand the Government going forward for sending some people outside. Nobody will object to it in any

case, in that situation but instead of doing that, these methods of coercion will lead to a crisis. In any case, it will create complications. The Government sticks to its position, its stand, that the West Bengal economy has reached a saturation point. Our point is quite different. There are still possibilities, and what is more industrial development . . .

{Time bell rings.}

I hope you will give me a few minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must give him sufficient time to reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you think, you can give me a few minutes more to finish my point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not beyond 5-30. There are other engagements. It is only a half-an-hour discussion. You take 15 minutes and you give him 15 minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can extend his time a bit.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have done it. Sometimes you do it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not for half-an-hour discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please let me develop. This is the point. What we say is, let them discuss over this matter specially when Dr. Roy himself has said it and it is possible and an economist has pointed out that the cost of rehabilitation would be, per family, much less than in Dandakaranya because there it would be Rs. 10,000 or so. K\$Pe, if you spend Rs. 6,000 per family it is possible to rehabilitate the families and in fact they are spending much more outside than in Bengal. Secondly, industries should be started in the State Sector and more funds should be allocated by the Govern-94 RSD.—5.

ment of India for carrying on rehabilitation there. That is also essential. It is most important today in this situation. I would beg of the Government to withdraw that declaration. That declaration has created all complications and that is something which is acting as a great provocation not only to the refugees themselves but to large sections of other people who are not refugees. This is what I say. I avoid sentiments. Large sections of public opinion in West Bengal, which is not small feel it. I don't represent a small force, however small it may be here. I represent there a big force and all the opposition parties are united over this matter.

(Time bell rings.)

As far as I understand, the refugees themselves had found 2 lakh acres of land themselves with their own efforts. They have found 1,47,000 acres. The Government found very little for them, for those who have settled in the lands, thought it is possible. In this document, many proposals have been submitted. This is an alternative proposal for the rehabilitation of camp refugees by the United Central Refugee Council. Let there be a discussion in the Consultative Committee, in a Parliamentary Committee. Let there be discussion in it. We would like that. If we still quarrel over it, let some expert commanding the confidence of both sides come and discuss on merits both the proposals that are there before us and on the basis of that arrive at a common solution. I would ask the Government and would appeal to them not to precipitate a crisis over this matter. Nobody wants a crisis, nobody wants to make political capital over this but it is wrong, it is cruel, it is inhuman today to threaten the refugees and then to push through this. Even now they are not in a position to take one or two thousand families there after all these talks about Dandakaranya because it has not progressed . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore in six months' time they will not be in a position to absorb these families there in any case. Even if I grant what they say, they will not be in a position to do that. Why then precipitate a crisis, why then stick to that hideous order and declaration and ultimatum? Take it back and come and have a common discussion and a solution could still be found. This is what would ask the House to consider.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What I question do you want to ask, Mr. j Prasad Rao?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: (Andhra Pradesh): I would like to know from j the Hon. Minister whether about this Dandakaranya Scheme the Governments of Andhra, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh were addressed about the rehabilitation of agricultural labourers from those States also and if so, what were the replies given by those Governments?

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पंजाब) : जनाब, मैं आनरेबल मिनिस्टर से एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। वेस्ट पाकिस्तान से ५० लाख रिफ्यूजीज हिन्दुस्तान में आये और वैसे ही ईस्ट बंगाल से ४० लाख रिफ्यूजीज आये। वेस्ट पाकिस्तान के रिफ्यूजीज ५०० करोड़ रुपये की जायदाद छोड़ कर आये और उसमें से सिर्फ १०० करोड़ रुपया उनको मिला। कोई कैम्प उनके लिये नहीं खोले गये और उनको कोई खास किस्म की एड नहीं दी गई, कुछ मामूली एड दी गई, बावजूद इसके व अपने आप को रिहैबिलिटेड कर सके।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No speech.

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : इसके अलावा १० लाख आदमी जो कि पाकिस्तान में लैडलैस थे वे टेनेंटस थे अब

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are making a speech.

SARDAR RAGHBIR SINGH PANJHAZARI: I will put the question.

मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर ईस्ट बंगाल के पुरुषार्थी रंडकारण्य में नहीं जाना चाहते तो क्या हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब वेस्ट पाकिस्तान के इन रिफ्यूजीज को रंडकारण्य में बसाना चाहेंगे। अगर हमारे रिफ्यूजीज को वहाँ बसाया गया तो मैं आनरेबल मिनिस्टर को यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि जितना भी उनका उस पर खर्च होगा या हुआ है उससे ज्यादा वे उनको वापस करेंगे, यही नहीं बल्कि सारी जमीन जो कि मध्य प्रदेश और उड़ीसा की है उसे अच्छी तरह से रिहैबिलिटेड करेंगे।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is an interesting strategy. This is propaganda value.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about yours?

THE MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA) : Sir, I have listened to the speech of Shri Bhupesh Gupta with great attention. In the notice that he had given to the Secretary, Rajya Sabha, in which he wanted to raise a discussion for half-an-hour this evening, he had made a definite statement and the statement was that the proposals of the Government did not take into account the economic, cultural and social aspects of the proposals that we are formulating for the rehabilitation of the displaced persons from East Pakistan. No mention of it has been made whatsoever. Shri Bhupesh Gupta has more or less dealt with the general Doiic, of rehabilitation of the displaced persons from East Pakistan. The time at my disposal being so short. I will not be able to do full justice to it but there are one or two important observations that I would like to make.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta says that we are using coercion, that we are using force in taking people from West Bengal into States outside West Bengal, I believe he has a very convenient

ient memory. This policy of the dispersal of the displaced persons from West Bengal into States outside West Bengal was adopted and pursued every year since as far back as 1949. In 1949, we sent the first batch of displaced persons from West Bengal to the Andamans. Then, Sir, a year after, that is to say, in 1950, as many as 13,880 families were sent from camps in West Bengal to Bihar and the Andamans and Orissa. About 8000 families were sent to Bihar and about 5,400 were sent to Orissa. This process has gone on till today, and about 30,000 families, comprising about a lakh and fifty thousand displaced persons have already been dispersed outside West Bengal. There is nothing new that the Government of India is doing. As far back as 1949 or in the early stages of partition, it was realised that two-thirds of Bengal having gone to Pakistan and one-third having come to us, and on the top of it lakhs of people were coming in—it was only a one-way traffic unlike in the West—from East Pakistan into India, the need was realised then, and the opposition leaders in this House, in the Lok Sabha and the Bengal Legislative Assembly have been party to the dispersal of Bengalis from West Bengal to States outside. This is one point which I wanted to make. I would like my figures to be contra-dinted and also whether this has not been a continuous policy from 1949.

About two years ago, when I started dealing with this matter in a very vigorous way, my hon. friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta—again I will remind him—it was he and his friends in the other House who suggested that the cultural life of the displaced persons, the community life of the displaced persons, more so of the Bengali who is wedded to certain ideas, to certain culture, to certain background and certain history, should be kept intact, that instead of spreading them all over in different States in small numbers, they should be taken to compact blocks the climate of which would be akin to that of West Bengal. Now,

Sir, what have I done? People have been taken to Madhya Pradesh. They have gone to Dharmajaigarh and other places, and in spite of the foreign element of which the hon. Member has spoken, in spite of the Memb of his party agitating against various things and persuading them to go back, people have stayed there and they have become a part of the population in Madhya Pradesh and are now wedded to the land and producing good results. Similarly, Sir, in Orissa, I have taken displaced persons to the Chilka Lake, and I have reclaimed a portion of it and I have set up a large number of colonies called Bhusandpur. And they are living there. What am I doing now? In these two States of Madhya Pradesh and Orissa—Andhra still is out of the picture—my hon. friend Dr. Gour is perhaps under a misapprehension . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not Dr. Gour, but Mr. Prasad Rao.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: I am sorry. Anyway, Andhra is not in the picture as yet. We are still operating only in these two States for the time being. . We may call it Ambikapur. We may call it Dharmajaigarh or we may call it Cuttack or Bhusandpur. To me the places are Pharasgaon, Narayangunj, Jagadapur or Koraput. These are the areas that I have taken. I have taken big areas, sizeable blocks where the population is very small and where the potentialities are tremendous and where the soil is virgin, and where large areas can be developed and Bengalis in sizeable numbers, not in hundreds, but in thousands, can be rehabilitated so that their cultural life and their community life can be kept intact.

AN HON. MEMBER: They can even better their lives.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: Sir, the question is about economic holdings. Shri Bhupesh Gupta has been very happy in quoting Dr. Roy where, from the main context he has taken one or two remarks. I also admit that a Bengali would like to stay in West

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna.] Bengal. So will I, a Pathan, like to be in Pathan land. So will a Maharash-trian like to be, so will a Gujerati like to be in his own place. But then in Bengal there are no lands and whatever land there is has been either occupied or is land of such a nature that it is all waste land which cannot be developed. And even according to the statement of Dr. Roy, which Shri Gupta has quoted, this is the position. I will quote the last two lines of the statement which is before the House:

"The quantity of land available for the execution of these schemes will never be such as to take us anywhere near the solution of the problem."

What is the problem? The problem my attention to the fact that even of whom about 32,000 are agriculturists. I am glad Mr. Bhupesh Gupta drew my attention to the fact that even of the remaining 30,00,000 displaced persons in West Bengal,—and he quoted Dr. Roy—50 per cent, of them are only partially rehabilitated. If they are only partially rehabilitated and the majority of them are agriculturists, what is to be done? Let him not forget this, because before him is this human aspect of the problem. He is so worried about the refugees that naturally his heart is pouring out and he is pleading the cause of all the opposition parties here. Now, if I take these 32 lakh families . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not 32 lakhs, but 32,000.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: If I take these 32,000 agriculturist families who are in camps, according to Dr. Roy, even with the best of efforts we don't get sufficient land. Danga land is to be reclaimed and the total area of danga land according to a survey recently undertaken from district to district, is not two lakh acres, but one lakh acres and even if you give 7 acres to a family, leaving aside for roads and so on, little bits here and there, you cannot

with the best possible human effort, do more, even with the imported machinery and all that from abroad. In a place like the Sundarbans which is a salty area, where the salinity of the water has to be washed away, in a place like Midnapur where contour bunding has to be done and aus-paddy has to be grown instead of green paddy, even there the time factor will be two to three years, and not more than 10,000 families can be taken. What am I to do with the remaining 22,000 families? What am I to do with the partially rehabilitated families? It is easier to take a man from the camp who is living in the camp on government doles to a place outside West Bengal and rehabilitate him. But when a family has partially taken roots in a place and has been living in West Bengal for seven or eight years— and their number according to the hon. Member runs to about 16 lakhs— what is to happen to them? Am I as a Minister to forget entirely their future?

If they are partially rehabilitated and they want to be an asset to the society and I have to discharge my obligations, then I have to see that they are rehabilitated. If I have to lay down priorities between a partially rehabilitated family to be rehabilitated in West Bengal and a family that has not taken any roots whatsoever, I would rather leave a partially rehabilitated family in West Bengal and see that after ten years of partial rehabilitation, his rehabilitation is not completely destroyed. So, even if we accept the statement of Dr. Roy. . . (*Time bell rings*). I will take two or three minutes more, because he took five minutes of my time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes. by whatever time I interrupted, you can extend . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No I cannot allow like that. It is a 'Half-an-Hour Discussion'. Please wind up.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: May I take two or three minutes, Sir?

Mil: DEPUTY CHAIKMAJM: One or two minutes.

'&HRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: Now, Sir, we have to take those partially, rehabilitated families into consideration. Much fuss has been made of coercion by the Government. He even called it bullets, batons and God knows, what not . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never said that . . .

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: During the last five months, since we took that decision—this is an important matter which I want the Housi to bear in mind—since the 1st July, 1958 til] the 30th November, 1958, during the five months that have intervened since the decision was taken, over six thousand families have left the camps of their own accord. The exact number is 6,200. Sixteen camps have been closed down. No bullet has been fired.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I said that this ultimatum has been given . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He said blackmail.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I said no bullet . . .

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: I know, Sir. According to him that was eminently human.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Brow-beating—he said.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: I want to make a statement. We have never used any coercion and we do not wish to use any coercion against an unfortunate brother who has lost all. But one thing, Sir, these camps have remained in existence for the last ten years. We are spending Rs. 3 to Rs. 10 crores every year on the maintenance of these camps. We propose to close down these by 31st July 1959. Let the refugee who is living there formulate a scheme for himself. I am prepared to look into those schemes and help him in the sanction of those schemes and their implementation. Let somebody else also put forward a construc-

94 RDS—6.

tive scheme instead of having-a-propaganda pamphlet submitted to some- body in Bengal, for which I have no time and no value. Otherwise, Sir. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it right for the hon. Minister to say that a | pamphlet submitted by all the Opposition Parties is something for which he has no respect? Is it right?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: I know. What I wanted to tell you is ■ this. I have given an offer and I propose to give an offer to all the displaced persons in camps in West Bengal. My offer to them*is, come with me. 7ou have tried me during the last two years in my schemes in Ambikapur, Dharmajaigarh and Rajaslhan and_ other places. My schemes' have' succeeded and not a single person has deserted from those colonies in spite of the pressure that has been brought- to bear upon them from certain quartet's.. Have faith in me. I will take you to Jagdalpur or Koraput, whether you call it Dandakaranya or not. I will provide you with continuous work and I will see that every family is rehabi-litated. But if they choose to follow Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or his party—or the U.C.R.C, which according to Shri Bhupesh Gupta is a very big organisation of all the leftist parties—I have nothing to say. But in spite of their good intentions, six thousand families have left the camps within the last five months. I do not think the displaced persons have much faith left in them now, because they know perfectly well that it is nothing else but political . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is the argument?

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: I did not give an ultimatum.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have given.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: I don't. I am too weak a man and I am too poor a man . . .

(.Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You shall close the camp, but . . .

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: I am not giving an ultimatum. I, as a Minister, am making a statement that the welfare of the refugees is dearest to me. I am a refugee. I know what it is to be a refugee. How one suffers as a refugee. It is all right speaking from the Bench here and living in Windsor Place No. 2 and No. 3, then talking about the displaced persons in Calcutta, (interruption.)

{Shri Bhupesh Gupta rose on his legs.}

Please sit down. Sir, I give you this assurance . . .

(Interruption.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA: I want to give this assurance to my displaced brothers. You have had faith in me during the last three years. You have benefited by it. It is my duty to see that I discharge it and I promise that every refugee family that I take to Dandakaranya will be rehabilitated and provided with continuous work. But if they want to stay in West Bengal, if they have taken roots there

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI

GUPTA: Nothing constructive.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday. The time is over.

The house then adjourned at thirty-five minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 15th December 1958.