

was on the 9th July 1951. No applications have been made, the date had expired viz., 6th November. As a matter of fact there was an Ordinance before. It - conferred the same rights and even in those two months nothing was done. We are doing it here because we had agreed to do it so that they might not complain that India had been guilty of non-observing the Agreement which it had solemnly entered into. I repeat once again what I said a few minutes ago that it is not a question as to who the Chief Commissioner is—whether he comes from outside or from Tripura. It is a simple matter. If the man who has gone returns before the 9th July, then he can take advantage of the Act. Has he applied before the 6th of November ? If he has, then his application may be considered. If he has not, then his application is rejected. Now, to the best of my information no such application has been made. There may be one or two, here or there. But supposing such a contingency does happen, then I gave the assurance elsewhere that I shall instruct the Chief Commissioner to look into that particular case, if it does happen, with favour, to look at it very favourably, and give it sympathetic consideration. What more is required ? I therefore, respectfully submit that the House may take this Bill into consideration and pass it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
The

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) :
Sir, I would like to have a little clarification. The hon. Minister said that there are allegations that Pakistan is breaking contractual obligations, that we are doing it and all that. Is he sitting in judgment between the two countries ? Or does he not know what really is happening in this country ? Or is he also of the view that we have been guilty ? I was not quite able to understand what the hon. Minister meant by his statement. Are we also guilty ? It would appear from his speech that he accused us of breaking certain contracts.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What he said was that Pakistan was accusing us.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : But he said, " This country accuses and that country accuses and I do not know, the whole thing is highly controversial ".

THE MINISTER FOR LAW AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI C. C. BISWAS) : I can mention for the information of the hon. Member that so far as the restoration of property to returning Muslims, who have returned within the appointed date, is concerned, it has not been quite so satisfactory as it should have been on our side of the border. I may mention the district of Nadia and the 24 Par-ganas. I did not want to mention this but if I am required to state the truth, I must say that there are thousands of holdings which have not yet been restored in Nadia to the returning Muslim emigrants.

DR. K. N. KATJU : I did not want the House to go into the details of West Bengal. Otherwise I know something of West Bengal, you know.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I wish he had remained silent over this issue, instead of making such injudicious remarks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
The question is :

That the Bill further to amend the West Bengal Evacuee Property Act, 1951 as extended to Tripura, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
We come to the clause by clause consideration now. There is no amendment to clause 2.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is : That clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

SHRI B. GUPTA : Sir, I move...