

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I rule out that these remarks are irrelevant to the Bill under consideration.

SHRI B. GUPTA : Sir, I do not know ; whenever I talk, I find myself in a state of irrelevancy. Therefore, I had better sit down in that case.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please confine yourself to the Bill and not matters unconcerned with the Bill. You may speak anything about Tripura.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal) : May I make a submission, Sir ? This applies also to West Bengal.

DR. K. N. KATJU : No, no.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : When the question of West Bengal comes, you can do it then.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : There is a similar Bill for West Bengal. If certain things under that Bill have happened in West Bengal, we are entitled to refer to that by way of suggesting what may happen in Tripura. It is because of our experience with regard to the similar Bill—just by way of illustration. I do not think that will be out of order.

SHRI B. GUPTA : May I make a submission, Sir ? Suppose, Sir, we discuss a banking Bill. Are we entitled to discuss the American banks or the British banks or some other banks to learn from those things ? Will that discussion be irrelevant just because our Bill may refer to a particular bank ? If that is not irrelevant, I do not see why this should be irrelevant here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Incidentally it may be relevant. But all your talk has been about Calcutta and Bengal. Nothing about the Bill in question. Please go on.

SHRI B. GUPTA : Very well, Sir. We thought we are all Bengalis. Quite a number of Bengalis live there in Tripura. Any way, I am coming to

Tripura. Sir, now if they come back, even if the provision is there, it does not guarantee that the lands will be given to the Muslims, for the simple reason that there are elements who want to frustrate the implementation of this measure and therefore, it is essential to create a machinery which would see to it that the measures such as this are duly implemented. This is point number one.

Point number two, Sir, is that it may cause eviction of Hindus who had already settled there on the Muslim lands because the Muslims had gone away elsewhere. We have to find lands for them. Now, generally they are not given compensation. Therefore, it is also necessary to create a machinery whereby adequate compensation may be given to them. The refugees who are evicted from the lands should be kindly treated and given lands where they could settle or where they could earn their living. At the moment this is not being done and one of the reasons why this is not being done is that the machinery is entirely bureaucratic. The hon. Home Minister has mentioned the name of the Commissioner of Tripura—the Chief Commissioner Mr. Nanjappa.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We are not concerned with names here.

SHRI B. GUPTA : The Chief Commissioner of Tripura or the incumbents of such offices have to be properly trained and coached. Otherwise, they will not be able to do the job. As far as this particular officer is concerned, I have no faith in him. The fact that this measure has been brought in does not give me the confidence that it would be implemented in the manner in which we want it to be implemented. What is necessary is to create popular committees consisting of the representatives of all the parties who understand the * ->cal problems intimately and who are not drafted from Madras or Hyderabad or any other place after doing all sorts of things there, to rule over a certain region. We want people who have got ties

with the local people to take the responsibility, people who know the local problems. In this particular measure, there is no such proposal. Probably the hon. Minister will say that some such thing will be done, that steps will be taken to see that it is properly done. I will take him at his word. What is necessary is to create a machinery. From my Bengal experience, I can tell you that unless and until such a machinery is created in which the local people are mobilised, you cannot implement such a measure. I want you to note this. You have to resettle Muslim refugees who come back to their lands and you have also to resettle the Hindu refugees who come from East Pakistan. This makes the task a little complicated. Therefore, it is necessary to deal with this in a much better, much more popular, and a much more democratic way instead of leaving it in the hands of certain officers, because, as it is usual with officers, they do not deliver the goods. They will not apply this measure in an efficient and popular way. Therefore, I trust—since the hon. Minister is here—he can give us an assurance that early steps will be taken so that both categories of refugees are looked after in a benevolent way.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE : Sir, I am afraid I cannot speak from the high moral plane from which the hon. Minister was speaking. But I should like to have from him information on one or two points.

Firstly, has he any information about how the Pakistan Government has carried out their part of the bargain ? So far as we have been able to understand, there is a considerable lacuna there. Even the hon. Minister for Minority Affairs had stated that he had received complaints running into thousands where the East Bengal Government had not carried out her part of the bargain. I should like to have some information, if the Minister possesses any, on that point.

Secondly, this Bill is the result of the Delhi agreement. I understand

that it is the result of the Delhi agreement. If the agreement were not there, there would be no necessity for this Bill. The Delhi agreement envisaged certain things to be done both by the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan. I should like to know from the hon. Minister as to whether Pakistan has honoured her part of the agreement fully so far as the Delhi agreement is concerned. I understand, Sir—I am not sure; I speak subject to correction and the acting Leader of the House will correct me if necessary—that if you enter into a contract either by fraud or de-ceipt or if it was found to be fraudulently entered into, then you are not entitled to observe your part of the contract. We have entered into the Delhi agreement on certain understandings. We have entered into that on the basis of certain assurances given by the Pakistan Government. If those understandings and those assurances have not been observed by the other Government, how far, in actual practice, should we consider ourselves bound in honour, bound to carry out the agreement on our part ? The hon. Minister has always taken a very moral attitude towards this question. He said, whether or not Pakistan Government carried out her part of the agreement, since we had agreed that such and such a thing would be done it was our duty to do those things whatever Pakistan Government might do. I am afraid, I am not such a moralist and I feel that where my interest has not been looked after, where I have been made to enter into a certain understanding, if I subsequently find that the assurances have not been carried out, then I feel that I should not make it so much a point of honour on my part to carry out the agreement.

This question is also related to the first question that I asked how far the Pakistan Government has carried out their part of the agreement, because apart from the failure of the Pakistan Government to implement their part of the agreement, which the hon. Minister also mentioned in the other