

Mukerjee, Shri N. M.
 Nambiar, Shri
 Nayar, Shri V. P.
 Raghavachari, Shri
 Ramaseshah, Shri
 Ramnarayan Singh, Babu
 Rao, Dr. Rama
 Rao, Shri P. R.

Rao, Shri Mohana
 Rao, Shri Seahagiri
 Rao, Shri T. B. Vittal
 Reddi, Shri Bswara
 Rishang Keishang, Shri
 Shah, Shrimati Kamalendu Mati
 Shakuntala, Shrimati

Singh, Shri R. N.
 Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
 Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
 Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
 Trivedi, Shri U. M.
 Veeraswamy, Shri
 Velsiyudhan, Shri

The motion was adopted.

TRANSFER OF EVACUEE DEPOSITS BILL

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to provide, in pursuance of an agreement with Pakistan, for the transfer to that country of certain deposits belonging to evacuees, the reception in India of similar deposits belonging to displaced persons, and matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration".

Sir, this is a short and simple measure, yet a very welcome measure which brings a ray of hope to the refugees. It is the result of an agreement between ourselves and Pakistan. It is based on reciprocity. Pakistan has already promulgated an Ordinance which provides for the transfer of certain types of movable properties. We on our part promulgated an Ordinance to the same effect. This Bill is meant to give permanent effect to the provisions of that Ordinance.

Broadly speaking, the history of this Bill is something like this. In 1950, we entered into an agreement with Pakistan which provided for the transfer of deposits of the evacuees in the civil and revenue courts, deposits in courts under the Guardian and Wards Act and deposits of wards with the Court of Wards. In order to give effect to that agreement, it was necessary for both India and Pakistan to pass legislation. Ever since 1950 for three years we went on trying to persuade Pakistan to undertake the necessary legislation, but we could not

succeed. Fortunately, as a result of the July/August 1953 talks between the representatives of India and Pakistan, it has now been possible for us to undertake the necessary legislation.

In order to understand the full import of this Bill, it would be necessary for hon. Members to look at the definition of the word 'deposit'. It consists of three parts: (1) any movable property in the custody of a civil or revenue court, (2) any movable property under the superintendence of the Court of Wards, and (3) any movable property in the custody of a manager under the Encumbered Estates Act.

This Bill provides that in the mass migration areas which are defined under section 4, where all the parties to a revenue or civil court deposit are evacuees, the deposits will be transferred to Pakistan. Similarly, where both the minor and the guardian are evacuees, the deposits will be transferred to Pakistan. In the case of Court of Wards, where the ward is an evacuee, the deposit will be transferred to Pakistan. On the basis of the reciprocal legislation passed by Pakistan, deposits of similar types in Pakistan will be passed on to India. Then, there might be certain deposits of this type in the mass migration areas where one or more of the parties may be evacuees, others may not be. In such cases, the Bill makes no provision for mass transfer and each case will have to be examined by the Custodian and the interests of the

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

evacuee will be transferred to Pakistan. Again, it has been agreed to between us and Pakistan that there will be a similar provision on the other side.

In the case of non-agreed areas, that is areas where there has not been mass migration, each case will be examined on the merits and only the interests of the evacuee will be transferred to Pakistan.

A further provision in this Bill is that deposits which are received from Pakistan by the Custodian of Deposits here in India may be disbursed among the claimants either by himself or, if there is a dispute between the claimants about those deposits, they may be sent to the civil court, which will decide the rights of the respective parties and disburse the deposits accordingly. Naturally, the Custodian has been given certain powers which are necessary for settling the question of rights in the deposits which we receive. I hope that the House will realise that this is one of the few measures in which we have succeeded in coming to an agreement with Pakistan, which is both beneficial to the refugees here and refugees there also. The House will also realise that as this Bill is based on an agreement with Pakistan and the provisions of this Bill have received the concurrence of the Government of Pakistan, as the corresponding legislation which has been enacted by Pakistan has received our concurrence, there is no scope for any amendments in this Bill. We have taken good care to examine all the possible aspects of this legislation, and I dare say that to the best of our ability we have given effect to the provisions of the agreement. I do hope that this Bill will be implemented by Pakistan and ourselves in the spirit in which it has been agreed, because in the past, while there have been many agreements implementation has fallen short of them. Already, we have started collecting data on the basis of this Bill and Pakistan

has issued similar instructions. Let us hope that the refugees here and on the other side will benefit by this Bill.

With these words, I commend this Bill for the consideration of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide, in pursuance of an agreement with Pakistan, for the transfer to that country of certain deposits belonging to evacuees, the reception in India of similar deposits belonging to displaced persons, and matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

The whole Bill must be finished by 4-30 P.M. I will call upon the hon. Minister some twenty minutes before that.

लाला अर्जुन राम (हिसार) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, इस बिल का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ और न केवल हिन्दुस्तान की गवर्नमेंट को ही बल्कि पाकिस्तान की गवर्नमेंट को भी तहे दिल से बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने आज इस किस्म का एग््रीमेंट, गो तीन बरस बाद किया, लेकिन किया खास तौर पर जब कि अभी तक इम्मू-वेबल प्रापर्टी पर कोई एग््रीमेंट अभी तक नहीं हो सका, ऐसी सूरत में ऐसा एग््रीमेंट होना बड़ी मुफीद चीज़ है जो कि रिफ्यूजीज के लिये हो सकती है। और इस बात का खयाल करते हुये कि अभी तक हमारे इस मुल्क के अन्दर कम्पेन्सेशन देने की जो मशीनरी है वह जोर से फंक्शन नहीं कर रही है, जितने भी ऐसे मेजर्स हों जिन से रिफ्यूजीज को रिलीफ मिल सके, उन का स्वागत करना जरूरी है।

इस के साथ ही साथ जैसा मंत्री जी ने कहा कि यह मेजर रिफ्यूजीज के भले के लिये, इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि यह रिफ्यूजीज के भले के लिये है, इस लिये रिफ्यूजीज दृष्टिकोण को सामने रखना भी निहायत मनासिब बात है। रिफ्यूजीज हर ऐसे मेजर

[लाला अर्चित राम]

को इस दृष्टि से देखते हैं कि उसका पूरा फायदा किस तरह पर उन को हो सकता है। पाकिस्तान गवर्नमेंट और हिन्दुस्तान गवर्नमेंट ने भी जो कुछ किया है उस को सब रिफ्यूजीज वेलकम करते हैं। लेकिन एक दो बातें में कहना चाहता हूँ।

यह बिल जो पेश किया गया है, उस के साथ एक फाइनेंशियल मेमोरैन्डम है और साथ में आब्जेक्ट्स और रीजन्स का स्टेटमेंट भी है। उस के अन्दर यह बात कही गई है कि इस बिल के पास होने के बाद कस्टोडियन मुकर्रर होंगे और इस के अलावा तीन असिस्टेंट कस्टोडियन मुकर्रर होंगे। साथ ही यह भी लिखा गया है :

"It is estimated that the total expenditure on the staff would be 95,000 during the year 1954-55."

तो यह जो खर्च है ९५,००० रु० वह कितना भी हो, चाहे दो करोड़ रुपया हो, कितना भी खर्च हो, यह बहुत अच्छी बात है। लेकिन मुझे इस पढ़ कर थोड़ा शक सा गुजरा कि यह जो खर्च रखा गया है यह १९५४-५५ के लिये है, तो इस बिल के बनाने वालों की मंशा क्या है। क्या वह इस मामले को इस साल से परे भी जाने का खयाल करते हैं या इस को जल्दी खत्म करना चाहते हैं। चूंकि यह बजट १९५४-५५ के लिये है न कि तीन या छः महीने के लिये, इसलिये यह खयाल हो सकता है कि कहीं यह और आगे जाने वाला तो नहीं है। जहां तक रिफ्यूजीज के मेजर्स का सवाल है अगर आप फंसला भी कर लें कि रिफ्यूजीज को ५० करोड़ रुपया मिलेगा, लेकिन १९७० में मिलेगा तो इससे कोई मदद नहीं मिलती। जरूरत इस बात की है कि जो भी रिलीफ मिले वह जल्दी मिले। इस का इन्तजाम होना चाहिये। मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट के दिल के

अन्दर यह खयाल होगा, लेकिन उस ने जो मेंजर पेश किया है, उसका खयाल करते हुये मैं गुजारिश करूंगा कि रिफ्यूजीज का इन्टरेस्ट इस में जरूर है कि वह डिपॉजिट मिले, लेकिन इस से ज्यादा जरूरत इस बात की है कि डिपॉजिट्स जल्दी मिलें। इसलिये मैं कहूंगा कि अगर आप इस मामले को २, ४, या ६ महीने में खत्म कर दें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। आप कोशिश करेंगे यह तो है, लेकिन मैं बड़ा खुश हूंगा अगर दोनों गवर्नमेंट मिल जायें और जब उन्होंने यह एग्रीमेंट किया है तो कुछ समय भी सेल्फ इम्पोज कर लें कि इस में चूंकि रिफ्यूजीज का सवाल है इसलिये इसको ३, ४ महीने में खत्म करना है। और अगर इतने समय के बाद मियाद बढ़ाने की जरूरत महसूस हो तो आप पार्लियामेंट के सामने फिर आ जाइये कि हमें २ या ४ महीने की और जरूरत है। मैं देखता हूँ कि जब मेरी जब मैं ५० रु० पड़े होते हैं तो मैं उन को जल्दी जल्दी खर्च करने की सोचता हूँ, लेकिन जब मेरे पास ४ आने ही होते हैं तो मैं बहुत सोच विचार कर और देर में उसको खर्च करता हूँ। इसलिये आप को चाहिये कि आप पहले एक समय मुकर्रर कर लें और अगर फिर भी वह खत्म न हो तो दुबारा मियाद बढ़ा लें। हम सब तो यही चाहते हैं कि यह काम जल्दी से जल्दी खत्म किया जाय। यह तो मुझे पता नहीं कि एग्रीमेंट के अन्दर यह चीजें हो सकती हैं या नहीं, कि हम तीन महीनों में इस काम को खत्म करेंगे, लेकिन हो सके तो हमें ऐसा जरूर करना चाहिये। रिफ्यूजीज के इन्टरेस्ट का खयाल रखते हुये आपको आस्टे-रिटी आफ टाइम जरूर कर लेना चाहिये।

इस के बाद अब मैं रिफ्यूजीज के दिल की बात कहूंगा। मेरा खयाल है कि उसको भी आपके सामने मुझे रखना चाहिये क्योंकि मुमकिन है कि आपके सामने यह मामला

न आया हो। जैसे आप देखते हैं कि हम कम्प्लेन्ट की बात करते हैं और आमतौर पर हम कहते हैं कि १० परसेंट हम देंगे, पांच परसेंट हम देंगे। और बड़ा जोर लगा कर हम २० परसेंट पर आते हैं। लेकिन रिफ्यूजीज के लिये एक एक पैसा भी बड़ी चीज है। मुझे यह खाल आता है कि यह जो डिपॉजिट्स हैं उन को पड़े हुये सिविल कोर्ट्स में और रेवेन्यू कोर्ट्स में ६ साल से ऊपर हो गये हैं, और आठ या दस साल हो गये हों तो कोई ताज्जुब नहीं है। जो डिपॉजिट्स हैं भी वह गवर्नमेंट के पास हैं। इस गवर्नमेंट के या पाकिस्तान गवर्नमेंट के। इसलिये कोई नहीं कह सकता कि जो हमारा है वह वैसे ही पड़ा हुआ है। तो जिस तरह से आर० एफ० ए० का मामला है, उन को रुपया देने की बात हुई और कहा गया कि हम ब्याज जरूर लेंगे। मैं तो यह नहीं कहता हूँ कि आप ब्याज न लें, लेकिन १ परसेंट लें। मझे मालूम नहीं कि एग््रीमेंट के अन्दर आपने इस बारे में कुछ किया है या नहीं लेकिन उन का जो रुपया है, उसका उनको ब्याज मिलेगा या नहीं? वैसे तो आप गवर्नमेंट में हैं, जितना चाहेंगे ले लेंगे, लेकिन मैं रिफ्यूजीज की ओर से कहता हूँ कि अगर आपने रिफ्यूजीज से ६ बरस के अन्दर ३ परसेंट भी लिया तो जोड़ कर १८ परसेंट हो गया। इस को छोड़ दिया जाय। रिफ्यूजीज की तरफ नेक नीयती होने के ख्याल से तो बड़ी भारी बात होगी। अगर पाकिस्तान का एग््रीमेंट हुआ है। आप कहेंगे कि हमें पाकिस्तान गवर्नमेंट को देना पड़ेगा। उनका रुपया इस्तेमाल किया है। लेकिन क्या आपने रिफ्यूजीज का रुपया इस्तेमाल नहीं किया है जो कि उसके पास था। तो यह कोई नयी बात नहीं है। मैं बहुत छोटी सी बात कह रहा हूँ कि इस को कर दिया जाय, मैं समझता हूँ कि आपकी नजर के सामने जो गरीब आदमी हैं, रिफ्यूजीज हैं

उनकी क्या हालत है। वह आकर मुझसे कहते हैं कि हम क्या करें। मैं कहता हूँ कि जाओ मंत्री के पास। आज मैं ने कहा कि चूंकि बिल पेश है इस वास्ते आज इस को न उठाओ। और वह अपने घर चले गये। वह अक्सर मेरे पास आते रहते हैं। गरीब आदमी हैं, उन के लिये दो पैसा बड़ी चीज होती है। इसलिये अगर यह नामुनासिब हो तो न किया जाय, लेकिन अगर आप इसे मुनासिब समझें, और मुनासिब यह है ही मेरी दानिश्च में, तो आप इसका प्राविजन कर लें। आपको उन को कुछ न कुछ पैसा देना ही चाहिये ताकि गरीब आदमियों को कुछ आराम मिल सके।

मैं इस से ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता। आखिर मैं मैं आपको बचाई देता हूँ कि आप ने यह काम किया। सिर्फ यह है कि इस को जल्द से जल्द किया जाय ताकि उन्हें रिलीफ मिले।

3 P.M.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): Sir, I welcome this Bill, as its object is to salvage our property, though in a very very limited measure, which will go to help a number of displaced persons here as well as victims of partition even on the other side. The hon. Minister said that he expects that Pakistan would implement the agreement, though it has been his experience in the past that many a time Pakistan has not implemented some agreements, or has only implemented them partially. Apart from Pakistan implementing it, I would invite the attention of the House to the fact that even our Government sometimes takes time to implement the agreements which have been arrived at. I refer to an agreement which was made in 1950 about movables of evacuees which were of a perishable and deteriorating nature. They were disposed of by the respective Custodians in India and Pakistan. I was shown the list about two years ago and I was asked to

[Shri Gidwani]

publish it in Indian language papers. It was published. I also know that a cheque was received from Pakistan. But I do not know whether that money has been disbursed even up-to-date. I have been receiving many telegrams and many people have approached me. I do not know what is the hitch, or what is the difficulty about the distribution of the amount which has been received here. It has now taken more than two years to disburse that amount.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): Earning interest!

Shri Gidwani: In regard to the other agreement also which was recently arrived at regarding household goods, I find from the Press note issued by Government that our Government suggested to Pakistan Government that both the Governments should agree to the proposal that income-tax clearance certificates should not be demanded from the evacuees from the other country to seek restoration of the movable properties. The House is aware of the fact that nobody can leave Pakistan unless he produces an income-tax clearance certificate. I find from the press note issued by our Government that they insisted that this should be agreed to. Pakistan had not agreed at that time. I do not know whether they have agreed to it now. If Pakistan does not agree, then it will be difficult for any displaced person from here to go there and bring anything here. So unless this restriction is removed, the object of the agreement would be defeated.

The third thing which I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister is about other categories of movable properties. I have gone through the press note issued by Government which says "The questions relating to bulk transfer of lockers and safe deposits, restoration of properties of non-evacuee joint stock companies and payment of compensation where properties of joint

stock companies have been acquired by Government and the release of shares, securities, debentures and insurance policies held in banks were examined and discussions will be resumed in the near future." No agreement was arrived at about this category of property. Many people have been anxiously waiting to receive particularly deposits in lockers and some of the jewellery and ornaments that they have left there. It is now more than six and a half years. Even at the last meeting of the officers of the two countries in Pakistan no agreement could be arrived at. Of course, our Government is always anxious to see that an agreement is made; but on the other side there is always some hitch, some reluctance and the matter goes on being postponed from day to day, from year to year and today we are where we were six and a half years ago.

As regards settlement of the immovable property, it is said in the press note that the problem of urban and agricultural property was discussed between representatives of the Governments, but no decisions were arrived at. The matter would be further discussed. You will see that on major categories of properties the value of which really run into crores, no decision has been so far arrived at; it is only in connection with the small categories, which also, as I said at the beginning, is welcome, Government should see that all efforts are made to come to early agreement on immovable urban property. If in the present context of things no agreement is possible, then unilateral action should be taken because there are certain persons—a large number of displaced persons—who cannot wait any longer. Both movable and immovable properties are linked. I would earnestly appeal to the Minister to see that this matter is settled early. If it cannot be settled, then wherever unilateral action is possible it should be taken

so that our displaced persons can be rehabilitated early.

About personal and household property and buried treasures, an agreement has been arrived at. But people really do not know what orders have been issued. Efforts should be made to see that every displaced person comes to know about the detailed instructions and they get every facility of filing applications here. Otherwise, if they are asked to send their applications to Pakistan it will cause great hardship to them. I do not know the exact machinery that has been set up, and what is the exact procedure. The procedure should be simplified so that every displaced person comes to know easily about these. It is not by publishing it once in the Government Gazette or any papers that people come to know. Our experience is that many people are illiterate; not only are they illiterates, they are also dispersed all over the country in the smallest villages. Therefore, this information should be given not once but a number of times so that every displaced person who can take advantage of this facility may conveniently do so.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): In all seriousness I thought whether I might join my friends in congratulating our Government and the Government of Pakistan as well for arriving at this agreement, but I must admit that there is some obsession in my mind so far as Pakistan's intentions and their doings are concerned. I may be wrong but I must at the outset say it frankly. I must not deceive myself. I think I should say what is in my mind and how I feel about the agreement that has been entered into.

So far as the particular clauses of this Bill are concerned, we have no quarrel with them. They are of course the result of an agreement and we cannot change a comma, or full-stop here or there and we will

be bound by them. Government has entered into that agreement with a foreign country and it should be a matter of gratification, as the Minister observed, that this is one of those few agreements that we have been able to come to with Pakistan. I wish he could have enlightened us on other matters as well where we could agree.

So far as my impressions are concerned, in every negotiation we have failed; in every agreement we have lost. Whenever there was an opportunity, Pakistan has only accepted that much which it thought to be to its advantage and never agreed to implement or even to agree to portions where it thought it might go against the interests of that country.

This morning, I saw one agreement being implemented. There was a batch of about 1300 people, Muslims, coming to Saharanpur to be settled and it was put down in the headline that it was in pursuance of that agreement of 1950—Nehru-Liaquat Pact. Certainly, I was surprised not because they were coming.—I would welcome them—but to ponder, within myself, whether there was such a pact existing and whether we really have any pact which is being implemented when I saw those headlines. But in my file, just attached to that agreement which I sought to find out, there was another agreement, trade agreement. There I found the statement of Mr. Neogy when our jute had been held up by Pakistan. And what he said appealed to me most, because he agreed with my feelings. He said:

"The trade agreement which both countries accepted only a few months ago as the basis of their mutual commercial relations is thus being honoured by Pakistan only to the extent of receiving its full monthly quota of coal".

Exactly that is my feeling. It is that part which benefits Pakistan.

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

and to that extent only Pakistan would implement an agreement. And that was what Mr. Neogy said at that time.

Even subsequently—though it may not be relevant—the other day we had a debate on the recovery of abducted women. We could not dwell on it in detail, but I have that information that even those ladies that have been returned to us by Pakistan were given to us out of the camps where they had already been located and very few had been recovered from the persons who had abducted them.

In other agreements also, if I were to go into those agreements, certainly I would be able to persuade my friends to accept that Pakistanis have never cared to implement any agreement that they have entered into. Whatever may be the terms of the agreement, they are not so material as the actual implementation and the intention to perform the part that is laid on that country. So here as well, my apprehensions are that this agreement would also be implemented in the same spirit in which other agreements have been implemented. We have certain very good intentions. We have expressed our hopes as well. I also pray to God that our hopes may be realised. Nobody would be more glad than myself if we could realise them. But the very initial suspicion that is lurking in my mind makes me doubtful whether this agreement is going to bring us any benefit.

It has taken three years, it has been said, to come to this agreement—not this agreement; it is only, I should say, the repetition or ratification of that, whatever we might call it. It was reached originally in 1950. Now our representatives went to Pakistan in 1953, spent about a month or so there, and they have brought back this agreement with them, jubilant that they have at

least this satisfaction that there is an agreement. They ought to be congratulated. They must have conveyed to the Prime Minister also that they have achieved something. It may be an achievement for them or a satisfaction for our Government that at least there is some point where we have reached that agreement. And let us hope that there will be further points as well. But when we find that this legislation is only a part of the agreement that was reached and when we go into that agreement itself then we feel disappointed at achievement of our representatives. I find that it is to our disadvantage. I do not know how this would be worked. It was better if we had got those figures about our assets and as to what would be our liabilities. I even now request our hon. Minister whether he could give us any idea about the assets that our Custodian has got and the assets that the Pakistan Custodian has got. Has any assessment been made? There may be other factors that may not be ascertainable at all. Now when I come to the Agreement, I am afraid the Agreement begins in category A and that is about immovable property. Of course, as was natural, no decision was arrived at. This is what we are told, and no decisions could be arrived at, because they had made no secret of their intentions. They have said that unless the Kashmir problem is settled there cannot be any settlement of evacuee property.

An Hon. Member: Quite honest.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Of course, we must give them credit for that. They are always honest. But, then, simultaneously they have said that this aid from United States of America would facilitate the solution of the Kashmir problem. Therefore, both things combine.

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): Even if Kashmir problem is solved, there will be other problems.

Sardar Hukam Singh: After the one that we have at present, there may be others. They want to settle them all by armaments. This is what they say. Therefore, we cannot hope that any solution would be found out or any agreement would be reached so far as this evacuee property is concerned. Our Government is looking towards Pakistan, and after a certain time of negotiation it is found that it has become disappointed and frustrated. They are much too clever for us. They give a hint that they are prepared to discuss the whole thing again. Then we have to wait for another year or so. This sort of thing continues, God alone knows for how long it will continue.

But, leave aside this immovable property. We are at present concerned with the movable property that has been agreed to. I find in the Agreement on movable property:

"It is agreed that all steps necessary will be taken for the expeditious implementation of the items referred to below in accordance with the provisions of the Movable Property Agreement and Implementation Instructions....."

I am glad to find that instructions have been issued to the Custodian General, Custodians and to everybody concerned, that they should prepare lists of assets and be ready to hand over everything to the representative of Pakistan living in Delhi. That is what is provided there. My fears are that everything would be done on our side. We will prepare those lists, we will hand over those properties and for articles that we cannot export, we will turn them into cash. We will do everything possible. My fears are that there would be no reciprocity. There would not get those things which we expect and hope. This is not idle talk that I am indulging in. I can quote instances one after the other

which would go to support my allegations. In 1949, the Government of Pakistan wrote to the Government of India to restore a race horse of a Hyderabad princess who had migrated to Pakistan. India replied that she was prepared to do it provided there was reciprocity. Pakistan said, yes, there is no harm, send the horse to us, there will be reciprocity. Everything was agreed. Our Government sent a schedule of only one farm, the Bahadurgarh farm in my district. Claim was laid for Rs. 30 lakhs. For two years, there was silence; no reply at all. Then the reply came that the farm is being run by the Agriculture Department, and that compensation would be paid. They put an arbitrary value of Rs. 82,000. Cattle valued at Rs. 30 lakhs were valued by the Pakistan Government authorities at Rs. 82,000. Our Government and the owner of the farm said, very well, if we could get this much, that is also good. Then we addressed the Pakistan Government, let us have Rs. 82,000 which you say is its worth. The reply was, it has been acquired for rehabilitation purposes and the case would be put up before a Joint Committee in view of the Agreement of July, 1950. We will see what happens to it.

There is another case. There is an eminent lawyer in Delhi. He had a library of considerable value. He tried to get it back. He was lucky enough to get the recommendation or whatever you may call it; the Governor-General of Pakistan and the Governor of West Punjab wrote down on the file that this should be returned. It is a fact that that library is with a lawyer living in his residence and is intact. The reply came that there is not a single book available there and that there is nothing that they can return.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): The registers containing the entries may be lost.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Everything would be done. So far as recovery

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

of buried treasures was concerned, in 1952, one Pakistani took away Rs. 50,000 from a buried treasure in Paharganj. So far as our claim was concerned, there was one gentleman who had 500 tolas of gold lying in the Wazirabad treasury. He has got the receipt of that treasury. That is not being returned. In the face of such instances, one feels diffident as to whether by such agreements we would be able to get something or it is only delusion and the something would continue.

One of my friends here told me yesterday that out of one lakh of rupees, we may get something. If out of Rs. 50 lakhs or one crore, they give us one lakh of rupees, that may be distributed among the refugees. Let us be contented even with that. Because our Government is proceeding with that, I said, all right, I have no quarrel with you, I certainly sympathise with you. My hon. friend Shri Gidwani looks to me; he was the gentleman who told me. That is our state of mind. Even an eminent man like Shri Gidwani thinks that if we could even get this much for our refugees, that would be something and we should not grudge it, and we must allow this Bill to be passed. If that be the idea, certainly, I would also join in applauding the Minister and congratulating those who have entered into that agreement. Let us proceed resigning our fate to God: what happens, we do not know.

One or two items I might mention here about the agreement that I was talking of. It surpasses my comprehension how people could ever agree to such an agreement, with Pakistan. My idea is that those who went there had absolutely no idea of what the facts are. They were ignorant of the realities of the situation. My hon. friend the Minister will kindly excuse me if I have to use these words, but I am pained really to read the

contents of this agreement. Is it an achievement? I say it is a matter of disgust when I read it. I am moved when I go into it. It refers to "movable properties lying with Custodians or friends or relations". Good God, have we got any friends or relations there? Would it be possible for any of our citizens in India to get anything. Then, it is said if any Indian coming from West Pakistan has a relation in Pakistan with whom he has left some property, he can get it. Do we honestly feel so? I ask the gentlemen who entered into this so-called "reciprocity" agreement: would this not be a one-way flow to Pakistan of the assets here? Would it not deplete that evacuee pool which is a trust with the Government? It is a breach of trust that has been committed by entering into this agreement.

Then there is mention about property lying with the Custodians. I cannot say about the whole of West Pakistan, but this is my experience of my own town, and it must be so in other places. I was still in Pakistan when properties from our houses were looted. The assets were taken away, most of them were removed. The Deputy Commissioner of Police, Montgomery, broke open certain locks of rich citizens there to get hold of the movable properties in their houses. What was done subsequently I do not know. What was done with the property that was taken away by the Deputy Commissioner himself, I do not know, but so far as the other properties were concerned, a very strong drive was undertaken by the Pakistan Government to recover all those properties, and Pakistanis were told that they could keep back 10 per cent. of the looted property—that was allowed—but they must return 90 per cent. for the development of Pakistan. Most of the property was recovered from those looters and put into the common pool for the development of

Pakistan. It has never gone to the Custodians there.

May I enquire whether those who entered into the agreement ever cared to find out if there was such property? May I ask whether there is any provision by which, if the major portion of the movable property is not in the hands of the Custodians, we shall still be able to get something? Would it not be a one-way traffic, and we shall have to give, and give out of the pool that is sacred with the Government, that is to be distributed to the refugees who are still living in hopes that they will get something out of it? May I enquire whether this was just and fair, whether still the officers think that they have got something by the agreement? May we hope that we will get anything out of it?

Instructions have been issued that it must be implemented forthwith. We have not been supplied with the facts. I wish our hon. Minister had said something about this agreement as well. He has confined himself to the provisions of the Bill alone, but that does not stand isolated from the agreement, because it is in pursuance of the agreement that we are passing this legislation. Implementation of other provisions do not require the sanction of any legislation, and because these two things are in the courts, it is necessary that legislation should be passed.

Then it was remarked that Pakistan was also proceeding in a similar way. But have the Government satisfied themselves that the Pakistan Ordinance is in similar terms?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Have they satisfied themselves that Pakistan has issued instructions to its Custodians?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Have they any idea of the assets there are with the Custodians? Could we know,

in all humility, its percentage in relation to what we have got? I want to know it from the hon. Minister, whether Pakistan will consider the suggestion made by the Government of India in respect of the following point. A suggestion has gone from our Government through the representative that we sent there, that there should be no restriction on the removal by evacuees, of cash or bullion, to the other country. I may be wrong in my conclusion, but I would like to be enlightened whether these words really mean what they are intended to mean. At present, this is a suggestion, but I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether Pakistan has condescended to agree to it,.....

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal Distt. cum—Almora Distt.—South West cum Bareilly Distt.—North): Has been pleased to accept it.

Sardar Hukam Singh:.....or has been pleased to accept the suggestion that we made, or whether they have rejected it, or no reply has come from them.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: If there were an agreement and a will to give they would have pounced upon it, and agreed to take everything.

Sardar Hukam Singh: When we made this suggestion to Pakistan, we should know whether they have been pleased to accept it or not, or whether they have rejected it. At least that much we should know now, for we shall be able to satisfy ourselves that Pakistan has rejected it, or not.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The Chair cannot compel the hon. Minister to disclose all those things.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I am not going to that extent.

An Hon. Member: There is no answer to that question.

Sardar Hukam Singh: There are other aspects of this Agreement that really upset me. But I may be called

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

to order by the Chair on the ground that I am taking the whole time in discussing this Agreement and the legislation before the House, though this Bill is restricted only to two items of the Agreement. But whether I discuss this Agreement for one hour or two hours, it will not bring us any consolation. Now that an agreement has been reached, we are expressing hopes that it should work—though I am sure, it would not, and the only result will be that we would be giving a few lakhs of rupees which Pakistan will enjoy, and there will be nothing beyond that. I am helpless, and I cannot do anything except to bring it to the notice of the hon. Minister that he should satisfy himself, before sending any assets from here, and before doing anything that might deplete our evacuee pool, that the Agreement is being implemented on the other side.

श्री बी० जी० देशपांड (गुना) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विषयक के विषय में मेरे दोस्त, सम्माननीय मित्रों व पाकिस्तान की सरकार को और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को बर्खास्त दी है। मुझे बताया नहीं गया कि बर्खास्त देने का समय आया है या नहीं, मैं अभी इतना ही कहूंगा कि बर्खास्त देने में बहुत जल्दबाजी नहीं करनी चाहिये। हमारे भराठी में एक कहावत है कि घृत आदमी के यहाँ भोजन का निमंत्रण आये तो भोजन करने के पश्चात् उस को सच्चा मानना चाहिये उसी तरह से खास करके पाकिस्तान के साथ जब आपका सम्झौता होता है तो बर्खास्त देने में बहुत जल्दी नहीं करनी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार से आज तक पाकिस्तान का और हमारा व्यवहार चल रहा है उसको देखने के पश्चात् भी हमारी सरकार आशा करती रहती है और उसको निराशा होती है। हमारे अर्थ मंत्री बड़े साक्षेपी हैं, बड़े काशस हैं। उन की सावधानता के बावजूद भी हमने देखा कि दो वर्ष पहले उन्होंने ९ करोड़ रुपया बजट में

रखा। दूसरे साल उसको १८ करोड़ रखा। वह मिला नहीं, तो अब तीसरे साल उन्होंने फिर ९ करोड़ रखा है। हमारी आशा अनन्त है, पाकिस्तान की तरफ से हमारी आशा का कभी भी अन्त नहीं होता, यह हम देखते हैं। इसी के कारण पाकिस्तान की और हमारी मैत्री इस प्रकार से चल रही है। आज तक मैं समझता था कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री की आशा बड़ी अनन्त थी और वह कहा करते थे "द्वैट ग्रेट नंबरली स्टेट आफ पाकिस्तान" "वह पड़ोसी पाकिस्तान का महान राष्ट्र"। हमारे हृदय में आज भी उन के लिये बहुत प्रेम होते हुये भी काश्मीर का विचार करते हुए हमारे प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि बदली हुई परिस्थिति में, बदले हुये संदर्भ में परिवर्तित संदर्भ में, हम को काश्मीर के बारे में, दूसरी तरह विचार करना चाहिये। हम देख रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान में किन तरह की बातें चल रही हैं, पाकिस्तान अमेरिकन एड ले कर शायद हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर आक्रमण करे। प्रधान मंत्री ऐसा नहीं कहते, वह कहते हैं कि दुनियाँ में बड़ी क्रान्ति होगी, अशान्ति होगी, इसलिये वह नाराज हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद लड़ाई होगी। तो उसी के साथ एक हजार से ज्यादा पाकिस्तान के लोग सहारनपुर में आ रहे हैं कि जो १९४७ में यहाँ से गये थे। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं पूछता हूँ कि वहाँ से यहाँ आने वाले लोगों में से कितने लोग आपने कराची में भेजे, कितने लाहौर में भेजे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : सात हजार आये।

श्री बी० जी० देशपांड : सात हजार आये, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत बुरी बात है। ये हिन्दुस्तान के राष्ट्रीय हैं या नहीं, मुझे पता नहीं। शायद पाकिस्तान की

राष्ट्रीयता, नैशनलिटी, उन को मिली होगी। मैं तो कहूंगा कि यह सात हजार की फौज हिन्दुस्तान पर आक्रमण करने को आ रही है। यह मैं कहना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन भय के कारण मुझे ऐसा कहना पड़ता है। हमारी भारत सरकार की जो नीति चल रही है उस को देखने के पश्चात् यह बातें कहनी पड़ती हैं। इसलिये मैं गवर्नमेंट को बधाई नहीं दे सकता, जिस तरह से कि औरों ने इस विधेयक के लिये बधाई दी है।

यह जो विधेयक हमारे सामने आया है, इस के सम्बन्ध में मैं, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपके सामने बड़ी नम्रता के साथ निवेदन करता हूँ कि हमारे एक मंत्री के पीछे दूसरे मंत्री इस सदन के सामने विधेयक लाते हैं और उसका जो संशोधन करना चाहते हैं, तो वह इस तरह हमारे माननीय हाउस को सरप्राइज से लेते हैं, वह सदन को आश्चर्य में डाल देते हैं, जैसे कि हम परीक्षा देने के लिये एग्जामिनेशन हाल में जाते हैं तो फिर देखते थे कि पेपर में क्या आ जाता है, आज कौन सी टाल्मी की ध्योरम आ गई या ऐसी चीज आ गई कि जो अब तक पढ़ी नहीं थी। तो इस तरह यह आक्षेप मैं माननीय मंत्रियों के लिये करना चाहता हूँ। मैं माननीय मंत्री को एक बात और कहना चाहता था कि आज जो व्याख्यान मैं बातें बताई हूँ वह एक व्हाइट पेपर में हमको दी जाती तो अच्छा था। लेकिन माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने मेरे उस आक्षेप को भी निकाल दिया, क्योंकि आषण म भी उन्होंने कुछ नहीं कहा कि यह समझौता क्या है, एग््रीमेंट क्या है। खास कर के हमारे माननीय मित्र सरदार हुकम सिंह जी ने यह बताया कि हमको पता नहीं कि हमको पाकिस्तान से कितना पैसा मिलेगा और पाकिस्तान को यहाँ से कितना पैसा जायेगा यह बात अब तक हमको नहीं मालूम होती तब तक

24 P.S.D.

गिडवानी साहब जैसा समझते हैं उस तरह की आशा के लिये भी कोई स्थान नहीं रहता। वहाँ से आने वाला पैसा थोड़ा हो तो यह भी नहीं होना चाहिये, क्योंकि हमारे लोगों का पैसा वहाँ ज्यादा था। फिर इनकम टैक्स वगैरह का भी हमको पता नहीं और यह भी नहीं होना चाहिये कि इस वजह से उन का पैसा कम किया जाय। यहाँ का पैसा ज्यादा चला जायेगा तो जो फंड रिप्यूजीज के लिये यहाँ है वह कम हो जायेगा : यह हुआ तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इवैक्यूईज को जो आशा दिलाई गई थी इस इन्टेरिम कम्पैनेशन के बारे में, आगे आने वाले मुआवजे के बारे में, तो उसका भी खतरा पैदा हो सकता है। इसलिये यह हमारे रिप्यूजीज को, शरणार्थियों को, वरदान न होते हुये एक श्राप हो सकता है। इस कारण मैं समझता हूँ कि यह विधेयक हम तब तक स्वीकृत नहीं कर सकते।

यह तो ठीक है कि आपका और पाकिस्तान का समझौता हो गया है, आपने हमारे हाथ बांध दिये। हमारे हाथ बांधने के बाद फिर आपने इस को आर्डिनेन्स के जरिये बरताव में भी लाना शुरू कर दिया है। अब आपका बहुमत है, आप इस को स्वीकार करा लें, लेकिन हमको इन कारणों से स्वीकार नहीं हो सकता। हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में कुछ ज्यादा विरोध भी नहीं कर सकते, लेकिन यह हमारे दिल की जो बात है वह हम जरूर कह सकते हैं। इसलिये हमारा कहना है कि यह हो सकता है कि इस विधेयक के द्वारा हिन्दुस्तान का और गरीब शरणार्थियों का फायदा होने के बजाय उन का नुकसान हो। इस के बारे में हम को पहले मिनिस्टर साहब की तरफ से फिगर्स मिलने चाहिये। आगे चल कर डिस्लेस्ड परसन की और इवैक्यूई की जो यहाँ पर व्याख्या की गई है इस से भी मेरे दिल में बड़ा डर पैदा हो रहा है।

[श्री वी० जी० देशपांडे]

१९४७ के बाद जो कोई यहां से चला गया होगा उसको आपने रेफ्यूजी ठहराया है। हमने जो Restoration of Evacuee Property Act पास किया था उसमें Intending Evacuee के बारे में बहुत से बंधन लगाये थे और दो साल के अन्दर जो कोई इम्यूबल प्रापरटी का कारोबार होता है उस के बारे में भी हमने बंधन लगाया था, कोर्ट को भी पावर थी और उस के अन्दर कस्टोडियन को भी हमने पावर दी थी। अब जिसकी मूवेबुल प्रापरटी है और जो यहां से चला जाता है उसको हम इन्वे क्यूरी डिक्लेयर करते हैं, उसका पचास हजार रुपया कोर्ट में डिपॉजिट है, तो वह आज अगर उठ कर पाकिस्तान में चला जाता है तो उसका पैसा आपको इस कानून की रू से भेजना पड़ेगा, उस पैसे को यहां भारत में रोक रखने के लिये हमारे पास कोई साधन नहीं है, और दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान में हमारा कछ है नहीं, बहुत थोड़े इने गिने लोग हैं, इस कारण उधरसे आने वालों को कोई बहुत फायदा नहीं हो सकता है, हां इधर से जाने वाले लाखों और करोड़ों रुपये लेकर जा सकते हैं। इस के अलावा यह भी बंधन लगाया था कि हम माहवार इतना भेज सकेंगे, इस प्रकार के बहुत से बन्धन लगाये थे, इस बिल में इस प्रकार का कोई बंधन न होने के कारण यह कानून एक खतरनाक और नुकसान देह चीज हमारे देश के लिये साबित हो सकता है। बहुत ज्यादा इस विषय पर मैं बोलना नहीं चाहता हूं लेकिन इस सदन के सामने मेरे हृदय में जो इस के विरुद्ध एक शिकायत है वह रखना चाहता हूं। मालूम होता है कि पाकिस्तान से हमारा जो व्यवहार हो रहा है उस बताव में पाकिस्तान से हमारे सम्बन्ध मंत्रीपूर्ण हैं और एक समझौते के काम चल रहा है यह दुनिया को बताने के लिये

कहीं छोटी छोटी बातों में हम शायद कोई ऐसी चीज न कर बैठें, जैसा कि सरदार हुकम सिंह ने बतलाया कि इस आशा में कि वहां पाकिस्तान से सोना और पैसा लाने देंगे, यहां से करोड़ों रुपये भेजने की इजाजत आप इस एग्जीमेन्ट की रोशनी में दे दें, यह डर और आशंका में मंत्री महोदय के सामने प्रकट करना चाहता हूं और मैं तो चाहता था कि मंत्री महोदय हमारे सामने सारे फीगर्स और आंकड़े रखते। खैर यह बिल तो अब पास ही हो रहा है, मैं आशा करता हूं कि हमारी सरकार के पाकिस्तान के साथ जितने भी एग्जीमेन्ट हुये हैं वह सदन के सामने रखे जायेंगे और सदन को उन पर विचार करने का अवसर मिलेगा। मेरी समझ में मंत्री महोदय के पास फीगर्स जरूर आये होंगे कि उधर कोर्ट्स में कितना रुपया जमा है, आप पता लगा सकते हैं और अपने देश के डिपॉजिट से मुकाबिला कर के देख सकते हैं कि अगर वहां की फीगर कम है तो आपको वहां पैसा भेजना है या नहीं और सब से बड़ी बात हमारी सरकार को यह भी देखनी है कि इस एग्जीमेन्ट के फलस्वरूप पाकिस्तान की तरफ से पैसा आता है या नहीं, आया है या नहीं, यह सब देखने के बजाय हमारे मंत्री लोग कहें कि हम तो सात्विक हैं, हम बड़े नीतिमत्ता के पुजारी हैं, पाकिस्तान कुछ भी करे, हम तो जो उचित और योग्य हैं उसे अवश्य करेंगे और किसी की नहीं मानेंगे, इस तरह से एक गुस्से में आकर ऐसी बात कह कर हिन्दुओं का नुकसान और अहित न करें, बस इतनी ही मेरी आपसे प्रार्थना है।

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, it appears that the whole House is one in this respect that there is entire distrust of Pakistan so far as we are concerned. And, with this distrust working on our minds, it will be quite hypocritical to say to the world that we still believe

in Pakistan. We must be very frank—as frank as the Pakistanis are—and we must tell them that we do not trust them. When two citizens of the same State enter into a contract, then we have got the provision that if that contract is broken, you can approach a court of law and that court of law will decide and enforce the contract as against the party committing a breach and in favour of the party for whom it is meant. But, what is this contract? It is merely a unilateral thing. I do not want to praise ourselves, but, we Hindus, have always been weak and tolerant, one of the banes of our country has always been that we have been tolerant and we continue to be tolerant and will continue to be so. What do we do here as good fellows? We say, we are prepared to give you and you take it. But, there is nothing for us to impose upon the other party that he should also return that which is our due. This sort of unilateral agreement or unilateral enforcement of agreement we have experimented upon in the Abducted Persons Recovery Act, the working of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act and also the trade agreements. They must open our eyes once for all that we cannot trust a nation which has never observed any of the rules of decency or rules of a civilised country.

If that is so, there seems to be no purpose in making this law. If we were honest, straightforward, and strong enough to impose our terms, then why have we left out of the definition all those moneys, all those properties, that may be lying buried, lying with the banks, or lying with the officers? Why should they not be allowed to go and take their property and bring it back? The Administration of Evacuee Property Act only applied to immovable property; it never applied to movable property. In this Bill, we have limited it to movable property in the custody or under the control of a civil or revenue court in respect of any proceedings before it and to movable property in the supervision or custody of a court of wards

for the time being in force. These limitations are too many.

We know that Sindhis were the richest persons living in India. They were the richest traders. Of all the various towns, it is said that only in the towns where the Sindhis lived there were millionaires and multimillionaires. Even Bombay was not considered as rich as certain towns of Sind. Millions of rupees were lying buried. Are we able to get back that money? The definition as it has been put here nullifies it. I know that my apprehensions are not wrong. I know your apprehensions too, but you have to make a show of believing persons whom you ought not to believe. Therefore, you say that we may be able to get it. But I say, we are not going to get it. We are not going to get even those deposits or those securities as defined here. Therefore, when we are attempting to pass a legislation, some material ought to have been placed before us. The hon. Minister as a representative of an honest and civilised nation is anxious to show to the world that we are prepared to do our part of the agreement. I cannot reprove him for that. But thinking of the past, keeping in our mind the actions of the other Government with whom we are dealing, would it not have been proper to place all the facts before the House in the shape of a White Paper and wait till the law is made there? Give us the law. Let us have a look at it. The hon. Minister says they are making the law. We do not know if it has been made. We have not seen it.

Shri A. P. Jain: It has been made. An Ordinance has been passed. We have got a copy of it.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I take it that what you say is correct. But the House should know that such a law has been passed. I know you must have verified. You are the Minister and if you say that it has been passed, we shall accept it. But even then the House will accept that our relations with Pakistan have not been such as to infuse any enthusiasm in us.

Shri A. P. Jain: There is a clear mention in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, which says, "The Government of Pakistan has also taken action to implement the agreement between the two countries by promulgating the Transfer of Evacuee Deposits Ordinance, 1954."

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): The Ordinance may not be followed up by legislation. That danger is there.

Sardar Hukam Singh: There is no need for legislation here.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: When an Ordinance of this nature has been passed there, the only accusation that could be made was that we were lagging behind. There was nothing else that could be said. Let that Act be passed and let it be placed before the House.

The very recent occurrences must not be forgotten or lost sight of. We see that our relations with Pakistan are getting strained. In however nice and diplomatic language you may talk, you cannot forget that our relations with Pakistan are not what they ought to be between two good neighbours. The Partition itself is the result of the acrimonious designs on the part of Pakistan, and such being the position, it is up to us to see that this piece of legislation will not deprive us ultimately of certain deposits from which we may be able to reimburse the poor refugees. Those who have come here as refugees—I do not call them a burden—are no doubt welcome and it is due to them that we have today attained *swaraj*. We have attained independence by sacrificing them and it is therefore up to us to do the utmost that we can do for them. It is incumbent upon us to exert ourselves to the utmost in order to prevent the flow of any money from this country into Pakistan.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह (हजारीबाग पश्चिम) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो विधेयक अभी संसद में विचारार्थ है उस के सम्बन्ध में अगर विस्तारपूर्वक कहा जाय तो बहुत

कुछ कहा जा सकता है। लेकिन अभी आप जानते हैं बहुत समय नहीं है। दुर्भाग्यवश जिस समय से पाकिस्तान की सृष्टि हुई है इस सरकार में श्री पाकिस्तान सरकार में न जाने कितने एग््रीमेंट हुए उनका कोई हिसाब नहीं है। और जब जब यहां कोई बात आती है तो हमारी सरकार के मंत्री या और लोग बार बार यही कहते हैं, जहां तक मुझे याद है, पहले गोपालस्वामी आव्यंगर भी कहा करते थे, और अब ये लोग भी कहते हैं कि क्या करें। पाकिस्तान सरकार हमारी बात नहीं मानती। सभापति महोदय यह भी कहा जाता है कि जैसे वह करते हैं वैसे ही हम भी करें। सीधी बात तो यह है कि यह ठीक है कि हमें हर सूरत से यह कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि जिस किसी व्यक्ति से या समाज से, राष्ट्र से, हम कुछ शर्त शरायत करें, उस के मुताबिक हमको चलना चाहिये। इस में कोई शक या शुबहा नहीं होना चाहिये। न किसी को सन्देह करने की जगह ही है। लेकिन इस के साथ साथ इतना खयाल भी होना चाहिये कि दूसरे से भी हम उसी शर्त शरायत के मुताबिक काम करा सकें। यह केवल कह देना कि हमको ही ठीक रहना चाहिये यह ठीक नहीं है। सभापति महोदय, ऐसे लोगों के लिये समाज में जगह नहीं होनी चाहिये। यह तो मैं मानता हूं कि हमको ठीक रहना चाहिये, लेकिन इस के साथ साथ हम में इतनी ताकत होनी चाहिये कि जिस से भी हम को सरोकार हो, उस को हम ठीक रास्ते पर ला सकें। मैं ने एक बार पहले भी कहा था कि जब सरकार कहती है कि पाकिस्तान हमारी बात नहीं मानता, न माने, तो कम से कम सरकार में इतनी अकल होनी चाहिये कि हमको किस से शर्त शरायत करना चाहिये। सो नहीं, शर्त शरायत करने में युधिष्ठिर बनेंगे, हम जितनी भी शर्त शरायत

होंगी सब का पालन करेंगे, वह करे या नहीं, और यहां आकर जवाब देना कि हम क्या करें, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। सभापति महोदय, उदारता और मूर्खता में ज्यादा फर्क नहीं पड़ता है। उदारता तो हो, यह बहुत खुशी की बात है, लेकिन दुनिया में रहने के लिये कुछ अक्ल भी होनी चाहिये। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि वे लोग ठीक रहें, ईमानदारी से काम कर दें, शर्त शरायत के मुताबिक, यह हमारे लिये आनन्द और गौरव की बात है। लेकिन यह भी निश्चय होना चाहिये कि जो शर्त शरायत हों दूसरे से भी उन को पूरा करवायें। अगर यह ताकत न हो तो कम से कम इतना तो होना चाहिये कि उन से और कोई एग्जीमेंट न हो, और कोई शर्त शरायत न हों, उन का साथ छोड़ दें। आप सुन रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान का क्या हाल है। अभी कल ही प्रश्न हुआ था जिस के उत्तर में बताया गया कि पाकिस्तान की पुलिस हमारे दो आदमियों को पकड़ कर ले गई। इधर सुलह भी हो और उधर यह सब बातें होती रहें, यह तो दिमाग में नहीं आता।

मैं तो इतना ही कहूंगा कि इस तरह के प्रस्ताव, इस तरह के विधेयक आप न लावें, और न इस को पास करें। इस को ठीक बनाकर लाइये और जो मैं कह रहा हूँ उसका ध्यान रखिये। अगर इतना हिसाब न करेंगे तो मैं कहूंगा, जैसे कि लोग कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान सरकार इस के अनुसार नहीं चलेगी। मैं कहूंगा कि इस से सरकार को बाज आना चाहिये। यह कमी न होना चाहिये कि जो एग्जीमेंट हो उसको हम तो पूरा करते जायें लेकिन उधर से इस के बारे में कुछ न हो। यह बात जनता के हित में नहीं है। इसलिये मैं इस विधेयक का विरोध करता हूँ। मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहता हूँ कि वे ऐसा बिल न पेश करें क्योंकि यह आपके ताकत की बाहर की बात है। आपकी ताकत

यदि बढ़ गई हो तो, दूसरी बात है। हालांकि आपकी ताकत बढ़ कैसे सकती है, उसने तो नई ताकत पैदा कर ली है, अमरीका ने सुलह कर लिया है अगर आप में इतनी ताकत हो कि शर्त शरायत को पूरा करा सकें तो कराइये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जवान में ताकत नहीं है, बूढ़े में है।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : अगर यह ताकत हो तो खुशी की बात है, लेकिन वह देखने में नहीं आती। मैं इस विधेयक का विरोध करता हूँ और मैं कहता हूँ कि संसद् के सभी सदस्यों से कि इस तरह की सरकारी बात को नहीं मानना चाहिये। इस बात को तो जहां तक हो सके रद्द ही कर देना चाहिये।

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I wholeheartedly support the Bill that is before the House. There are misgivings in the minds of many of my hon. friends. But as practical men we should think in practical terms. We want to give some benefit to displaced persons who are amongst us. This we try to do to the best of our ability.

4 p.m.

Sir, going through the Bill, I think there will be many movable things which can immediately be adjusted between the two Governments. From practical experience we know that in many cases whatever moneys they possessed are still in the banks, post offices, insurance policies, etc. and are still hanging in the balance. It would have given much benefit to the distressed displaced persons if they had got them in time. I must here refer to one instance.

One lady with her daughter came from East Pakistan. She had all her only Rs. 572 in postal savings bank in Eastern Pakistan. Her daughter, when she came here, was eighteen years old. Here, they were a burden to a distant relative. The mother was

[Shri S. C. Samanta]

very anxious to give her daughter in marriage. The only property that she could call hers was that much money deposited in the P. S. bank. She settled everything for the marriage of her daughter and for want of money it could not be done up till now. I approached the hon. Minister for Communications and he has been kind enough to give her Rs. 500 on condition that the money will be adjusted when it will come from East Bengal. Such are the things. When this Bill is being presented here, we are glad but at the same time I would request the Government to see towards Eastern Pakistan where also these things are to be handled. With the request that Government should give immediate and proper thought as regards movable things left in Eastern Pakistan, I again support this Bill.

Shri A. P. Jain: I must confess that I was not at all surprised at the wide scope which the debate assumed this afternoon; a scope not germane to the objectives of the Bill. In fact the whole of the relationship of India with Pakistan has been discussed. The entire movable property agreement has also been discussed. This bill relates to certain types of movable properties and in a way that discussion is relevant because after all, this Bill is a part of the wider agreement. But I think for the purpose of the debate on this Bill, we should primarily concentrate ourselves on the provisions of this Bill and see if it is beneficial to the refugees or not.

I do not propose to deal with the larger aspects of the debate, namely, the relationship between India and Pakistan. It is true that there have been many unhappy episodes. But we have entered into an agreement and in dealing with its provisions, we should approach with an honest intention. There is nothing more fatal to the successful working of an agreement than to approach it with reservations. That does not mean that we should go ahead like blind persons and only do one-sided implementation. The implementation has to be two-sided

but our approach must be honest with a view to fulfil the objectives of the agreement.

An objection has been raised that I have not given figures of the deposits with the courts and courts of wards etc. on this side, and the other side. In the first place, these figures are not available; some figures are available but not the whole of them.

These figures will have to be collected on either side. But to look at the agreement from that narrow point of view would be totally wrong. When an agreement is entered into, there may be some items in which one country gains and there may be other items in which the other country gains.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: As a part of this agreement, is there an agreement on other matters also, for instance cash, etc.?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Will they also be given effect to?

Shri A. P. Jain: Not in this Bill.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Otherwise?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes

Now, Sir, you cannot find any international agreement anywhere on the face of the earth which is only a one-sided affair. Therefore, to criticise a single item as being beneficial to us or to Pakistan would be a totally incorrect way of looking at the matter. What some of the hon. Members here have said is this: let us see whether we are going to get more from Pakistan than what we would give to them—in other words, we should not pass this Bill if we have to pay more. I am not in a position to say exactly what will be the position, although I think that, judging from the general economic conditions of the people who have come to this side and of those who have gone to the other side, we should on the whole stand to benefit. But when we say that we should only implement this part of the agreement if we get

more from them, then they can also take up a similar attitude and say "No agreement on this item because we have to pay you more". That would be a vicious way of looking at the matter.

Sardar Hukam Singh: They are often proceeding on that assumption.

Shri A. P. Jain: The proper way of looking at this agreement is whether refugees on this side are having their due, and whether refugees on the other side are having their due. Judging this agreement from that point of view I think it is a wholesome agreement.

My friend Shri Samanta has cited a case. And that is the only way of looking at the thing. I know also of some cases, at least of one in which a widow has come to me, who has left vast properties worth lakhs of rupees in court of wards. She came to me to ask for some money for the marriage of her daughter. It was difficult for me to give her loans for that purpose; there was no provision. In fact I helped her somehow. The proper way of looking at this agreement is from the point of view of that widow who retrieves or salvages her property, and not by way of any kind of recriminations or attack upon Pakistan from this side or that side. In fact, we should approach this agreement with all the goodwill and implement it in an honest way. And we should at the same time see that Pakistan correspondingly implements the agreement.

A few things have been said with regards to certain aspects of this Bill, and I will mainly confine my remarks to those few things. My friend Shri Achint Ram said that the early implementation of the Bill is of great importance. I fully share his feelings. In fact we have already started the implementation of the Bill as far back as 22nd January, 1954, even before the Ordinance was passed: we issued instructions to State Governments and to the other authorities concerned to collect the relevant figures. Similar instructions have been issued by

Pakistan. And according to the instructions issued by us and Pakistan, all these figures are to be collected by the 31st of March.

I think that is quite a business-like and expeditious way of doing things. I am hopeful that if things progress as I expect them to, at least the items covered by this Bill would be implemented within the financial year 1954-55.

There were a few other points raised, for instance one about the delay in the payment of some money to the refugees which we received from Pakistan. Shri Gidwani made a complaint that some money has been received from Pakistan by the Government of India, but the same has not been disbursed. I do not know what particular item he had in mind but I take it that he refers to an item of three and a half lakhs which we received from Pakistan.....

Shri Gidwani: Yes.

Shri A. P. Jain: That sum was received by us on account of the deposits from the sale proceeds of certain movable property. Incidentally I might here say that this gives a denial to what Sardar Hukam Singh said that there are no deposits with the Custodian. In fact, we have received some money in the past and we hope that when that part of the Agreement is implemented, we shall receive more. So far as that particular money is concerned, three lakhs out of three and a half lakhs belonged to a party by name Ganesh Kopra Mills. We subsequently received a communication from Pakistan that there was no amount due to that mill and therefore, this amount should be returned to them. We have not returned that money, but as soon as the dispute is settled, the money will be properly disbursed.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Is it the hon. Minister's assumption, or...

Shri A. P. Jain: Shri Gidwani also referred to the income-tax clearance certificate. It is true that Pakistan has not agreed to forgo the income-tax clearance certificates altogether, but has agreed that for the time being the existing exemption applicable to temporary visitors for a period of three months may continue, and if it is found that it gives rise to difficulties then the matter would be considered later. At any rate one cannot have his whole way in international matters. I think that so far as income-tax clearance certificate is concerned, the present arrangement meets with our wishes to a fairly large extent.

I do not think that any other serious objection has been raised against this Bill and I conclude with the hope that it will be possible for Pakistan and ourselves to implement this Bill and to open a new and better chapter.

Lala Achint Ram: What about my point as to whether the refugees will be given interests on their deposits?

Shri A. P. Jain: There is no provision. In the case of court deposits there is never any provision for interest and as such this Bill makes no provision.

Lala Achint Ram: The Government was getting interest and why not they pay it to the refugees?

Shri Gidwani: What about the other items amounting to Rs. 50,000?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide, in pursuance of an agreement with Pakistan, for the transfer to that country of certain deposits belonging to evacuees, the reception in India of similar deposits belonging to displaced persons and matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are no amendments to this Bill. I will put all the clauses to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That clauses 1 to 14, the Title and the Enacting Formula stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 to 14, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri A. P. Jain: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved.

"That the Bill be passed."

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, इस बिल के बारे में जो बहस में ने मिनिस्टर साहब की सुनी उसके मताल्लिक इधर से या उधर से किसी किस्म का कोई ऐतराज नहीं किया गया। जो कुछ उन्होंने जवाब दिया वह जवाब भी इतना माकूल है कि उस पर हम कोई ऐतराज करने के काबिल नहीं हैं। हम में से कोई भी ऐतराज नहीं करना चाहता, जहां तक हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन का सवाल है, कांस्टीट्यूशन में दर्ज है कि जितने इंटरनेशनल एग्रीमेंट्स होंगे और उन के इम्प्लीमेंट करने में और जो फ़ारेन पालिसी होगी, उस के बारे में हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन में निहायत अच्छी बातें दर्ज हैं और अपने जवाब में उन्हीं को हमारे आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब ने दुहराया है और इसलिये मैं उन का स्वागत करता हूँ। लेकिन जनाब-वाला, कितने ही हम इंटरनेशनल एग्रीमेंट्स करें और कितना ही हम अपने कांस्टीट्यूशन को याद करें, यह बात किसी आदमी से छिपी नहीं है और किसी के दिल से यह चीज हटने वाली नहीं है कि जहां तक हमारे ताल्लुकात

पाकिस्तान के साथ रहे हैं वह इस किस्म के नहीं रहे हैं जिन से हमें कोई एक ज्यादा उम्मीद पैदा होती हो। सच तो यह है कि मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ, उन असहाब को जो एग्रीमेंट करते रहे हैं उनको दू, किस बात का मुबारकबाद देता हूँ, मुबारकबाद इस बात के लिये नहीं कि उन्होंने पाकिस्तान के साथ एक समझौता कर लिया, बल्कि उनकी पेशन्स के लिये, उनकी पेशन्स इनफ़िनिट हो गयी है और उनकी औप्टीमिज्म भी मिल्लकली औप्टीमिज्म है। मैं आपको बतलाऊँ कि जिस वक्त यहाँ हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का झगड़ा उठा, तो वहाँ से उनके सेक्रेटरी आये और उन के साथ हमारे सेक्रेटरी बैठे और सेक्रेटेरियट लेवल पर हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच एक एग्रीमेंट उस काफ़िस में हो गया, जब पाकिस्तान वाले एग्रीमेंट करने के बाद भारत से वापिस गये और श्री जिन्ना के हजूर में उसको पेश किया और बतलाया कि हमने भारत के साथ यह एग्रीमेंट कर लिया है तो जिन्ना साहब ने फरमाया कि तुम पाकिस्तान को मार्टगेज करना चाहते हो जो यह फंसला कर आये हो, वह दिन है और आजका दिन है पाकिस्तान ने कभी भी इम्यूबुल प्रापरटी के एक्सचेंज करने या मुआवजा देने की कोशिश तो दूर खयाल तक नहीं किया। हिन्दुस्तान में जिस वक्त एग्रीमेंट हुआ था, हिन्दुस्तान के लीडर्स ने यह सोच कर कि किसी तरह पाकिस्तान के साथ समझौता हो जाय अपने क्लेम्स को इतना छोटा कर दिया था ताकि पाकिस्तान उस को अदा कर सके, लेकिन क्या नतीजा हुआ? यहाँ पर मूवेबुल प्रापरटी का जिक्र आता है, मैं अदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान के अन्दर दुकानदार कौन लोग थे, पाकिस्तान में अनारकली के बाजार में आप जानते हैं कि हमारे हिन्दू दुकानदारों की दुकानों में करोड़ों रुपये का माल भरा हुआ था, उसका क्या हुआ, जितनी

मूवेबुल प्रापरटी पाकिस्तान के अन्दर रह गई थी, उसका मुआवजा किस को मिला है? एग्रीमेंट हो जाने से क्या फायदा जब दूसरी साइड उसको इम्पलीमेंट न करे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे लोगों का वहाँ के खजानों में जो रुपया पड़ा हुआ है, सेफ्स में रुपया पड़ा हुआ है जिस के डिटेल में कोई झगड़ा नहीं है वह हमें वापिस कर दिया जाय, क्योंकि यहाँ से कोई भी पाकिस्तान उसको लेने के लिये जाने को तैयार नहीं होता था, लेकिन हमारा रुपया वापिस नहीं किया गया। मुआहिदा तो हुआ, कि बैंकों में जो रुपया पड़ा हो वह भेज दिया जाय, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज तक वहाँ से क्या मिला और कितने सेफ डिपॉजिट्स वहाँ से मिल पाये हैं? क्या मुझे बतलाया जायेगा कि कितने आये हैं और कितने अब तक वहाँ पड़े हुये हैं? मैं चाहता था कि एक मुआहिदे के जितने टुकड़े हैं सारे मुआहिदे को "एज ए होल" इम्पलीमेंट किया जाय। मुझे यह देख कर बड़ी खुशी हुई कि चलो हमारे श्री अजित प्रसाद 'The Transfer of Evacuee Deposits Bill, 1954' पेश कर रहे हैं और उन को भी इस बात का इतमीनान हो गया होगा कि इस एग्रीमेंट को पाकिस्तान भी इम्पलीमेंट करेगा, उन के दिल में भी यह बात होगी, वैसे हमारे मिनिस्टर चाहे हवाई बातें करें लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि वह भी उसी तरह सोचते हैं जैसे हम सोचते हैं, हमारे मिनिस्टर कुछ हम से बहुत ज्यादा दूर नहीं हैं और उन को भी इस बात की उम्मीद होगी कि जब हम इस एग्रीमेंट को इम्पलीमेंट कर रहे हैं, तो हमको भी वहाँ से हमारी बहुत चीजें वापिस मिलेंगी।

लेकिन जब मैं ने बिल को पढ़ा तो मैं समझ गया कि इस बिल में कहीं तक सच है। बिल के अन्दर इन सब चीजों का कोई

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

जिक्र नहीं है जिसका मुआहदा किया गया था। अगर पाकिस्तान की नियत साफ है, हमारी नियत तो साफ है, मैं बतौर नानआफिशियल मेम्बर के कहता हूँ कि हम एग्नीमेंट को पूरी तरह से निभाना चाहते हैं। हम नहीं चाहते कि हम इन्टर्नैशनल एग्नीमेंट कर के फिर उस को न निभायें, हम राइचुअसनेस को छोड़ने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, भले ही कोई अपनी राइचुअसनेस को छोड़ दे, लेकिन जो चीज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि हमने एंड्रक्टेड फीमेल्स के लिये मुआहदा किया और २००० के करीब हमारी औरतें मुसलमान ऑफिशल्स के घरों में पड़ी हुई हैं, उन में से कितनी वापिस आई ? बहुत कम। मैं इस मुआहदे के लिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर पाकिस्तान ने मुआहदा किया है तो उस को ईमानदारी से पूरा करे। अगर मुझे कुछ नहीं करना है तो मैं कहूँगा कि रजिस्टर ही फट गया, हम किस चीज को कहां देखें ? यहां कोई एन्ट्री ही नहीं है।

आनरेबुल मिनिस्टर साहब का यह खयाल था कि यहां के आदमियों का रुपया वहां बहुत पड़ा है। यह बिल्कुल दुरुस्त है। लेकिन कोर्ट्स के अन्दर रुपया किसका होता है ? जो लोग कि अमीर होते हैं। जो लोग यहां से गये, उनके मुकाबले में वह लोग बहुत अमीर थे जो वहां से यहां आये हैं। मैं फिर दोहराता हूँ, बार बार यहां पर दोहराता रहता हूँ, और आनरेबुल मिनिस्टर से कहता हूँ कि यहां के लोगों का जो लाखों रुपये का पाकिस्तान जाने वालों के जिम्मे कर्जा था आप के हुक्म से, गवर्नमेंट के हुक्म से, स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के हुक्म से या सेंटर के हुक्म से, लोगों ने उसकी फेहरिस्तें बनाई। अपने क्लेम्स दिये, तहरीर-रात पेश कीं। वहां के लोग इन लोगों के मक-रूज थे, राजस्थान में फहरिस्तें बनीं, गंगा-

नगर में बनीं, मालेरकोटला में बनीं। उस का रुपया क्या आप पाकिस्तान से वसूल करेंगे और देंगे इन लोगों को ? मैं नहीं कहता कि वह रुपया खजाने से दीजिये लेकिन अगर कुछ मिलता है तो पहले उन को हक है जिन की वह रकम है। खैर, इस को छोड़िये। मैं पूछता हूँ कि आप जो मूवेबुल्स का जिक्र करते हैं उन के बारे में आप का क्या खयाल है ? उसका अन्दाजा आपको कैसे लगेगा ? मैं तो कहता हूँ कि अगर जो कुछ वहां रह गया है उसके मुकाबिले में आपको एक पैसा भी मिल जाय तो मैं राजी हूँ कि उसको ले लीजिये। लेकिन कम से कम अपने क्लेम्स की तादाद कम न कीजिये। आप रोज जिक्र करते हैं कि मूवेबुल के लिये इतना रुपया हमको पाकिस्तान से लेना है। मुझे दुख होता है कि आपको इस का अन्दाजा भी नहीं है कि वहां हम लोगों का कितना रुपया और मालमत्ता पड़ा हुआ है ? कुछ भी हो, उन से आपको कुछ भी मिले, आप फंसला कर लें, मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। लेकिन जो कुछ भी उन से मिले, एक पाई भी अगर उस के बदले में मिले, आप ले लीजिये। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि आपने मुआहदा किया, आपको मुबारक हो लेकिन मुझे डर है कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि यह आखिरी चीज हो। मैं तो यह मानता हूँ कि जो भी आपने मुआहदे किये हैं, आप उन को पूरा कराइये। उस के लिये बिल की क्या जरूरत है ? आपने मुआहदा कर लिया तो ठीक है, हां कोई चीज बाकी रह गई तो उस के लिये आप जो चाहें कर सकते हैं। और अगर बिल आना ही है तो मैं कहता हूँ कि पहले यह तो तसल्ली कर लीजिये कि वहां पर क्या क्या रह गया है। मैंने पिछली दफा एक मोके पर अर्ज किया था, और वह दर-असल कंट्राडिक्ट्री सी चीजें हैं, ऐसा आप कहेंगे लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि यहां पर सरदर हुक्म

सिंह न कहा कि वहाँ एक रेस हासं रह गया। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि एक नहीं पता नहीं कितनी चीजें रह गईं। सरदार दातार सिंह का एक कैंटल का हर्ड रह गया जो कि बहुत बड़ा था और निहायत बेशकीमत था। उन में से आप को कितनी गायें और भैंसें मिलीं? वह सब की सब वहीं रह गईं। पेशतर इस के कि आप बिल लायें, मेरी राय में पहले आप अपनी तसल्ली तो कर लीजिये। तसल्ली करने के बाद कोई मुआहदा करना ठीक होगा। फिलवाक्या, वसूली के लिये हम लोगों के पास दो ही रास्ते हैं, एक तो मुआहदा है, और दूसरे के लिये में कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता।

श्री यू० एम० त्रिवेदी : समझते तो सब कुछ हैं।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब : हम सब से ज्यादा बेहतर आप समझते हैं। यह बिल ऐसा है जिस पर कोई ऐमेन्डमेंट नहीं है।

संसार मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : आप बहुत अर्ज कर चुके।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब : अच्छी बात है।

श्री ए० पी० बॉन : जनाब, मुझे इस के जवाब में कोई खास बात नहीं कहनी है सिवा इस के कि यह जो कहा गया है कि बाकी चीजों के लिये क्यों नहीं बिल लाया गया। मेरा कहना है कि उन चीजों के लिये बिल की जरूरत नहीं है। यह बिल इसलिये लाया गया कि अगर अदालत में कोई डिपॉजिट है तो वह कानून के ही जरीये से एक जगह से दूसरी जगह जा सकता है। अगर कोर्ट आफ वार्ड्स हम को पैसा देता है, या मनकूला जायदाद को मुत्तकिल करता है तो वह तो कानून के

ही जरीये से हो सकता है। मनकूला जायदाद के बारे में जो फैसला हुआ है, उस में जिन के लिये कानून की जरूरत है वही इसके अन्दर लाई गई है। जिन के लिये कानून की जरूरत नहीं है, उन को इस में रखने की न जरूरत थी और न उन के लिये कानून आयेगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed"

The motion was adopted.

AIR CORPORATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Air Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 1954.

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend the Air Corporations Act, 1953, as passed by the Council of States, be taken into consideration."

This is a very simple Bill, which seeks to extend the period provided in the Act for certain purposes. I do not think any speech is necessary, because the Statement of Objects and Reasons makes it quite clear. I hope the House will pass this measure.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to amend the Air Corporations Act, 1953 as passed by the Council of States, be taken into consideration."

I shall now call upon Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy. Hon. Members will take as little time as possible, of course, very effectively.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): The hon. Minister has spared some time for us.