

MANIPUR COURT FEES (AMENDMENT AND VALIDATION) BILL

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I beg to move* for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Court Fees Act, 1870, in its application to the State of Manipur, for the purpose of giving effect in that State to certain amendments made in that Act by Assam Act VIII of 1950 and to validate the levy of court-fees in certain cases.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Court Fees Act, 1870, in its application to the State of Manipur, for the purpose of giving effect in that State to certain amendments made in that Act by Assam Act VIII of 1950 and to validate the levy of court-fees in certain cases."

The motion was adopted.

Dr Katju: I introduce the Bill.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Prime Minister and Leader of the House (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): If you will permit me, Sir, before we take that Resolution, I should like to indicate to some extent next week's business. At any rate, I wish to indicate that we should like to have, subject to your convenience, the food debate on Monday next, the day after tomorrow. If you are agreeable, Sir, and the House is also agreeable, I think the sooner we have the food debate the better, and I suggest, therefore, that after the Question Hour on Monday, day after tomorrow, we might take it up.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): The papers have today announced that the Food Conference which was to have been held, has been cancelled. Would it not be better if some note is circulated to the Members so that the debate may be real? Otherwise, it will be of a rambling character. We do not exactly know what the Government position is as the Food Conference has been cancelled. If the debate is held after two days, and in the meanwhile a note is circulated, it would be better.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is the very reason why I need an early discussion of the food question. It is desirable to have it at the earliest date possible, and I have suggested

*Introduced with the previous recommendation of the President.

the date. It is not wholly correct to say that the Food Conference has been cancelled. It has been postponed, i.e., we shall hold it not immediately, but some time later. Recently, we have been considering certain matters of immediate importance, if I may say so affecting a very small part of the food problem, and the Conference is held not only for these parts, but for others. In regards to those small parts, we have decided, in concurrence with the Food Ministers of the Provinces—we have been in touch with them—not to make any vital change to what we have thus far done; they may make only some minor adjustments here and there. Therefore, it did not become necessary to hold the food conference just now, and we thought it would be better to hold the conference later to consider the wider issues without any rush or hurry.

MOTION RE MIGRATIONS BETWEEN PAKISTAN AND INDIA

Mr. Speaker: I may request the hon. Leader of the House just to move his motion, and then I will clarify certain points about the amendments, so that the amendments may be considered along with the principal motion.

The Prime Minister and Leader of the House (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Yes, Sir. It was really my intention just to move the motion at this stage anyhow, and then to have the advantage and opportunity of listening to hon. Members of this House, and later to say whatever I may have to say on the subject. I beg to move:

"That the situation arising out of the migrations between Pakistan and India be taken into consideration."

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the situation arising out of the migrations between Pakistan and India be taken into consideration."

Now, in respect of this motion, several amendments have been received, and I have admitted most of them, excepting just a few, in respect of which I have my doubts. Of course, the doubt is not with reference to everything that is said in the amendments, but only certain parts of the amendments. In a general motion of this type, it is very difficult to define the exact scope, and amendments may come in, bringing in various matters which, it would be difficult to say, are clearly out of the

scope, and equally difficult to say are within the scope quite clearly. But, looking to the scope of the intention, more or less, apart from the wording of this motion, it is clear that the wording is general, such as "the situation arising out of the migrations". The issues sought to be taken into consideration are, to my mind, very definite. The issue is the actual situation with reference to migrations. The motion cannot include all matters of dispute or relations between India and Pakistan. If this interpretation is correct, as I think it is, then some of the amendments contain some kind of suggestions which, at least at the present stage, go much beyond the scope of the original motion. There are some parts of these four amendments—one by Babu Ramnarayan Singh, the other by Shri Boovaharaswamy, the third by Shri Bahadur Singh, and one by Dr. Khare—which are already covered in the admitted amendments. There is practically no question about that. But there is one by Shri Boovarahasamy.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): It has not been circulated to us.

Mr. Speaker: I am mentioning it only. As I did not admit it, I did not circulate it. But I thought, I should have, without taking much of the time, the views of the hon. Members and then decide. One of his amendments says:

"The whole basis of partition of India has disappeared. This House therefore calls upon the Government of India to take steps for the annulment of the partition in respect of Eastern Pakistan, and effect a re-union of the two Bengals."

It may be open to a person to argue this as a remedy to the situation. But the point is whether such a proposition as that can be treated as an amendment or an effective part of an amendment, because it is not a mere expression of opinion or views. So I am inclined to think that this is inadmissible.

Then there is another amendment by Shri Bahadur Singh which reads:

"The House demands that Indian forces should be employed to ensure the security of life, property and honour of the minorities in East Bengal."

That means calling upon the Government of India to go outside its territorial limits, in foreign jurisdiction, and maintain its forces. I think it is going beyond the scope.

Dr. Khare's amendment reads:

"The basis of partition has gone, and hence a reunion of East and West Bengals should be brought about."

Here also it is the same issue. So practically to my mind it appears that these parts of the amendments will not be in order, as they are not within the scope of the motion. Other things are suggested, and it may be argued as to why these only should not be admitted. I think I need not go to explain the difference between the two. All other amendments, I have admitted. I should like therefore to know the views of hon. Members as to why these parts of these amendments should not be deleted. If any hon. Member has to say anything, he can do so.

Then, of course, I would exclude those parts as being out of order.

Now I shall call upon the various hon. Members to move their amendments.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): May I ask the hon. Leader of the House whether the amendment of Sardar Amar Singh Saigal, a Member of the Congress party would be considered as an official amendment to the motion, or as a private Member's amendment? I feel that it is a very important point, which we should know.

Mr. Speaker: I think it is clear that it is not the concern of the Chair to see as to what party the Members belong to, in considering the admissibility or otherwise of any amendment or motion that has been tabled. A Member is a Member, whichever party he belongs to, and has got the right to table any amendment he likes.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: With due deference to you, Sir, I had only requested the hon. Leader of the House to clear the point. I did not address the question to you.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I do not think the question really depends upon the decision of the hon. Leader of the House. The hon. Member will note that the conduct of proceedings is in the control of the Chair. Outside the House it may be otherwise. So, if the motion is there and the hon. Member chooses to move it, I do not think anybody can prevent him from moving that particular motion. It is for the hon. Member who has tabled a motion to say whether he moves it or not.

Now I shall call upon the hon. Members who have given notice of the amendments to move them.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): I beg to move:

(i) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the only method of solving the East Bengal problem is to bring about a peaceful exchange of population between the Hindus in East Bengal and the Muslims in West Bengal with suitable adjustment of properties on Governmental level."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the only method of solving the East Bengal problem is to bring about a peaceful exchange of population between the Hindus in East Bengal and the Muslims in West Bengal with suitable adjustment of properties on Governmental level."

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampur): I beg to move:

(i) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that as the Government of Pakistan has failed to secure the protection of the elementary democratic and human rights of its minorities the Government of India should take firm and energetic action in terms of the Partition Agreement and other agreements with Pakistan to secure the just rights of the minority community to enable them to live in that State with honour and security."

(ii) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government has failed to tackle the serious situation arising out of the systematic squeezing out of the minorities from East Pakistan and it should impress upon the Government of Pakistan, the necessity of securing the protection of the elementary democratic rights of the minorities according to the terms of Partition Agreement and subsequent agreements with Pakistan in this respect."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment's moved:

(i) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that as the Government of Pakistan has failed to secure the protection of the elementary democratic and human rights of its minorities the Government of India should take firm and energetic action in terms of the Partition Agreement and other agreements with Pakistan to secure the just rights of the minority community to enable them to live in that State with honour and security."

(ii) That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government has failed to tackle the serious situation arising out of the systematic squeezing out of the minorities from East Pakistan and it should impress upon the Government of Pakistan, the necessity of securing the protection of the elementary democratic rights of the minorities according to the terms of Partition Agreement and subsequent agreements with Pakistan in this respect."

11 A.M.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion—

- (1) that the Pakistan Government have failed to implement the terms of Indo-Pak Agreements, with regard to protection of the minorities;
- (2) that such failure on the part of Pakistan Government constitutes a violation of the basic condition of partition;
- (3) that the Government of India have also failed to secure the implementation of such Indo-Pakistan agreements and to discharge their responsibility in the matter of the protection of the life, honour and property of the minority in East Pakistan; and
- (4) that the rehabilitation of the migrants from East Bengal has been utterly inadequate, thus adding to the miseries of millions of people.

This House, therefore, deplors the Government's attitude of complacency in this matter, specially after the introduction of passport and visa, and urges upon the Government—

- (1) to provide for adequate rehabilitation of those who have come; and
- (2) to take firm and effective steps including economic sanctions so that conditions may be created in East Pakistan which would enable the minorities to live in peace and honour and thus to fulfil the pledges and honour the assurances given by the Prime Minister to the minorities at the time of Partition."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added.

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion—

- (1) that the Pakistan Government have failed to implement the terms of Indo-Pak Agreements, with regard to protection of the minorities;
- (2) that such failure on the part of Pakistan Government constitutes a violation of the basic condition of partition;
- (3) that the Government of India have also failed to secure the implementation of such Indo-Pakistan agreements and to discharge their responsibility in the matter of the protection of the life, honour and property of the minority in East Pakistan; and
- (4) that the rehabilitation of the migrants from East Bengal has been utterly inadequate, thus adding to the miseries of millions of people.

This House, therefore, deplors the Government's attitude of complacency in this matter, specially after the introduction of passport and visa, and urges upon the Government—

- (1) to provide for adequate rehabilitation of those who have come; and
- (2) to take firm and effective steps including economic sanctions so that conditions may be created in East Pakistan which would enable the minorities to live in peace and honour and thus to fulfil the pledges and honour the assurances given by the Prime Minister to the minorities at the time of Partition."

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion the following be added:

"and having considered the same this House declares its firm determination to secure by peaceful means the settlement of all issues outstanding between India and Pakistan and to further friendly, economic, social and cultural relations between the two countries."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion the following be added:

"and having considered the same this House declares its firm determination to secure by peaceful means the settlement of all issues outstanding between India and Pakistan and to further friendly, economic, social and cultural relations between the two countries."

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government has failed to protect the lives and honour of millions of Scheduled Castes men and women who have not the means to come to India; and calls upon the Government to take effective steps so that the Scheduled Castes in Pakistan may live in security; and to arrange for the evacuation of those Scheduled Castes people who do not feel secure in Pakistan with government expenditure."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same this House is of opinion that Government has failed to protect the lives and honour of millions of Scheduled Castes men and women who have not the means to come to India; and calls upon the Government to take effective steps so that the Scheduled Castes in Pakistan may live in security; and to arrange for the evacuation of those Scheduled Castes people who do not feel secure in Pakistan with government expenditure."

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi—Bolangir): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion

[Shri R. N. S. Deo]

that the Pakistan Government having failed to honour the Indo-Pak agreements and to discharge its responsibilities for the protection of its minorities, the Government of India should adopt a firm and strong policy towards Pakistan to ensure that the minorities can live in Eastern Pakistan in safety and with honour."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Pakistan Government having failed to honour the Indo-Pak agreements and to discharge its responsibilities for the protection of its minorities, the Government of India should adopt a firm and strong policy towards Pakistan to ensure that the minorities can live in Eastern Pakistan in safety and with honour."

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion—

- (a) that the Pakistan Government has violated the Indo-Pak agreements and has deliberately followed a policy of squeezing out its minorities periodically and systematically,
- (b) that the Government of India has failed to take a firm attitude to ensure protection of minorities to whom solemn assurances had been given at the time of partition,
- (c) that the periodical influx of East Bengal refugees is upsetting the economy and endangering the peace and security of India, and
- (d) that it is no longer possible for India to absorb or rehabilitate more refugees.

This House therefore urges upon the Government of India to demand from the Pakistan Government the transfer of sufficient territory to India for the resettlement of East Pakistan refugees and to adopt a firm attitude to ensure that there is no further exodus from East Pakistan and the minorities there can live in peace, honour and safety."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion—

- (a) that the Pakistan Government has violated the Indo-Pak agreements and has deliberately followed a policy of squeezing out its minorities periodically and systematically,
- (b) that the Government of India has failed to take a firm attitude to ensure protection of minorities to whom solemn assurances had been given at the time of partition,
- (c) that the periodical influx of East Bengal refugees is upsetting the economy and endangering the peace and security of India, and
- (d) that it is no longer possible for India to absorb or rehabilitate more refugees.

This House therefore urges upon the Government of India to demand from the Pakistan Government the transfer of sufficient territory to India for the resettlement of East Pakistan refugees and to adopt a firm attitude to ensure that there is no further exodus from East Pakistan and the minorities there can live in peace, honour and safety."

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House approves all the steps taken so far in the matter."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House approves all the steps taken so far in the matter."

As regards the amendments in respect of which I expressed a doubt, I shall delete the portions inadmissible, and then ask the hon. Members to move them.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India has failed to realise the gravity of the situation and also to deal with it in a proper manner as a self-respecting Nation and therefore urges upon the Government of India to take all possible and immediate steps to permanently secure the protection of life, honour and property of the Hindus in their own homes in East Bengal."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India has failed to realise the gravity of the situation and also to deal with it in a proper manner as a self-respecting Nation and therefore urges upon the Government of India to take all possible and immediate steps to permanently secure the protection of life, honour and property of the Hindus in their own homes in East Bengal."

Shri Boovaraghasamy (Perambalur): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Pakistan has failed to protect its minorities and has adopted a deliberate policy of squeezing them out from time to time."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Pakistan has failed to protect its minorities and has adopted a deliberate policy of squeezing them out from time to time."

Shri Bahadur Singh (Ferozepur-Ludhiana—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Pakistan has failed to fulfil the minimum responsibility of any civilized Government to protect the lives, property and honour of its minorities."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Pakistan has failed to fulfil the minimum responsibility of any civilized Government to protect the lives, property and honour of its minorities."

The original motion together with all the above amendments is now open for discussion.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: We are today to discuss a matter of very vital importance not only to millions of individuals but to the entire country. It is not the first time that this matter is coming up before the House. It has been given to me to place the viewpoint of a large number of citizens of this country on this grave issue during the last 2½ years.

Today I feel overwhelmed by a sense of pang and sorrow as also a sense of responsibility and duty as I start to speak on this motion. I feel along with many that the policy hitherto pursued by the Government of India has not been at all satisfactory and it has failed to achieve the objective in view. Many of us have expressed opinions which have not been found acceptable to the Government. The issues before us are so momentous that none of us would like to proceed in an atmosphere of anger or passion but would like to place our respective viewpoints with the utmost frankness in the hope that before it is too late a solution of this gigantic problem can be found.

The question of the minorities in Pakistan has been settled during the last five years in different ways. So far as West Pakistan is concerned, today it stands virtually denuded of its minority population. During the last fortnight two shiploads of Hindu migrants came from Sind to India and I do not know how many thousands are still there.

So far as East Pakistan is concerned, at the time of partition the population of the Hindu minority was about 1 crore and 40 lakhs. According to Government figures, about thirty lakhs have come out during the last five years. We do not accept the accuracy of these figures, but I do not wish to go into the details. If we refer to the last census report of the Pakistan Government itself, it appears that nearly 45 lakhs of Hindus have come out, because according to that census the present Hindu population in East Bengal is about 95 lakhs.

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

Facts and agreements were enacted between India and Pakistan on this issue, not once, not twice but thrice and all of us remember vividly the tragic circumstances under which the pact of April 8, 1950, was enacted between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan. It fell to my lot to oppose that pact,—oppose not in the sense that there was nothing good in that post but oppose it on the ground that the very people who were responsible for carnage were being again entrusted with the responsibility for looking after the minorities. I felt that this scheme would not work. How grand were the wordings of that pact? I have the language before me. I do not wish to re-read it, but all the high sentiments which were expressed and rightly expressed remain unfulfilled. After all, what was being asked from Pakistan? Nothing unnatural or unique was being asked from her. We merely asked her to function as a civilised State and look after her minorities. But in spite of the flowery language that was used on that occasion, the basic principles of the pact have been violated by Pakistan during the last two and half years and we have witnessed during the last few months another mass migration.

Here one point which I would like to emphasise and which is extremely important is that it is only when large scale exodus takes place that public opinion in India is shaken. It is only when these unfortunate people come, not in hundreds but in thousands and even lakhs, carrying with them tales of woe, of shame, of misery and of humiliation, that public opinion is shocked and our Government starts considering the matter *de novo*. But if migration is not on a large scale, but on a homeopathic scale, then obviously it does not attract sufficient notice and it is sought to be concluded that perhaps things are all right in East Pakistan.

Many of us have pointed out repeatedly during the last two and half years that the real way of looking at the question is not through the eye of statistics alone—I do not ignore the value of statistics—but also with a human approach to the problem, and specially to find out how these people are living in East Pakistan, what are the conditions which they are being forced to accept and whether the minority can really live there or not. Unfortunately, for whatever reason it may be—whether due to want of machinery or due to want of co-operation on the part of Pakistan—such information has not been always available.

I would like the House to bear one point in mind. These unfortunate people who are now coming out had decided in spite of everything to stay on in East Pakistan. They did so in spite of the tragic happenings of 1950 when about 50,000 Hindus on a modest scale were killed in the course of a few months and when unparalleled barbarities took place, obviously with the connivance of the authorities of that State. In spite of all that, these people had decided to stay on, for after all who wishes to leave his hearth and home, and with what expectation? Undoubtedly, we have opened our door to them but we know how difficult the task of rehabilitation is. When humanity is uprooted it is not easy that it would be able to resettle itself under different conditions altogether.

So, when during the last few months according to Government about 3 lakhs but according to us at least double that number has been forced to come out, we can easily realise what force of circumstances has been compelling them to do so.

What are the basic factors of this movement from one country to another? First of all, as we all realise, there is the very conception of the Pakistan State. Pakistan was born out of hatred of Hindus and of India. Although it was thought that the makers of Pakistan would be able to settle down and think in terms of the development of their country keeping an atmosphere of goodwill with India, those expectations have been belied. The creation of a homogeneous Islamic State was the principal aim of the founder of Pakistan and those who have come into his shoes have carried that ideal into execution in every possible way. Hindus have been deprived of their rights in every sphere—social, cultural, economic, religious and political. They are treated as *Zimmis*.

Secondly, the policy of squeezing out the minorities—squeezing out, not flooding out. I shall have to refer to this because a point was raised by the Minister of Rehabilitation the other day that if the policy of the Pakistan authorities is squeezing out its minorities, then why are not more people coming out after passport. Why should Pakistan prevent the passing out of a larger number of people? But it is squeezing out, not flooding out; because if very large numbers of people come out at one time, then, immediately it produces reaction in India and naturally it

may create a situation which may not be very desirable from the point of view of Pakistan.

Thirdly, Sir, it is not at the Hindu minority alone that the attack is aimed, and this is a symptom which we cannot forget in consideration of this major problem today. The authorities who are in power today have carried on their administration in such a way that any attempt to give expression to democratic ideas or to owe allegiance to true freedom has been checked. How else can we explain the continued detention of that great leader, Abdul Gafar Khan or his compatriots, who, though Muslims, are rotting in Pakistan jails and against whom only a week ago, the Chief Minister of the North West Frontier Province declared his charge that they were after all the spies and friends of India and could not be trusted? How, else can we explain the recent trouble that arose in East Bengal over the language issue when as many as 18 Muslim students received bullets on their chests and not on their back because they had the courage to face the bullets for the recognition and protection of what was after all their own mother-tongue? Those symptoms are also there. All these factors have to be borne in mind if we are really anxious for a lasting solution of this problem.

About four months ago, when I pointed out the wrong approach of the Prime Minister in dealing with statistics, he grew angry. He challenged me to produce statistics. It is not a question of a challenge or a counter-challenge, but I would appeal to him to drop the faulty method of looking at the entire problem. What are the statistics? They are said to be statistics of movement of people from one country to another. How are they obtained? There is no *dhobi* mark on each individual who goes to Pakistan or who comes from Pakistan indicating whether he is a Hindu or a Muslim, but some sort of rough and ready method is followed and a communal division of the migrants is made. Then again, the calculations are made only at two railway stations, omitting the 700 miles border between East Bengal and West Bengal, omitting the border between Tripura and Pakistan, omitting the border between Assam and Pakistan. So, when Government proceeds fundamentally on the basis of these statistics and tries to justify its wrong policy, I say, Sir, the Government does something which is not only not fair to itself but unfair to the people at large. The only possible way of appreciating the problem will be to know what the conditions are in East Pakistan. I would ask the House, the

representatives of 360 millions of free Indians, to make up their minds once for all whether under the existing circumstances it is possible for the minority to live in East Pakistan—that is the fundamental issue—and if they say that it is not, then to make up their minds whether it is possible for the free Government of India to take any effective steps for their protection.

I need not go into the details of the history of partition of this country. They are well known to all the Members of this House. But there is one fundamental point which is to be remembered now. What was the basis of the partition of India? The basis was that minorities would continue to live in their respective territories. I was one of those who was against the division of India under any circumstances. I supported the partition of Bengal and the partition of the Punjab only after it was decided that the partition of India was inevitable, because then Mr. Jinnah's claim was that the whole of Bengal and the whole of the Punjab should go into Pakistan. What we did was not to agree to the partition of India but we supported a movement which led to the partition of Pakistan itself. At that time I remember I saw a number of Congress leaders and especially Gandhiji, and some of us begged of him to appreciate the real point of view, whether it will be possible for the minorities to live in Pakistan, in view of the circumstances under which that new country was taking its birth. And we suggested a planned exchange of population and property at Governmental level as part of the partition scheme. He was not willing to accept it. The Congress leaders were not willing to accept it because their viewpoint was that what they were agreeing to was not a communal division of India but a territorial division of India. They emphasised with all the depth of their feelings that there was no question of the minorities being compelled to leave their hearth and homes, either in the new India or in the new country to be called Pakistan. When it fell to my lot to move about among these people in East Bengal, I carried with me the message from these Congress leaders, one of whom adorns the position of Prime Minister of India today. Assurance was given to them that their case will not be forgotten, that if any real emergency came, free India would not sit idle and they would be protected, hoping at that time that perhaps the need for such protection by India of the minorities in Pakistan would not be necessary. Here one fundamental point India cannot afford to forget. There was no Hindu, no Sikh, no non-Muslim for the matter of that, who

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

wanted the division of India. The demand for the division of India came from a large section of Muslims who followed the directions of the Muslim League and, therefore, the minorities who laboured hard for the freedom of undivided India, who shed their life-blood, who sacrificed everything that they held dear to themselves, when they were asked to live in a country which was foreign to India, obviously, they were asked to surrender something which was extremely dear to their hearts. Appreciation of that sacrifice came from the leaders, came from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I will read out only one sentence from the statement which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru issued on 15th August, referring to the Hindus in Pakistan, the minorities in Pakistan.

"We think also of our brothers and sisters," he said, "who have been cut off from us by the political boundaries and who, unhappily, cannot share at present in the freedom that has come. They are of us and will remain of us, whatever may happen in future and we shall be sharers in good and ill fortune alike."

And, now, I call upon Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who is the Prime Minister of India, to fulfil this pledge which he had given in such noble words to those who had suffered with him and others like him for the liberation of their motherland. A message like that came from Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. Of course, he went a step further and said that he still waited for the day when this artificial partition of the country will cease and the two countries will be re-united again.

A message came from Gandhiji. Then the drama began. Blow after blow came and when people started coming out and when reports of oppression and atrocities started coming, I was a part of the Government. We considered the matter. We recognised the gravity of the situation. I went as a representative of the Government of India to Calcutta and attended the first Indo-Pakistan Conference to consider the East Bengal situation. The leader of the Delegation from Pakistan was Mr. Ghulam Mohammed, now the Governor-General of Pakistan, and Khwaja Nazimuddin also was there. We spent days and days together. When I ask for strong action today, I do so not in a spirit of huff. I do so not in a childish spirit, I do so not in a fantastic mood, but I refer to our experiences, our bitter and tragic experiences of failures that have taken place during the last five years and we are asking Govern-

ment to adopt 'other methods'—the expression deliberately used by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in February 1950—'When peaceful methods fail, other methods will be adopted by Government'. And I would now ask the Prime Minister to tell us whether the time has not come to adopt other methods.

I have got the reports here. We signed agreements, pledges, promises—everything. It went on for a few months, and as usual, they were violated by Pakistan. Later, we met again here in Delhi and Mr. Ghulam Mohammed came again as the leader of the Pakistan delegation. Interpretation of the first Indo-Pakistan Conference was solemnly recorded followed by another agreement! I was a party to it. I was a party to it because even at that stage I felt that we should not leave any stone unturned for securing a peaceful and honourable solution of this problem. Undoubtedly, normally the Government will have to take charge of its people and it is for the Pakistan Government to protect its minorities. We went on on that basis. That agreement was signed. Things went on again for a few months. And then came the tragic blow of January-February 1950. I need not go into those details. But even then Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan came. He came, why? He came because he found that India's opinion was shaken to its very root. He came because he found that there were preparations of a different kind going on in India. There was pressure upon him from England and America. Millions of Muslims went out from India to Pakistan. He found that it had ceased to be a one-way traffic and that the same game that he was playing, others also were capable of playing. He came: he came in a mood of outward friendliness, and there was the Pact of April 8, 1950. That has gone on for the last 2½ years.

So my fundamental question to Government is this: do you believe that you have any responsibility for the protection of the minorities? Panditji had said on that occasion that "they are our concern; the protection of the minorities will be a matter which we will have to take in hand. They will be rehabilitated in their homes, if possible, or elsewhere, if necessary". Now, if the Pakistan Government fails time after time, what is the answer that the Government of India is going to give? The passport system has been introduced. It is said that on account of the passport system, people are coming away. Our Minorities Minister, Mr. Biswas, the other day held a Press conference in Calcutta and he pointed out that passport was only a

symptom, using the same language as we are using, that that was not the main cause for people coming away. Something deeper was happening behind the scenes, and it might have added to the panic, to the fear. But if everything else was all right, why should the mere adoption of passports create such terrible panic in the minds of people that they should be forced out of their country?

Now, here I come to the present dangerously complacent attitude of the Government, and specially of the Prime Minister. I was amazed to hear his statement, which has been repeated many times, telling the public that the problem is practically solved, that people are not coming in large numbers, that there are no passport difficulties—they are virtually nil—and that except the matter of rehabilitation which, of course, is undoubtedly important, for the time being there is no other trouble. I join issue with him, Sir. That is not the correct position. Undoubtedly the number of people has been reduced. Mr. Jain said the other day that it was an inconsistent attitude. 'You say on the one hand that these people are being squeezed out and on the other hand, they are being prevented from coming. So if Pakistan wants to drive them out, why are not people coming in larger numbers?'

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): A reference has been made to me twice. I did not actually say what the hon. Member is now repeating. What I said was that allegations had been made by the leaders of West Bengal, namely, that Pakistan was squeezing out the minorities, and, secondly, that these minorities were not allowed to come. These two things are inconsistent.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is exactly what I said. Probably my language is not as perfect as his.

The point is that Pakistan's policy is that the minorities either should go or those who remain will remain as converts or serfs. It is clear. It does not intend that all should go out. If people accept the kind of living which is open to them in East Pakistan, then perhaps they may continue to live there. And Pakistan does not desire that people should come out in very large numbers, because it knows that it will then immediately produce tremendous reactions in India.

So far as passport is concerned what is the position? The Prime Minister has given some figures. I have got the official figures here. Up till 15th October every day thousands were coming—seven, eight, ten thousand per day.

Suddenly from 18th October the number dropped to zero at one stage. None came. From 18th October to 2nd November at the station of Bongaon which was receiving five, six, eight thousand people every day from East Bengal, the number was actually nil—zero. Is it to be seriously suggested that just overnight conditions changed there so miraculously that people stopped coming for so many days together? Similarly, with regard to Banpur the number dropped to eight, six some days ten, some days eleven and some days zero.

Now in the papers reports are appearing as to the reasons why the people are not being able to come and they are appearing daily. What is this passport system, Sir? People have to go, submit their applications, present a form, fill it in, make a payment and have all sorts of enquiries to face. The matter goes to the police. Photographs have to be given and the latest reports published in yesterday's papers show that now the price of each photograph has gone up tremendously. You cannot get a photograph unless you pay 10 rupees, 15 rupees. And it affects whom? Not people in the urban areas alone. It affects thousands and thousands—and they live in villages. It affects people who are ignorant, who are illiterate. Those who have come have written to us, have seen us and they describe the state of affairs which is extremely delicate and dangerous. Thousands of people there who had come out of their homes for the purpose of coming over to India were detained suddenly on and after 15th October. When I met Panditji in Calcutta at that time, I specially requested him to take steps so that these people who might have numbered two lakhs or three lakhs might not be trapped. They had come out of their homes and they were somewhere on the way, and the bulk of them were illiterate, ignorant, poor agriculturists, land labourers etc. It is not rich people today who are coming in large numbers. They have come out already. And pathetic reports came to us about their condition. Some of them have gone back; many of them are untraced—I do not know where they are today. And then when they have to start this process again, passing through the passport regulations and coming over to India, it is not an easy matter. So it is not that everything is all right and people could just come if they wished, or need not come if they did not wish. A report reached us day before yesterday that thousands have been waiting near the Dacca Passport Office. Many of them

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

have come from distant parts and they do not know where to sleep at night. The steamer service has been cancelled. Does the Government of India know that the steamer service between Narayanganj and Goalando has been stopped? It is one of the most important routes in Eastern Bengal. Some other steamer routes have also been cancelled, so that even if people wished to come out it will not be easy for them to do so.

People are anxious to sell their properties at any price. There is a ban, which has been reported in the papers, given under the orders of the District Magistrates: "Don't purchase properties of Hindus." So that, practically for a long time they are selling off their properties without registered documents and they are coming away as virtual paupers.

This is the report which was published five days ago in one of the papers in Calcutta, giving the statements of Muslims who have come from East Bengal to India. I think their statements should be accepted more readily by the Prime Minister, because there is no communal colour here. What is it that they have said. Janab Rahim, a sixth year student crossed over after securing the necessary passport. He said he could secure his documents after efforts extending over twenty-two days. Then Janab Akbar Khan, who entered India with a passport described that a large number of people were waiting at Dacca and with great difficulty he could secure his travel permits to come over to West Bengal. A Pakistani Christian gentleman described that after strenuous efforts and by speaking to some of the high officials at Dacca he could get his passport. Then, of course, there is a Hindu also who has supported this testimony and has stated how he and other were deprived of whatever money they had and they had come as virtual paupers. This is what is happening after the introduction of the passport system.

I do not want to go into details, but I should mention that a passport size photo is now costing Rs. 10 in East Bengal. And a class of lawyers have suddenly come up, who pose as experts who could secure passports easily and they are charging Rs. 40.

Then another report has come from Tejpur (Assam) side. There, the Deputy Commissioner of Durrang has been apprised of the situation. It is of a different type. About 250 Hindus who were coming out were pre-

vented and only Muslims were allowed to come. The Deputy Commissioner has sent a 'strong' protest to the East Bengal Government.

Similarly, there is a letter which I received this morning. It is very interesting and I do not know whether the Prime Minister knows about this position. This happened three days ago in Calcutta. A Hindu gentleman wants to go back to East Bengal for certain private purposes. He went to the Deputy High Commissioner's Office in Calcutta and he writes to me that after repeated efforts, going from day to day, he failed to secure the passport and on the last date he was told that he is now required to prove his Pakistan citizenship by documents or other material which he must bring or secure from Pakistan so as to get back to East Pakistan. This certificate must come from a Union Board President or a gazetted officer in Pakistan and if he cannot manage to get it there is no chance of his getting his passport. He says that this rule was changed three days ago.

Another letter which I got today is a copy of a letter which has been sent to the Prime Minister by one Dinesh Chandra Sur. I do not know him. But he gives a pathetic tale as to how his mother has been detained in East Bengal. His father has come out. They sold their property—a sort of exchange between a Muslim who was in West Bengal and these Hindus who were in East Bengal. After having got the house the demand came for cash money, which they did not have. His wife has been detained and these people have sent a pathetic appeal to the Prime Minister that some quick steps may be taken for the recovery of their money. This letter came only today: the original is with the Prime Minister.

A report has come about 8,000 Hindus who are stranded. I mentioned about this to the Prime Minister in Calcutta. We have, as you know certain Indian enclaves, a sort of pockets within East Pakistan near Jalpaiguri. There are about 8,000 Hindus living there and it is impossible for them to come out, because they have to pass through Pakistan territory and they will not be allowed to do so without passports and nobody is being allowed to enter into those areas. Government have protested; the people have sent frantic wires with regard to their desperate position. I can give hundreds of such instances but it is not necessary. All that I want is to demolish the hollowness of the argument of the Prime Minister that everything

is all right; that the passport system is there—people may come if they wish, and if they do not wish they need not. That is not so. What is happening there is the Pakistan Government has adopted measures to make it difficult for these people to come. Forget not the moral depression of these people. What is their mental state now? Many of them are poor, illiterate. They were running from here to there and today they are face to face with this intricate problem of getting passports under difficult conditions.

We talk of Harijans. We have a special provision in our Constitution, for looking after them. Does the House know that out of 95 lakhs of Hindus who are in East Bengal, more than 50 lakhs are Harijans. I met some of their representatives. Some of them described to me their pathetic conditions. There were Namasudras who could stand and fight. But the oppression that has been pursued makes it impossible for them to live. They do not care for rules or regulations. They know how to get their birth-right. But they stand today completely humiliated and weakened.

What will happen to them. They say: We came to India for rehabilitation; we have got it. Our children have died. We are going back. What is the crime we have committed? We did not want Pakistan. You asked us to live there and it is only because we are Hindus we are facing this crisis. We will embrace Islam—we will surrender ourselves. Will it bring credit to India? Will it be something of which Indian can be proud?

Gandhiji gave his life for the cause of Harijans. Everyone talks in the name of Gandhiji—Gandhian ideology, Gandhian philosophy. I know the circumstances under which Gandhiji went to Noakhali, because the majority of the people there belonged to the depressed classes. You have now handed over these 50 lakhs of people to a Raj which does not know how to perform its elementary duty and they are facing slow death.

I look at this problem from two points of view: one rehabilitation and the other the future of these people who are still in East Bengal. Rehabilitation must naturally be continued. I do not deny the importance of it. I am prepared to say at the very outset that so far as rehabilitation is concerned, it should not be made a matter of party politics. It is a national issue and it is the bounden duty of all, irrespective of political differences, to offer their wholehearted co-opera-

tion for making rehabilitation plans a success, provided such co-operation is sought and provided also that rehabilitation and the administration of rehabilitation are really consistent with the requirements of these unfortunate people and also with national demands.

People have come from West Pakistan—65 lakhs of them. You have spent Rs. 130 crores. Have you been able to rehabilitate them completely yet? What about their compensation? Their verified claims, I am told, come to about Rs. 500 crores. Then there is the question of their agricultural land. There is so much yet to be done. I do not blame anybody. It is a stupendous task—65 lakhs of people to be cared for, although the bulk of them have been rehabilitated on land and in occupation by a bloody process of exchange of population and property. The Hindus came and the Muslims went. I was in the Government. It was not desired that this should be done. But events over-took the Government and then the very Government which would never look at exchange of population under any circumstances yielded to this gigantic pressure. You know what terrible days they were for Hindus and Muslims—for both. But in spite of all this we have not been able to do our duty towards these large number of migrants from West Pakistan. From East Pakistan 30 lakhs have come. During the last few months another 3 lakhs have been added. Yesterday the papers said that the West Bengal Government has asked for another Rs. 30 crores. Where will be your planning schemes? What are you going to do if another fifty or sixty lakhs of people are pushed out of Pakistan and they come over here? You will have to spend another three hundred crores of rupees on their rehabilitation only. If you have to compensate them, there will be at least one thousand crores of rupees worth of property belonging to Hindus which are lying in East Pakistan. Will you be able to rehabilitate or look after them? And why should India be placed in this position and allow her own economy to collapse?

We accepted partition under certain basic conditions. When that basic condition is not observed by Pakistan, then the very basis disappears. From that point of view the partition stands annulled and India is not bound by her commitments. It is not my wording alone.

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

The Prime Minister himself has declared from that very place that the basic condition is that the minorities must be protected by Pakistan. We have done our duty. India has protected its minorities. In spite of so many odds and difficulties, as any one would have seen from our discussion of this problem, we have never allowed it to be looked at from a communal plane. It is a political problem. It is not a provincial problem. It is a national problem, and we must find a national solution for it. Killing of some innocent Muslims because Hindus are butchered in Pakistan will be a vicious circle and is most inhuman. The true interpretation of Hinduism is that if a man goes wrong you should punish him, but if a man is innocent and you go and cut his throat that simply poisons the atmosphere. It does not save people.

That is why we have been pressing over and over again: Wake up, Prime Minister, realize your responsibility, do not allow the situation to go from bad to worse, do not allow the elemental passions of man to take charge of the situation, function as a responsible government and fulfil the pledges you have given.

Rehabilitation must be done. But rehabilitation is not the only problem. The problem is with regard to finding out means for the safety of these people so that they may live in their hearth and home.

What is the position in Pakistan? Hindus have no place or status there. I shall read out only a few words from a speech which was delivered in the Pakistan Constituent Assembly by a Member of the Pakistan Constituent Assembly in March last. The name of that Member is Mr. Bhupendra Kumar Dutt. He was a member of the All India Congress Committee. Twenty-three years of his life he spent in jail for the cause of Indian freedom. He has not come away from Pakistan. He decided to live there. He found what had happened in Pakistan during the last five years, and he had the courage to stand up on the floor of the Pakistan Constituent Assembly and throw his charge against the Pakistan Government. He did not do it by means of a statement after running away to India. I admire his courage. I wish there were more men with that courage who could have faced the facts as this gentleman did. What did he say? I shall just read a few words because this will give a correct impression to

the House and to the country as to how things are happening in East Pakistan which make it impossible for any one to live there unless he completely surrenders to the authorities. He says thus:

"So far as this side of Pakistan is concerned, the minorities are practically liquidated. Those of us who are here to represent near about a crore of people still left in East Bengal live under a total sense of frustration. I stand here as the representative of a frustrated people."

Then he refers to what happened after February, 1950. I am not going to ancient history. I am referring to the manner in which the Delhi Pact was deliberately torn to pieces by the Pakistan authorities. My charge is not against the people of Pakistan. In all my speeches and utterances I have distinguished the difference between the Pakistan Government and the people of Pakistan. I cannot have the temerity to say that all people in Pakistan are bad just as I cannot say that all the people in India are good. There is a mixture of good and evil. But it is the Government there which is functioning ruthlessly, tyrannically and in a manner which makes it impossible for the people, specially Hindus, to exercise their fundamental rights. This is what he says with regard to what happened after 1950. After the 1950 Pact secret circulars were issued by the Government.

"A circular went out to all thana officers to report on the extent, nature and source of influence wielded by particular individuals of the minorities (Hindu) community and the forces and parties that might work against them"—a complete circular for getting information. "Another circular went out asking heads of many commercial firms to obtain the previous approval of the District Magistrate before giving employment to any non-Muslim (in East Bengal). Few firms would undertake the trouble of obtaining the District Magistrate's approval for favouring a non-Muslim with a job."

When this circular was mentioned on the floor of the House earlier, it was challenged, and later on a copy of this circular had been sent to the Speaker by the European Secretary of a commercial organisation, and the copy was with him.

That was the second portion of his observations. Now comes the last and most amazing one which has a direct bearing on the Delhi Pact:

"The latest came a few months back. It was addressed to all District Magistrates—a fourteen page circular. It instructed them by no means to return the lands and properties to the returning migrants but to distribute them among the (Muslim) refugees. The returning migrants were to be put off on some excuse. A long list of statutes and orders and the relevant legal bars were to be put forward in each case one after another. The more significant line follows. In dealing with all other matters the District Magistrate was to bear in mind the instruction in this behalf: 'Talk sweetly to minorities and their representatives, even with smile on your lips. You have earned the compliments of persons like the hon. Mr. C. C. Biswas who have stated that it was only some subordinate officials who were responsible for the troubles' (hoodwinking even the eagle eyes of my hon. friend Mr. C. C. Biswas) 'try by all means to maintain your reputation. Keep this instruction secret. Do not trust other officers. They sometimes mismanage and mishandle things'."

Do you want any other commentary on the sincerity of the Pakistan Government to put into operation the provisions of the Delhi Pact? It is not a statement manufactured by communalists and reactionaries in India. It is a statement which was read out on the floor of the Pakistan Constituent Assembly in the presence of Khwaja Nizamuddin and the rest of them. And he did it at the risk of his life. He had the courage to face the Pakistan Constituent Assembly: He could even be killed, but there he was to expose Pakistan Government and specially the manner in which they were running the administration of the country.

I do not wish to read the details of it, but he gives his comment:

"The Delhi Agreement has never worked in its proper spirit, not because of any inimical relations subsisting between the (two) communities (in Pakistan) but because of the official dodgings, manoeuvrings and manipulations that are the outcome of the circulars and resolutions."

Since I have read a portion of the statement, according to the directions which you have very often given, it is my duty to place the entire statement before the House. If you permit me, Sir, I place it on the Table of the House so that any Member interested in reading the entire speech may do so. [Placed in Library. See No. P-77/52].

I can give you other illustrations. But I do not wish to do so. I shall only say this. What has been the nature of the oppression? The other day my hon. friend Mr. Jain said "We are not hearing many instances of oppression now". How can he verify? Neither can he admit, nor can he deny. That sort of statement was made by my friend Mr. Jain—who is smiling at the ludicrous nature of his answer! So far as instances are concerned I have got nearly about five hundred of them. I cannot obviously go through them.

I do not wish to tire the patience of the House but the most painful and the most humiliating aspect of these atrocities has been the tragic dealings with Hindu women. One's voice is choked completely to make any public speech on an issue like this. If you read the names, addresses and the manner in which this violation has gone on during the last few months it staggers one, Sir. It was the carrying away of one Sita that created the Ramayana. It was the disrobing of one woman, Draupadi, that created the Mahabharat, and today even though large scale outrages have occurred we are sitting tight, helpless, impotent. If you bring this to the notice of the Government, they will say "Well, we need actual proof". Who can prove this? Is it always possible for people to go and prove such incidents in a court of law? It is said reference has been made to Pakistan Government. Pakistan Government's reply is "No. Nothing has happened". I do not wish to refer to those details but the number is large and the list can be supplied. Of course that will go to the Record Department of the Government of India which will not help the unfortunate people in any way. I can give you four or five examples of atrocities. One relates to Chittagong Hill tribes. The Prime Minister remembers this. We discussed and discussed about the fate of 95 per cent. of Budhists and the hill tribes in the small territory which unfortunately went out of India although the Muslim population there was only 2 to 5 per cent. Do you know, Sir, that they have been pushed out? Many of them have been killed. The

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

entire area has been cleared up. A new batch of 500 tribesmen has been recently forced out of the Chittagong hill tribes. How deliberately they have been turned out of that area! And they are moving about as beggars in Assam. I next refer the Prime Minister to a statement which was issued by the President of the West Dinajpur Northern District Congress Committee. I have taken special care to take statements issued by Muslims and Congress leaders so that they will carry conviction with the Prime Minister more quickly than otherwise. Here is published the result of enquiry which the President of the Dinajpur Congress Committee carried on accompanied by some Muslims indicating how the atrocities took place in the last few weeks when people were coming out from East Bengal to West Bengal. Then I refer the Prime Minister to the manner in which humiliation and insult was offered to some officers of the Government of India.—Mr. Burman, Collector of Central Excise, Shillong,—how he was harassed and insulted and he himself saw the instances of similar harassment as he was coming out from Pakistan. I feel greatly relieved to read the announcement that the Government of Assam has sent a very strong protest to East Bengal Government. It is not a strong protest, it is a very strong protest. Perhaps everything will be all right now. Similarly with regard to conversions. A large number of conversions have taken place. Hundreds of them were reported. I am taking here a typical case from the Pakistan paper *Azad*. I have got cuttings from this paper. It is under Maulana Akram Khan who was once a great Congress leader. There he describes how Hindu young girls are embracing Islam and he has emphasised that they are doing so out of conviction. It is described how insistently they urged in favour of conversion and Muslim leaders had to agree. Their names are given and then it is added that the majority community there is kind and generous, immediately arrangements for marriages are made and a large number of youths come forward willing to marry such girls if they only embrace Islam. Names and addresses are given. The finishing touch is equally interesting. Relations of the converted family who had gone away to West Bengal for rehabilitation have come back and are also voluntarily embracing Islam. Then I will give two other cases. Sir P. C. Ray was one of the great Scientists of India, in fact many of

12 Noon

the great men of Bengal, like J. C. Bose, C. R. Das, all come from East Bengal. In his (Sir P. C. Ray's) village a few weeks ago, after the introduction of the passport system, a horrible incident has taken place. A leading Doctor, Behari Lal, was approached by some Muslims. They told him that he should invite them to a dinner. He agreed. They said they were 50 but actually 80 men came and naturally the good Doctor was unable to find the necessary eatables for such a big party. They said "You need not worry, we will look after ourselves". They went to the Goshala, got hold of a calf and then that was killed and food was prepared. The Doctor was asked to partake of it. He had to. After the party had gone away the Doctor went to his room and committed suicide. A few hours later his wife came and she saw the dead body of her husband and she also did the same. Their family has come to West Bengal and details have been published. Another incident occurred in Rangpur where a Doctor was invited to the house of a certain Muslim who was anxious to get hold of the Doctor's girl. After he had gone there that offer was made. The Doctor refused. He was detained there and the members of his family were brought to his house. When the girl saw that they were confronted with a dangerous situation, she volunteered to save the life of her father. The father was released. The next day a so-called marriage took place and in the evening the girl committed suicide. The number of such cases is not known. I have only got the names and addresses of some that have reached us. An iron curtain is there. The administration of that country has morally collapsed and a large number of people is coming from day to day. I myself feel how difficult it is for these people to resist this for such a long time. In a village in Rangpur, on 28th September, a Hindu girl who had just been confined was forcibly taken out at night and her dead body with blood was found in a field the next day. These are horrible instances. We have got a number of such cases before us.

Border incidents are taking place. Why this insecurity today? Today's issue of *Hindustan Times* gives details of a border incident in Assam where firing was continued by Pakistan for two days and the fun of it was that at that time a conference between the two Chief Secretaries was being held in Shillong for discus-

sion as to how peace could be established in that area. Of course a very strong protest has been sent to East Bengal Government. In Tripura border, the Prime Minister knows,— and a copy of the telegram has gone to him.—a large number of people came a few days ago inside our border and hoisted the Pakistan flag on the Indian side of the border. It might be a small thing from that point of view but this is the way in which things are going and what is the impression that is produced in the minds of the people when the Prime Minister says "everything is all right except some insecurity and so on"? He may declare his helplessness but for heaven's sake, do not say things which are not true. That will be like throwing salt into the gaping wound. You may not be able to protect them, you may not be able to help them, but do not minimise the gravity of the situation. Unfortunately, the statements which the Prime Minister made during the last few days will form part of Pakistan propaganda. They will retort and say "Here the Prime Minister himself says there is nothing except some stray incidents here and there", and humiliation and repression will continue.

What is the remedy? We have suggested some remedies and these are the phrases that have been hurled against us: childish, fantastic, quack; I have forgotten the other phrases. They come one after another. That is not the way the Prime Minister should respond. He has not sent for us. I could have understood his calling the leaders of all parties and sitting together to consider this question. I do not want this to be made a party issue. We do not wish to play with fire. We know the dangers inherent in the situation. This is not a matter which Government alone can solve. We are here to offer a hand of co-operation. But, we want a solution. We do not want that people should be killed by inches. If they have to die, let them die once for all. But, this is a chain of terrible humiliation and misery which affects not individuals alone, but which humiliates the status and stature of the nation. We have given some remedies; other remedies may be suggested. Economic sanction is one. Naturally demand for land is one. It was Sardar Patel's remedy. If one-third of the population who happen to be Hindus is pushed out, Pakistan must give one-third of the land. We cannot ruin the whole country of India for the misdeeds of Pakistan. There must be a re-parti-

tion of the territory of Pakistan and these people must be settled there. Some say we must have an exchange of population. That is not an easy matter. There also, the question of rehabilitation will come. The Prime Minister will retort, how am I going to get land. If Pakistan takes four crores of Muslims, they may demand more land. They may say, more Muslims are coming. But, some Muslims do not wish to live in Pakistan unless they belong to a particular type of mind. To this one may reply, one-third of Kashmir is with them. That may be *quid pro quo*. That area is as big as half of Bengal. That is a question of argument. Exchange of population and property on a Governmental level, not through the hands of men; that was suggested some time ago. To that also he will naturally reply, how can I push out people if they do not wish to go out of the country; they live under a Constitution; how can I do it? But, the main problem is not solved. I agree that in both these cases, the problem is not ultimately solved. This tremendous problem of rehabilitation comes. We have seen the horrors and consequences of lakhs of people coming from the West and the East. We may have to face the horrors again. We have therefore said that Government must take the responsibility for the safety and protection of the minorities in that area and give us a political solution.

It was once said, that I was a war-monger, how am I going to take charge of East Bengal? That was not indeed my remedy. I always quote bigger names in support of the remedies. That was a remedy which Gandhiji suggested. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur will remember that. She and I saw him a few weeks before his death. We were discussing this question. He came out with fire in his eyes. He said: we did not agree to the partition of India for this terrible problem of rehabilitation causing misery to millions of people; it was on a certain fundamental basis: the minorities must be protected; they must live in their own homeland; no question of their being turned out as beggars. What was his remedy? He said: let India play her part; you protect the minorities; let not one man be turned out from here; then turn towards Pakistan and say, we have fulfilled our part, but you have not; it becomes a world problem; it becomes a moral problem. The words which he uttered are still ringing in my ears. He said: if Pakistan fails to do so, if there is no other remedy, you must take charge of East Bengal; let Gov-

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

ernment take charge and protect the people. He added: I cannot join the war; I do not believe in it; but I will bless you that you have the moral courage for it. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur will remember that. He dealt with this in one of his speeches also. I am not advocating war; but if there is no other means of protecting the minorities of East Pakistan except to take charge of that territory, Government of India will some day have to consider it. I am not using this word lightly; I am not saying that immediately war should be declared. It would not be necessary also. There was no war in Hyderabad. They are not ready for war. Goondaism does not wish to face war. They want to gain something without sacrifice. Only if the Prime Minister says Government will act firmly and adopts a policy not of weakness and appeasement, you will see what happens. He is proud of appeasement. I am amazed at it. He may say, I cannot find a solution; I can sympathise with that. But, he glorifies appeasement and goes on appeasing. At whose cost? If he does it at his own cost, I do not mind, though I shall be sorry. But what right has he to appease at the cost of the nation? It is a question of the honour and self-respect of India. Something has to be done to prevent a major catastrophe.

It is not for us to suggest remedies nor can many remedies be openly discussed. There sit the Government. They are doing whatever they like in respect of all matters. Does the Opposition go on giving advice to the Government and is there any moral obligation on the Government to accept that? We may have the privilege of making some suggestions and let him have the pleasure of rejecting them. But, it would not do for him to say that it is fantastic and all that. Let him find a solution which will, in the real sense of the term, solve the problem. We will all be with him. Let there be a solution. We want to settle the question by peaceful methods. Here our Communist friends will speak. They have not agreed with us. We, all the parties barring the Communists, have stood on one platform in this respect. The Congress cannot come. But, I know there are lakhs of Congressmen who feel in the same manner as we do. If any peaceful method can be found, do it. Who wants war? Who wants trouble? I know what the horrors of war are. No one is saying, declare war tomorrow. Find

out an effective solution by which these people can be enabled to live exercising their elementary rights without being ruined as refugees or beggars or slaves.

The Prime Minister very often says he believes in a healing process. Undoubtedly. Healing by what means? Healing by curing the disease? If there is cancerous growth, will you put sandal oil on the cancer and heal it? You will have to go to the root of it. You will have to appreciate what the disease is. Now, Government are running away from the real problem. That is what shocks me and pains me. They just say, there is no problem, people are not coming. But, coming or not coming, the disease is there. Can the people, who are sitting here, go and live there? I made a suggestion in 1950. Until you can go and settle there with your wives and daughters, you cannot realise the agony of millions. Sitting far away, it is easy to deal with abstract theories, but once you place yourselves in their shoes, you will realise where exactly the pain lies. They never wanted this partition and they demand fulfilment of past pledges. We also want the healing process. Let us not talk of Gandhian ideology. Whatever Gandhiji was, cowardice was not within his ideology. Inaction was not within his ideology. He would never have sat quiet and helpless. When I came to Delhi and reported about the happenings in Noakhali, everything else became secondary to him. He came to Calcutta and we gave all the details. He had his own way of doing things. We might or might not have agreed with him. At the time of the Dacca riots, I came and reported to him. He said publicly in *Harijan* next week, that his first remedy was that people should go to the assailants and die and sacrifice themselves. I said, that was not possible; if a goonda comes to attack me, the Penal Code gives me the authority to kill him; I may not kill an innocent man; but the right to attack a man who wants to injure me is a right that I get under the law. He said, you may do so. Then he added: resist non-violently if possible, violently if necessary; but never submit to a wrong. I ask the Government to accept that as the policy. Resist this national wrong.

The Prime Minister said four days ago in his statement:

"I am quite clear in my mind that the ultimate remedy for the ills of Indo-Pakistan relations is to apply the touch of healing to

them and not the touch of loud shouting."

Let us do it with small shouting.

"That does not mean that one should submit to wrong things."

I have underlined it. That is what I am asking today. That is my charge against him that he is submitting to wrong things.

Not only are you submitting, but you are making the people submit to wrong things, and you are humiliating the entire nation. He adds one should resist evils all the time, and should be prepared for any emergency, whatever it is. When will that emergency come, I ask? Thousands have been killed. Hundreds of women have been kidnapped, raped. So many lakhs of rupees worth property have been looted and destroyed. The entire morale of the people has gone. Still the emergency is to arise. What more do you want? Say, "I want so many more people to be killed or so much more wrong to be committed; when that report comes, I shall declare an emergency." Let us know what is the limit. We will then patiently wait and see. But this emergency will never come under the Prime Minister's leadership.

Lastly, I would conclude by saying, —peace, undoubtedly, is wanted but peace with honour. Let us follow the path of peace. If we can lay out a scheme whereby we can finally solve this problem, peacefully, then let us do it. But if not do not submit; and the greater the delay the Government makes in solving the problem, the greater the possibility of repercussion coming within the country. That must be avoided at any cost. Now, nothing has happened, but Pakistan has carried on false propaganda that 400 Muslims have been killed in Malda. I am glad today the Government of India's protest has been issued in the press. That is exactly what Pakistan has been doing always, to put India on the defensive. Among these false propaganda stories is that of 400 Muslims being killed in Malda. Government have come out with a very, very strong protest that has been published in today's papers. But propaganda will go on unless India's policy is substantially changed. It is important to realise this and decide upon our course of action so that Government will be able to secure the willing support and co-operation of millions of countrymen in India for averting a national disaster.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Shri A. C. Guha (Santipur): It is a

very delicate task for me to speak on this subject, particularly after the very eloquent speech delivered by Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee.

I am in the unhappy position of not agreeing with either set of opinions prevailing in the House.

As regards the analysis of the situation, I feel our Government have not taken the correct appraisal of the situation. Either they do not like to see things in the proper perspective, or they have not been able to see things as they really are; but as regards the remedy suggested by different parties and different groups, I feel, and at different occasions I cannot agree with those suggestions.

This partition of India was effected on a particular and definite understanding between the two parties, and also the then existing British Government. The understanding was that the minorities of both the countries would be properly treated. As far as India is concerned, it can be said and we can be rightly proud of the fact, that India has redeemed that understanding, and has given proper protection to the minorities living in India. According to our Constitution, we make no distinction between man and man because of his religion. In practical usage, we find we have not been making any distinctions between Hindus and Muslims in Government or administrative matters. But, as far as the minorities of East Bengal are concerned, they are living in a State which is avowedly communal, which is admittedly declared to be an Islamic State. I think that is the first revocation of the fundamental agreement behind the partition of India.

When Gandhiji, after his release from jail, started negotiations with Mr. Jinnah, there was not much support for his proposal. Myself and some of my friends were then in jail, and we smuggled out our support for Gandhiji's proposal. We supported the proposal that the people should be allowed the democratic right to settle their own future set-up of Government. But then, when the suggestion came by the end of 1946 or the beginning of 1947 for partition of India, we could not agree with the proposal because it was not based on the fundamental principle of the democratic rights of the people. It was a suggestion which emanated from the Anglo-American policy of war strategy, and of international policy. And I think in spite of the categorical and definite declaration by Mr. Attlee and of the Cabinet Mission in India, this partition has been effected simply because of the Anglo-American bloc's insistence that

[Sri A. C. Guha]

India should not be allowed to grow as a united and strong nation. The blame and sin of this partition of India is, I think, clearly traceable to their war strategy. And when we opposed partition, I know even the Hindus of East Bengal blamed us. I had occasion to visit many towns and districts of East Bengal, and we were insulted and abused. Then, an assurance was given to the Hindus that they would be protected, that it would be the concern of the Congress and the Government of India to look after their interests. The A.I.C.C. adopted a resolution favouring partition in June or July, 1947. I remember the wordings of that resolution. The wording clearly left an impression on our minds that the partition was accepted by the Congress with the lurking expectation that some day this artificial division would be done away with.

The resolution referred to history, traditions, mountains, rivers and the geography of India, and it referred to the fact that these were unchangeable, and that these things could not be changed by some political manoeuvres. Then, partition was effected, and slowly the process of East Bengal's Hindu minorities being squeezed out started. By 1947, I think, about 7 lakhs of Hindu refugees came into West Bengal, and some must have gone to Assam and Tripura also, but here in this House, we were all along told that there was no refugee problem in West Bengal, as there was no refugee coming from East Bengal. It took about full year for this Government to be convinced that there was really a refugee problem on the eastern side. Then by the middle of 1948 the exodus was rather heavy. I had some discussion then with the hon. Prime Minister as to what should be done. I realised the difficulty. I also realised that the expectations that we held at the time of partition were based on certain fundamental codes of conduct and etiquette of civilised society. If a particular government or state did not conform to those civilised codes of conduct and etiquette, then all our expectations become frustrated, and we feel naturally helpless. Some negotiations started thereafter. Dr. Mookerjee referred to the Indo-Pakistan Pact in 1948 and also in 1949. Anyhow, the exodus was reduced in volume, though not absolutely stopped.

Then came the 1950 holocaust. Here I should refer to certain things that happened at that time. The 1950 incidents started originally on 20th December 1949 in a village in Khulna, a district just adjacent to Calcutta.

It took full one month for this Government or for the West Bengal Government to get any information about the things happening there; it was only on 20th January 1950 that they could obtain any information about them. The hon. Prime Minister in his statement in this House on 23rd February 1950 used the language that a sort of iron curtain was hung over the affairs of the whole territory. If that was the state of affairs in 1950 when there was no passport system, may I beseech this House to think for a moment what the situation would be now when this passport system has been introduced? In 1950 an agreement was signed between the two Prime Ministers, and, personally, I could not be very happy over that. At the same time, I also realised the difficulty of the Government and accepted that agreement in the hope that the best would come out of it. But the fundamental principles of that agreement were not respected by the Pakistan Government. Dr. Mookerjee referred to a speech delivered in the Pakistan Constituent Assembly, in which instances were cited as to how the agreement or some provisions of that agreement were flouted by the Pakistan Government. I would like to refer to some of them. Clause 6 says something about property, and under that clause a Board of Trustees was set up both in East and West Bengal to look after the property of the migrants. In this House on more than one occasion questions were asked as to the working of this Board of Trustees, whether they had been able to realise any rent or any money for the property left by the migrants etc., but no answer was forthcoming. I know that the Board of Trustees set up according to the Delhi Pact of 1950 is for all practical purposes null and void. It can hardly be called existing.

Then there was also the question of setting up a Minority Commission. What is the position of the Minority Commission in East Bengal? The only Hindu member who is also the secretary of the Congress Party in East Bengal Assembly is now under detention, and his seat in the Minority Commission has been declared to be vacant. He was a nominee of the East Bengal Government, and that Government has put him in detention and declared his seat in the Minority Commission as vacant. So the Minority Commission does not exist there. It was also provided in the joint statement by the two Governments that this Minority Commission will submit reports to the two Minority Ministers. I do not know if any report was submitted to the Minority Ministers, and also what action the

Minority Minister at least on our side has taken on those reports. I think the Minority Minister at least on our side would be frank enough to admit that he has not been able to do anything as regards the report of the Commission, or probably I think, he has not even received any report from the Commission.

Several times in this House, I have referred to the question of requisitioning of property, particularly urban property. That was a process deliberately arranged to squeeze out the middle-class Hindus living in the urban areas, so that the rural Hindus mostly belonging to the Scheduled Castes may be deprived of the necessary leadership. They want to break up the leadership, and thereby the morale of the Hindu community in East Bengal, and that is why this requisitioning of urban property was particularly manipulated to squeeze out the urban Hindu citizens of East Bengal. It has been mentioned in the Delhi Pact that for requisitioned houses rent would be collected and paid to their owners. It has also been stipulated in the Pact that if a migrant returns within a certain date then his house, property etc. would be restored to him. I know for certain that it has not been done. Dr. Mookerjee has quoted from a speech in the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, referring to a circular issued by the Pakistan Government that those properties might not be returned to the returning migrants.

In this House, on the first day of this session there was a reference to harassment and molestations of migrants in the course of their journey. I could not understand why the hon. Minister for Rehabilitation took an attitude of shielding Pakistan and avoided giving a definite reply. They have received certain complaints and they must have formed certain opinion on them. It might have been said that those complaints were baseless or that the Government had found them acceptable to a certain extent; but he simply said that they could not be verified. I asked what attempt was made to verify them, then also I could not get any reply.

I object to this attitude being taken up. It is an ostrich-like attitude trying to be blind to the realities of the situation. It is a complacent attitude. I think, born out of the feeling of impotence and helplessness, and that is a dangerous attitude for any Government to take.

Repeatedly as Congress leaders and as responsible Minister of this Government, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others have given this assurance to the East Bengal minorities that they

will be the concern of this Government, that this Government or the Congress will look after their interests. So, when certain complaints are received by this Government, it is the moral obligation of the departments of this Government to make a proper enquiry into those allegations and to come to some opinion at least.

I realise that while dealing with another independent State we may not be able to take any effective steps, but there should not be an attempt to cover up things and to present a state of affairs which does not really conform to the realities of the situation. I think this Government must have received some complaints that migrants and also other Hindu citizens of East Bengal were subjected to some forcible collections in the name of the 'Liaquat Fund'. Unless certain money was given for that fund, migrants were not allowed to proceed. I believe it is the duty of this Government, according to the Delhi Pact, and it is duty of the Minister in charge of Minority Affairs to inquire into these allegations and tell this House how far they are true.

It has been stated here that the present exodus is primarily due to the introduction of the passport system. I admit the increase in the rate of migrants had something to do with the introduction of the passport system, but the mere fact of the introduction of the passport system would not and could not make thousands of people leave their parental houses and homesteads for an unknown destination. During the middle of October I had occasion to visit some of the border stations and on the evening of the 14th October I was present at one of the border posts which practically demarcated Indian territory from Pakistan territory. I have seen hundreds of men coming, horried, harassed, broken down and lying on street sides; and it was raining on that day. I know thousands of others were waiting at intermediate stations. I knew the Government of West Bengal was apprehending—I had definite talks with them, with responsible officers on the border stations—that those who were then at some intermediate stations such as Khulna, Jessore, Barisal, Goalundo, Sirajganj etc., would all be coming. But suddenly on the 15th the train came empty. Sometimes some people might have put one cat or one dog in the train; and the entire train was coming empty. But what happened to these thousands of men who were waiting at the intermediate stations? The Prime Minister admitted in this House in 1950 that on several occasions the migrants were detained at intermediate stations and were not allowed to proceed. I apprehend

[Shri A. C. Guha]

that something must have happened this time also to those migrants who were at the intermediate stations. Before they left their houses, before they could reach some intermediate station, they must have sold their houses and disposed of all their property, or their property must have been taken possession of by neighbouring Muslims. When they returned from those intermediate stations, where did they go? And what arrangements were made for their accommodation or for their living? I do not know if this Government have made any enquiries about those thousands of intending migrants who were waiting at so many of the stations—railway stations and steamer stations. I consider it to be a great lapse on the part of this Government that they did not make proper enquiries and did not take any steps for the amelioration of their miseries.

Then, Sir, in this House mention was made repeatedly about the declining economic condition of East Bengal and the Prime Minister admitted that this economic distress falls more heavily on the minority than on the majority. When there was a famine condition or near famine condition, it was stated in this House that relief measures were mostly given to members of the majority community and the members of the minority community were not getting sufficient or adequate relief from the Government. I suggested then that some international relief organisations such as the Red Cross Society or some such body might be asked to look after the distressed members of the minority community in those famine or near famine areas. Only a few days ago, Mr. Fazlul Huq, made a statement that in Barisal, Tripura, Sylhet and Rangpur almost famine conditions were prevailing, and you can imagine what must have been the condition of the large number of minorities still residing in those areas.

I would like to draw the attention of this House to one fact here. Whenever there is anything wrong in Pakistan either administratively or economically or in any other matter, there is always an attempt to divert the discontent of the people to the Hindus and to India. The price of jute on which the entire economic life of East Bengal depends, this year has come down to about Rs. 5 or 6 or 7, and last year the price was nearabout Rs. 40 per maund. And propaganda is going on that it is the Hindus who are res-

ponsible for this economic distress. Now that a semi-famine condition is prevailing, the same manoeuvring will be taken recourse to see that popular discontent may not be rivetted on the maladministration of the Government, on the shortcomings and failures of the Government, but that it may be directed against India and the Hindus. I feel, there is no remedy either in the hands of this Government or of this House for such a state of affairs and to give relief to the East Bengal minorities there.

Sir, mention was made by Dr. Mookerjee about the Chittagong hill tract. In the 1941 census it was 97 per cent. non-Muslims. I think in 1951 census, it has been shown to be only 90 per cent. non-Muslims. That has been the improvement during these 5 years. It is a territory which was more or less in the nature of a Native State. It was ruled by some native chiefs who enjoyed certain rights under certain treaties with the then existing Government of India. So, according to the terms of reference, this territory should not have been within the purview of the Radcliffe Committee and I think if we, at that time, had taken sufficient precaution, this territory would not have been lost to India. And what is the position now? Dr. Mookerjee stated only 500 men, but I have a statement made by Shri Diwan, one of the leaders of the Chukmas, that 12,000 of them have recently been squeezed out of the Chittagong hill district. I remember that in the latter part of 1947, I put a question in this House about this tract and the reply that I received was that a Cabinet Committee had been formed to consider the position of this territory. I do not know what has happened to that Cabinet Committee. I do not know if that Cabinet Committee came to any decision, or if the matter was taken up with any authority. I think it was a fit case—I do not know whether it is yet a fit case, at least it was then a fit case—for us to take to the International Court of Justice. It was outside the jurisdiction of the Radcliffe Committee, being something like a native State. And, now, those Chukmas, those peaceful Buddhists, they are being gradually squeezed out and it is the policy of the East Bengal Government to turn it into a Muslim majority area.

Mr. Chairman: May I just remind the hon. Member that many other hon. Members are anxious to speak? He has taken nearly an hour and I hope he will bring his remarks to a close soon.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): I may make a submission? You will perhaps remember, Sir, that on the last occasion in 1950, the debate was carried on for 2 days or 3 days. On this occasion it is being confined to one day and half the day is gone. I submit another day should be given.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, Sir, I cannot possibly find a day in the course of this session. There is other very important work. I am very sorry, and if I may say so, I regret that speeches are so long. How can I help it? Even if we have 3 days or even 30 days, if the speeches are too long we will not be able to finish.

Shri A. C. Guha: I shall finish soon, Sir. During the last session I put a question about the Dacca Home for the accommodation of rescued abducted girls. I had some correspondence with the External Affairs Department about the running of this Home. I made certain allegations and then Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar admitted in this House that the affairs of this Home were not satisfactory. The Government were not satisfied about the running of this Home and they assured us that they would hold an enquiry. I do not know what enquiry they held and how this thing has been set right. This is not merely the case of a particular Home but it refers to the whole case of abducted girls. I know that girls recovered and accommodated there once gave their consent to return to their parental house and the next day, under the pressure of the abductors or their associates who had free access to the inmates of the Home, they had to revoke their consent.

I should like to refer to another matter here. The Prime Minister on the 20th February, 1950, referred to one incident in Nachol in the district of Rajshahi. One girl was arrested with a whole lot of them and horrible stories came out in the court about tortures perpetrated on her. I cannot say and I do not say that all that was published in the papers was correct. But if even 25 per cent. of these stories are correct, it was a horrible thing. I appeal to the sense of humanity and to the womanhood of India to take up the case of that girl. I know she has been convicted and the trial was protracted for about 2 years and her name is *Ila Mittra*. I think the women's associations of India should take up her case and try for her release.

Then, I come to the remedy suggested. I have stated in the beginning

that I cannot agree with the remedy suggested. I know the situation is very grave and I also know that the Government of India is not bestowing the required seriousness to the matter. But situated as we are in the present international set-up, I cannot find any effective remedy. So many remedies are suggested. War is out of any practical consideration, not only from the point of view of practical politics but also from the point of view of human considerations. War cannot be a practical proposal here. Then the exchange of population would not solve the problem. The present proposal is for economic boycott. I think that is a very ineffective weapon. All the nations belonging to the League of Nations imposed economic sanctions on Italy because of the Abyssinian War, but Italy could easily proceed with the war and could win the war also. We have been conducting an economic boycott against South Africa for so many years and yet I do not think South Africa has been cowed down and has been persuaded to accept our viewpoint. So, I do not think economic boycott can in any sense be effective. Moreover, I think position will become more serious to the remaining minorities there. Even now, after the present exodus, there would be at least 90 lakhs of Hindus in East Bengal. If we start economic boycott here, it will not only be a question of riots and molestations and all other things, but it will also be a question of their economic distress. A weapon which cannot be effective for the object for which we want to use it, may also injure those whose interests we want to secure.

But, I would like to submit that certain aspects at least we can take at international level. I know I shall get the retort that after our experience in the Kashmir affair, we should be careful about taking anything at international level. Even then, we are living in a civilised world and whatever Pakistan may do, we have also to consider the opinion of all other nations in the world, and I think the position of the minorities in East Bengal and the fundamental understanding and conditions under which partition was effected are both fit subjects to be referred either to the U. N. O. or to the International Court of Justice at the Hague. Moreover, we should press our point of view on the Anglo-American bloc. Pakistan is the child of their war strategy. It cannot continue without their active support. Therefore, we should make it clear to the Anglo-American powers that we cannot tolerate such a state

[Shri A. C. Guha]

of affairs in a neighbouring State, because it is sure to have repercussions in our own State.

The position in East Bengal is very desperate and grave. Yet, I would like to say that we should not be panicky. I know the Muslims of East Bengal perhaps better than most other Members, and I can say that even now I can depend on their good sense. I would like to make a distinction between the Government of East Bengal and the Muslims of East Bengal. The East Bengal Government is dominated by West Pakistan and West Pakistan's strategy, which may not be quite in conformity with the interests of the people of East Bengal. We should see what is the feeling and opinion among the Muslims of East Bengal. I believe in the democratic right of the people of any particular region and I also believe in the dictum that it is for the majority to concede to the minority the right to secede and that it is the privilege of the minority to ask for accession. I believe that the course of history cannot be checked or fundamentally altered by Anglo-American manoeuvrings or by some policy dictated by those in West Pakistan.

Before concluding, I would like to mention one point which I forgot to mention earlier. Only on the 12th of this month there was a reference in the Pakistan Constituent Assembly saying that East Bengal has 1,500 people per square mile and therefore it is the most densely populated a territory in the world. On that plea, the Chief Minister of East Bengal made a claim that East Bengal should get more territory to relieve the economic distress and the density of the population. East Bengal cannot get more territory except at the cost of India. I think therefore that the Government of India should take note of this statement. The other side of the argument may easily be by putting forth another suggestion, namely, that if they could not get more territory the only way was to reduce the density of the population by squeezing out the Hindus. This, I submit, is the thin end of the wedge. It is possible that the Chief Minister of East Bengal was merely the spokesman of this subtle propaganda on behalf of the Central Government of Pakistan. I think that the Government of India should send a protest to the East Bengal Government asking them where from the East Bengal Government can claim any territory except from Indian territory.

With these words, I beg to conclude.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I rise to take part in this debate with a very grave sense of responsibility, because in the minds of millions of people—especially in my part of the country—there is great apprehension and anxiety, and a terrific responsibility devolves upon us to see to it that nothing is said or done in this House to aggravate that apprehension.

Mr. Chairman: There is hardly any time left now. I think he may continue after lunch.

The House then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The House re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Gidwani (Thana): Will you please place a time-limit on speeches, because there are a number of speakers?

Mr. Speaker: On a subject like this, it is difficult to put any time-limit and to satisfy a large number of Members who would certainly like to speak, I would, therefore, prefer to have representative views, as I thought it was inevitable for completely bringing out all points before the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: As I was saying, a very special responsibility devolves upon us to see to it that nothing is said or done in the course of this debate which is going to aggravate the apprehension and anxiety which is weighing over the minds of millions of people, particularly in my part of the country.

My hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee said that none of us should proceed in an atmosphere of anger and passion. I know that as an accomplished speaker he tried from time to time to give an impression to this House that he was keeping away from any idea of rousing anger and passion. But I would say with all respect, that as a matter of actual fact the remedies which he has suggested and the approach which he has propounded in the course of this discussion are such that they are bound to rouse passion and anger, if not in this House at least in certain quarters, and the results of that passion and anger would have to be borne by the common people of this country as well as of Pakistan.

Now, I do not want to say anything about Dr. Mookerjee's sledge-hammer style of oratory, but I do feel that

something ought to be done, at least in bodies like this House to make sure that we are not carried away by the presentation in very eloquent terms of the agony of the people in such a way that we do not succeed either in relieving or mitigating the agony and the causes of their agony, but on the contrary we proceed to the adoption of policies which are going to mean an exploitation of these agonies.

Now, I do not say for a moment that the Government would be right if the Government takes up—as sometimes it has appeared to us that the Government has taken up—a somewhat complacent attitude. Dr. Mookerjee accused the Prime Minister of being rather complacent. Now certain things have happened which have also given rise in our minds to a suspicion that the Government has taken up a somewhat complacent attitude. Surely a complacent attitude should be given up immediately—there is no doubt about it—because there is a tremendous human problem involved, the problem of the rehabilitation of the refugees who have come into this country and who also have come recently in somewhat frightening numbers and that problem till that is solved to the satisfaction of the needs of our people is a problem to which we must devote very serious and immediate attention. So, I do not say that the Government can be exonerated of all responsibility in the matter of complacency. But I do say, especially after having heard Dr. Mookerjee's speech and after having followed the kind of propaganda that he and his friends have been carrying on in the province of West Bengal—a propaganda which we in our way have tried very seriously and earnestly to counter—we decide on the essential steps which we have to take and I am sure that we shall find out some sort of remedy—a remedy which may not solve the problem straightway, but which would keep us on the right track, as far as a solution of this stupendous problem is concerned.

As regards the ruling group in Pakistan, I should say that it is an ugly conglomeration of the rankest reactionaries and this ruling group has been behaving in a fashion which is absolutely and utterly reprehensible and we should try and see to it in our own fashion, as far as we can, that the perpetrations of this ruling group are put an end to as soon as possible. But we have to find out ways and means of doing that. It is not merely by raising the kind of passion and anger, very subtly and cleverly as Dr. Mookerjee was trying

to do in this House, that we are going to bring to book those people who are ruling Pakistan today.

I speak on behalf of a party whose General Secretary in Pakistan, a very dear friend of mine, is facing trial on a capital charge in the so-called Rawalpindi Conspiracy case. Members of my party in Pakistan are suffering unbearable oppressions. One of our comrades—who was mentioned by my hon. friend, Shri Arun Chandra Guha,—Shrimati Ila Mitra has been sentenced to transportation for life and she had had to undergo such tremendous persecution as really cannot be unfolded in this House. It is a story much too heart-rending for me to narrate to the House. I do not for a moment hold any brief for the Government of Pakistan which has been behaving for quite some time in a manner which we find absolutely reprehensible. But that is no reason why we should go forward and say that in the competition of ugliness we are somewhat better and therefore we should impose a demand upon Pakistan and say that we are going to ask you to behave better and if you do not—well, what Dr. Mookerjee suggested amounted to that—a declaration of war.

Dr. Mookerjee has talked openly of it. I do not know why he did not mention it here in this House—it may have been part of his subtlety in oratory—he has talked openly of economic sanctions; he has talked about declaration of war. Actually I have got here a translation of the speech which he made in Calcutta, reported in the *Jugantar* a Bengali daily of 28th October, when he said: "If there is to be no war, then why all this expenditure on defence?.....If Pakistan is not agreed, then if need arises, other methods would have to be used. Among other methods if may be necessary to resort to war."

I say with a full sense of responsibility that the kind of propaganda which was conducted on this issue by Dr. Mookerjee and some of his friends for some of whom I have real and genuine respect, would mislead people into walking into Pakistan's trap. That propaganda has created in West Bengal a situation of very considerable tension. It was only the real, basic good sense of the common people which prevented the outbreak of communal rioting. It was roundabout the time of Divali that there were rumours all over Calcutta and its neighbourhood that there were going to be communal riots. That was the time that he talked of economic sanctions and the declaration of war and forcible exchange of population and all that sort of thing.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Now Dr. Mookerjee is a very clever and crafty politician. He has been saying from time to time in his speeches that he is opposed to Pakistan because Pakistan is behaving badly regarding its treatment of minorities, in particular Pakistan is trying to be an Islamic State, and that Pakistan Government is pursuing a policy against all democratic principles. He said again in the course of his speech that he made a difference between the people of Pakistan and the Government of Pakistan. Now I should say, Sir, if that is so why do you suggest remedies which really mean the commencement and perpetuation of a state of war between our two countries? He posed two fundamental issues before us. He asked: is it possible for the minorities to live in Pakistan? And his answer was: No. If that is so, he asked: what steps are you going to take? Suggesting the steps he said that the basis of partition, namely the protection to be given to minorities, has been entirely broken and, therefore, as he had suggested some time in 1950 or thereabouts there should be planned exchange of population on the basis of numbers and property. And then of course he has other schemes regarding economic sanctions and declaration of war. He has even had the gumption to quote Mahatma Gandhi and said he suggested that we should march our troops into Pakistan in order to teach the Pakistanis a lesson.

I do not for a moment minimize the gravity of the situation. I respect the genuine feelings of the people who have suffered. But I do not want to take massive advantage of the misery of the people for the pursuit of policies which are so apparently disastrous to the interests of the people in this country as well as in Pakistan.

What exactly is the remedy which my friends here are going to suggest? They say: Pakistan has behaved so badly that nothing can be done about it, we have to cry halt, we have to say 'either you behave properly or you will be taught a lesson'. And we go forward to teach them a lesson.

Do we consider that congenitally the Indian Muslim who lives in Pakistan is incapable of human conduct? Do we repudiate the entire history of our freedom movement? Have we forgotten the part which the Muslims have also taken in the achievement of freedom for this country? Do we not know that so many of us have dear Muslim friends? Do we not also know that the common people, Hindu

or Muslim, have qualities that make them superb? Do we not know that the working people of the world, Hindu, Muslim, Christian or other, are the salt of the earth and to be part of their destiny is the greatest adventure of our time? Why do we walk into the trap which is being laid for us not only by the ruling clique of Pakistan but also by forces behind them? Why do we not remember the background of partition of our country? We know that partition was conceived in folly and executed in filth. We also know—there is no doubt of our realization of it today—that the division happened because the Imperialists wanted to retain their stranglehold on our country by having us as two States fighting like Kiikenny cats who will always be in an atmosphere of animosity so that they may operate from behind the scene.

I have read a report recently of the Punjab Muslim League at Lyallpur where leading representatives of the Pakistan Government have begun talking in terms of war in regard to India over the issue of Kashmir. I relate it with the Anglo-American conspiracy which is being conducted now in the headquarters of the United Nations, where the Arab-Asian bloc has been working harmoniously together, where India and Pakistan sit at the same table and talk in terms of the utmost cordiality. The Arab-Asian bloc is taking up an attitude there in regard to Tunisia, Morocco and Korea which is against the interests of the Anglo-American bloc as far as international strategy is concerned today. And it has come forward, as we all know here and now, at this juncture of affairs, with a resolution on Kashmir in order to drive a wedge between India and Pakistan. They have done it with deliberate intent. They have done it in order to bring about in our country a situation where India and Pakistan would continue to be mere pawns in the imperialist game which they are playing. Their hand can be seen, not too invisible, at every point of the communal disturbances in this country.

What happened in 1950? It was at that time that the economic situation inside Eastern Pakistan had become so serious that they had to do something. There was the Bagerhat incident which was purely of an economic nature. And it was in order to give a twist to the whole thing that they started the communal carnage which they knew would have its repercussions in West Bengal and its repercussions in Eastern Pakistan.

These factors are always behind the scene. And we can never forget them, because they are so important, if we are to understand the reality of the situation. If we remember the background of our national movement, the circumstances in which the partition of our country was accomplished, if we remember the role which imperialism was playing—and which it has played ever since—we can see the finger of imperialism, by no means invisible, behind the present acrimony between India and Pakistan. And we know, whatever some of us might think about the congenital incapacity of the Pakistani common people for real mass organisation and struggle, whatever our opinion, that the Pakistani has been fighting for a better order.

Only yesterday there was a report of a debate on food in the Pakistan Parliament which shows how the ruling party feels utterly in a very weak position. Dr. Mookerjee himself referred to the language movement in East Bengal. Mr. Guha referred to the character of the East Bengal Muslim. The late Shri Deshbandhu Gupta also said. I think on the 8th or 9th of August, 1950, that when he went to Dacca he found there was a great feeling among the Muslims of East Bengal over the Bengali language issue against those ruling the roost in Karachi. Today we see an enormous movement over the Bengali language issue and it was in the course of that that eighteen young Muslims, as Dr. Mookerjee knows, braved the police bullets and with their blood the streets of Dacca were drenched. That sort of thing happened only the other day.

We know that only the other day there were questions in Parliament in regard to the strike of the Bengal Mariners' Union. Those workers—I happen to be associated with some of their work—were fighting against the British capitalists who kept them under conditions absolutely unacceptable, and they brought about a strike both in West Bengal as well as Pakistan. The seamen in Pakistan, most of them Pakistan nationals, who depend for their living on their employment in the Calcutta port and on ships which go out of Calcutta, found out—I know them because I am associated with them very closely—how the link between India and Pakistan must remain, and there is anti-passport movement in Pakistan today, which went up to such dimensions that when Khwaja Nazimuddin, himself a member of the Dacca Nawab family and the Bengali Prime Minister of Pakistan and who was Governor-General of Pakistan (quite a big wig), came to

the Dacca airport, the Dacca citizens held a black flag demonstration in order to impress upon him the desirability of not introducing the passport system. I find here a press report sent by the P.T.I. on 13th October that 700 railwaymen, including engine-drivers, etc. in Pakistan passed a resolution at a meeting and threatened that they would submit their resignations if the passport system was introduced. On the same day there was a message sent both by the P.T.I. and the U.P.I. from talks with a large number of Muslims who had been migrating from East Pakistan that nearly ten thousand Muslims originally belonging to U.P., Bihar and West Bengal and who had opted for Pakistan, were strongly opposing the introduction of the passport system. This passport system which is extremely prejudicially affecting the life of the common trader between West Bengal and East Pakistan, is opposed tooth and nail by these people. They have not ways and means today perhaps for making their grievances properly realized. They cannot assert their organized strength. But the movement is there.

Why should we not therefore look at the matter from a wider point of view? Why should we not realize that behind the Indo-Pakistan tension there is the Anglo-American imperialist conspiracy? Why do we not see it? (*Interruptions*). I know some of my friends do not see it. They believe perhaps that the Muslim is congenitally incapable of decent conduct. I shall never say anything of that sort in regard to Hindu, Christian or Muslim. I know that the Muslim has militancy of an order which if properly organized can achieve miracles. And you, Sir, as a Congressman of long standing know very well how the experience of our national movement substantiates my assertion. If that is so, why do we come to the conclusion that nothing can be done? Why do we come to the conclusion that today unless you threaten Pakistan you cannot achieve results? What will happen if this threat is put about really seriously by the Government of our country?

I say, of course that the Government has to take a strong attitude. I may recall the Prime Minister's attention to what he said in this House which I think was absolutely correct. He said this on the 7th of August 1950 in the course of the debate on the Bengal situation. "When you deal with a foreign Government, you can deal roughly in two ways, one is the way of negotiation with such pressure as can be exercised through negotiation,

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

whatever the pressure may be, political, economic, diplomatic, but fundamentally it is the way of negotiation. The other is the way of war. There is no third way". Now this is an absolutely unexceptionable formulation. There is no third way and if you do what Dr. Mookerjee suggests then the result would be you would supply the ruling clique of Pakistan with arguments such as would lead to the life of the 90 lakhs of Hindus in East Pakistan becoming an almost impossible proposition. I would say that I am not going to recount stories because in the first place it is not necessary, in the second place these stories have been exploited for very undesirable purposes and I do not want to follow in that wake; but I say this especially to those who are interested about the fate of the minority in Pakistan. What is going to happen? If the policy you propounded is going to be put into effect, what is going to happen if you are going in for exchange of population? You may call it the "planned" exchange of population, or whatever adjective you may think of. The exchange of population means that in Pakistan the Hindu minority will feel absolutely down and out and the Muslim minority in India would feel that they are also down and out and the moment you start this exchange of population the feeling of the majority community in the other country will be raised to such a pitch of fury that there would be incidents which, just to imagine, is something horrible. I am sure that sort of thing is going to happen. We cannot solve the problem of refugees and we are going to talk about the exchange of population and the exchange of property and all sorts of things. I read in Professor C. N. Vakil's book on economic consequences of the Partition that it seems 4000 crores of rupees worth of properties have been left in West Pakistan, 4000 crores of rupees worth in East Pakistan. This question of exchange of property cannot be solved in the way some of our friends are trying to suggest. If you are going in for the exchange of population, we have not got the mechanism for it, we need not do it, we should not do it, there is no reason for it because we have to depend in the last resort upon the movement of the common people in either country. I would say, therefore, that all talk about war, all talk about economic sanctions which is really a variety of war, all talk about threats of such a nature would really bring about a disastrous situation as far as the minority in the other country is concerned. That should be avoided. We should behave in a way which should alle-

viate the agonies of those people, agonies which are absolutely insufferable so far as they are concerned. But these things happen, these threats happen and I would say, let our Government come forward with a more positive policy. Let the Government come forward and say that "we want to re-open the whole matter on the question of passport". Possibly there are difficulties. The hon. Prime Minister may think they are insuperable difficulties. I do not know but I would say, in spite of difficulties let us make a fresh attempt. The honour of India will not be jeopardised if India comes forward to make generous gestures, because surely if we think that Pakistan is incapable of generosity, that should not mean that India should give up her potentiality for generous conduct. Let us try to re-open the question of this passport business, let us try to utilise the public feeling against passports which exists as far as Eastern Pakistan is concerned. Let us try and say that we want real economic collaboration between the two countries. Any economist will tell you, Sir, that without real and genuine co-ordination of the economic life of our two countries, we cannot solve our short-term and long-term problems, we cannot rehabilitate refugees properly and we cannot go forward at the rate at which we want to go forward in order to have economic reconstruction. There is no doubt about that. If we really want the question of refugee rehabilitation to be an incident in our history and not a permanent and continuing ulcer in our body politic, then we must do something in order to make it possible for real economic co-operation between the two countries. In normal circumstances, a "Zollverein", a customs union between India and Pakistan would be signed in two minutes' time, but in abnormal circumstances let us try and not fight them, let us try to realise that there is a lot of goodwill as far as our two countries are concerned, as far as the common people are concerned, and if the Government comes forward as a champion of the interests of the common people, then and then alone can Government do something. I know that Dr. Mookerjee has from time to time said that we make fantastic propositions like the despatch of goodwill missions.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I did not say fantastic, I said useless.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not think that despatch of goodwill missions is considered to be such a useless thing in the country where Gandhi is called the Father of the Nation. I do not see why, when Urdu

language has been specialised in by Hindu writers, writers of Urdu and Hindi cannot meet. As a matter of fact they are meeting from time to time and when they meet the enthusiasm of the common people knows no bounds. I have seen it myself, Sir, at many *mushairas*. I think we should take a positive attitude. Let us decide once and for all that we will not go to war as far as Indo-Pakistan policy is concerned and that we should settle everything through negotiation whatever the provocation from the Pakistan side may be. Let us say that we shall make another effort to reopen the whole question of passports and let us say that we shall take every possible step for securing friendly social, economic and political relationship between the two countries. Otherwise we are going to march down the road to absolute ruination. If, for example, the idea of economic sanctions is pushed to its logical conclusion, if, as Dr. Mookerjee suggests, we send Indian troops into Pakistan, Sir, do you imagine that the Anglo-American Rulers of the world will sit tight and do nothing about it? Already they have bled Kashmir to their heart's content. They carry on their conspiracy and the moment an incident occurs, situation would be created where the American gods of creation would be ruling this country much more unashamedly than they are doing now. That is a prospect which is perhaps by no means unpleasant to some of our friends here but that is a prospect which leads us to ruin as far as our people are concerned and that is why I say, Sir, that remembering our past relationship, remembering how the past relationship was poisoned, remembering how the partition was wangled by these imperialist bandits in order that they could further their own interests, remembering how imperialism conducted itself after the partition, remembering how the economic interests of the people are being disregarded by the ruling clique of Pakistan, remembering also that the economic interests of India are not being solved because we cannot go forward with those policies which alone can bring real relief to the sufferings of our people, if you remember all these, certainly we shall have some policy of friendship between the two countries. I know it is difficult but that is the only policy which can be propounded, that is the only policy which is in conformity with our self-respect, with our honour, with our character and that is the only policy which ought to be commended and that is why I suggest, Sir, that we will throw out all ideas in regard to such intimidatory conduct as would make the life of the Hindu minority in East

3 P.M.

Pakistan absolutely impossible. Think of that minority, 90 lakhs of people, who can form a State of their own. It has been suggested by some friends here that these 9 million people would be absolutely in jeopardy to an extent too horrible to contemplate. That is the responsibility of the Government. That is something about which the Government should be wide awake. There is a suggestion of complacency—there is no doubt about that. There is a suggestion that the Government has not taken note of the basic background of the Indo-Pakistan division. There is no doubt that Government has not done anything in order to assist and encourage the democratic movement in Pakistan. I say this is a very bright example of how things operate. Exactly those people who are shouting loudest for economic sanctions are the people who are against the agrarian reforms that have taken place in Kashmir, which won the hearts of the people of Kashmir. It is exactly this sort of people who do not want our economy really to march along the road to progress. We have a terrific responsibility. As I said earlier, it is not for us to be swayed by the subtle oratory of people. It is for us to assess the reality of the situation. If we do so, we shall be alive to the tremendous dangers inherent today. I am reminded of the parable in the Bible, of the Watchman on the Tower. The king comes out and asks: watchman, what of the night? And the reply is: the night is very dark, Sir. I know that the night is very dark as far as our country is concerned. But, if the dawn is to break, we must depend upon the work of the common people in this country and in Pakistan. We must pursue policies which would assist the democratic and progressive movement of the common people in this country and in Pakistan. We can only ensure that if between these two countries, the link of solidarity that is there in spite of the Nazimuddins and others who talk about strife, the link of friendship between East Bengal and West Bengal would grow and become such a mighty power that no force of reaction can break through.

Mr. Speaker: Shrimati Sushama Sen. I am going to call upon the hon. Prime Minister to reply at four o'clock.

I was told that he may require about an hour.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am in your hands, Sir. It is for you to decide.

Pandit Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East cum Ballia Distt.—West): I would request you to give us more time, at least a day more. This is a very important matter. It is not to be disposed of like that. My hon. friend.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He need not call the names. Is it possible to spare any more day?

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: This is a request from all sides of the House.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Tomorrow, it is exceedingly difficult. May be, at the end of the session, if the House likes, I would find another day. It would be doubtful even then, with all the desire that I have. This is a subject to be fully discussed. It is not quite clear how the numbers of speeches throw much light.

Mr. Speaker: That is exactly what I also felt. Therefore, I said, instead of short speeches with no points, it is better to have representative speeches, and I gave ample time, without any time limit. There is only one hour for us. I would therefore request hon. Members to be as short as possible so that the largest number may be accommodated.

Some Hon. Members: We may sit till 6 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is that going to solve any difficulty?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): We would all request the hon. Prime Minister, if he can manage to give us one more day. We all feel very strongly on this motion and are anxious to express our views. I know that some of the speeches according to you may be called useless. But, this is the national forum where all are expected to express their views. Therefore, I would request, if possible, that a day may be given, not at the end of the session because it is urgent matter.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): We can sit on a Sunday, tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members who are anxious to speak are not anxious to be present in the House at other times. They speak and then go away. It is convenient for such people to come and want to speak on a Sunday. I was unwilling even for this Saturday sitting. However, as the matter was important, I thought we might sit on a Saturday. At the most, the compromise may be, we might sit a little longer.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no objection.

Mr. Speaker: I do not mind if the House sits till six o'clock or a little earlier. I think we may try to curtail the speeches and state only the points. I should say, six o'clock does not matter. Under no circumstances should there be any further extension beyond that. If it is convenient to the Leader of the House I may call him at 5 o'clock.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: That would give some more time. Every speaker will always have in mind that there is a time limit, self-imposed.

Shrimati Sushama Sen (Bhagalpur South): I do not wish to make a long speech in the House and take the valuable time of the House.

Much has already been said; I do not wish to go over the same ground again. The hon. Prime Minister has been giving a lot of time during the past few weeks to this question and discussing with the West Bengal Ministers as to how best to rehabilitate the refugees and how to settle them on a community basis so that large concentrations of refugees may live together without any feeling of isolation or linguistic difficulties so that they may be happier than before. This is most important because we have seen that these refugees, isolated and away from their homes, are most miserable.

One very important question I would like to place before the House, and I would make a special appeal to the hon. Prime Minister—it is the question of the women who are still left in Pakistan. There are about 86 lakhs of Hindus left in Pakistan and more than half would be women. We know from facts that they are subjected to terrible sufferings and atrocities are being practised on women. In fact, the police in Pakistan are themselves taking part in these atrocities and are not dealing with the question as they should. I would appeal to the hon. Prime Minister to take particular care of this question so that the women of Pakistan may be protected. They are not getting this protection. Purely from the humanitarian point of view, and fundamental rights of each person I would urge that protection of women is most essential. Their position should be safeguarded and should not be left as it is at present. I have been enquiring from reliable sources; there have been recently many cases of molestation of women and these reports are correct. I would appeal to our Prime Minister to look into the question carefully and see that due

justice is done to them. I would not take the valuable time of the House. but as this question of protection of women is most urgent, I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity, to say these few words.

लाला अचिन्त राम (हिंसार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस वक्त जितनी भी स्पीचें हुई हैं उन से एक बात बड़ी साफ हो जाती है कि कुछ बातों के मुताल्लिक सारे हाउस के अन्दर ऐग्रीमेंट (agreement) है। पहली बात यह कि इस वक्त तक तीन दफा एग्जोडस (exodus) हो चुका, सन् १९४७ से लेकर १९४९ तक, १९५० में और अब। एग्जोडस के मुताल्लिक कुछ डिफरेंस (difference) हो सकता है, लेकिन तीन दफा आये यह साफ है। इधर लोगों का खयाल है २६ या २७ लाख हिन्दू आये हैं, उनका खयाल है कि ४० लाख आये हैं, लेकिन कम से कम इस बात पर ऐग्रीमेंट है कि अगर ४० लाख नहीं तो कम से कम २६ लाख जरूर आये हैं।

एक बात और है जिसके मुताल्लिक ऐग्रीमेंट है। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि "दि कन्डिशन आफ हिन्दूज देअर इज नाट सैटिसफैक्टरी"। उनका खयाल है कि भले ही बहुत ज्यादा खराब उनका हालत न हो, लेकिन हालत अन-सैटिसफैक्टरी (unsatisfactory) जरूर है। यह बात भी साफ है।

अब सवाल यह है कि क्या वजूहात हैं, क्या कारण हैं जिनकी वजह से यह हालत है। इसके लिये पांच बातें कही गई हैं। पहली बात यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के रिलेशन्स (relations) अच्छे नहीं हैं इसलिये यह हुआ। इवैक्यू प्रॉपर्टी (Evacuee Property) का मामला है, काश्मीर का मसला है। दूसरी बात यह है कि वहां की एकात्मिक कंडिशन (eco-

nomie conditions) ऐसी हैं जिनकी वजह से लोगों को पाकिस्तान से यहां आना पड़ा। तीसरी बात पासपोर्ट (Passport) की बतलाई जाती है जिनकी वजह से लोगों को आना पड़ा।

इन तमाम बातों के अलावा चौथी बात कही जाती है कि वहां संपेरेट इलेक्टोरेट (separate electorate) है इसलिये वहां सुलह नहीं हो सकती। पांचवीं बात यह कही गई कि पाकिस्तान गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी बाहर निकालने की है। यह पांच बातें कही गई हैं।

जहां तक पहली चार बातें हैं वहां तक तो सब का ऐग्रीमेंट है। एक बात के मुताल्लिक इस्तिस्नाफ हो सकता है। पाकिस्तान गवर्नमेंट इस बात को नहीं मानती।

एक बात और कही जाती है। वह हमारी जिम्मेदारी की बात है। यह बात सभी कहते हैं कि यह गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की जिम्मेदारी है। कहा जाता है कि सरदार पटेल की भी यही राय थी, पंडित जवाहर की भी यही राय थी और महात्मा गांधी की भी यही राय थी। लेकिन इस जिम्मेदारी को पूरा करने का रिकार्ड क्या है? जिम्मेदारी सभी महसूस करते हैं। वहां से जो लाखों आदमी आते हैं उनको हम लेते हैं और इस तरह अपनी जिम्मेदारी महसूस करते हैं। फ्रॉम सिंक यह है कि एक कहता है कि इस जिम्मेदारी को इस तरह पूरा करना चाहिये और दूसरा कहता है कि इस तरह करना चाहिये। लेकिन जिम्मेदारी के मुताल्लिक सब का ऐग्रीमेंट है।

अब सवाल रह जाता है कि इस जिम्मेदारी को पूरा करने का हमारा तरीका क्या है। किन तरीकों से हम हालत को इंच

[लाला अब्दुल राम]

(case) कर सकते हैं। इसके लिये यह तरीके बतलाये जाते हैं :

१. जितने हिन्दू हैं उन को यहाँ बसाया जाय लेकिन यह बात फिजूल है।

२. दूसरी बात है ऐक्सचेंज आफ पापुलेशन (exchange of population)। हमारे स्थाना प्रसाद साहब जब लड़ाई का नाम लेते हैं तो खोर से इस बात को नहीं कहते। क्यों ऐसा नहीं करते मालूम नहीं।

३. तीसरा तरीका बताया जाता है कि टैरिटरी (territory) ली जाय।

इन बातों से तो लड़ाई ही होगी। न तो वह आसानी से टैरिटरी लेने देंगे और न आसानी से ऐक्सचेंज आफ पापुलेशन ही होगा। इन का नतीजा वार (war) ही होगा। तो अगर आप वार के लिये तैयार हैं तो आप इन बातों की मांग कीजिये। और अगर वार के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं तो इन बातों को छोड़िये। रही सैंक्शन्स (sanctions) की बात, वह तो जैसा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा फिजूल की बात है। पाकिस्तान वाले अपनी चीजें, जैसे कोयला बगैरह, दूसरी जगहों से ले सकते हैं।

तो अगर आप वार के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं तो यह चीजें नहीं हो सकतीं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इस वक्त हालत ऐसी हो गई है कि आप यह नहीं कह सकते कि यह जैसा चल रही है वैसी ही चलती रहे।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग गवर्नमेंट को या पंडित जी को ऐक्यूज (accuse) करते हैं यह भी ठीक नहीं है। पंडित जी ने एक वक्त कहा था कि अगर पाकिस्तान ने

काश्मीर में कोई कदम उठाया तो इट विल बी आल आउट वार। इस में खानिब होता है कि ऐसी हालत पैदा हो सकती है कि तमाम मुष्किलों के बावजूद भी वार करनी पड़े। और जब हमारे पंडित जी ने यह कहा होगा तो इन सब बातों को सोच लिया होगा। तो यह कहना कि गवर्नमेंट वार से बचगती है इन्फ्रान्ड के खिलाफ़ होगा।

अब एक तरफ यह कहा जाता है कि बी मोर पीसफुल (be more peaceful) और जितने अमेंडमेंट आये हैं उन में कहा गया है कि बी मोर फर्म (be more firm), बी मोर एक्टिव (be more active)।

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): We want have English or Hindi. We don't want 'khichri'. I protest against it.

लाला अब्दुल राम: तो कुछ कहने हैं कि पीसफुल (peaceful) रहो और कुछ कहते हैं कि स्ट्रॉंग (strong) रहो यह दोनों बातें कैसे हो सकती हैं? जहाँ तक मेरा ताल्लुक है, मैं पंडित जी को पालिसी से दिल से इतिफ़ाक़ करता हूँ। जब इंडो पाकिस्तान पॅक्ट (Indo-Pakistan Pact) हुआ था तो मुझे शक था कि यह कुछ कर पायेंगे या नहीं, लेकिन अब मैं समझता हूँ कि उस से बहुत फ़ायदा हुआ है। मुझे इस बात से यकीन है कि इस से देश का बला हुआ है।

मैं आप को अपने कुछ तुच्छ सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। आप उन्हें मानें या न मानें। मेरा स्थाल है कि यह जो वार की वान कही जाती है यह तो आउट आफ क्वेश्चन (out of question) है। मैं खुद वार के खिलाफ़ हूँ। आई विल नाट जाइन वार, लैट बी कंट्री गो टू वार। खुद मेरी यह बात है। यही गांधी जी की भी बात थी। लेकिन

मेरा कहना है कि जितने भी पीसफूल मैथड्स (peaceful methods) हो सकते हैं पहले उन सब को इस्तेमाल कर लिया जाय उस के बाद वार करो। मैं समझता हूँ कि जैसे गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने और बहुत सी मिनिस्ट्रीज (Ministries) बनाई हैं उसी तरह एक और मिनिस्ट्री कायम की जाय जिस का नाम हो, मिनिस्ट्री फार ईस्ट बंगाल माइनारिटीज। इस वक्त जो हमारे माइनारिटी मिनिस्टर (Minister for Minorities) हैं वह तो हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमानों के लिये हैं। यह जो मिनिस्ट्री होगी यह पूर्वी बंगाल के हिन्दुओं के लिये होगी। इस मिनिस्ट्री के इनचार्ज मौलाना आजाद हों और इस मिनिस्ट्री के ऐडवाइजर (adviser), मैं दरखास्त करूंगा, आचार्य विनोबा भावे बनाये जाय। उन से दरखास्त की जाय कि वह इस मिनिस्ट्री के ऐडवाइजर हों। इस में ऐसे लोग रखने चाहियें जिन के दिल में हिन्दुओं और मुसलमानों के लिये बराबर हमदर्दी हो। जिन्होंने मेवों को दसा कर इस बात का सबूत दिया है। तो यह काम कैसे हो? तो इस मिनिस्ट्री में मौलाना आजाद दो सी मुसलमानों की सरविसेज रिकरूट करें और जिन मुसलमानों को मौलाना आजाद ऐनलिस्ट (enlist) करें, दे शुड बी प्रिपेयर्ड टू गो टू ईस्ट बंगाल एण्ड वर्क देयर। लेकिन जो आदमी इस काम के लिये ऐनलिस्ट किये जाय वह ऐसे हों जो कि पार्टिशन (partition) को ऐसटैबलिशड फैक्ट (established fact) समझते हों। दूसरे वह लोग इंडो पाकिस्तान रिलेशंस को बेहतर बनाने के हक में हों, तीसरे वह लोग नान वाइलेंट (non violent) हों और नान-ऐग्रेसन (non-aggression) में फेथ (faith) रखते हों और चौथे वह लोग सिक्युलरिज्म (secularism) में विश्वास करते हों। जो लोग इन चार बातों

में विश्वास करते हों उन की ही सरविसेज हासिल की जायें। यह मिनिस्ट्री पांच साल के लिये कायम की जाय।

अभी हमारे डाक्टर मुकजी साहब न कहें कि एक साहब ने वहां कांस्टीट्यूएंट असेम्बली (Constituent Assembly) में कहा कि मुसलिम मासेज (Muslim Masses) माइनारिटीज को निकालना नहीं चाहते, हेड्स आफ गवर्नमेंट (Heads of Government) उन को निकालना नहीं चाहते कुछ छोटे मोटे आफिशियल्स (Officials) हैं जो कि ऐसा करना चाहते हैं।

अगर यह हालत है तो आप बढ़िये। जब तक वह मानते हैं आप कोशिश करिये। कोई ऐसा इलाज हो तो आप करिये। पहले मामला और शुरू हो गया, फिर पासपोर्ट का मामला शुरू हो गया, इस तरह के मुस्तलिफ़ मामले हो गये। इस की वजह से १२ लाख आये, १४ लाख आये, अब सुनते हैं कि कम हो रहे हैं। अच्छी बात है। लेकिन इस चीज को भी ट्राई किया जाय। अगर आपको वहां पर अच्छा रैसपांस (response) हो तो इसको चलाइये। वह भी समझ लें कि इस तरह के चार्जज (charges) लग रहे हैं कि वहां पर ऐबडक्शन (abduction) होते हैं कनवर्शंस (conversions) होते हैं, वहां पर कोअर्शन (coercion) है, आप्रेशन (oppression) है, तमाम बातें होती हैं। इन तमाम बातों के लिये अंडर दी डाइरेक्शन आफ अवर मिनिस्टर, अंडर मौलाना आजाद एंड अंडर दी ऐडवाइस आफ आचार्य विनोबा भावे, वह आदमी काम करें। मैं समझता हूँ कि गुडविल (goodwill) का काम करने वालों का तबादला हो सकता है। उस तरफ से २०० ऐसे हिन्दू जिन में उन

[लाला अब्दुल राम]

का विश्वास हो, वह यहां पर काम करें। मैं २०० मुक़र्रर नहीं करता, २०० हों, ४०० हों, ५०० हों, लेकिन वह जा कर काम करें। उन का काम क्या हो? वह वहां पर जा कर देखें कि जो प्रेंस का टोन (tone) है वह ठीक हो। अगर दो सौ मुसलमान ऐसे हों तो वह वहां पर जा कर इन्तज़ाम करे, और अगर उन का इन पांच बातों में फ़ैस हो तो वह वहां जा कर पहले प्रेंस को ठीक करने की कोशिश करें। धर वहां जा कर गांवों में पंचायतें करें और मुसलमानों और हिन्दुओं को बतायें कि उन का इंटरैस्ट (interest) किस में है। और वह वहां पर ऐसा लिटरेचर बांटें कि जिससे इस कायम हो। वह वहां के लोगों की तकलीफ़ को गवर्नमेंट के सामने रखें। लोगों का कहना है कि गवर्नमेंट शिकायतों की परवाह नहीं करती, इन को वह लोग गवर्नमेंट के आदमियों से मिल कर ठीक करें न।

मैं आप को यह पीस का मंथन बतला रहा हूँ। आप इन सारी चीज़ों को रखें और यहां पर वापस आ कर आप देखें कि रिसपांस अच्छा हो तो आप पार्लियामेंट के सामने रखिये कि यह चीज़ है। पाकिस्तान इस को मानता है। उस हालत में मैं समझता हूँ कि तमाम पार्टियों का ईस्ट पाकिस्तान माइनारिटी बोर्ड (East Pakistan Minority Board) बनाया जाय। वह तमाम काम को देखें और उस पर रिपोर्ट दें और वह बोर्ड हर साल के साल रिव्यू (review) करे और हर साल गवर्नमेंट को रिपोर्ट दे कि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में अब हालत अच्छी है या अब हालत खराब है। लैट वैन एडवाइज ब्रह्माट दे थिक। सिचुएशन को रिव्यू कर के वह गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को बतलायें और

फिर गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया मून-सिब कार्य-वाही करे।

तो इस स्कीम को मैं ने आर के सामने रखा है। इस को पूरा करना आप का काम है। मैं यह लड़ाई की बात नहीं कहता, यह पीस की बात है। इस को आप पूरे ख़ोर से कोज़िये और मेरा ऐसा ख्याल है कि अगर सच्चे दिल से कोशिश की जाय तो ज़रूर कामयाबी होगी। अगर बार हूँ गये तो, जैसा मैंने पहले कहा बार से कोई काम निकटने वाला नहीं है। इसलिये मैं कोई बार की बात नहीं कहता हूँ। मैं यह पीस कुर्मुमैयड बतला रहा हूँ। इसलिये मेरा ख्याल है कि इस वक़्त खास तौर पर जो ईस्टर्न पाकिस्तान की हालत है वहां यह आदमी जा कर काम करें और सही हालत को पेश करें। इस तरह से हालत को ठीक किया जा सकता है। इस बातों में सरता है कि यह रस्ता है। अब सोचो रहो की बात नहीं है, आइदर मव रा ट और मूव लफ़्ट, बट यू शुड मूव। आप को पूरी तरह कोशिश करनी चाहिये और मुझे आशा है कि आप को कामयाबी होगी। हर साल आप इस तरह काम कर के रिव्यू करेंगे और देखेंगे कि हालत क्या है। पांच साल हो गये हैं, आप ने काम किया। अब आप पांच साल इस तरह ट्राई करिये। पांच साल इस तरह की स्कीम पर काम करें। मौलाना आज़ाद माइनारिटी के इन-चार्ज (In-charge) हों और विरोधाभासे उन क एडवाइजर हों। इस तरह होगा तो मेरा ख्याल है कि कामयाबी होगी इस तरह हम को चलना है। हाय रख कर नहीं बैटना है। आप कहते हैं कि ऐसी ऐसी बातें लोग करते हैं। लेकिन मैं यह

पीतकुरु मैवड बजला रहा हूँ। लैट अस
मूव विद दिस स्कीम, इस को आप ऐकसैट
करिये। इस तरह आप को काम करना
है और यू शैल हैब टु मूव फंडर।

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I rise to speak on the amendment that has been moved by my friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee. I may say that though I have spoken on this subject several times here in this House, still this time I do not feel any enthusiasm, and I have no desire to speak. Again and again since the partition, this subject has come up for discussion. It is like a running sore. We come here and talk. But what has been the value of all these speeches? They do not yield any result. There is therefore great frustration in us. What is the point then in speaking, one does not understand.

But we cannot ignore the fact that again a serious situation has arisen. Within a few days, three lakhs of people have come out of East Pakistan: Why have they come out? They are poor people, mostly ignorant, the conditions are such that they could not stay in their houses, so they came out in a stream. They were held up at the borders, they had to undergo all kinds of difficulties which you will appreciate when I mention them later, and they have now reached our borders in West Bengal. The West Bengal Provincial Government is unable to cope up with this heavy influx of population, which creates law and order, economic and rehabilitation problems for us. When such a serious situation has arisen, we have to discuss it, and give serious thought to it. That is why, when after this artificial stopping of the migration of people a sense of self-complacency—I do not like to use the word self-complacency, but some sort of complacency—or some sort of feeling that perhaps the problem is not so acute has come over the Government, we feel that it is our duty to draw the attention of the Government to the seriousness of the situation that still prevails. The problem is as acute as it was. It has not abated at all, to any extent. What is this problem? Let us go to the fundamentals, and find out what it is due to

Why did we agree to the partition? A handful of people wanted that the country should be divided, and they were helped in this by the British power. They wanted this division of the country. None of us who have worked for the freedom of the country wanted it excepting one small

group of people. But what happened? How did we agree to partition? There was large-scale killing, murder, and horror perpetrated and ultimately, to get out of this difficulty we said: "Let us partition the country, let those people who want to carve out a little territory for themselves do so and live there in peace, let us be in peace in our country". The basic understanding behind partition was that the minorities that remained in Pakistan will be looked after well by Pakistan and the minorities in India by the Indian Government; that the minorities would enjoy full rights of citizenship, and get protection of life, honour and property. On that understanding we had this partition. I remember even today the words of Gandhiji still ringing in my ears. At the time when discussions were going on regarding the partition, a few of us were once sitting with him, he was turning the idea in his mind, and said: 'Why do you want partition? आप समझते हैं

शान्ति मिलेगी? शान्ति नहीं मिलेगी। [You

think you will get peace, but you will not get peace.] Now I can realise how true his vision was. We partitioned the country to get peace, we partitioned because we thought that we will be able to live a civilised life on either side of the border. But what has happened actually after partition? There was a tremendous flare-up specially in the western zone. Killing and murder was let loose. I remember the terrible scenes I witnessed when I visited Rawalpindi, Jhelum, Campbellpur and other places there. Whatever it was, people from West Pakistan came over here once and for all. We could assess the immensity of the problem, and set about the task to rehabilitate them. But what happened in East Bengal? The Hindu population in East Pakistan was about 1.35 lakhs out of a total population of about 4 crores. Our own Government shuddered at the idea of having that huge population coming over here. Therefore we were reluctant even to recognise the existence of their problem for a long time. I remember even when Hindus had come away in large numbers from East Pakistan, there was no attempt at rehabilitation, the ministers refused to recognise it as a rehabilitation problem, but took it as only a problem of giving relief. After February 1950 exodus I myself remember having discussed with the then Rehabilitation Minister of Bengal—I forget his name—about this question.

For one hour I talked with him. I wanted to get some help from him. After one hour's talk the only reply

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

that I got out of him was: 'Please help us to send back these people'. That was the situation. Here they had come, they could not stay nor could they go back! The peculiar situation that obtains in E. Pakistan is that the number of Hindus is so large that neither are we willing to take them in nor can they stay there.

Why are the Hindus of East Pakistan coming away? It is not due to a killing here or a killing there or a small riot here or there. They are coming away because of the theory of the Pakistan State, it is a theocratic State, it is an Islamic State. They have made no bones about it. They have declared from the housestops that it is an Islamic State and Islam will pervade all aspects of their life and would mould and shape the whole society. Those who do not fit in naturally have to fall out.

I do not want to take much time, but I will read out one or two quotations. This is from a statement of Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan—a small portion:

"There is no doubt in Pakistan about the intention of the State. The State will seek to create an Islamic society free from dissensions. If we want to build such a State, we must create the conditions which are conducive to the building of a truly Islamic society which means that the State will have to play a positive part in that effort".

There is more, but I do not want to quote it. Then I will read to you an extract from the speech of Mr. Husain, who was the Governor of the State Bank of Pakistan. He described Pakistan as an 'Islamic country pledged to build up an Islamic concept of life and society'. He further said:

"We fought and won the battle of Pakistan ostensibly to experiment in Islam. But now Providence has granted us the power and opportunity to make that experiment. Our pursuit of Islamic ideals can only be an act of offensive character. We are pledged to pursue Islamic ideology in the age to which we belong. Our slogan should be—'Onward with the Quoran!'"

That is the conception of the State. When that is the conception of their State, it is natural that the minorities, I should say those who are not Muslims, will find it very difficult to stay there. And what is the result? The result is that increasingly they are

having to come away. Why do they come away? Not always because there is physical persecution. The minorities do not get any opportunity in the services; they cannot get into the army; they cannot carry on business or trade; they cannot have homes to live in. The houses are requisitioned, even while they are staying in them. I have got all the documents here, I do not want to read them and I do not want to repeat what some of the previous speakers have said. I want to take as little time as possible. Here I have got some figures. In the educational sphere 80 to 90 per cent of the teachers in East Pakistan used to be Hindus. But what happened? They preferred to have less educated people. They preferred to have bad teaching, but the Hindus must not teach them. So every avenue of life is closed to them. Therefore, they are to come away.

I have some figures which will show to what extent the Hindus have come away. These figures are slightly old. So the more recent figures will be even higher. I take the City of Dacca which is an index to the situation prevailing in the whole of East Pakistan. In Dacca the holdings of non-Muslims—total holdings—used to be 7175. In place of that they are now 920. These are 1950 figures. I will give you some school figures. In boys' schools—I have taken only one portion of Dacca, not the whole of Dacca even for these figures—there used to be 2889 students; in their place the number when these statistics were taken was 142. In place of 2889 there are 142! For girls, the figures are 2074 and 25! In that way I can give you other statistics about shopkeepers and others. There were 1499 shops; in place of that their number now is 157.

It is therefore impossible for the Hindus to stay there. That is why they are coming away in increasing numbers. The upper classes who have a little wealth and who want to lead a little cultured life have come away. Who remains? The poor peasants—people who are attached to their land, who would tolerate a lot of suffering, even a lot of insult and injustice in order to stick to their little land, because people do not easily leave the land. They remained there. Even they, after the killings of February 1950, started to move out. I went to Calcutta and spent quite a few days there in March 1950. And I remember what type of people were coming—peasants, cultivators, artisans, fishermen etc. in very large numbers. Then followed the Nehru-Liaquat Pact after the killings of February 1950.

Some of us thought that that would solve the problem; it would give some protection to the minorities. These are some of the terms of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact—I will read a little portion of it. The Agreement was:

“The Governments of India and Pakistan solemnly agree that each shall ensure, to the minorities throughout its territory, complete equality of citizenship, irrespective of religion, a full sense of security in respect of life, culture, property and personal honour, freedom of movement within each country and freedom of occupation, speech and worship, subject to law and morality. Members of the minorities shall have equal opportunity with members of the majority community to participate in the public life of their country, to hold political or other office, and to serve in their country's civil and armed forces. Both Governments declare these rights to be fundamental and undertake to enforce them effectively.”

What more can you want? We thought we covered everything and the Nehru-Liaquat Pact would give them protection. An agency was created to implement this Agreement. Minority Boards were created. Just now my friend, Achint Ramji was talking of Minority Boards. But what has been the fate of these Minority Boards? I think Mr. Biswas will enlighten us more on that point, but as far as I know, the Provincial Minority Board has not been called for over a year in spite of insistent demand by the minorities. The District Minority Boards are unable to redress any of the grievances of the minorities.

Lala Achint Ram: That was not the type of Board I suggested.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: It is another kind of Board which you suggest. I know how these Boards have fared. Your Board also will fare the same way. Then the only Hindu representative member of the Minority Board, Shri Manoranjan, is lying in jail for over a year. Other Hindu leaders, well known people, Govind Banerjee, Satin Sen—Satin Sen is a veteran Congressman and I saw him when I went to Noakhali and I knew how bravely he was working for protecting the minorities—are all in jail. The upper strata of the Hindus have come away, only the lower strata remain. A few of them stayed on. Even they are being victimised. How do you expect the minority members to stay there?

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

So the result is that the Pact has been observed more by breach. The final touch came when the question of the imposition of passport arose. It was clearly laid down in the Pact that there would be freedom of movement between the two countries. This was done because of the peculiar situation that prevails in Bengal. The Evacuee Property Act of the kind that applies to West Pakistan refugees and evacuees of West does not obtain in Bengal.

Therefore, we had this arrangement so that people may be free to come and go and thus look after their properties. Now, who wanted the imposition of the passport system? Not we, but Pakistan. We come to an agreement with Pakistan, we want to abide by it, it is Pakistan that violates it. Because Pakistan wanted it, we had to agree to impose the passport system. The result is what we have seen.

We are now told that the exodus has stopped and, therefore, the situation is not serious. Therefore can we be complacent about it? I want you to look into the figures of exodus a little more carefully. According to the West Bengal Government's own figures, the exodus started in May continued till August and then from September to middle of October there came a big influx. This totals to about 2½-3 lakhs. Now they say the exodus has stopped altogether. It is true the exodus is reduced to a certain extent. That is due to the difficulties created by the introduction of the passport system. I need not go into details. A poor villager who wants to come away—wherefrom will he get money to buy the 3 photographs that he needs to get a passport? He will have to run all over the country and get the necessary permission. Because of these complicated formalities he is not able to come. They are, therefore, coming in small numbers. I spoke to the most responsible person in charge of relief and rehabilitation in Bengal and I was told that they expect that by the end of the year they will find a very large number of Hindus who will have migrated from East Pakistan to West Bengal. That means the exodus has not stopped. The exodus continues. It is not coming in a big stream, but it is regulated and coming in smaller numbers. But whatever it is, the position remains the same, that from the time of partition to this day they are coming and coming and coming. That is why again and again we have to have these very boring debates which neither we nor you

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

like. We do not enjoy repeating ourselves. But the running sore continues. Therefore, we have to remind you again and again of its existence. I have already explained in what state they are. They have left their homes, they are living at the border stations, they have no facilities of relief and help; and their sufferings are daily increasing. I do not want to repeat the "stories" of their suffering as my friend, Mr. Hiran Mukerjee, chose to describe them. They may be "stories" for him but they are not "stories" for the people who have had to undergo these sufferings. I will give you one more "story". That story has been published in the Bengali papers. The story is that when some of these unfortunate people were trying to cross over—naturally they had young girls with them, their daughters, wives and sisters—at place after place they were stopped and they had to pay a tax called the Girl Release Duty—G.R.D. Long details with names of people are given. Such and such a person had to pay at such-and-such a place Rs. 40/-, at such-and-such a place Rs. 50/- and at such-and-such a place Rs. 10/-, and so on. This is the way how these people are coming over here. I was really surprised when some of my friends asked me, how many were killed? Is killing the only form, of oppression or exploitation of the people? Killing may be the least part of it. There are other forms of tortures. How do you expect any community, any people with self-respect to stay there when there is no security for their person, property or honour. They have to come because they are denied these.

I do not want to go into further details about it. But what is the issue? When we talk on this subject we are dubbed communalists. I can assure my friends sitting on this side and on the other that we have been very far from communalists. All our lives we have tried to serve people of all communities. We do not think of people in terms of communities but we think of them in terms of the nation. Is this a communal problem or is it a national or an international problem? If people keep on continuing to come what will happen? We are a very poor country; we are an undeveloped country, a very backward country, we are straining every nerve, we are putting forth all our efforts to build up this country. How are we going to assess our requirements? Can we make economic plans? Can we do anything unless we know for how many people we are going to cater?

Just now we have made a Five Year Plan. But, if after making that Five Year Plan, another crore of people come over here how can we proceed? All these are national problems. This is not therefore a communal question; it is a national question even an international question. Whenever such things happen, whenever these people come and whenever such stories are told, naturally our emotions are also stirred. You may say, "All right, it does not matter much that such and such a thing has happened. That is a mere story." It may be a story to you, but it may not be a story to me. We have divided the country artificially. Today you may say the people of Pakistan are not our nationals therefore we have nothing to do with them. But they are our brothers and our sisters. I may have my brother, I may have my sister, there, and I may have my dearest friends there. Their suffering is bound to upset my mind. Therefore it leads to the question of law and order. So, if we have to carry on our government properly, if we want law and order, if we want to have peace to build up our nation—which we must do—then this is one of the most essential questions that we must settle first.

The second question is, have we any responsibility towards them? Can we say that they are not our nationals and so we have no responsibility for them? I myself went to West Pakistan just before partition. I travelled through those devastated villages, where mass massacres had taken place. I saw people living huddled in *gurdwaras* or such places—they asked me with great pathos, "Shall we cross over the border or shall we stay on here? Will you be able to protect us if we stay on here?" I was carrying the message of our leaders. I told them, "You stay here, after the partition our Government will be able to protect you. After the partition, Acharya Kripalani and I went to Karachi—he was then the Congress President and was not on this side of the House—they asked us again and again whether they should come over. We told them from the house-tops that our Government will be able to extend protection to them. We told them to say there, we gave them assurances and now have we no responsibility towards them? Though they are technically nationals of another country, have we treated them strictly as nationals of another country? Do you think if a crore of people from Tibet were to pour down here or if they were to pour down from Afghanistan or from

any other neighbouring State we would allow it, and will our Rehabilitation Ministry, will our Government take steps and make arrangements for their rehabilitation? We have recognised the basic fact that towards these minorities who had been left in Pakistan—though technically they are not our nationals—we have got a very great moral responsibility and that is why we are making arrangements for their rehabilitation. We cannot deny our responsibility towards them and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in his speeches, has again and again said that he cannot deny his responsibility. If we cannot deny our responsibility towards them, then what is our duty? Our duty is not merely to make some kind of rehabilitation arrangements for them after they are driven out. I can tell him; I have gone to Bengal. I am acquainted with the rehabilitation affairs of Bengal maybe much less than our friend Shri Ajit prasad Jain, but I do know something about it. I know what that rehabilitation is worth. I know the Government have tried their best. But the resources are not enough; the available land is so bad, it is sub-marginal land on which, if you want to settle people you have to spend a lot of money. First develop the land, then you can settle them. In West Bengal rehabilitation is not worth the name. One of the most senior officers of the Central Ministry has told me—these are his words—“that rehabilitation in Bengal is in its infancy.” After five years we are told that rehabilitation in Bengal is in its “infancy”. I know that some people who worked with me in Noakhali in 1946 and came over to India these have yet not been rehabilitated. They have got no land or house or job or any means of permanent livelihood. So rehabilitation is a very difficult and grave problem for Bengal. If we think that by mere rehabilitation we can solve this problem, we are greatly mistaken. What we have to do is not to try to bring over this one crore of people here but make them safe over there. It has to be done; it is not an easy job. I know we can very glibly say, “Do this or do that”, but it is very difficult to execute it; I do not minimise Government’s difficulties. I appreciate these. But at the same time even after five years we cannot go on tolerating the situation that is prevailing. We cannot allow the minorities to be pushed out in waves like this. Neither can we allow them to be treated as serfs and as people who have no rights of citizenship. Therefore we have to take some step by which we can make it possible for

them to stay there. Just before Gandhiji died, I think two or three days before his death, I and other members of the Central Relief Committee were having a talk with him. We asked him what programme we should take up for the Relief Committee. At that time the Rehabilitation Ministry had not taken the work of rehabilitation. I therefore suggested to him some small schemes of rehabilitation. But Gandhiji said, “No, you are not to do that; you have to give them employment in the camps”. I was very surprised. You will please note what he said. He said, “it is intolerable to me that people of Multan should be in Delhi and people of Delhi in Multan. I want to take back all the people of West Pakistan who have come over and bring back all the people of India who have gone there. They have to live in their own homes.” That was what he aimed at. He wanted them to live in their own homes—that was what he was aiming at. He had carried on a fast here and he was going to undertake another fast in Karachi. I do not know what he would have done had he lived. Anyway he wanted the minorities to live in their own homes. If he cannot take them back to their old homes at least we should stop further displacements.

Now, how are you going to achieve it? Are you going to achieve it by mere protests, or by pacts which are treated by the other party as mere scraps of paper? What has been the situation after the Nehru Pact? That is why out of desperation, after mature consideration, we suggested at the Calcutta Conference the imposition of economic sanctions. It has been made fun of; it has been scoffed at. This is only our suggestion. You have to find a solution by which some pressure can be put on the Pakistan Government. Is this suggestion such an absurd suggestion? Is this measure such a stupid measure? Has this measure never been tried before? Did we not try it against South Africa ourselves? Suppose it does not put any great economic pressure on Pakistan; it has got some moral value; the whole world will know that we have done it, because there is some thing seriously wrong in the situation. Well, if this solution is not to your liking, if you think it to be a fantastic, or foolish suggestion, that it will lead to further aggravation of the situation, all right, we do not claim to have all the wisdom, nor do we claim to have all the knowledge. You are running the Government. You have all the detailed information about the situation prevailing there: it is for you to

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

find out a solution. Our main concern is that this kind of intolerable situation should not be allowed to persist and if we allow it to continue, if we allow a neighbouring State to do what it wants at its own will, it will do serious injury to our nation. More than anything it will be a degradation of our national prestige. It will be a betrayal of the minorities whom we gave all kinds of assurances. We shall have to hang our head in shame as a nation.

I do not want to take any more time. But I would very humbly ask the Prime Minister not to scoff at the suggestion. If it is not acceptable to you, think of any other solution,—but something has got to be done by which this exodus of the minorities, this oppression of the minorities, the ill-treatment of the minorities, has to be stopped.

We believe in human rights. We send our representatives to the Human Rights Commission. We stand for the Koreans; we stand for the Tunisians. But for our own men in East Pakistan we cannot raise a voice? What is the meaning of this? I cannot understand the present policy of the Government.

Before I sit down I would like to reply to a charge of Mr. Hiren Mukerjee that those who have been working in West Bengal and who have raised this issue of economic sanctions are raising communal feelings, and that this may lead to unrest. As far as I know, our greatest anxiety has been to prevent the raising of any communal feeling. We have tried to raise this issue from the communal plane to the political plane. I would like to remind him that when the call for 'Direct Action' Day was given in Calcutta in 1946, no other party supported it except his party.

With these few words, I support the amendment that has been moved.

Pandit L. K. Maitra (Nabadwip): Coming from West Bengal I must express my gratitude to the Government for allotting one day to the discussion of the East Bengal question. I am still more grateful that there has been a further addition of time by one hour, so that Members from different parts of the House might speak on this issue. Personally I would wish that one additional day had been given for this. That would have given an opportunity to all parts of this House to express their views. It is not a

question of making a long speech or a short speech. What is important from our point of view is, whether this East Bengal question is to be treated as a provincial or an All-India issue. That is the crux of the whole question. And I must frankly admit with sorrow that for a long time past nobody hears much about East Bengal Hindus here except through an interpellation now and then, or through some speech in the course of the year by one or two members, as if the whole matter had been settled up and there is nothing to worry about.

While standing to speak on it, I share the pessimism expressed by my sister Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani that the outcome or upshot of all this discussion will not be much. Be that as it may, I think the situation as it has arisen today demands our serious consideration, serious in the sense that we should now bring it to some sort of finality. The question of refugees, so far as Western Pakistan is concerned is no more, in the sense that you have not got to talk in terms of exodus or "inodus"—influx or efflux. Here it is a continuous thing going on for the last six or seven years. From the very beginning I have been drawing the attention of the Government to the technique pursued by East Pakistan Government, the technique of slowly, but steadily, driving out the Hindu minority community numbering about a Crore and a quarter, so that they could, like the western wing, have a thoroughly homogeneous Muslim state. It is well known, unless one chooses to forget it or ignore it. It is well known that Pakistan is a theocratic State. They have made no secret of it. They have been telling people in season and out of season that it is a purely Islamic theocratic State and they have also made it clear that in every field, in every sphere of activity the injunctions of the Holy Quoran should be carried out and implemented. It is in this context that you have to consider the whole question once for all—no use raking it up session after session or year after year. Decide it one way or the other. Let us know where we stand. Let these unfortunate Hindus of Eastern Pakistan who are on tenter-hooks of agony, and suspense know once for all that they are nobody's concern here. Be it pleasant or unpleasant, let the matter be appraised at its proper value by all concerned.

4 P.M.

Now the basic facts are there. Are they denied? Are they in dispute? Is Pakistan really a democratic state in the sense that the modern world

understands it? It is not. Have the Pakistan Government in East Bengal ever been able to create conditions in which the non-Muslims minority community there can live in security? Now that is a question to which a straight answer is necessary. Does the Government of India really feel, or does any hon. Member or any section of this House honestly feel, that conditions of life are such in Pakistan that safety of life and property of the minority there is assured? Is it only out of cussedness that people are coming out, leaving behind their hearths and homes hallowed by the memories of generations of their forefathers? Is it not an undisputed fact that there has been a large exodus by now? There may be quarrel about figures, but the census figures tell you that nearly 26 lakhs came here up to 1951. These are Government figures. And during the recent period, 2½ lakhs at least have come. (An Hon. Member: 3 lakhs). May be three lakhs because the Government's calculations cannot include all the border movements. They always forget, and the House is also likely to be misled by the calculation, that there is an eight-hundred-mile border line between Eastern Pakistan and West Bengal, and through all these eight hundred miles people trek into the Indian Union from Eastern Pakistan. There is no clear-cut demarcation. You will be surprised to be told that there are houses on the border where a portion, for instance, the kitchen, has come to the Indian Union and the bed-room has gone to Pakistan! This is the kind of demarcation that has been there. So, whatever the figures may be, nobody can say that they are absolutely correct. If I say it is 40 lakhs, nobody can say 'I will straight-way challenge it, it is an over-estimate', because I challenge the very basis of his calculation. But whatever it is, the fact is that your census figures show it as 25,80,000. That is there. And if three more lakhs of people have come, it is 28 lakhs, or nearly 30 lakhs. That is the position.

Why do these thirty lakhs of people come away from Eastern Pakistan? For the mere fun? Is it for mere merriment that they have come here, bereft of all their belongings, undergoing all manner of humiliation, torture, harassment and persecutions on the way, only to have a jolly good time in West Bengal? So you have got to go to the bottom of it and try to understand it in the light of human nature as it is. Unless you do that, you will not be doing justice to their cause. (An Hon. Member: Or our-

elves). Yes, also to ourselves. And therefore, if you are to do justice to ourselves, to these people, you should for the time being forget that you come from Madras or U.P. or Bihar, and try to place yourself in my position, that is, the position of West Bengal, a province which has been artificially divided into East Bengal and West Bengal. There are so many ties that bind man and man. They cannot be snapped asunder by artificial means. There are thousands of families where some brothers are in West Bengal while the others are in East Bengal, some of their relations in East Bengal and some in West Bengal. If you can place yourself in that position, then alone can you understand the agonies of Bengal; not otherwise. For instance, if U.P. were to be divided in that way, one portion going to Pakistan and the other to India,—and if people started trekking from the portion which was under Pakistan and came in to the other and narrated all the miseries and sufferings which they underwent there and on the way, then my U.P. friends would have realised the position. Similarly with my friends from other provinces. Otherwise they may, at best, have a sort of theoretical sympathy: 'Well, Panditji, Maitra Sahab'

‘कैसा बंगाल का हाल चाल है, ठीक है न?’

This is how my friends from other Provinces enquire of me about Bengal. They seem to understand the position only in terms of mass massacres, loot and things like that.

It is only in 1950 when there was the holocaust in East Pakistan, that it attracted all-India notice, not before that. Migration had been in trickle. This trickle at once became a torrent. From 1,000 or 1,500 it swelled in three or four days to 2 lakhs. Do you know that that also does not give you the full picture? I have got reports just as those which Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee has quoted. I do not want to repeat them. Fortunately or unfortunately similar representations, telegrams, or reports also come to me. Nearly 2½ years back from this very place I had to voice the miseries of the East Bengal refugees. That was in February 1950. Then also I had to criticise the Government for their faults of omission and commission in that respect. But I felt it was the call of humanity and it was a duty which I was bound to discharge. Today also I have stood up not because I have much new to say but because I want to be very clearly understood as to how our minds work. There is

[Pandit L. K. Maitra]

no communal approach to the question. Let there be no mistake. Not a single speaker, either Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee or Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani or others who have spoken have talked in terms of Hindus or Muslims. Nothing like that. Some friend from the opposite side tried to import into it something of a communal colour. Our grievance is against the Government of Pakistan. Does the Government of India really believe that conditions at present in Eastern Pakistan are such that the minority, the non-Muslim community, can live there with peace and honour? (An Hon. Member: not at all.)

That is one thing, peace and honour. But can they even carry on their bare animal existence? See, from the very beginning there was economic strangulation and no Hindus were allowed to carry on any trade, business, industry or commerce. Nothing. Traders, business people, they had all been driven out. Fantastic amounts of Income-tax had been assessed on them and they had to flee. Zamindars, educationists, political workers, middle-class men, in fact almost all those elements that constituted the real life in East Bengal had left, because the policy of the Government was to compel them to leave. They had so planned it, that only those would be allowed to remain who were required there for essential services, so-called scheduled-castes and other poor people like that; but they were to be kept as slaves.—“Jimmies,” as they are called. What they said was: “after the passport system we will not grudge Hindus living here, but they should give some tangible proof of their allegiance to the Islamic State by adding something to their names—Khan so-and-so. Maulana L. K. Maitra or Khan S. P. Mookerjee. That was the suggestion talked about in public meetings by rank Muslim Leaguers. They said: “We do not want any fifth columnists to remain here; if Hindus want to live here they must give proof positive, not by word of mouth alone but by adopting an Islamic prefix or suffix to their names, that they are part and parcel of the Islamic State.” (Interruption). Letters to that effect appeared in the papers. My friend, the Minorities Minister and Law Minister combined together reminds me here of this. Does he not know that in a recent meeting with the Pakistan Ministers (I mean the Minority Ministers of Pakistan and India) I was present and I raised this crucial question to the Pakistan Minister: Tell me, do you ask me or any of us to seriously believe that the recent

exodus has been merely due to the passport system? It may be one of the factors, a vague undefined fear about the passport. Maybe. But what about the systematic process of squeezing out that has been going on? Immediately before the introduction of the passport system the people were also threatened: “Look, if you do not go now, you will have to remain here and will not be allowed to go later on.” And when asked for rent from the Muslim tenants they were told:

साला, दस रोज बाद लाठी दे कर भगा देना, किराया मांगने बय्या है ?

That is: you demand rent from us; after ten days the passport system will come and we will get everything; you have the cheek to ask for rent!

In such an atmosphere do you expect anybody even to carry on his animal existence? But man was not created for animal existence alone, man was a paragon of creation; he had also his own cultural life and spiritual life.

All this is a negation in Pakistan. Now the position is that 5 lakhs have come today and many more lakhs also were ready to cross to India. The system of communications in Eastern Pakistan is so restricted that they could not come and as you know, the steamer services between Narayanganj and Dacca were discontinued. The steamer service is the only means of communication in many parts. I have reports and I have no reason to disbelieve them that at various points throughout Eastern Pakistan thousands had collected after having disposed of whatever they could and suddenly on the 17th October the passport came and they got stranded. Immediately thereafter the steamer strike occurred. Therefore the position really is that this exodus has not stopped, but there is a temporary lull due, among other causes, to these difficulties in the way of securing passports. Now you will ask me, what to do now? “What is your suggestion?”

Certainly this is not the place to discuss remedies in matters relating to another State. Here our function is to bring to the notice of the Government the miseries and sufferings of the people through accounts, personal, impersonal, documentary, oral or otherwise so that Government may know the position from all view points. We can only give an indication of our minds. We feel strongly on this question. We feel that Pakistan has not been dealing fairly with the Hindus

minority and Pakistan must be told that we have seen through this game; it has already pushed out 30 lakhs of people which has almost shattered our economy. West Bengal's resources in terms of space accommodation, food and other essential supplies, are very limited. This small province with the additional 30 or 35 lakhs of refugees is in acute distress. You can well understand the sufferings of the people living there. We want to tell the Government that they should now take a definite stand. We feel that we should adopt and maintain an attitude of firmness from now onwards. I think every Government knows what firmness means—in place of softness, in place of imbecility. I want that, I believe in that. I do not say that you should go in for a declaration of war. I do not know whether there is any lunatic here who wants Government to go immediately to war. Nobody would say that. At the same time I feel that war may become inevitable. I know and the world knows that war does not solve problems. It creates more problems than it solves. Yet in the course of a generation of 25 years, two of the biggest wars have been fought. They involved the whole world and the third one is now in the offing. War has to be talked of not lightly but if for the vindication of national honour, national prestige, it becomes at any time necessary that risk has to be taken. (*Hear, hear*). In clear and unmistakable terms we should tell Pakistan that "we are not going to stand this any more. You have already pushed out about 30 lakhs of people. It is sure to have a disastrous effect on our economy let alone its other reactions and if you do not mend your ways, if you do not take back these people or at least stop further exodus, then the Government of India will not take it lightly". Is Pakistan a friendly State to you? Do you not consider that Pakistan is a hostile State? Do you still honestly believe that it is a friendly State? In every matter it is against you. Think of the number of outrages. I deliberately avoided mentioning this but my hon. sister referred to the insult on womanhood. The history of modern times does not afford a parallel to such large scale dishonour of womanhood as has been the case in East Pakistan. Have we not shouted from the housetops that they are cur kith and kin? Where is that solemn word now? I felt that enlightened national self-interest demands a firm attitude.

The House will recall that a year and a half back, Pakistan in one of its periodic feats of Jihad wanted to declare war on Kashmir and its Prime Minister put up his clenched fist and

atonce caught the imagination of the Pakistan youths. Everywhere clenched fists were shown. Very well. Our Prime Minister rose to the occasion and instead of a clenched fist he made a magnificent response. He said "Look at my hand and clutch it in love but if you start aggression on Kashmir, we will consider that as an attack on the whole of India and there will be an all-out war". This one single sentence followed up by deployment of troops in the different fronts at once flattened out the clenched fist of Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan and thereafter what followed is a matter of recent history; but the fact is that since then Pakistan is talking less of Jihad. I say honestly and sincerely that that was a magnificent stand. The Prime Minister had our support cent per cent. If we could do that in case of Kashmir, have we got no obligations to one crore and 20 lakhs of our Hindu brethren who fought shoulder to shoulder with us in the fight for the freedom of this country? Have we no obligations to them? I find schoolmasters lecturing here about what sanctions mean. Nobody has talked of sanctions as the remedy. You can put all manner of pressure, political, economic, diplomatic, strategic, all that you are capable of. You have to do it; if not, let the position be made clear. Tell us definitely that Hindus in East Bengal are no longer the concern of the Parliament of India or the Government of India, that they are citizens of Pakistan, and as such we absolve ourselves of all our responsibility in that matter; let them shift for themselves. That is an honest, straightforward proposition. I shall not be the least sorry for it. That will be a clear, logical thing to state. Of course it will be for you to face the bar of national opinion and the verdict of history, having on all occasions stood up for the cause of the down-trodden elsewhere. In the case of South Africa we imposed sanctions to vindicate our national prestige. The Finance Minister would be able to tell you how many crores India has lost during the last few years. It will be a few scores as a result of our sanctions. We have suffered that loss. We have not cared, about that. With Pakistan, what is our trade balance? Is it passive or active? It is passive but I need not go into the details. We are now fighting for the Indians in South Africa. They were once the people of this soil. They had gone to South Africa several scores of years ago. Our heart is burning for them. We are bleeding for the Tunisians. We are not sitting idle over the question of citizenship of Indians in Ceylon. For all manner of countries and people, we have shown active sympathy. If on this issue of Hindu minority in Eastern

[Pandit L. K. Maitra]

Pakistan you do not do anything, it does not reconcile. I am at the close of my political career. Before I close my eyes, I do not want to see the whole minority community liquidated in this way but that the Government of the day to stand by it and vindicate the national prestige by affording it either shelter or protection. I see before me so many friends who are sympathetic to me. I appeal to them earnestly that this matter is not lightly treated by them. Whatever resolution or amendment you want to carry, do it. But for God's sake, sit down together to find a remedy. Let the Government sit with the leaders of different parties and seriously try to evolve a solution. I will make another request here. Do not put questions here about East Bengal or East Bengal refugees. The replies that come generally go against them. They are utilised by Pakistan for all manner of purposes. You do not serve really the interests of the refugees of East Bengal by putting questions and supplementaries here. With the best of intentions, you do to their cause more harm than good. Finally, I appeal in all sincerity and earnestness that this question may be looked at from the angle in which I have tried to put it; viz. national angle. Not that I want to create any embarrassment for the Government. It is my own party Government. Nevertheless, I do feel that I should tell the Government firmly that the Bengali Hindu race is being thus slowly but methodically liquidated. For whose fault? Because of the Division of the country, for which these people were not responsible. Because the freedom of the country came all of a sudden, these people were not prepared and they are now paying in blood and tears the price of the freedom which we are enjoying. Let us not forget this.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): I have very little time. I shall dwell only on some of the points raised in the amendment of Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee.

I have listened with great attention to the speech which he has made and I was surprised to see that though he has advocated economic sanctions in his amendment he has not at all dwelt on that aspect, in his speech though that has been the main thing that he has been agitating for in Bengal. As far as condemnation of the Government regarding the rehabilitation of the refugees goes, I am one with him. Because, during the last few months, during the recent influx of refugees consequent upon the introduction of the passport system, I have been along with him in the border areas and I have

seen how the women coming are living in Bongaon and other places, in the open and under trees. I have seen babies without food for 2 or 3 days. I have seen how they have suffered. So far as that goes, I am absolutely one with him. I am one with him also when I think of those who have come four years ago, still lying there on the platform of Sealdah station, and when I think of the so called deserters who have come away from the wasteland given to them to cultivate, who are told that they will have to pay the price for coming away and that Government will not help them. We also listened to the reply which Mr. Jain gave to the question: "Why should not the Evacuee Property Act be extended to East Bengal also?" He said, "No, it cannot be done". In all that, we are absolutely one with Dr. Mookerjee. When we extended our hand of co-operation it was refused by the Rehabilitation Minister of Bengal. At a time when the people were offering food to these refugees, they discouraged public organisations, saying that they were creating more trouble. Mr. Chairman, I will not dwell much more on that, because we know the sad tale of what happened to those who have come four years ago. We have not been able to rehabilitate them. We talk of the honour of the women in Pakistan. There are such cases; we do not deny that. We know that their honour has been desecrated. But, we also know that when they have come away here have we been able to save them? Do we not know how at dead of night people trade in flesh and trade on human suffering and have used Hindu women for nefarious purposes? Do we not know how children have been carried away by jackals at Ranaghat Camp? Do we want to call upon these 95 lakhs of people still in Pakistan to share that same fate? If we had been able to provide an honourable life to them, then, certainly, we would have demanded that they might come over. That has not been possible. In a State where our own people have no food, where our own people have no employment, where we are carrying out mass retrenchment, when unemployment among agricultural labour is growing by leaps and bounds, when the purchasing power of the people is going down, when people are living at a semi-starvation level, how can we expect others to come over here and how can we say that we are going to give them an honourable livelihood and that we will save their lives? I will not dilate on that any more.

I am afraid Dr. Mookerjee has completely remained silent about this question of economic sanctions. Will the question of economic sanctions solve the problem? They have said, well, if

economic sanctions cannot solve the problem, let us at least hear what else can solve it. This, of course, is shifting the position from what has been going on in West Bengal. Dr. Mookerjee and his other leftist friends have been crying for economic sanctions.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Effective action.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: I would like to say, that in fact, the tension which has been prevailing during the last few years has resulted in a certain amount of economic sanctions already. For instance,—I hope my hon. friend Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra will not get angry, I am talking about economic blockades—I was a school mistress and I hope he will forgive me—the figures show, in 1948 the exports to Pakistan were of the order of 83 crores, in 1949, 38 crores, in 1950, 30 crores. As for imports from Pakistan in 1948, it was 117 crores, in 1949, 40 crores, and in 1950, 32 crores. Many of us in West Bengal used to say that if we had economic sanctions, Pakistan will collapse. But, in spite of the economic blockade, that has virtually been there our position still remains where it was. Take the question of jute. In 1947-48, we imported 49 lakh bales, 75 per cent. of our net requirements. Now, what is the position? In the latest trade agreement, the article has been wholly omitted. Let us remember how the whole trouble started. There was undoubtedly the political tension. Together with that, there was the question of devaluation.

We devalued, and Pakistan did not. After that, they wanted that we should fix the prices at the devalued level. After that, from September to December, we did not buy any jute from Pakistan. Pakistan thought that we could not do without jute, and so they tried to find foreign markets. Today, what has happened? To-day, we find in Pakistan the price of jute has gone down to Rs. 5 or Rs. 6. Who has suffered? Is it Nurul Amin? Is it Nazimuddin? Or, is it the poor peasantry of Pakistan? Seventy-five per cent. of our jute goods used to find a market in Pakistan, but we find today that there is a world slump in jute goods. In 1939-40, we used to export Rs. 108 crores of jute goods. That has come down to Rs. 75 crores in 1951-52, and it is even worse this year.

The same thing is to be found in cotton. Before partition, Pakistan used to export 980,000 bales of cotton to us. We imported in 1949-50 only two lakhs bales. Much of this is being compensated by imports from the U.S.A. For instance, during the same period, out of Rs. 136 Crores worth of cotton, we have imported Rs. 62½ Crores, i.e., almost 50 per cent. from the U.S.A. Coal

also. Whereas in 1948-49 we used to export 6 crores of tons to Pakistan, in 1949-50, we are exporting only 5 lakhs tons. Therefore, I would say that in order to find out a new field for this coal, we are having to sell it to South Korea, to Singapore, to Japan, to Hong Kong. We have to depend upon the favours of the U.K. and the U.S.A. We are giving the material to kill the patriotic Koreans fighting their freedom battle, and the heroes of Malaya fighting for their liberation. That is what has happened. In Pakistan, they are trying to get coal from East Africa, Cuba and other satellites of U.S.A. and U.K. This is the result of economic blockade. Therefore, it is now clear who profits and who loses by Dr. Mookerjee's slogan of economic blockade. It is the imperialists who gain, and it is the poor people of Pakistan and the poor people of Hindustan who suffer from it.

As far as economic blockade goes, look at China. You may laugh at it, but China was blockaded by a much stronger power than ours, U.S.A. What has happened to it. That blockade has become the laughing stock of the world.

Dr. Mookerjee has asked us for a solution. The other day in the lobby he said: "Give us a solution". He himself does not give a solution. He says it is for the Government to give us a solution. Certainly, but he has asked us for a solution. Yes, we have a solution the only one, a very, very difficult one, which needs immense patience and intense sacrifice. The only solution and the guarantee for the minority lies in the growing strength of the mass movement and the strengthening of the democratic movement in Pakistan. It is undoubtedly true that the democratic movement in Pakistan is still weak. We do not doubt it. That is why as yet communalism holds naked sway through the machinery of the State there. They are able to utilise that in order to crush the popular movements which arise from time to time. But that is no reason why we should play into the hands of the reactionaries. Why should we allow them to utilise and fan this communal hatred by methods which would be only suicidal?

Pandit Algu Rai Shastri: How can we do that?

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: To fight these evils which emanated from imperialist domination without fighting imperialism itself is a foolish thought. I would not like to repeat the things that my friend Mr. Hiren Mookerjee has already stated, of the growing movement in Pakistan. If we really hold out our hand of brotherly soli-

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

clarity to the people fighting for their national honour, those who have shed their blood on the streets of Dacca for the Bengali language movement if we really help their cause, if we extend our hand of solidarity to the mariners who, as soon as their President landed on the side of Pakistan, raised the cries of "Hindu-Muslim Zindabad", "Hindu-Muslim Bhai-Bhai"—that is the cry that is rising in Pakistan. Let us help that cry; let us depend upon that cry. It is the soaring of the new Prometheus, and once it unchains itself, that will really secure the safety of the minorities. Nothing else can.

Together with that, we should go on trying—people have ridiculed us about our goodwill missions. Yes, it is easy to laugh at it because really to establish goodwill is a very, very difficult process. It requires a good deal of patience. It requires a great movement. My friend Lakshmi Kant Maitra has talked about Kashmir. Let us not forget the great people's movement in Kashmir that was there. On the one hand, there was the people's movement, and together with that we were able to really fight and put back those who were trying to get the upper hand and trying to take away the liberty of that State. Therefore, unless we have that backing, the popular movement there, we will not be able to do anything.

My friend Dr. Mookerjee has also told me: "Go there, and live there, and show us how we can live there". I would tell him we have hundreds of comrades like Lila Mitra who have suffered, who have been raped.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Where is she now?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: She is still there suffering in jail, and I can tell Dr. Mookerjee that it is they who are trying to build up the movement alone.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Your's is a movement of betrayal in this country?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I would like to tell what she has written to us from jail. "Do not weep for me" she says. "The rising today of the great movement of the peasantry of Hindus and Muslims, all together, will really guarantee the safety and prosperity of Pakistan". That is what she has said. With this cry of "Jehad", we are destroying their work, we are playing into the hands of the reactionaries who are utilising the slogan of "Pakistan in danger", and fanning the fanaticism which still lies there. As yet the democratic movement is weak. We must help them. We must not allow the reactionaries to be strengthened.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): I was somewhat distressed to listen to the speech of Prof. H. N. Mookerjee. When reason is dominated by dogma, difficulty arises, and you cannot really take an objective view of things. He was pooh-poohing the united demand of all the Bengal parties. For the first time in the history of my province, all the political parties except our comrade friends.....

Dr. N. B. Khare: And the Congress.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: joined hands, and they in their corporate wisdom said that we should call upon our Government to give up the weak policy of drift and vacillation, and we suggested, amongst others, the immediate promulgation of economic sanctions. The Communist conscience is shocked. They are talking of history. They made history in the streets of Calcutta on the day of the "Direct Action" when Janab Suhrawardhy, with his myrmidons of the Muslim League, plunged Calcutta and the Province of Bengal into chaos and disaster and bloodshed. Only the Communist Party was helping the Muslim Leaguers (*Interruption*) in their attempt for Pakistan. They are talking of democratic movement. The only democratic movement they promulgated was to foster the greatest forces of reaction which have led to the partition of India and the creation of this unholy State of Pakistan. That is what they have achieved. They are now saying that it is a crude consequence of the Anglo-American conspiracy. Either they have manufactured their own history, or they have rediscovered facts. The fact is that they should now talk of Anglo-American Communist conspiracy. (*Interruption*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On a point of order, Sir.....

Mr. Chairman: He is not giving in.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I want to go on, Sir, without being interrupted. I had the privilege to preside over...

Mr. Chairman: After he has finished his speech, if any hon. Member wants to put a question, then he may answer.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I had the privilege, Sir, of presiding over one of the biggest conferences held in East Bengal, called the Barisal conference.

There all parties were united and all joined in the demand that there shall be no Pakistan and no division when Mr. Jinnah's lieutenants were carrying on a tearing and raging campaign for Pakistan. All parties joined except the Communists who

were trying to sabotage that union. (Interruptions). Now they say that it is purely an Anglo-American conspiracy. But what I want to ask is: Has not the great professor learnt the great and sacred lesson of history? Economic sanctions were imposed against a Fascist State by the democratic nations of Europe, and every one was applauding them. One of the ministers in the British Cabinet had to go out because of his weakening on the demand for economic sanction. Now what is wrong if one has to suggest economic sanctions in order to teach a lesson to the barbarians who were carrying on terrific genocide and these atrocities in the State of Pakistan? They talked of economic sanctions against a totalitarian state. But what is happening in Pakistan? The speech of Professor Mukerjee will gladden the hearts of the Ansars and the "pure Pak" politicians in Pakistan and may possibly help the gangster elements there. But it will do no good to the 9 million people who are being oppressed, tortured, submerged and who are steadily being degraded into the position of mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. That is the state of Pakistan. What is the good of talking about democratic movements?

After all, they have driven out successfully and squeezed out successfully the Hindu and Sikh minorities from the West. The same game they are playing on the Eastern front also. Only the technique is slightly different, and it has been slightly modified. After this outrage upon lakhs and lakhs of the Hindus, is it solemnly suggested that we should degrade ourselves by going down to the level of sending out goodwill missions to these people who are deliberately torturing these minorities, persecuting them and depriving them of the fundamental rights of human beings and are disintegrating their economic life? Their whole social life has been disrupted and their religious life has been wiped out. Is it then necessary to send out goodwill missions? Even the ministerial tours that recently took place are futile, they do no good. It may give them a chance of making some propaganda there but nothing else can come out of it. Economic sanction Pakistan has already imposed on us, and our Government has not got the courage to admit and take suitable action. Have not they banned Indian films? Is not that economic sanction? My hon. friend Mr. Gidwani comes from the district of Thana. From two taluks of that district, "pan" worth Rs.

2 crores used to go every year to Pakistan. But they have now imposed a ban on that. Is not that economic sanction? They do not give us the jute we require and they are creating trouble unnecessarily. Every time Pakistan was economically in a sorry state, our Government has gone to its rescue and has tried to rehabilitate it and put it on its own feet. What is the harm in talking of economic sanctions? They have imposed a ban on us, and pursuing that policy they have stopped many things. After the Delhi pact what has happened? Professor Samar Guha does not belong to my organisation, nor to Dr. Mookerjee's; he is the Secretary of the East Bengal Minorities' Association, an M.Sc., and also a professor and a scientist as also the General Secretary of the Pakistan Forward Bloc. He has published a book 'Non-Muslims Behind the Curtain of East Pakistan' wherein he has pointed out that they have deliberately violated the basic conditions of the Delhi Pact. Are you going to say it is only a sporadic thing? Consciously, deliberately they have done it. Not a single house requisitioned by thousands in East Bengal has been restored to the Hindu owners. The Minority Minister Mr. Biswas is here, and he cannot contradict it. Not a single gun belonging to the minority communities confiscated by the Government of Pakistan has been restored to its owner. The guns have all been given to the Ansars and other gangster elements for indulging in atrocities on Hindus and other minorities. I was at the Bongong Railway Station on the 14th October, and by one train Barisal Express large numbers of people from Barisal, over 3000 people, had come the previous day. The Inspector-General of Police was there, the Deputy Inspector-General of Police was there on the 14th—and we were expecting at least double that number, about 7000 people altogether. Six thousand people were actually on the platform. It was a very sorry sight and I do not want to give you harrowing tales of the misery of these people. When the Barisal Express arrived on the 14th October only 200 people came out from it. It was a 'free' day, and yet only 200 people had arrived. Pakistan had already started propaganda in such a sinister fashion, that although it was a free day, still people could not come. Thousands and thousands of people were waiting at the railheads, and at the wayside railway stations, but they could not

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

come. It will be only self-complacency if we think that because there is no rail movement, there is no migration and all is quiet on the eastern front. It is not so. The Minister cannot understand Dr. S. P. Mookerjee and others saying that Pakistan wants to squeeze out the Hindus from that State. If that is so, he asks—why interdict movement by passport? The explanation is simple. Their aim is not merely extermination, not merely squeezing out, but also conversion. Squeezing out process applies to the top-dog but conversion and assimilation process applies to the under-dog. That is the latest East Pakistan technique pursued by the rulers of that State. That is what they are doing. Therefore there is no incongruity in our stand, and we are not saying anything that is unreasonable.

Ask the migrants who have come; they are just as good as you or myself, or perhaps even better; they were occupying important positions socially; some of them were bankers or traders and some were occupying positions in the industrial sphere. Why should they come? If you ask them "What do you want the Parliament to know? What do you want Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to know? What do you want our Government to know?" all of them say 'Could you tell Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the Government of India that these atrocities are going on in East Pakistan, because the Muslim League leaders, the *Ansars* and the people who rule East Bengal know that they can carry on their activities with impunity, and that whatever may happen the Government of India will never take any strong and stern action against Pakistan?'

I convey to the Prime Minister of India this message which has been communicated to us by this uprooted humanity. They have asked me to communicate that message to my fellow Members of Parliament and to the Prime Minister. It is this feeling of immunity which has got to be knocked out. The barbarians know, the *goonda* elements know, the gangsters know, the *Ansars* know and the Pak Police as Mrs. Sen said, who do not take any notice of complaints made of molestation of women, they also know the attitude of our government. When you record there in the Police thana the details and the names of the miscreants with eye-witnesses' accounts, no action is taken. This

immunity, this sense of immunity, this feeling that they can carry on without any trouble and without any impediment, this is most distressing. What I am saying is not my own assertion. The hon. the Deputy Minister, Mr. Bijesh Sen of the West Bengal Government has issued a public statement wherein he has said that his Government has gone into cases and reports of molestation of women which have been going on—not the past cases but the recent cases—and that the Government was satisfied, said the hon. Minister, that substantially these reports of molestation of women were true. What is the position? We talk of transfer of population. Political wiseacres shake their heads. But they have denuded the West of Hindus and Sikhs and they are now trying to do likewise on the Eastern Side. Are we going to submit our economy to this strain of one-way traffic from time to time or are we going to stand up and say 'It is a question of honour' as Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra has said, 'you have got to think of something else'.

You have enforced economic sanctions against South Africa and you are still continuing those sanctions, although they may not be effective.

Dr. N. B. Khare: It is not their handiwork; it is my handiwork.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I will not deprive Dr. Khare of the credit of initiating economic sanctions but they are being continued. It is only just and proper that a self-respecting nation and a self-respecting Government should continue them. Although it may not be effective, a civilised people and a civilised Government cannot tolerate uncivilised attitude. This kind of attitude on the part of Pakistan should no longer be tolerated. This kind of deliberate denial of fundamental rights, of oppression and Hindu-baiting we are not going to tolerate any further. That is the issue. Of course the onus is on Government. It is not for us to dictate to the Government. We can only advise; we can only suggest certain alternatives. But it is for them to judge. My Communist friends were happy when people wanted to apply economic sanctions against Mussolini or Hitler or even against Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose when he was threatening to come here. But when you talk of economic sanctions against Pakistan, they become perturbed. There is no need to be perturbed. I

submit this is a problem which is very grave. The onus is on the Government to solve it. With these few words, Sir, I support the amendment moved by Dr. Mookerjee.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On a point of information, Sir, I wanted to refer to an allegation made in the speech of Mr. Chatterjee as well as, I understand, towards the end of Mrs. Kripalani's speech to the effect that when in 1946 the Muslim League declared a 'Direct Action Day' immediately before the outbreak of the riots in Calcutta the Communist Party supported the slogan of 'Direct Action' on that day. Now that, Sir, is not true.

Dr. N. B. Khare rose—

Mr. Chairman: There are only five minutes left. I will call upon the Prime Minister at five.

Dr. N. B. Khare: All right, Sir, I will even at the risk of being called a fossil and a revivalist and what not, begin my speech with a Sanskrit sloka from Mahabharat. It says:

एतावानेष पुरुषो यदमर्षी यदस्त्री ।

क्षमावान् निरमर्षश्च नैव स्त्री न पुनः पुमान् ॥

It says, Sir, that that alone is a man, a manly man, who does not forgive his enemy for the insults and humiliations showered upon him and does not give up the idea of revenge and gets also angry about it; and that person who has not got these attributes is neither a man nor a woman. That is what the Mahabharata says and it was said not even by a man, but a lady, named Vidula. Now I will ask what can be said of such a person? Well, I would say that such a person is soulless, and further on if somebody asks again the question: "breathes there a man with soul so dead?" I will frankly answer "Yes. There is such a man and he is the man who has got the undeserved honour of leading this House" It is not a matter of laughter, Sir. It is a serious matter. (Interruption).

One must understand the basic nature of this problem. This problem is not a temporary one; it is a perennial one, and it will continue as long as any number—any considerable number—of Hindus will be found in Pakistan. I may tell you Pakistan's ideal is a homogeneous population professing one faith and to achieve that ideal, they follow three methods: expulsion, conversion and extermination. Whichever suits them on whatever occasion, they follow it and they are bound to do it. Did they

not do it in West Pakistan and get rid of all the Hindus and Sikhs from that place? And surely if they do the same in East Pakistan, nothing surprising. As a matter of fact in December 1949 from the platform of the Hindu Mahasabha at the Calcutta session, to which I have the honour to belong and preside I gave a definite warning in my speech—you can see it—that what Pakistan did in West Pakistan is surely going to happen soon in East Pakistan. And at that time the whole Congress Press ridiculed me as a warmonger, a communalist and what not. I am not sorry for it. I am proud of it because I gave a definite warning to my countrymen which they did not heed. That was not my fault. I did my duty. And, what happened? In January-February 1950 conversions and massacres began to happen in East Bengal. This will go on definitely and unless India stands up as a man against the humiliation and insults offered to us at every step, I think there is no hope for India. I can die of hunger, I can die of thirst, I can die of cold, I can die of heat, but I refuse to die as a dishonoured and insulted man. I refuse to die like that. This is the only question. It is not a communal question, it is not a provincial question; it is a national question. If at all a nation lives, it lives by its honour. I am ridiculed because I threatened to boycott cricket. I am proud of it. I warned my nation against moral and national degradation. Why do you laugh? I have not got a broad mind; I have a narrow mind. I do not want to kiss the boot which kicks me. You may do; I will not do it. You may say 'be broadminded'; I am content to be narrow-minded.

Then there are so many remedies suggested. My hon. friend, Dr. S. P. Mookerjee read the speech of Mr. Bhupendra Nath Dutt, a brave congressman staying in Pakistan. He exposed the schemes of Pakistan. Pakistan wants to create conditions, has created conditions in which Hindus cannot continue to live in that country. People should not do anything; they should be peaceful and quiet. But if the Government of India has got any sense of honour, any sense of humanity, they should create the same conditions for the minority here as they have done in Pakistan—I am not afraid of it. That is all I have to say and my time is over. I have nothing more to say.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I should have thought after this long day's debate that the final touch that has just been given to it was an adequate

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

answer to everything that has been said because that is a kind of thing that puts an end to all sense of decency and everything that is good for this country. And that is the kind of thing that is being exploited today in the country to the disadvantage not only of the rest of the country but of those unhappy millions in East Pakistan whose cause we plead here. I wish to speak with restraint but there can be no restraint when this indecent talk is indulged in this House, when an hon. Member of this House dares to say—I say, dares to say—that he wants ill-treatment, inhuman treatment to be given to the citizens of India because he does not like some things that are being done elsewhere. That is, I say, a terrible thing which the House should not tolerate. That is what has been said,—the last sentence of this debate,—and, therefore I took it first of all.

It was my intention, and it is my intention to consider this question of great import, which concerns so many people with all the calmness and objectivity that I could command. I cannot speak in the eloquent terms of my hon. friend who spoke first on this motion, nor can I indulge in the perfervid oratory of my other friend, Pandit Lakshmi Kant Maitra. The matter is too serious, if I may say so, for eloquence only. It is a matter which concerns obviously millions of people in East Bengal, millions in West Bengal and all the millions of India and Pakistan. It is a serious matter and if any hon. Member on the other side thinks—and they have said so several times—that the Government are complacent about it and thinks that nothing need be done and everything possible has been done, all I can say is, they are grossly mistaken, and that I confess my fault that Government has failed to demonstrate that we—whether we are right or wrong is another matter—consider this as a matter of the gravest import. It may be that our methods are somewhat different from those of our friends who are gifted with the language of oratory. It may be that we try to deal with serious matters in a serious way and not in theatrical ways. But the fact is, let us admit,—let nothing more be said about it—that it is a matter of greatest importance, not relating to East Bengal or West Bengal only but relating to the whole of India and that every person in India is concerned with it. Not only concerned because of the human aspect of it, which is important enough, but because the

consequences that flow from it are such that they would affect the whole of India. Every single person in India is affected by this problem. So, let us put that aside. It is of the highest importance and the House can take it from me that I would not grudge this House discussing this matter—not for a day but for months—if by discussion we can solve it. Let us discuss it as far as we can if light has to be thrown, but sometimes when we discuss rather difficult and rather delicate problems in a light way or mix it up with mere condemnation of Government policy—which it is always open to any hon. Member to do—the reality of the problem goes into the background and other factors come in. Sometimes these long debates in which long speeches are made make the solution of the problem a little more difficult; and when hon. Members speak—they may be very few on the other side of the House—unfortunately even a speech sometimes comes in the way. It is exploited.

My hon. friend, Dr. Mookerjee said that what I had said on previous occasions, sometimes in answer to a question or elsewhere, had been exploited in Pakistan, by the Pakistan Press or the Pakistan Government, because it was said to be to their advantage. What I have said I do not quite remember. It may be so. When I am questioned in this House, I have sought to tell the truth as I could find it and as I knew it. I have not balanced as to whether the truth was favourable to me or to Pakistan; and it may be that occasionally truth was not to the liking of some hon. Member opposite. But may I draw his attention to this fact that among those who are perhaps most quoted in the Pakistan Press are the speeches of himself and of some of his colleagues? Among those who are referred to most frequently in the Pakistan Press and who get headlines are members of those organisations represented by some of the hon. Members opposite, who are making these various demands,—whether it is an economic boycott or something else, let us examine them—and who have taken a prejudiced attitude which was indicated in its intensity by the last speaker who preceded me. They get a great deal of publicity. They get publicity because they serve the purpose, the very purpose against which they contend, because they sail in exactly the same boat as the communalists of Pakistan. They may dislike each

other, they may fight each other but they are birds of the same feather and they quite understand each other.

In the past when we fought for the freedom of India—I am not referring to any individual, I am merely talking about groups—in the past although they criticised each other they could function together and they did function together before independence came. The question that we have got to consider is, are we going to consider this question in a highly sentimental way and relate stories which are painful to hear as they must be painful to relate, are we going to decide great political questions by relating these stories, getting greatly excited over them and getting almost hysterical over them? Is that the way of a mature people, a mature parliament, and a mature nation behaves? I put it to the House: here is a question which may well affect the future of India, here is a question which may have an effect on the future of the world, when we are discussing, to some extent in a historical way, should we try to excite the passion of the House by stories which may be true, which may not be true? Of course, many of them are true; I am not denying them, but I am not prepared to believe every story which is told to me by any person who comes and relates it. It is obvious that there has been inhumanity, it is obvious that there has been oppression—I am not denying that—but it is unnecessary for stories to be related and sometimes related as an hon. Member related them with modulations of voice, high and low, as if a tragedy is being enacted. What are we here? The House of the People of the Republic of India. Here important matters are considered.

Reference has been made to what is happening to the people of Indian descent in South Africa and we have been told that we troubled ourselves about that but not about our own friends and relatives in East Bengal. About Ceylon also we have been reminded. We are, if I may say so, deeply interested in people of Indian descent in Ceylon or in South Africa. Why? They are not Indian nationals—that is admitted. They are nationals of Ceylon or nationals of South Africa. We are interested for other reasons, for humanitarian reasons, for cultural reasons, for reasons of self-respect and all that. Now, if that is so, it does not require very much argument for any one to see

that we must be interested, infinitely more than in others in the people in East Bengal. It is obvious; it is patent that everyone of us must be interested in them because they are of us. It may be a fact that they are Pakistani nationals today. But this cannot write off, or scratch out, or erase the history of hundreds, or thousands of years. It is patent. So, it is not a question of lack of interest or lack of sympathy or lack of anything else. All of us I hope realise the difficulties that they had to undergo, or they may have to undergo in future. All of us sympathise and have intense sympathy for them. That is so.

What then are we to do? For the last two or three years there has been a war going on in Korea. For the last year or more there has been a talk of truce going on there. But whoever may be right or whoever may be wrong in Korea, the fact is that all these forces of liberation in Korea have ruined Korea and made it a heap of ashes of the country. If the advice of some hon. Members was followed and the Government of the day here, whoever it may be—we are passing men—acted in that way excitedly, hysterically irresponsibly, I shudder at the fate that would come to India—and Pakistan, of course. It is much too serious a matter to be talked about lightly, to be talked about in terms of party advantage. Generally speaking, when such serious matters confront a nation, they are considered, as far as possible, without consideration of political advantage for a party. I do not mean to say that criticism or even condemnation should not take place. Of course, it must. A serious matter should be considered fully and nothing should be behind the *purdah*. Nevertheless an attempt should be made to face that serious peril and crisis, as far as possible, jointly.

So far as this matter is concerned, it can be divided into two parts. There is the part dealing with relief and rehabilitation and the other part, the major part, of conditions in East Bengal and the consequences of those conditions. Now, so far as the first part is concerned, I do not wish to say much. I am prepared later to discuss the matter with hon. Members of this or that side of the House, or rather my colleague Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain is fully prepared to do that. But I would say this much about it. In the last nearly three years or two and a half years, this

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

matter became relatively more important in the scheme of rehabilitation. I say 'relatively' because previous to that the number of people from Western Pakistan were infinitely greater. But in the last two and a half years our attention, the attention of the Ministry of Rehabilitation, has been taken up far more by the problems of the refugees who have come from Eastern Pakistan than the others. And undoubtedly it is so, because that problem became graver and graver. Whether we have succeeded, or the Government of West Bengal have succeeded in our attempt is a different matter. Hon. Members have criticised our efforts. Their criticism may be justified to a degree—I will not go into that matter. That is a matter of detail. But I wish to assure the House that the attention of Government has been constantly directed to the problem of East Bengal refugees and we have tried to do what we could.

Among the inherent difficulties of the situation which have confronted us one is that, unfortunately, a certain political element has come in dealing with this problem. Some who are no doubt interested in this problem as much as anyone else have tried to turn it into a political problem. I remember at Sealdah station, where some of these unfortunate people arrived, it was an amazing sight. It was like the Magh mela with all the pandas and their flags up. During the Magh mela at Triveni every party has a flag—each fighting for its customers. Instead of jointly serving them, it was a political fight for the refugees—"we shall have him; we shall profit by him politically". I am glad that is over now—it has been dealt with in a different way. Also, when an attempt was made to send many of these displaced persons who had come to other provinces, nearby provinces or farther away, difficulties were put, not, I think, by the refugees themselves so much but by others, for political reasons. Now, I do submit that that would not serve the cause of the refugees. If any party or any individual is angry with the Government, it is perfectly open to them to vent their anger, or condemn us. But it is rather unfair, instead of venting their anger at us, to do something which harms those very people whom we are trying to serve.

Now, it is our intention—it is the intention of my colleague the Minister for Rehabilitation—immediately

or very soon, because of the growth of this problem and because it is necessary to deal with it as adequately as we can, first of all to set up a small fact-finding committee consisting of officers of the Ministry of Rehabilitation, the West Bengal Government and the Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta, to make a survey and assessment of the conditions in relief camps and rehabilitation colonies,—in particular housing and gainful employment provided for and vocational and technical training given to displaced persons in West Bengal and the results of various other rehabilitation measures undertaken by Government and to submit its report to the committee which I shall refer to later. That would be a full appraisal of the situation as it is and as it is likely to be. It is also our intention to appoint a Cabinet Committee consisting of the Minister of Finance and the Minister for Rehabilitation of the Government of India, and the Chief Minister of West Bengal to make, on the basis of the report submitted by the above fact-finding committee, an appraisal of the actual extent of rehabilitation achieved in West Bengal, to examine the various rehabilitation schemes in operation in West Bengal, whether they have made satisfactory progress or given adequate results; if not, the reasons therefor and suggest measure for improvement and for financial adjustments and in regard to the future lay down policies, etc. The committee is expected to complete its work in the next three months.

We are trying to proceed in a methodical way in this matter—first of all through an enquiry and at the same time through a very high level committee—to deal with the problem as best as we can. In doing so, we shall very gladly consult those persons or groups who are specially interested in this problem and who may have particular information or particular views in regard to it. So, I shall not say anything more about the rehabilitation aspect of it except to say that it is our bounden duty to do our utmost for it. To say that does not mean that we can by imagination deal with the problem and produce hundred per cent. results quickly. That cannot be done. And in doing that inevitably even if we work better than we are working, a great deal depends on factors which are completely outside our control.

I may mention that among the things to be enquired into, and that

we are enquiring into, is the settling of refugees in other States, nearby as well as farther away, not settling them in small numbers but in fairly large groups, so that they can live their community life there—say, a group of ten or fifteen thousand or even more—so that they may not feel isolated. So much for rehabilitation.

But the major problem, of course, is something different, out of which all this business of refugees coming and rehabilitation arises. I should like, as far as possible, to put before the House my appraisal of this situation. I do not say that it is hundred per cent. correct or not. But I do feel that it is not right for us to take too one-sided a view of anything.

I believe that this whole question has arisen to some extent because of partition, of course, and because of the huge eruption that took place at the time of partition which few people expected in that shape—hardly any, I suppose. And all kinds of forces were let loose, all kinds of passions were aroused, and all kinds of deep injuries were caused then which it takes time to heal. And the healing process has proceeded to some extent in many places, it has not had a chance in other places, notably in East Bengal or West Bengal.

But I should like the House to remember one thing. When we talk about East Pakistan or West Pakistan whom do we talk about? Are we talking about the people there or about certain groups there or about certain Governments there? What do we talk about? My hon. friend Dr. Mookerjee said quite clearly that he did not refer to the people there. He referred to the official authority presumably, or some groups only. Well, I was glad to hear it.

He said he was not approaching this question from a communal point of view but from a political point of view. Well, I entirely welcome that statement of his. And I say the first thing we should be absolutely clear about is this, that this question cannot and must not be considered from the communal point of view. Let us confine it to the political approach.

If that is so, then may I enquire if such suggestions as an exchange of population are a political approach or a communal approach?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Political approach, according to international precedents, at governmental level.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Is it a political approach to pick out a religious group in one country and push it into the other country? That, according to the hon. Member, is the political, international approach! Well, I am not aware of any international law which permits that, or has permitted it from the beginning of time. I say so with all authority. He may point out to something in Turkey or Greece. It has no relation to this, it is a completely different thing.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta—North-West): This was done in Turkey.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have myself said Turkey. I said so. If the hon. Member would listen to me he would not have taken the trouble of interrupting.

What I say is that if the hon. Member says that this should be dealt with on a political level and then tries to reconcile his statement of exchange of population...

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I myself pointed out the difficulties of such an exchange and said that it may not solve the problem.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am glad. I will not pursue this matter. So that remedy is over. I hope nobody will talk about it in future.

Mr. Chairman: There is an amendment to this effect.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But I take it he will withdraw it.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: No, I will press it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, it takes all sorts of.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: How did he accept it with regard to the two Punjabs?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Did I accept it? Of course not. I did not accept it.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: You succumbed to it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Certainly, to a large extent I succumbed to it. I did not accept it. And it was a tragedy. We should not try to repeat it or do anything which might cause it to be repeated.

My difficulty is we, that is the Government of this country at the present moment, cannot easily deal with this problem on the political level.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

because of the intrusion of the communal approach to it; not only of the intrusion of the communal approach but the intrusion, if I may say so, of irresponsible talks of the big stick and of war and things that lead to war. Because, that political approach which might be efficient or effective is undermined by it. Immediately we have to face that difficulty.

May I point out it has been said constantly in the course of this debate, as previously, that Pakistan has broken the Agreement of April, 1950, Pakistan has not adhered to that Agreement in many ways, has broken it in some ways, sometimes in actual letter, certainly in spirit. True. May I remind hon. Members opposite that some of the things that they have been saying and doing—not today but since 1950—are a continual breach of that Agreement and it has put us in the most embarrassing position? Because, we have been charged again and again: "You gave us year pledge and your undertaking that this will not be done; and this is being done in your country, this is being done by so-and-so, this paper and that group." And we have to admit it. All that we can say is: "We are sorry, ours is a free country, we have got our Constitution, we have got many honourable people in this country, what are we to do, we cannot control them."

Shri V. G. Deshpande: When Mr. Liaquat Ali came for this Pact the country was not 'free'. When this Pact was arrived at, Veer Savarkar was arrested and we were externed from Delhi.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not challenging anybody's right. I am merely saying that there are organisations in this country which have stated as one of their objectives to put an end to the partition and have Akhand Bharat. Now, that obviously is a clear defiance of the April 1950 Agreement. Because, it is stated there by us and agreed to by us that this kind of thing will not be permitted by us as a government. In fact we pledged ourselves to suppress this kind of agitation. And yet this has been constantly done. The House will of course appreciate that we pledged ourselves to something which we could not wholly in law give effect to; in reality it merely became our intention being expressed. So that, this whole approach has been coming in the way of any positive and effective political approach. Because, when we could point out to them, as we did repeatedly, all their failures, they could point out a good

few on our side too. Not by the Government, maybe. The difference is this.

I say that with due modesty on behalf of our Government. It is true that I think so but that does not take me very far when failures take place here—and the consequences of the failure have to be faced—and the agitations are carried on here on a basis which can only lead to certain reactions there and certain justifications on the other side of what they do and what they do not do. That is the main difficulty we have had in the past. If I may put it very briefly in a sentence we cannot. You can adopt the attitude. It is not a very reasonable or a good attitude. I will say this much. It is at any rate a frank attitude which my hon. friend Dr. Khare exhibits, an eye for eye and a tooth for tooth; but fortunately for this country we are not controlled by the ideology of the Old Testament—both in our social and political spheres. We think on a different level. Now can you go for an eye for eye and a tooth for tooth ideology which of course is not practical politics apart from everything else, even if it was practical politics (somebody might consider it is, but it is not and can easily be shown to have been a failure where such an attempt was made). If that is not so, how am I to proceed? We cannot think today in terms of conflict, let us say, between just some small or great organised armies. People come into the conflict, and in a large way. That is why wars today are fought with infinitely more destruction. That is why wars do not yield the results. In short that is why political or economic questions cannot be solved through war. Through war you never get it. You cannot control it. Therefore to talk lightly of war, if I may say so, does not show any mature approach to this problem, it is immaturity. You rule out war,—rule out, of course, in the sense that if we are attacked, naturally, we cannot help it, we will fight. We did fight, that is a different matter, but I say if you think of war as a solution of the problem, it is not understanding the modern world at all, the modern forces which are at play, nor the consequences of war. It would merely be adventurism and medievalism.

Now unfortunately we have got to deal in various ways with a country whose real ideology at present is medieval, i.e. Pakistan. Now are we going to meet their medievalism with the medievalism of India? It is a matter for us to consider because there are plenty of people in this House whose

logic and thinking proceeds from the same medieval outlook. It has no relation to modern India or to the problems of the day. It is a dangerous thing, just being swept away by a wave of sentimentality and forgetting the facts of the case. How then can you deal with a particular situation? It is difficult enough in all conscience. In the world today when a conflict arises of any size or shape, it continues. There is no end to it, because it has deep roots and yet some hon. Members propose something which may lead to that conflict and then imagine that somehow or other, by some magic method we will finish the job quickly and solve the problem. Now, therefore, I would beg this House to consider it, keeping in view the realities of the case. What are our objectives? After all we want to gain certain objectives. We do not want, like some ancient chivalrous knight just to show our courage and fail in our endeavour. After all, as a nation you have got to gain something. What is our objective? For the moment, let us say our objective is to help, or to help in such a way as we can, the minorities in East Bengal. Of course, the objective is a larger one but we will put it at that; we want them to be able to live decent lives or to make progress etc. How are we to attain that particular objective? Obviously whatever else we may attain or gain, we do not get it by some of the methods suggested. Some of the amendments I have disposed of; exchange of population or exchange of territory, all those things do not help that in the slightest. As a matter of fact once you start thinking in those terms you rule this out. Thus, whether in India or Pakistan, immediately a Stateless people are created, millions and millions of people become helpless and stateless, a prey to every kind of misfortune and it may take you a generation to dispose of them this way or that way. Till then there will be this utter chaos and misery of millions.

We raise our voice for the misfortune of the minorities in East Pakistan. That is right because I have no doubt that their life is, has been, a very difficult life, difficult sometimes by the pressure of Government, difficult more so by the atmosphere that is being created which makes them full of fear and apprehension—that is much worse than some acute crisis. I know that and the main thing we have to contend against is this atmosphere of fear. Now, Mr. Lakshmikanth Maltra and other friends mentioned figures, 20 lakhs, 30 lakhs, 50 lakhs. I do not wish to go into figures but I think that in using figures we might try to be a little accurate. We should try

to find out. I do submit that we have enough facts before us, not to be absolutely precise but certainly to be precise within certain limitations, and the figures that are repeated sometimes are far from precise. Far from that, if you want to understand the picture, we must see both sides of it. If a large number of Hindus have come from East Bengal as they have and to some extent might well continue to come, there has also been a stream backwards. There has also been a stream of Muslims going to Pakistan not only to East Pakistan but to West Pakistan. I think it is due to us to recognise the nature of the problem. Let us not think that we have created perfect conditions in our country. There can be no perfect conditions in this country—leave out other factors.—so long as the cry is raised, the communal cries are raised against this group or that group and the kind of solutions which are suggested means converting India into a communal State. Hon. Members referred to theocratic background of Pakistan because they have said it will be an Islamic State. It is an Islamic State. Yet, many of the hon. Members, who referred to this are quite content with the demand of what they call a Hindu Rashtra in India.

An Hon. Member: Not all, Sir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not say the hon. Member is. I do not accuse of him at all. Not all, of course not. I may really put it to you, even if a small group think that—undoubtedly some groups think that they are functioning on an identical level—they are functioning on the ideology of theocracy of Islam.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Entirely wrong.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May be so. You are unable to see any other picture except the one you have formed for yourself. I say it is an extraordinary thing how the ideology that they say gave birth to Pakistan and the Partition and that is causing all the troubles in East Pakistan and elsewhere is an identical ideology in the reverse on the part of these communal organisations in India who talk so loudly against the other ideology.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: It is the Congress ideology.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The Congress ideology of Ram Raj, he says.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Of Course, it is not easy for me to explain in words of one syllable to men that do not understand those ideologies easily.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I have to use multi-syllables and it will take long to explain. But, I do submit to this House, that if there is one thing clear, it is this: that this problem cannot be solved by our becoming cheap imitators of Pakistan and their methods and their ideologies and their approaches. That must be made perfectly clear. How then can we solve it? Ultimately, I say—I hope I am not saying something which is too big for me; I do not for an instant claim in this matter to be big; the thing I say is big; I am a small man saying a big thing—I say with all humility that the problem of India and Pakistan, whether it is tomorrow or day after, or a year hence or ten years hence can only be solved by the touch of healing being applied to both the countries. I do not know what will happen before that occurs, before that process succeeds. I have no shadow of a doubt that you cannot have two contiguous countries with people who have been living together, who have been working together, who may have had quarrels, who are racially and culturally of the same stock. It just does not matter what some people or many people may say about it; some of them may be leaders. They cannot change the course of history and the past. I say we have to come together. What the time or form shall be, I do not know. We have to associate ourselves more and more in the future. It may be that before that happens.....

Dr. N. B. Khare: That means Akhand Bharat.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: When I say that, I merely wish to place before the House that that is an inevitable thing that must happen, the alternative being a continuous process of mutual extermination. I am talking in terms of historical perspective: not of today. There are no other alternatives.

Surely no person with the least wisdom in him is likely to prefer the course of mutual extermination spread over generations. Therefore I should like that ultimate idea be kept in view and not allow ourselves to talk in terms of unreality today, because, reality today is different. We recognise that. And yet, when we say that reality is different, it is not so different. I do distinguish between groups in Pakistan as you and I must distinguish between groups in India. I am quite certain that a large number of people in Pakistan, ordinary people, have no animus against India. In fact, if I may say so, in other words, they feel regret at the happenings of the last five years, which have estranged them, which have put difficulties in their way and

in our way. I do not mean to say that they want the partition to be annulled and all that. They feel regret for all these things. You cannot reverse history like this. But, I do mean to say that a great majority of the people in Pakistan, as obviously in India, have friendly feelings to the people on the other side. I have no doubt about that. Except when they are excited, when they are worked up on occasions, which can be done in Pakistan or in India on some cry, they have friendly feelings. There are groups, of course, who work them up, who exploit these feelings for their ends. Because, remember, one of the easiest methods for dominating groups to retain power is to exploit sentiment against another country and fear of another country to strengthen itself, and thereby try to put aside from the people's minds the political and economic problems that they may have to deal with. All that is happening there.

What policy in our country helps or hinders the right process in the other country? It is patent and I hope every Member of this House, even such of the hon. Members as totally disagree with me, will appreciate that the approach of the big stick and the threat of war or something leading to war is just the approach which strengthens those forces that create all the trouble. Because, they use that as something that cements their hold. They use that to make the people forget their other real problems and make them think in terms of fear and apprehension. So that, this approach from our side harms them. It harms above all those minorities in the other country, immediately. You can have no half-way measure. You have to face the whole situation and take some other step and so on.

I have tried to put before the House frankly as my mind reasons this matter out. I have put very simple facts. It is a very difficult and delicate matter for one to discuss fully and absolutely. I am prepared to discuss it further.

Take another aspect of the case, that in spite of every effort from us, a situation arises on the other side which is worse. I hope this House will not ask me to say what in a particular situation in the future one may have to do. That has to be judged. I can only state before the House the general objective that one aims at, what one avoids doing and what one tries to do. Economic sanctions have been mentioned. Of course, economic sanctions at the present moment mean

very little in reality. They mean something in psychological approach, not in practice. If it is thought that the application of economic sanctions brings pressure, it does not, in any large degree. It is an expression of a psychology. That is a different matter. If we wish to express that psychology, if you think that that would do good, we will consider that. I do not think it will do good. I think it will help the very elements which you do not want to help there. As a matter of fact, the history of the last few years in India, four or five years, in regard to trade with Pakistan has been a chequered one. There has been very little normal trade intercourse, and the hon. Member was quite right—I forget who he was—in saying that in particular matters they have applied sanction. We have applied sanctions, too, in particular matters. It has been mutual. We have refused to buy this or sell that. It has been a mutual affair. It is still happening. In fact, our trade is at a very low level, and probably a good part of the so-called trade between India and Pakistan is just smuggling. You do not apply easily economic sanctions to smuggling so that from the economic point of view, it has no real importance. Personally, I feel that from the other point of view of really settling down as between India and Pakistan, it is desirable for our trade contacts to increase, for other contacts to increase. These can help indeed much more our people on the other side—the minority community on the other side—than mere talks and suchlike things. Talks etc., can go only some distance. I would not say that if I were not sure in my mind that the people of Pakistan would welcome that, are prepared for that. I am quite sure of that, except for an excited few.

Hon. members here read sometimes speeches of some leaders in Pakistan, sometimes newspaper articles in Pakistan, and when they read them, their reaction is strong, quite rightly, because some of those articles in newspapers and some of the speeches made there are, I think, highly objectionable. And when anybody reads them, he reacts strongly against it, but may I suggest that hon. Members try to picture to themselves that, when an average Pakistani reads some of the speeches delivered here, and some of the articles written here, his reaction is also strong. He feels the same thing. We say: "This is the voice of Pakistan", although it is not the voice of Pakistan. It is the voice of a group or some people. He also feels frightened, and thinks: "This is the voice of India. They are threatening us. They

are going to do this or that", with the result that the person who normally was friendly, gets frightened, and ends up with strange reactions. Therefore, that approach does not carry us anywhere, unless we declare that the only solution is that of the big stick. Then let us go ahead with the big stick. I do not understand hon. Members repeatedly talking of firmness, and strong action and all that. I may be no judge of my Government's firmness or weakness. It is for others to judge. Maybe we are not firm enough. Certainly, we cannot compare with some hon. Members opposite in regard to strong language, whatever else may be said in regard to action. But what is this cry I just fail to understand—this cry of firmness, cries of condemnation and cursing and vilifying. You must be clear about these things.

I said something which I knew was an invitation to criticism. I said: "I am not afraid of appeasement", but I qualified it. I said, not of evil, but of human beings, of groups of peoples, but I shall not be a party to appease evil, whatever the consequences. And I do not understand.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: What is the degree of evil which will make you do that?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is a matter for wisdom to see.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: When will that wisdom dawn on the Government.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Can appeasement go to self-immolation?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I purposely and deliberately used that word on the previous occasion, that I am not afraid to appease. And if I may say so with the greatest respect, I showed a lot of courage in using that word. Few people today in Europe, in America, in any country, are prepared to use that word, because they are afraid of its meanings.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Chamberlain did it with regard to Hitler and he was proud of it then.

Dr. N. B. Khare: He had an umbrella with him.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am grateful for these illuminating interruptions, but I do not wish to end up in this rather trivial way. We have to deal with this very difficult question, and I do appeal to this House and to all, whether they sit on this side or the other side, that this question must be treated on the high level of an international question which has international implications and consequences.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

and not merely on a party level. So far as I am concerned, I would gladly confer with hon. Members opposite, but it becomes a little difficult to confer when the attitude, the approach, is so utterly different.

Now, some hon. Members opposite have declared some kind of a day called "East Bengal Day" for some day in the future.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: "All-India Day".

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Why not make it "All-Asia"?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: We are following your example with regard to "South African Day" which you are celebrating tomorrow—"All-India South-African Day".

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, this day would be celebrated presumably by speeches which are less restrained than the speeches delivered in this House, presumably by speeches which will go in the perfervid style of Pandit Lakshmi Kant Maitra, stories of all kinds of abominations and inhumanities, to excite passions like that. Are you going to solve this problem in that way, I should like to know. Is that the path which any wise man, any responsible man or group ought to take, even to solve this problem?

Pandit L. K. Maitra: What is the objectionable language that I have used, I do not understand. What is the language you are objecting to from the very beginning?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am objecting to the perfervid language. I am not an admirer of perfervid and rather hysterical oratory. It is a question of taste.

Pandit L. K. Maitra: I have got my own way of speaking.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have mine, and I have my taste.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I have mine also, Sir.

Pandit L. K. Maitra: I have been talking in this way for the last 19 or 20 years in this House. Do you expect me to change immediately to some other style or form? I cannot understand. I was speaking what I felt. I spoke out my heart.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Sometimes, the heart is to be controlled by the mind.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I want to know from the Prime Minister if the question of South Africa can be solved by celebrating "South Africa Day".

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Or "All India South Africa Day" in India?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My answer is "No." It will not be solved by that.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Thank you.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But it will not be made worse either.

Dr. N. B. Khare: It is a matter of opinion.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Reference has been made to the passport system. As the House knows we did not want the passport system. We resisted it, but when it was coming unilaterally, naturally it had to come on both sides. Immediately, we came to certain agreements. When they wanted to postpone it again, just a few days before, we refused to postpone it, but we said then: "We are prepared to scrap it, but we cannot just postpone it. Once we postpone it, we are neither here nor there, and the feeling of uncertainty continues." We are prepared to scrap it now, if you want it. There is no difficulty on our part.

One hon. Member talked about masses of people held up all over as soon as this happened. Now, that is, I do submit, very wide of the truth. It is a fact that when passports suddenly started, there were people here and there on the border and elsewhere, but very soon those were dealt with. Some came over here. They were given emergency certificates for passport or migration certificates. My colleague Mr. Biswas went there, and in his report, he has said—I will read a paragraph of his report:—

"Since the introduction of the passport system, and by about the end of the first week of November, a total of about 250 families representing about 1250 persons have obtained migration certificates from the Indian Deputy High Commissioner at Dacca. There is no congestion of any kind of intending Hindu evacuees. At any rate... stationed in East Bengal and an authority of the Indian High Commission visited some of the principal stations in East Bengal soon after the 15th October and found no such congestions. We also noticed none during our tours."

Now there is no doubt about two things. When the people came away,

in a rush in the first half of October, they came away principally because of the fear of this passport system, i.e. the fear that they might not be able to come if they wanted. But it is obvious that the passport system is not the origin or cause of their fear. There is something more basic about it, otherwise they would not have come. That is patent, that does not require argument. They have this feeling of insecurity, they have this feeling of unhappiness and uncertainty about the future, apart from the other difficulties they had to face, and I think this is common ground. When they found that perhaps in the future they might not be able to come, they tried to come in a rush. Now that they have discovered that at any rate so far as the rules are framed, those who want to migrate or want to travel are quite free to do so, that particular urge of rushing in is not there. But the other thing may well be there. Of course there are persons who gradually want to shift, and there is that fear and apprehension. We have to deal with difficulties, we have to deal with imponderable things, we have to deal with specific things of course, but we have to deal with imponderable things, fear, apprehension and the rest of that.

Take this evacuee property law, which was fortunately not introduced into West Bengal and East Pakistan. Although approaches were made, to us, still that law was not introduced then. Take this evacuee property law, which from such laws as I know, seems to be a negation of all law. Yet certain circumstances compelled us to adopt that type of law, here; in Pakistan it was slightly worse, but there it is, and we go on doing things step by step, which any person with an amount of legal sense will rebel against. And what is the result of that evacuee property law there or here? Take for instance not only the evacuee, but that fantastic thing "the intending evacuee" coming on the scene. You declare a man an 'intending evacuee' because you think that he might in future do something, and so you gain a certain control over his property.

Shri Gidwani: It is not so. Unless he sends some assets to Pakistan, he is not declared as such.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know a little more about it than my hon. friend Shri Choitram Gidwani, slightly more about it. I am not discussing the clauses of the law. I am talking about the consequences of that law, and the consequences of that law in Pakistan and in India are that vast numbers of people are under fear, and

duress and oppression all the time; they cannot do any trade or any commerce or sell their property—because there is no buyer—lest they should be declared as intending evacuees. A person is not declared an evacuee now, but he might be declared an intending evacuee, so why should I get into trouble by buying or selling this property? That is the position of tens and thousands and millions of people, our nationals in India as well as many people in Pakistan. It is worse still in Pakistan. We have got tied up in different knots in all these problems and it is all very well for us to say that our hands are completely clean and Pakistan's are all red with blood. I think our case in this matter is a strong one, but it does not become strong by our looking at the picture on one side only; we have to confess that our hands are not so clean, that many things that have been done on our side are not so good; we have to confess that while it is true that we have treated our people far better governmentally and otherwise, we have to confess that we have not removed fear and apprehension from their minds. I have not a shadow of doubt that if we do the right thing, then right consequences flow from it. I do not want this House or this country to submit to an iota of anything which lowers the self-respect and dignity of this country. I do not want this House to agree to anything which is injurious to those people in whom we are interested in any way especially in East Bengal, but let us think logically and clearly how to open those knots. We do not open a knot by putting another knot on the top of it or by putting a hammer and then trying to open it. As Rabindranath Tagore said, you open a box with a key, not by hammering the lid of the box. All the methods that are suggested of hammering the box will not only open it, but will ultimately cause damage to the box and everything else. I submit that in this matter, we must adopt certainly a firm attitude, certainly a strong attitude, but at the same time a wise attitude, a far seeing attitude, and not do something in the excitement of the moment for which we might have to repent later.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Is the hon. Prime Minister ready to open afresh with the Pakistan Government the question of scrapping passports?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the hon. Member means by that. I have said that I am prepared to scrap it if they are agreeable. If by opening afresh, the hon. Member means that I should send them a letter to that effect or any telegram, I am prepared to do so, and I declare it openly here.

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): More than one telegram has already been sent to them about it.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): On a point of information on one thing that has perturbed me. May I know what sort of unclean things have been done in India during recent months, because this statement of hon. Prime Minister will give a handle to the Pakistan Government?

Pandit Algu Rai Shastri: That must be cleared up.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Among them are many speeches delivered by members of organisations to which I made reference.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Government's hands have been clean completely?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They have been clean, so far as I know.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is enough for us.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put the amendments to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the only method of solving the East Bengal problem is to bring about a peaceful exchange of population between the Hindus in East Bengal and the Muslims in West Bengal with suitable adjustment of properties on Governmental level."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that as the Government of Pakistan has failed to secure the protection of the elementary democratic and human rights of its minorities the Government of India should take firm and energetic action in terms of the Partition Agreement and other agreements with Pakistan to secure the just rights of the minority community to enable them to live in that State with honour and security."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government has failed to tackle the serious situation arising out of the systematic squeezing out of the minorities from East Pakistan and it should impress upon the Government of Pakistan, the necessity of securing the protection of the elementary democratic rights of the minorities according to the terms of Partition Agreement and subsequent agreements with Pakistan in this respect."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same this House is of opinion—

- (1) that the Pakistan Government have failed to implement the terms of Indo-Pak Agreements with regard to protection of the minorities;
- (2) that such failure on the part of Pakistan Government constitutes a violation of the basic condition of partition;
- (3) that the Government of India have also failed to secure the implementation of such Indo-Pakistan agreements and to discharge their responsibility in the matter of the protection of the life, honour and property of the minority in East Pakistan; and
- (4) that the rehabilitation of the migrants from East Bengal has been utterly inadequate, thus adding to the miseries of millions of people.

This House, therefore, deplors the Government's attitude of complacency in this matter, specially after the introduction of passport and visa, and urges upon the Government—

- (1) to provide for adequate rehabilitation of those who have come; and
- (2) to take firm and effective steps including economic sanctions so that conditions may be created in East Pakistan which would enable the minorities to live in peace and honour and thus to fulfil the pledges and honour the assurances given by the Prime:

Minister to the minorities at the time of Partition."

Mr. Chairman: The number of those against the amendment is so preponderantly large that I will not be justified in calling a division. Where is the use of counting, when the number is so large? I declare that the Noes have it.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I demand a division.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: What is the rule?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: The counting must be announced.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: The division makes it known who is for and who is against. The country wants to know.

Mr. Chairman: Rule 266(3) says:

"If the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of a question is challenged, he may, if he thinks fit, ask the members who are for 'Aye' and those for 'No' respectively to rise in their places and, on a count being taken, he may declare the determination of the House. In such a case, the names of the voters shall not be recorded."

If hon. Members are so anxious about counting, I will take the count. But I think it is evident that there is a preponderating majority against and we need not go into it.

The amendment was negated.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion the following be added:

"and having considered the same this House declares its firm determination to secure by peaceful means the settlement of all issues outstanding between India and Pakistan and to further friendly, economic, social and cultural relations between the two countries."

The motion was negated.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government has failed to protect the lives and honour of millions

of Scheduled Castes men and women who have not the means to come to India; and calls upon the Government to take effective steps so that the Scheduled Castes in Pakistan may live in security; and to arrange for the evacuation of those Scheduled Castes who do not feel secure in Pakistan with Government expenditure."

The motion was negated.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Pakistan Government having failed to honour the Indo-Pak agreements and to discharge its responsibilities for the protection of its minorities the Government of India should adopt a firm and strong policy towards Pakistan to ensure that the minorities can live in Eastern Pakistan in safety and with honour."

The motion was negated.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion—

- (a) that the Pakistan Government has violated the Indo-Pak agreements and has deliberately followed a policy of squeezing out its minorities periodically and systematically,
- (b) that the Government of India has failed to take firm attitude to ensure protection of minorities to whom solemn assurances had been given at the time of partition,
- (c) that the periodical influx of East Bengal refugees is upsetting the economy and endangering the peace and security of India, and
- (d) that it is no longer possible for India to absorb or rehabilitate more refugees.

This House therefore urges upon the Government of India to demand from the Pakistan Government the transfer of sufficient territory to India for the resettlement of East Pakistan refugees and to adopt a firm attitude to ensure that there is no further exodus from East Pakistan and the minorities there can live in peace, honour and safety."

The motion was negated.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India has failed to realise the gravity of the situation and also to deal with it in a proper manner as a self-respecting Nation and therefore urges upon the Government of India to take all possible and immediate steps to permanently secure the protection of life, honour and property of the Hindus in their own homes in East Bengal."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion, that Pakistan has failed to protect its

minorities and has adopted a deliberate policy of squeezing them out from time to time."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Pakistan has failed to fulfil the minimum responsibility of any civilized Government to protect the lives, property and honour of its minorities."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"and having considered the same, this House approves all the steps taken so far in the matter."

The House divided: Ayes: 216; Noes: 59.

Division No. 1

AYES

[6-20 P.M.]

Abdullahai, Mulla
Abdus Sattar, Shri
Achint Ram Lal
Achuthan, Shri
Agarwal, Prof.
Agarwal Shri M. L.
Aktekar, Shri
Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari
Azad, Maulana
Bala-subramaniam, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Banasi, Shri
Barnan, Shri
Beseppa, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhartiya, Shri S. R.
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhatt, Shri C. S.
Bhawani, Shri
Bheekha Bhai, Shri
Bhosale, Major-General
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Borooah, Shri
Bose, Shri P. C.
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Charak, Shri
Chatterjee, Dr. Smitranjan
Chaturvedi, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri G. L.
Chaudhury, Shri R. K.
Chaudhri, Shri N. Shafee

Damodaran, Shri G. R.
Das, Shri B.
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri Ram Dhani
Das, Shri S. N.
Das, Shri N. T.
Datar, Shri
Deb, Shri S. C.
Desai, Shri K. K.
Dholakia, Shri
Dhusiya, Shri
Diwan, Shri R. S.
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Dube, Shri U. S.
Dubey, Shri R. G.
Dutt, Shri A. K.
Dutta, Shri S. K.
Ebenezer, Dr.
Elaysperumal, Shri
Fotedar, Pandit
Gadgil, Shri
Gandhi, Shri Feroze
Gandhi, Shri M. M.
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Garg, Shri R. P.
Ghose, Shri S. M.
Ghosh, Shri A.
Ghulam Qadar, Shri
Giri, Shri V. V.
Gounder, Shri K. P.
Gounder, Shri K. S.
Hazari, Shri J. N.
Heda, Shri

He m Raj, Shri
Hembrom, Shri
Hyder Husein, Ch.
Ibrahim, Shri
Iyyani, Shri E.
Iyyanni, Shri C. R.
Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Jain, Shri A. P.
Jajware, Shri
Jangde, Shri
Jasani, Shri
Jaysahri, Shrimati
Jena, Shri Niranjan
Jethan, Shri
Jha, Shri Bhagwat
Jhunjunwala, Shri
Joshi, Shri, Jethalal
Joshi, Shri Krishnacharya
Joshi, Shri M. D.
Joshi, Shri N. L.
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Jwala Prashad, Shri
Kajrolkar, Shri
Kakkan, Shri
Kale, Shrimati A.
Kamraj, Shri
Karmarkar, Shri
Kasliwal, Shri
Katiya, Dr.
Kazmi, Shri
Keshavlengar, Shri
Khen, Shri S. A.
Khongmen, Shrimati
Kidwai, Shri R. A.

Krolkar, Shri	Nehru, Shrimati Uma	Sidhananjappa, Shri
Kolay, Shri	Neswi, Shri	Singh, Shri D. N.
Krishna Chandra, Shri	Nijalingappa, Shri	Singh, Shri H. P.
Kureel, Shri B. N.	Pannalal, Shri	Singh, Shri L. J.
Kureel, Shri P. L.	Pant, Shri D. D.	Singh, Shri T. N.
Lal, Shri R. S.	Parekh, Dr. J. N.	Singhal, Shri S. C.
Lalanji, Shri	Parmar, Shri R. B.	Sinha, Dr. S.
Lakshmayya, Shri	Patel, Shri B. K.	Sinha, Shri A. P.
Lingam, Shri N. M.	Patel, Shri Rajeshwar	Sinha, Shri Anirudha
Maitra, Pandit L. K.	Patel, Shrimati Maniben	Sinha, Shri G. P.
Majhai, Shri R. C.	Pawar, Shri V. P.	Sinha, Shri Jhulan
Majithia, Sardar	Prabhakar, Shri N.	Sinha, Shri N. P.
Malliah, Shri U. S.	Raghubir Sahai, Shri	Sinha, Shri S.
Malviya, Pandit C. N.	Raj Bahadur, Shri	Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwar
Malviya, Shri Motilal	Ramananda Tirtha, Swami	Sinhasan Singh, Shri
Mandal, Dr. P.	Ramaswamy, Shri P.	Somana, Shri N.
Masuoedi, Maulana	Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.	Subrahmanyam, Shri T.
Masuriya Din, Shri	Rane, Shri	Suresh Chandra, Dr.
Maydeo, Shrimati	Reddy, Shri H. S.	Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu
Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha	Roy, Dr. Satyaban	Telikra, Shri
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Roy, Shri Patiram	Thomas, Shri A. M.
Mishra, Shri L. N.	Rup Narain, Shri	Tivari, Shri V. N.
Misra, Pandit Lingaraj	Sahu, Shri Bhagavar	Tiwari, Pandit B. L.
Misra, Shri B. N.	Sahu, Shri Rameshwar	Tripathi, Shri K. P.
Misra, Shri R. D.	Saigal, Sardar A. S.	Tudu, Shri B. L.
Misra, Shri S. P.	Saksena, Shri Mohanlal	Tyagi, Shri
Mohd. Akbar, Sofi	Samanta, Shri S. C.	Uikey, Shri
Mohiuddin, Shri	Sangama, Shri	Upadhyay, Shri M. D.
More, Shri K. L.	Sankarapandian, Shri	Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
Mudaliar, Shri C. R.	Satish Chandra, Shri	Vaishnav, Shri H. G.
Musafir, Giani G. S.	Sen, Shri P. G.	Vaishya, Shri M. B.
Muthukrishnan, Shri	Sen, Shrimati Sushama	Varma, Shri B. B.
Nair, Shri C. K.	Shah, Shri R. B.	Varma, Shri B. R.
Narasimhan, Shri. C. R.	Shahnawaz Khan, Shri	Vidyalankar, Shri
Naskar, Shri. P. S.	Sharma, Pandit K. C.	Vyas, Shri Radhelal
Natawadkar, Shri.	Sharma, Prof. D. C.	Wilson, Shri J. N.
Natesan, Shri.	Sharma, Shri K. R.	Wodeyar, Shri
Nehru, Shri Jawahar Lal	Shastri, Pandit A. R.	Zaidi, Col.

NOES

Achalu, Shri	Kachiroyar, Shri	Raghavaohari, Shri
Bahadur Singh, Shri	Kandasamy, Shri	Ramaseshaiah, Shri
Basu, Shri K. K.	Kelappan, Shri	Ramnarayan Singh, Babur
Boovaraghasamy, Shri	Khare, Dr. N. B.	Rao, Dr. Rama
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu	Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta	Rao, Shri P. R.
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.	Krishna, Shri M. R.	Rao, Shri K. Subba
Chatterjee, Shri Tuskar	Lal Singh, Sardar	Rao, Shri P. Subba
Chaudhuri, Shri T. K.	Mangalagiri, Shri	Reddi, Shri B. Y.
Chowdhury, Shri N. B.	Mehta, Shri Jaswantraj	Reddi, Shri Madhao
Damodaran, Shri N. P.	Menon, Shri Damodara	Reddy, Shri Esvara
Das, Shri B. C.	Mookerjee, Dr. S. P.	Reddy, Shri R. N.
Das, Shri Sarangadhar	Mukerjee, Shri H. N.	Rishang Keishing, Shri
Deo, Shri R. N. J	Muniswamy, Shri	Saha, Shri Meghnad
Deogram, Shri	Murthy, Shri B. S.	Singh, Shri R. N.
Deahpande, Shri V. G.	Nambiar, Shri	Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
Gidwani, Shri C. P.	Nathani, Shri H. R.	Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
Girdhari Bhoi, Shri	Nayar, Shri V. P.	Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
Gurupadaswamy, Shri	Pandey, Dr. Natabar	Swamy, Shri N. R. M.
Hukam Singh, Sardar	Punnoose, Shri	Veeraswami, Shri
Jena, Shri Lakshmidhar		Verma, Shri Ramji

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

the steps taken so far in the matter."

"That the situation arising out of the migrations between Pakistan and India be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House approves all

The motion was adopted.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter to Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 17th November, 1952.