

India during the year 1956 and during 1957 so far?

The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Raghuramiah): 16 officers of the armed forces of foreign countries have visited India as members of delegations or on other official duties during 1956, and 27 officers and 1 other rank during 1957. Of the 43 officers, 10 were General Officers or of equivalent ranks in the Navy and the Air Force and the remainder were Colonels or below.

Drilling for Oil in Bombay

177. Sardar Iqbal Singh: Will the Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 212 on the 24th May, 1957 and state whether any progress has been made since then with regard to drilling in selected places near Bombay (Kaira District) for finding oil?

The Minister of Mines and Oil (Shri K. D. Malaviya): At present only one site, 5 miles north-west of Cambay has been selected for drilling. Preparations for carrying out drilling are in progress. Drilling rig procured from the U.S.S.R. Government is being transported to the site. The foundation work for the drilling rig and the construction of tube well for water supply are in progress.

12 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AT REHABILITATION MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Mr. Speaker: There is an adjournment motion tabled by Shri Bimal Ghose and Shrimati Renu Chakravarty regarding the statement made by the Minister of Rehabilitation at the Rehabilitation Ministers' Conference in Darjeeling in connection with the rehabilitation of future migrants from East Pakistan. I have put it down for this day. The hon. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal

Nehru): I have not been able to understand how this question has become one for adjournment.

Mr. Speaker: I only wanted to hear him, whether he would like to make a statement on this matter.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Minister for Rehabilitation in the course of a conference in Darjeeling made certain suggestions for the consideration of that conference and later. The first point is that no decisions were arrived at at all. It is an idea thrown out for consideration and it will no doubt be considered not only there, but by the Central Government and by this Parliament too possibly.

Secondly, I am not aware of the fact, as stated in these motions for adjournment and I believe in a question too, that this Government or in fact any national leaders have undertaken to support all the minorities that live in Pakistan for future ages indefinitely. It is an impossible position. In fact, it just cannot be done. Even passing of a resolution or Act of Parliament does not produce results; it cannot be done.

May I say, there is no question, of course, of people being stopped from coming and going. They are welcome; they are welcome to migrate even to India. But the question was whether we should give a continuing guarantee that whoever comes from East Pakistan for whatever period in future will be the responsibility of the Government of Bengal or the Government of India. We have never done that. I do not see how any Government can do that. We have, as is well known, received in East Bengal, i.e. in the eastern section only, 4,200,000 refugees and it has been a tremendous task to settle them. Some have been settled and some, as hon. Members know, are very far from being settled or rehabilitated. In Bengal itself or in Tripura or in Assam, there is practically no room left. You have to go to other places. Therefore, for us to give vague promises for the future that we shall take everybody of the 9 million

remaining people of the minorities in East Bengal seems to be rather a large order to make, a large assumption. As I said, this was an idea thrown out for consideration. If this House wishes to discuss it, we shall discuss it in this House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): May I seek one clarification? As far as my adjournment motion was concerned, I have not raised the question of the Government of India giving protection to the national minorities in our State. The hon. Prime Minister has said no decisions were taken at the Darjeeling conference. As far as we know, and the papers have flashed it, I think four or five decisions were taken. Whether they are final or not, I do not know.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not said that no decisions were taken. I said, no decisions were taken on this subject of the adjournment motion. Other decisions might have been taken which have no relation to this.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Our point is, already the migration numbers have come down. What was the necessity without consulting the Parliament—I do not know whether he consulted the Cabinet—to raise an issue whether we are going for all time to come to give rehabilitation benefit or not in a situation in which it was absolutely unnecessary to raise it at all, and in a situation when the Kashmir question as well as the question of joint electorates and separate electorates have raised very serious doubts and fears in the minds of the minorities? If we read the statement made by the Prime Minister in this House when he placed on the Table of the House the Liaquat Ali-Nehru Pact, at that very moment, he said very clearly that so far as the refugees are concerned, the Government of India has undertaken unlimited responsibility for their welfare. Earlier also, once before, the Minister for Rehabilitation stated that after a particular date no further migrants would be allowed and immediately there was a huge influx. That is why we feel so perturbed about the fact

that the Minister should go and take certain decisions which may not be of a firm character, but which raise serious doubts in the minds of minorities elsewhere.

Shri Bimal Ghose (Barrackpore): May I add a few words, because I was rather surprised and a little pained by the statement made by the Prime Minister? I was surprised because he said that no final decision has been taken. We know that. But a responsible Central Minister has thrown out a suggestion and it is at that time that we must consider this, because if decisions are taken, then the matter becomes closed more or less. The responsible Central Minister has said that rehabilitation facilities would be withdrawn and since this has been published, this is the time....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Withdrawn from whom?

Shri Bimal Ghose: Withdrawn from future migrants.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How can anything be withdrawn in the future when it is not given?

Shri Bimal Ghose: I am coming to that. I was surprised at the argument made by the Prime Minister for not admitting the adjournment motion. Coming to the question as to whether an assurance has been given by the Prime Minister, by this country, in regard to future migrants from East Pakistan, I am a little pained. I know that no assurance has been given to every single individual of the minority community in East Pakistan. But I should like to remind the hon. Prime Minister that responsible leaders in this country have stated that we would regard ourselves as trustees of the members of the minority community who were in Pakistan; and, because of the conditions for which they were not responsible and because they agreed to the division of the country and we got our independence, we have contracted a debt of honour. Should we now go back and say that, if they are forced to come away for

[Shri Bimal Ghose]

conditions for which they are not responsible, this Government will not take any responsibility for their condition? The question of rehabilitation benefit is an entirely different thing. Refugees have come over and Government have to discharge the debt of honour, taking upon themselves the responsibility. In future, if migrants come over, does the hon. Prime Minister feel that they should be vagrants here, that they should die and the Government will just look upon the situation? The difference he wants to make is really a very thin one and will not bear scrutiny, that he will permit people to come over, not give them any assistance and let them die on the streets.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not merely surprised to listen to the eloquence of the hon. Member opposite. If I may use a stronger word, I am astounded at the irrelevance of what the hon Member has said. Here is a Member of the Government suggesting for the consideration of the Conference of Rehabilitation Ministers that we have to think in terms of the future; there is no good being vague about it and asking them to think about it and asking us to think about it. And, I am told, "Oh! He has no business to do it" and an adjournment motion is brought because he has ventured to ask the people to think about a problem in a particular way

I do submit this is beyond any logic or reason or rules or anything else that I can think of. Not only was he right, but I propose to refer to this matter again and again for people to think about it. It is an important matter and I do not see why we should feel shy about it. Whatever we may decide or Parliament may decide, here is a question and we must not whisper about it, we must not talk about it! It is a most vital question which should not only be talked about but shouted about as to what the future is going to be.

Therefore, to say that there should be an adjournment motion, I submit, is out of the question. It is all beyond reasonable provocation to put forward this thing.

The second question is which the hon. Member, Shri Bimal Ghose, has raised about people starving, in eloquent and defamatory language. I really cannot understand this. An hon. Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty read something I said in 1950—that it is the Centre's responsibility. What? Of course, all those people who have come over here; not all the minorities of Pakistan are to be settled by us in future days for ever. It is impossible for any country to undertake that. And it is unfair to those minorities and it is unfair to India for they will never settle down anywhere.

The 1950 Agreement took place, if the House will remember, in order to facilitate the return of the refugees because, early in 1950, owing to a scare, large numbers of people had come from Eastern Pakistan to India and large numbers of people had gone to Pakistan from India, both sides. Owing to scare, large numbers of people had gone to Western Pakistan even from UP, Rajasthan, etc; some from West Bengal too. Now, because of this scare we met and the major thing we decided was that these people should go back, the migrants should return. In fact, several hundred thousand migrants returned because of the assurance given about fair treatment etc etc. That was the main thing decided.

At that time I stated that for the people who remained here—it was an assurance to the Bengal Government—we are prepared to take the responsibility because the burden is too heavy. We had taken it up and in fact we have spent vast sums of money.

But the point to be considered is—and I say so—from the point of view of those minorities themselves. We are interested in them; nobody denies

that. But, are we to say—because what the hon. Member said may ultimately come to that—that we take an indefinite, unlimited responsibility, not in terms of years, for the people who had gone that we shall look after them? Anyhow, I don't wish to enter into this argument. But I do protest against the context in which Mr. Bimal Ghose raised this matter and the speech he has made, for really they may tend to make matters worse.

Shri Bimal Ghose: May I submit. .

Mr. Speaker: There ought to be an end to this discussion. This adjournment motion is ill-conceived. I never wanted this adjournment motion to be raised here. But, as all were interested in the welfare of the refugees, and as the Government has been taking interest, I wanted to know from the hon. Minister the latest position regarding this matter to clear up any possible misunderstanding. It has been done. To say by way of an adjournment motion that the Government is not even competent to think in those terms and find out whether the present situation requires a change of policy, assuming that it is a change of policy,—to say that it ought to be done by this House etc. seems to me rather curious. I disallow this motion.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May we have an opportunity of discussing this?

Mr. Speaker: I cannot say. The hon. Member knows how to move the House with respect to these matters. Now, papers to be laid on the Table.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—East): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: When the point is over, where is the point of order?

Shri Sadhan Gupta: While giving a ruling about the admissibility of an adjournment motion, we hope you won't express any opinion about whether the adjournment motion is right or wrong. You might leave it to us—both sides of the House. It is better

for you to say that this motion is not admissible under the rules. When you use the word "curious" or "ill-conceived" it gets quite a different colour.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Is the hon. Member trying to advise you as to how you should conduct your high office?

Mr. Speaker: So far as the word "ill-conceived" is concerned, there is nothing wrong in saying that a motion is ill-conceived. There may be something else which is conceived properly.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATION ISSUED UNDER REQUISITIONING AND ACQUISITION OF IMMOVABLE PROPERTY ACT

The Minister of Health (Shri Karmarkar): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 22 of the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952, a copy of the Notification No. SRO 3252, dated the 12th October, 1957, making certain amendments to the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Rules, 1953 [Placed in Library. See No. LT-327/57.]

STATEMENTS SHOWING ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON ASSURANCES ETC.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given by Ministers during the various sessions shown against each:—

- (1) Supplementary Statement No. III—Second Session, 1957 of Second Lok Sabha. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 54].
- (2) Supplementary Statement No. IV—First Session, 1957 of Second Lok Sabha. [See Appendix I, annexure No. 55].