

[Shri Mehr Chand Khanna]

are eligible, we will see what best can be done; our idea is to see that they are rehabilitated.

Shri S. M. Banerjee rose—

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow any further discussion. I have allowed him ample opportunity. Those persons who have been asked to go have sent in their representations. In respect of displaced persons, the hon. Minister says that on a prior occasion they took steps; as regards those who still remain to be accommodated and provided for, the hon. Minister will kindly do the needful.

Regarding those who move from one part of Assam to another part for more favourable conditions and so on, it seems clear that that is an area which belongs to the tribals, it ought to be reserved for them and no intrusion ought to be made. Certainly, they will be separated; to persons who are settled there and are displaced persons, everything that is possible so far as displaced persons are concerned, will be done. Let there be no harshness in evicting them. I do not think that anybody would do so; nor is the hon. Minister here responsible for it. The hon. Minister has also agreed to place before the House as much information as he gathers. As soon as he gets more details regarding this, he will place them on the Table of the House.

I do not think it is necessary for me to give my consent to this adjournment motion.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): Can the hon. Minister give an assurance that without providing some alternative arrangement for their rehabilitation, those people who were there for about six or seven years will not be evicted forcibly through elephants and so on?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member knows that in respect of any person who moves from one part to another part, the hon. Minister cannot give an assurance, but with respect to displac-

ed persons, the hon. Minister has said that he will look into their cases.

Shri A. C. Guha: I mean only for displaced persons.

Mr. Speaker: That is all right. If they are displaced persons staying there for five or six years, he has undertaken to see that as far as possible, provision is made for them.

Shri Mehr Chand Khanna: Those who are eligible for rehabilitation benefits and have not received any rehabilitation benefits—I am prepared to look into those cases.

REPORTED OCCUPATION OF THE SALT LAKE IN LADAKH BY CHINESE

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of another adjournment motion from Shri Braj Raj Singh, relating to the reported occupation of the Salt Lake in Ladakh by the Chinese. What is this matter about? Is it not already covered in the previous discussions? He has said:

"It is reported by one of the foremost political parties in Jammu and Kashmir that the Salt Lake in Ladakh has been occupied by the Chinese and the local Indian population there is not getting the salt. . ."

Has there been a fresh encroachment or fresh aggression?

Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir): This was denied by the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): I want the Prime Minister to enlighten the country about the conflicting and contradictory reports emanating from the Government of India and the Government of Jammu and Kashmir. According to the report, "the people of Zanskar, who had been using salt from Chantham have been refused access to it by the Chinese military

and those who had gone to Chantham for salt were beaten up". The report also said:

"A considerable number of unknown people in the guise of Buddhist monks have entered Zanskar from the Tibetan side".

Mr. Speaker: Is this lake situated in the area which was occupied some-time ago, with respect to which there had been a discussion in the House? Or is it a new act of aggression?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: This is a place which is our territory, territory in our occupation (*Interruptions*). There is a contradiction in the report of the Government about this.

The report says:

"Commenting on a Jammu report that the Chinese had occupied the Chantham salt mines in Ladakh, an External Affairs Ministry spokesman said on Friday that the Government of India were making inquiries".

On almost the same day, the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir told the State Assembly that the reports were quite baseless and there was no truth in them. My point is: how did the Government of India not know about this and how did they make a statement here without ascertaining facts from the Government of Jammu and Kashmir? Without ascertaining facts from other sources, they made a statement here which were contradictory to the statement of the Jammu and Kashmir Government.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I do not think there is any contradiction. In this motion for adjournment itself, reference is made to the denial by the Jammu and Kashmir Government and the statement made by the External Affairs Ministry. The External Affairs Ministry made the

statement after receipt of information from the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and such other sources as they have here. They have both denied them.

The hon. Member talked about some Chinese in the guise of Buddhist monks going to this particular area. That has been denied. That particular area he referred to is roughly 150 miles in the heart of our territory. So there is no question of border incursion. Nobody can say that some disguised persons may not go there. I cannot suddenly deny it, that somewhere in the mountainous area one or two disguised persons are there. But, our information is, no such thing has happened; and it is based on information received from the Jammu and Kashmir Government who are dealing with this matter. I have before me a letter from the Chief Minister; and, I think, he made a statement in his Assembly yesterday or the day before yesterday on this very subject. So, I do not quite know what more I am to add except one thing that even the climate today is against any such thing happening. It is practically difficult. In the middle of the cold weather people wandering about there is exceedingly unlikely. But, as I said, factually it has been denied by the Jammu and Kashmir Government on the information at their disposal.

Mr. Speaker: All that the hon. Member has stated is that he has no independent information except what has appeared in the statement of some political parties. He only wanted some clarification and the clarification has been given by the hon. Prime Minister. He depends for this information on the information given by the Prime Minister of Kashmir that there has been no such occupation of the salt lake. Some casual Bhikkus coming there does not indicate any aggression or occupation.

In view of the statement, it is not necessary to pursue this matter. I am not giving my consent to the adjournment motion.