

taken to salvage you from this situation. And it is true that some of the countries are likely to be economically affected. But I salute the people of those countries that notwithstanding this impending difficulty they are very firm on their commitment against apartheid, they are prepared to suffer to dismantle apartheid. And naturally the Commonwealth countries will have to go into this question. They will have to go into the details. They will have to work out the details as to how best to salvage such countries from the difficulties that they are likely to confront. And I assure the hon. Members that so far as India is concerned, it would not leave any stone unturned for the purpose of finding out the best of the solutions that are necessary in order to ultimately achieve the objective of dismantling the apartheid.

Sir, I thought that these particular submissions of mine have not specifically gone into the question that have been raised by the various hon. Members. Some hon. Members have asked a very direct question whether India has got the courage to take steps. India has only survived on the courage. (*Interruptions*) It is over the years. We have survived. We have faced the odds. We have tried to stand up on our own. And that shall be our policy. We shall not be swerved by the influence of 'A' country or 'B' country. We would only follow the footsteps of our elders, the ethos and values to which we stand committed. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

IV. Law and order problem in Darjeeling district arising out of the agitation by Gorkha National Liberation Front on the 27th July, 1986

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI BUTA SINGH): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Gorkha National Liberation Front has recently been engaged in a series of agitational activities. Their main demand appear to be the creation of a separate State of Gorkhaland and the abrogation of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty of 1950.

In April 1986 the Gorkha National Liberation Front organised a black flag agitation in Darjeeling. The Front organised a 72-hour bandh from May 12 to 14, 1986 in Darjeeling District. During the bandh there were several incidents of violence. Agitators at Panighat under Naxalbari police station attacked police forces, who ultimately had to open fire killing one person. Later, on May 25, 1986 following the arrest of some persons accused in certain cases, Gorkha National Liberation Front Supporters took out a procession at Kurseong violating prohibitory orders and later attacked police personnel, who were forced to fire resulting in the death of 5 persons and injuries to two others. The situation almost came to normal after a few days.

The Central Government made available para-military forces to the State Government as requested by them; in all 5 Companies of CRPF and 3 Companies of BSF were made available.

Again, the Gorkha National Liberation Front gave a call for the boycott of those who accepted the literary award to be given by the Nepali Academy on the 13th July, 1986 which is the birth anniversary of Bhanu Bhakta, a renowned Nepali poet. However, there was not much response to this call.

Meanwhile Gorkha National Liberation Front had planned agitation programme for 27th July which involved public burning of Article 7 of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty, 1950, in different parts of Darjeeling District. In view of this the Government of West Bengal had extended the existing prohibitory orders u/s 144 Cr. P.C. in the town of Darjeeling and Kurseong. The prohibitory orders were also imposed in Kalimpong town.

On 27th July the Gorkha National Liberation Front supporters in large number tried to violate prohibitory orders in Kalimpong when 27 persons were arrested. Subsequently the Police had to intervene to prevent fresh attempts to violate prohibitory orders which led to confrontation between violent mobs armed with Khukries and Police. The violent mob damaged

public property including road transport vehicles. The police used lathis and tear gas as well as opened fire to bring the situation under control. As a result of this as per the latest information available from the State Government 11 persons in all have died which includes one Constable of the State armed Police. About 32 persons were injured apart from one DIG and several police-men. Two CRPF jawans are reported to be grievously injured.

On the evening of 27th the State Government called in the Army in aid of Civil Administration in Kalimpong, and imposed indefinite curfew in that town. As per the latest reports there have been no incidents so far in Kalimpong after the induction of the Army. Three Companies of paramilitary forces were made available on 26th July, 1986 on the request of the State Government and 3 additional companies of BSF are now being made available to the local administration.

In protest against the incidents of 27th, the Gorkha National Liberation Front has given a call for 108-hours bandh with effect from 12-noon today in affected areas of Darjeeling District. Meanwhile Army units from Siliguri and Darjeeling are moving towards Kurseong to ensure that the hill road between Siliguri and Darjeeling is kept open.

The Central Government is in touch with the State Government and it is hoped that the situation will soon return to normalcy. Any political demand supported by violence is against the law and Constitution of the country. Any attempt to go beyond the norms established by law and the Constitution will undermine the democratic set up of the country. It is my earnest hope that there will be no further recourse to violence which may lead to further loss of life and destruction of public property.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, the statement issued by the Home Minister gives a narration of the development of the movement being led by the Gorkha National Liberation Front there. But from a hurried look, it does not appear as to what the attitude of the Government is towards the demand of the

Gorkha National Liberation Front. That is the question of formation of a Nepali-speaking State outside West Bengal and inside the Indian territory. That is the vital and important political question about which the hon. Home Minister seems to be silent. I still remember, Sir, when the House was discussing several days back a Starred Question put forward by Comrade Sukomal Sen, when the Prime Minister was present in the House, when he was confronted with the suggestion from some Members of the Opposition that Government should make clear its stand about the demand for the formation of a separate Nepali-speaking State, the hon. Prime Minister conspicuously remained silent. What he said was that the Central Government will not act over the head of the State Government but will act unitedly with the State Government. This silence of the Prime Minister is also reflected in the statement of Mr. Bata Singh. This is quite intriguing to me because, Sir, the situation that we face in Darjeeling district or some part of Darjeeling district is really alarming. Today morning I came from Calcutta. I have detailed information of what actually happened there. In my opinion, more or less a part of the border where the agitation is another part of the Indian frontier facing the Himalayas which we may also consider to be a sensitive part of our country. This is also alarming because that is a part of our border where the agitations taking place and it is a sensitive border because of many reasons known to us. Let us not go into the details about it. Therefore, once again, another part of the Indian border seems to be threatened by a movement which is more or less of the like of Punjab movement.

Sir, the demand of the movement is the formation of a separat State of Nepali-speaking people. I had been to Darjeeling only some days back. I had seen with my own eyes that printed maps are being circulated with the portrait of their self-styled leader, Mr. Subhash Gheishung wherein it is delineated that a future Himalayan State will be born with a part of the Darjeeling district where Nepali speaking people reside along with Nepal and Sikhim. Therefore, Sir, the so-called innoc-

ous demand at the present moment of time of the formation of a Nepali State may ultimately turn out to be a State outside India consisting of some countries outside India, maybe that it will be a buffer State. And we know what fate remains for them when great powers, particularly America tend to offer help on the Indian border. Therefore, Sir, it is not an innocuous demand of a linguistic state being formed with the Nepali speaking people but it is a demand and it is a moment having connections, I suppose, with the forces which are out to destabilise the country which are out to dismember the country, which are out to threaten the integrity, national integrity and sovereignty of the country. (Time bell rings)

May I kindly, Sir, expect you to be a little more indulgent because I come from that State and I have some very important points to share with the Members of Parliament and with our honoured Member of the Government holding the important portfolio of Home?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot make a full length speech.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I am not doing that. I am only trying to drive the gravity of the situation to the knowledge of the Home Minister, who seems to be oblivious of it.

Sir, the point is that a demand is for the formation of a State and the point is that some forces are at work there and the point is that the demand at the moment is having a link outside the country, the point is that cassetted speech recorded speech of Mr. Subhash Gheishing is being circulated in the same way the speech of Mr. Bhindrawale was circulated in Punjab and we are told that it was money from Canada that came to Punjab and now it is money from Nepal is trickling down in the stretches of Kurseong Darjeeling. Therefore, there is grave similarity and there is no hints in the statement which has been just given by Mr. Buta Singh. Secondly, Sir, today there is a statement, there is a news appearing in the Jugantar, a leading Bengali journal of Calcutta. The news says that yesterday Mr. Subhash Gheishing categorically stated

in Darjeeling that Mr. Ram Kishan Sarogi, once upon a time a Congress leader and a member of S. S. Ray Cabinet met him and requested him to go over to Delhi and he had purchased an air ticket for him and Mr. Sarogi had telephoned Delhi from Kalimpong and he had talked with some very important person in Delhi and having an assurance from the leaders of Delhi that he requested him to come over to Delhi. Sir, this is very important because if Subhash Gheishing is asked to come to Delhi and if Government of India shows an indication to negotiate the matter with him over the head of the Government of West Bengal and if this is initiated by a member of ex-Congress cabinet, this is a very serious matter. And, I say that this Ram Kishan Sarogi was sent there by Mr. S. S. Ray. I charge. Mr. S. S. Ray was a politician but now he is a Governor. The Governor of Punjab has enough time to think of West Bengal. I do not know how much of time he devotes over Punjab. But he has surplus time to think of West Bengal and, therefore, Sir...

श्री कल्पनाथ राय (उत्तर प्रदेश)

आदरणीय उपगभूपति महोदय, मेरा एक व्यक्ति का प्रश्न है। श्री गिद्धार्थ शंकर राय गवर्नर हैं और इस सदन में मौजूद नहीं हैं। उनका नाम इनको रेफर नहीं करना चाहिए।

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): So what?

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, there is a proverb in Bengali that a Bengali woman cannot name the husband or the elder brother of the husband. But my relations with Mr. S.S. Ray are not like this. I can refer to his name. It is up to the Government to go into detail and find out whether my complaint is correct. My point is this that Mr. S.S. Ray is meddling into the politics of West Bengal and Gorkhaland and there is concrete proof because Mr. Sarogi was the agent of Mr. S.S. Ray when he was contesting elections, not as a Congress candidate, but as an independent candidate. Therefore, relations between Mr. Sarogi and Mr. S. S. Ray are quite clear. Secondly, Sir, I quote. Mr. Subroto Mukherjee,

[Shri Gurudas Das Gupta]

leader of the West Bengal Congress, who has said on a number of occasions that a part of Darjeeling Congressmen are associating with this moment. Therefore, sending of Mr. Sarogi to Mr. Subhash Geishing and participation by a section of Congressmen in this movement coupled with the conspicuous silence of the Government of India on the nature of the political demand breeds suspicion in my mind and breathes a doubt because there is a feeling that the attitude of the Government of India towards the demands of Nepal State is soft and, therefore, there is a gradual feeling in the political circles, in the minds of the organisers of the movement in the Darjeeling district that the attitude of the Government of India towards the demands is soft. Therefore, if a thrust is given to the movement, if the movement can be given a little more momentum, then the Government will negotiate with them in the same way it has done with Laldenga and the demand for formation of a separate State of the Nepali people will be a reality. Sir, this doubt or this confusion or this apprehension must be dispelled. The Government of India must tell in unambiguous terms as to what its attitude is towards the demands for formation of Nepali-speaking State in India outside West Bengal.

My second point is, *(Time bell rings)* these Liberation Front leaders are making use of some genuine feelings of Nepali people and one of the genuine feelings of Nepali people is non-inclusion of Nepali Language in the Eighth Schedule. This is being misused by these people. West Bengal Assembly had passed a resolution on a number of occasions requesting the Government that they should include this language in the Eighth Schedule. Now, to assuage the violent feelings of the Nepali people, I suggest, the Government of India should include Nepali language in the Eighth Schedule and I would like to know the hon. Minister whether he is prepared to do it.

My third question is, Government of India must make available more funds to

the Government of West Bengal so that more developmental projects can be undertaken in that particular area.

Lastly, Sir, I request the Government of India to categorically state as to what is its attitude towards the political demands of Nepali people, whether they are ready to include Nepali language in the Eighth Schedule and whether they are ready to make more funds available for the development of the poverty-stricken Nepali hill people of Darjeeling district.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal):

It is good that the hon. Minister of Home Affairs has come out with a statement on the developments in Darjeeling district, in regard to the activities of the Gorkha National Liberation Front. I have gone through the statement but I am dismayed at the concluding part of it. At Yesterday's happenings where some people died, it was the occasion of burning of a copy of the Indo-Nepal Treaty. They are objecting to clause 7 of this treaty which was signed in 1950, and clause 7 says: 'Government of India and Nepal agree to grant, on reciprocal basis, to the nationals of one country in the territories of the other, the same privileges in the matter of residence, ownership of property, participation in trade and commerce, movement and other privileges of the similar nature.' Now, they are objecting to this innocuous clause of the treaty and are burning it. The point is, they are objecting to the reciprocity of the treaty. They refuse to be treated as Indian citizens. That is the main point. They say that Darjeeling district was a part of Nepal and the King of Nepal in earlier days, presented Darjeeling district to East India Company and therefore from this Darjeeling district has become a part of India. They refuse to be treated as Indian citizens. They want to be treated as Nepalese and that is why they are objecting to the entire clause?

Now, the Home Minister's statement says that the demand is for creation of a separate State within the Indian Union. It is unambiguous on it. Had it been so, then the people would not have burnt this

particular clause of the treaty. They would not have said that Darjeeling was part of Nepal and was handed over to the East India Company by Nepal Government. They would not have asked the Gorkhas in the Indian Army to quit and fight. They would not have gone to the U.N.O. The hon. Minister himself has admitted that they have gone to the U.N. O. for help. They have applied to the other countries for help. Had they wanted Statehood, a State of their own out of West Bengal and within India they would not have gone to this extent. They would not have approached the other countries and the U.N.O. They would not have burnt this Treaty, copies of this Treaty. Therefore, this is a separatist movement. The aim of the movement is to go out of India and to disintegrate that part of the country. Sir, the hon. Minister was good enough, when we discussed about Khalistan in this House only today, to agree with the viewpoint of our party leader, Comrade Dipen Ghosh, that this is part of the conspiracy by the foreign imperialists. It appears to me, this movement is also part of the same conspiracy. They want to create Khalistan there and Gorkhaland here. They want to destabilise our country, India. This is part of the same conspiracy. Therefore, we should treat it as a separatist movement. If the Government's view is that they only want a State within the Indian Union, I think, the Government of India's attitude is not at all correct. Then, Sir, I come to the point which my friend has also raised. There are newspaper reports. The hon. Minister says that we should not read too much in the newspaper reports. We have to read newspapers. They give us certain information. There was news that the leader of the GNLF, Shri Subhash Gheishung, had actually booked air ticket from Siliguri to Delhi twice, but he cancelled it. It is not clear, what is the attitude of the Government of India and the attitude of some of the Central leaders. We do not know whether they want to have negotiations with the GNLF leaders. This is not clear. There is not at all a word here whether they consider this movement as a separatist and anti-national movement or not. I, therefore, demand that the Government of India should come out

in clear terms, without mincing words, as to what is their stand, what is their view in regard to all that is happening in Darjeeling district. They are holding violent demonstrations with deadly weapons. They have called for an 108-hour *bandh*. They will go on doing like this. In view of this situation, I would like to know whether the Government of India considers this movement as an anti-national and separatist movement? I would like hon. Home Minister to come out very clearly on this, without mincing words.

Secondly, I would like to know whether any act of abetment or encouragement by some people who are outside the GNLF, by contacting the leaders of the movement and by trying to arrange for negotiations between them and the Central leaders, would also be considered as an anti-national and separatist act?

Thirdly, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether there was any attempt on the part of some Central leaders to bring the leader of the GNLF, Shri Gheishung, to Delhi, for talks? Newspapers have been replete with this news, that some forces are trying to bring the leaders of the GNLF to Delhi for talks. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, Mr. Buta Singh, whether there was any attempt to bring Mr. Gheishung to Delhi for talks?

Fourthly, — my friend has also raised this point—what is the Government of India's stand on the demand of the people there—this is not only the demand of the movement leaders, but of the entire people in that area as well — that the Nepali language should be given Constitutional recognition? I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether they will give Constitutional recognition to the Nepali language? I would seek clear replies from the hon. Minister, without any mincing of words.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Sir, the statement which has been made by the hon. Home Minister seems to be an attempt at passing the buck on to the State Government of West Bengal. This is my charge. Why I make this charge?

[Shri Chitta Basu]

Firstly, in the first paragraph, he says 'Their main demands appear to be the creation of a separate State within the Indian Union.....' How does the hon. Minister come to this conclusion that they want a State within the Indian Union, within the framework of the Constitution of India? Has he got any proof? Can he take the House into confidence that the demand of the Gorkha Liberation Front is to have a separate State within the Indian Union and within the purview of the Constitution of India.

Secondly, the major plank of the demand is the repeal or abrogation of Indo-Nepal Agreement. Has the West Bengal Government signed that agreement or has it been entered into by the sovereign Government of India with the sovereign Government of Nepal? What is the attitude of the Government? West Bengal Government or the West Bengal Chief Minister did not sign that agreement, nor he is in a position to explain the Government of India's position in regard to this. Would the hon. Minister explain, what is the attitude of the Government of India with regard to the demand of the GLF about abrogation of the 1970 Indo-Nepal Agreement? What is the implication of this? The Government of India seems to have a soft attitude towards this movement, that is my charge. The movement for all practical purposes and intents is a divisive one. It is a movement of separatists. It is a part of the move of destabilisation encouraged and initiated by the foreign agents. Wherefrom do these people get money? Isn't the Government of India aware that the missionaries are supplying them the money in adequate quantity. Is the Act relating to foreign contributions not applicable to them? Are they not prohibited from accepting foreign contributions or foreign donations? Isn't that particular Act applicable in their case.?

Thirdly, Sir, has the Government of India received any memorandum submitted by GLF? If so, would the hon. Minister give a point-to-point reaction to the demands made by GLF? As far as I remember, they have given a demand that by the end of 1987 the Gorkha people.

Nepali people, are going to have a separate Gorkha land. I would like to know whether they have received this memorandum and if so, I would like to have the relation of the Government of India to it.

Then, Sir, I would like to know whether the Government has got contacts with some leaders of this movement over the head of the State Government. He has mentioned some name of an ex-Minister of West Bengal.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why do you repeat it?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: He has made a categorical statement stating that somebody approached Mr. Gheishing, who introduced himself as the agent or messenger from some high-up in the Government of India and he extended invitation to Mr. Gheishing to come and meet some high-ups in the Government. Is it not an indirect way of encouragement? If they have not encouraged, let them come out and state in unambiguous terms that they are not supporting this movement, they are going to combat this movement, they are going to help the State Government to nip in the bud those divisive and separatist forces.

Lastly, is it not a fact that the Darjeeling District Congress Committee passed a resolution recommending union territory status for Darjeeling district? Was it brought to the notice of the Prime Minister by a delegation led by the Darjeeling district Congress Committee secretary, Mr. Narhula? If it is a fact, would the Government make it clear that they have advised them in a particular way? Lastly, Sir inclusion of the Nepali language in the Eighth Schedule. As far as I remember the late Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, assured the Nepali Bhasha Prasar Samiti that the demand for the inclusion of the Nepali language in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution would be conceded. If that was the assurance given by the late Prime Minister, what is the attitude of the present Prime Minister and the present Government with regard to that very emotional demand?

7 p.m. Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, assured the Nepali Bhasha Prasar Samiti that the demand for the inclusion of the Nepali language in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution would be conceded. If that was the assurance given by the late Prime Minister, what is the attitude of the present Prime Minister and the present Government with regard to that very emotional demand?

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): Sir, our country has been, now for quite sometime having problem on the periphery of our country. We find that in 1947 when we became free, we were one well-knit lot. After that something went wrong somewhere with the result that regional aspirations have been rising to the foremost. All those Congress Governments, right from the beginning till today, have never carved out a long-term permanent policy as to what is to be done when certain demands with respect to regional interests are raised. Some policy should have been framed, some consultations should have been held with all concerned — the political parties including Opposition parties at the regional level and the national level. That exercise has never been done. We have lived from day to day without looking at a distance. A problem arises today. That problem we want to solve now in whatever manner it can be solved without any national perspective or positive perspective, with the net result that we have been having one problem after another.

Nagaland — you have been sitting over this problem for so many years now and yet we still find that it is necessary to post army there. The same was the case with Mizo problem till today. I read in the newspapers in the morning that all the Mizos have come overground, all the weapons have been surrendered by them and now they have become totally peaceful and they are going to change their MNF constitution. Now who says so? Somebody has said it and they want everybody to believe it. Has the Government of India verified that this fact is correct that the Mizos have come overground, all the weapons with them have been surrendered, all those weapons are still not underground or not disposed of left and right to some forces here and there in the State?

Punjab — that problem still continues. We have riots in this country time and again — communal riots and all types of riots — where number and number of people are killed and massacred. And now we find this problem all of a sudden. This problem must have been simmering for quite some time, but now it has again ta-

ken the front-page headlines. Under these circumstances it is the paramount duty of the Government of India to come forward and spell out its thinking. Unless it spells out its thinking, there can be no talk, no negotiations and things will continue to go from bad to worse and ultimately we will be faced, as has rightly been pointed out, with the same situation as has now resulted in Punjab. We must try to avoid it. It is not a happy thing that police has to interfere. I can understand if the Government of West Bengal has had to use the para-military forces or if the force opens fire upon the people and kill so many people. I can understand, for a Government of the people wedded to looking after the interests of the lowest strata of society, which is not imperialistic or bourgeois in nature, the problem would have been such that it was unavoidable. If such unavoidable things happen, it is extremely bad. And what is the Government thinking over it? If the Government of India is forthright in condemning all these things and if the Government of India feels that such regional demands cannot be acceded to, if the Government of India thinks that whatever concessions were given to Laldenga in Mizoram were wrong and they cannot be repeated anywhere else, they should say so. We are told every day that whatever settlement has been reached with Laldenga will pave the way for the disintegration of the country. It is a bad accord. The Punjab accord is a bad accord. All these accords are bad accords. Just to have a little name that you are doing a wonderful thing, you are coming out with accords, accords and accords, and for headlines in papers, for records and let the country be damned. This policy is wrong.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Just one minute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is speaking.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: Therefore, I would ask the honourable Home Minister as to whether this Laldenga chapter is closed or whether such an accord is even possible with the Gorkha

[Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta]

people. I want to ask this because it was suggested that they will now be inspired by Laldenga and the Mizos over there and with that inspiration they will speed up their activities over there. So the Government must come forward and say that the accord with Laldenga was a mistake or that whatever it was, it is the last, not to be repeated, it cannot be repeated anywhere else and nobody can open it. But it must come out with a statement. Also, what does it think about this Front which is now in a violent manner trying to acquire their rights or fighting for their own homeland, within the Indian Union, may be? What is the attitude of the Government about such like regional demands? It should give out its stand clearly. Sir, I want answers to these questions. Thank you.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मान्यवर, मेरी अपनी समझ से भारत सरकार का नजरिया इस मामले में विनकूल साफ नहीं है और अभी भी भारत सरकार के मन में शक और शंका है कि जो गोरखालैंड की बात हो रही है और गोरखालैंड की मांग जो भारतीय गणराज्य के अन्दर हो रही है और भारत नेपाल की जो संधि 1950 में हुई थी दोनों देशों के बीच में उस को रद्द कर दिया जाये यह राष्ट्र विरोधी और अलगाववादी है। और मेरी राय यह इस लिये बन कि मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में अंतिम पैराग्राफ में कहा है कि :

"Any political demand supported by violence is against the law and Constitution of this country."

इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि भारत नेपाल की जो संधि 1950 की है वह रद्द हो और भारतीय गणराज्य के अंदर गोरखालैंड राज्य कायम हो। अगर यह मांग अहिंसात्मक ढंग से चलती है, उस में हिंसा न हो तो इसका मतलब है कि यह मांग भारतीय संविधान के अन्तर्गत है और कानून से संबद्ध है। दूसरे इस मामले में जो अप्रैल से यह मांग शुरू हुई, आज तक 17 जाने जा चुकी हैं और सार्वजनिक संपत्ति का नुकसान हो रहा है। तो मेरा सीधा-सीधा प्रश्न

भारत सरकार से यह है कि आप क्या यह बतलाने की कोशिश करें कि जो भारत नेपाल संधि 1950 की प्रतियां हैं उन को जलाना सार्वजनिक रूप से, जो कि हमारे देश और हमारे पड़ोसी राज्य नेपाल के बीच में हुई थी, यह काम राष्ट्र विरोधी और अलगाववाद है या नहीं? और दूसरे, जैसा कि मैंने प्रारम्भ में कहा कि यदि यह मांग अहिंसात्मक ढंग से राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी के रास्ते पर चल कर का गई होत और उस के लिये कोई आन्दोलन खड़ा किया जाय तो उस सूरत में भारत सरकार इस आन्दोलन को राष्ट्र विरोधी और अलगाववादो सम्झेगी या नहीं?

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, on the 5th of May, 1986 the demand for a Gorkhaland, a separate State, reared up. On the 16th of May the Central Government was still treating it as a State law-and-order problem. This shows that we have not learnt from our past lessons, and we have other States still burning and still reeling under unsolved problems and bloodshed by terrorist activities and uncontrollable situations. The Central Government has still taken the stand that it is a State subject and that it is merely a law-and-order problem. Today 108-hour bandh has been declared starting today, and today is 28th of July. This makes one sit up and wonder at the attitude of the Central Government. The hon. Minister has repeatedly claimed that we are all working for a a united India. India is being subjected to fragmentation. Repeatedly this is happening, time and again, and we are not taking timely action.

The title itself "the Gorkha National Liberation Front" has to be questioned. Do they want liberation from the nation? What is it that they are looking for? What is the liberation that they are looking for?

Today we do not even have an official figure of how many Gorkhas reside in our nation. An unofficial figure is that there are 1 million Gorkhas residing in the nation. This appears to be a slight enlargement of four people occupying the Golden Temple and declaring Khalistan. One

million persons of a nation like ours suddenly want a separate State, and we are taking a soft attitude and beating about the bush.

The State Government had made some specific suggestions to the Central Government. I want to know to what extent they abide by the State Government if they want to help the State Government in pursuance of peace for the entire nation.

There was a remark made by the hon. Home Minister a week ago in one of the English national dailies. He said that they were striving for peace, law and order, but that it was difficult for them to do so and keep optimum peace and order in any States which were not ruled by the Congress (I). It was one of the national dailies. I will produce the paper, the evidence thereof. This makes one sit up and wonder, if they are not able to control and help the State Governments in keeping law and order in the non-Congress (I) States, whether it is because the Congress (I) is responsible for the law-and-order problems in the non-Congress (I) States. One is forced to think along those lines because while West Bengal was reeling with the problems of Gorkhaland, the insurgency that was taking place there, the local Congress leaders were laying the blame at the door of West Bengal saying that the whole movement rose because of the inadequacies of the State Government. By no stretch of imagination can I conceive that as joint efforts working towards a peaceful India.

Also, Sir, they have some genuine grievances. As has been stated by some of my learned hon. colleagues who stated that the language recognition...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can ask questions to the Minister pertaining to what the Government has actually done.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Yes, I am asking.

Does the Government realise that they could have quelled it without letting it escalate to this proportion, if they had genuinely meant so, by assuaging the feelings of the Nepalese by including simply

the language in the Eighth Schedule? Why was it not done when the Sindhi language which is spoken even less than Nepali has been included in the Eighth Schedule? Why has Nepali not been done? There is a general grievance of neglect by the Centre. It is not under the State Government's purview, and it cannot be accused of neglecting it. The general grievance of neglect by the Centre has resulted in the up-coming of this kind of impression.

Being a sensitive Himalayan border region, you cannot view it any more as an isolated incident pertaining to Darjeeling. There are the Nepali youth in Kathmandu who are coming forward and arousing the sentiments of the Nepalese in Sikkim, and this will escalate, snowball further and further if the Central Government does not do some thing immediately about it. Now, regarding the inclusion of the Nepalese language...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is the one you said now.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: No, Sir. I am going to ask why they are taking so long. Mrs. Maitry Bose Bill and the all-Party Memorandum signed by 74 MPs and the All-India Nepali Bhasha Samiti had claimed for constitutional recognition in 1967. Now, because of the gross mismanagement of the Centre, their delaying tactics and shelving the things and the ostrich attitude is resulting in all this separatism and sectionalism that is coming up in our nation.

With this I conclude. I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

श्री कैलाश पति मिश्र (बिहार) :
उपमभा पति महोदय, जो स्वराष्ट्र मंत्री के वक्तव्य का परिपत्र मिला है उसमें 1950 का उल्लेख है—इंडो-नेपाल फ्रेंडशिप ट्रीटी, 1950 और उसके बाद एकदम उछल कर पहुँच गये अप्रैल, 1986 पर। अप्रैल, 1986 के बाद एक के बाद हमारी, तीसरी, चौथी, पांचवीं घटनायें इतनी तेजी से घटती जा रही हैं कि पैरा-मिलिटरी फोर्स, मिलिटरी पहुँचाने को नौबत आ गयी है। मैं स्वराष्ट्र मंत्री जी

[श्री कलाश पति मिश्र]

से प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ कि 1950 से लेकर अप्रैल, 1986 तक वहाँ कौन सा ऐसा अवस्था पैदा हो गई जिससे एकदम अप्रैल, 1986 से लेकर अब तक कई मरने की घटनाएँ हुई और पैरा-मिलिटरी भेजने की नींबा आ गया, ब्लैक फ्लैग डिमोन्स्ट्रेशन का घटना हो गया ? तमाम ऐसा अनेक घटनाएँ होने का नींबा क्यों हुई ? आज राज्य सरकार को हाँ केन्द्रिय सरकार से पैरा-मिलिटरी फोर्स को सहायता मांगने की नींबा आ गया । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि केन्द्रिय सरकार को सामान्त आंचल के लिये अचानक इतना सहायता क्यों देना पड़ रहा है । जबकि गुप्तचर विभाग राज्य सरकार का, केन्द्रिय सरकार का गुप्तचर विभाग हर क्षेत्र में चप्पे-चप्पे पर रहता है ?

मैं स्वराष्ट्र मंत्री जी से कुछ बातें जानना चाहता हूँ कि 1950 से लेकर अप्रैल, 1986 तक यह अवस्था कैसे आयी और इसके बीच के समय में सरकार के पास से कौन-कौन सी खबरों की सहायता दी गयी ? एक और चीज जानना चाहता हूँ कि जितने क्षेत्रों की मांग गोरखा नेशनल लिबरेशन फ्रंट ने की है उस क्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत उसमें गोरखों की आबादी कितनी है और गोरखों के अतिरिक्त जो मूल भारतीय हैं उनकी आबादी कितनी है ?

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : मूल तो गोरख भी हैं ।

श्री कलाश पति मिश्र : मैं बृहन्नर भारत की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि गोरखा के अतिरिक्त वहाँ आबादी कितनी है और अगर यह गलत काम कर रहे हैं, गलत आन्दोलन के अभियान के लिये जा रहे थे तो भारत सरकार और राज्य सरकार दोनों ने गैर नागरिकों में राष्ट्रीयता का पाठ पढ़ाने के लिये कौन से कदम उठाये ? अगर नागरिक में से कोई वर्ग अराष्ट्रीय कदम उठाने की बात करता है तो सामना करने का केवल सरकार का दायित्व नहीं है नागरिकों का भी दायित्व

है उनके अन्दर यह भावना जागे इसके लिये सरकार ने कौन सा प्रचार किया ? उनके गलत कदम के संबंध में कितना लिटरेचर बाँटा, कितना प्रचार किया कौन से कदम उठाये ?

अन्त में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि फोर्स, पैरा मिलिटरी फोर्स भेजने की नींबा वहाँ पर क्यों आ गई ? लगता है वहाँ पर कुछ लाख लोग हैं इससे इससे ज्यादा नहीं । आखिर इतनी बड़ी ताकत जिसके कारण मिलिटरी वहाँ भेजना पड़े, उन्हें सहायता कहां से प्राप्त हो रही है ? वहाँ से ताकत मिल रही है या कहीं बाहर से ताकत मिल रही है ? सरकार इस पर बिल्कुल मौन है । अन्त में एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अप्रैल, 1986 के पहले भारत सरकार इसके ऊपर क्यों मौन रही । स्टेटमेंट के अन्त में स्वराष्ट्र मंत्री ने बड़े कॉन्फिडेंस के साथ लेकिन बड़े ही सहजपूर्वक कहा कि अब इसके बाद हिंसा की घटना नहीं होगी । मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि इतने दमखम के साथ कहने का आधार क्या है कि इसके बाद हिंसा की घटनाएँ नहीं होंगी । इन शब्दों के साथ अपनी बात समाप्त करते हुए मैं यह मुझाव भी देना चाहता हूँ कि समस्याओं का समाधान बिल्कुल बन्दूक की नाली से या मिलिट्री से नहीं होता है बल्कि हृदय परिवर्तन करने से और मानसिकता के निर्माण से होता है । इसके लिये सरकार क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Sir, I will speak first and then my colleague, Mr Dipen Ghosh will speak.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One can speak.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You might remember that three Members from the Lok Dal party were allowed to speak today.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Sir, I will be very brief. I will ask one question for two reasons. One is Mr. Buta Singh who is not only a member of the Cabinet,

but he is also a leading light of the ruling party who knows how the Centre has burnt its fingers in Punjab. The second reason is that there is a very interesting spectacle in West Bengal. A General Secretary of the ruling party accuses the leaders of the District Committee of the Darjeeling of being in connivance with the Gorkha National Liberation Front. But the President of the same ruling party is trying to throw the General secretary out of the organisation because his election prospects in Darjeeling...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please put your question.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: I am coming to that. He is afraid of such statements because their election prospects in Darjeeling may be affected. My question is very straight forward. Is Mr. Buta Singh as a member of the Cabinet as well as a leading member of the ruling party in a position to assure the House that Mr. Subhash Gheising will not be utilised for the purposes of election in the coming Assembly of West Bengal as has been done with Mr Bhindranwale for which the Centre has burnt its fingers?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Sir, I want to go back what I have stated in this morning and Mr Buta Singh, Minister of Home Affairs had agreed with me.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't make a speech.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am not making a speech. This is every serious matter. I appreciate that in the morning Mr. Buta Singh had agreed with me when I brought to the notice of this House that there was a definite conspiracy to destabilise our country and there was also a failure on the part of some of our ruling party members at the Centre as well as some opposition parties to comprehend that conspiracy. Mr. Buta Singh was good enough to say, while agreeing with me, that there was some lack of comprehension of the situation. Now, after having gone through this statement in the evening, I am constrained to say that Mr. Buta Singh himself betrays the lack of

comprehension about that conspiracy. This conspiracy is not limited to a particular area of our country, that is, Punjab but this conspiracy is widespread. Some are in the name of 'Khalistan'. Some are in the name of 'Gorkha Land'. Some are in the name of 'Jarkhand'. Some are in the name of 'Uttarkhand'. Some are in the name of certain other things. If you look at the whole North-Western and North-Eastern areas of our country, you will come to know about all these things. Sir, now I come to the question. In the statement the Minister of Home Affairs has stated in the first para third line that the movement is for the abrogation of the Indo Nepal Friendship Treaty of 1950. This treaty is a Central Treaty. This treaty was signed between the two Governments, the Government of Nepal and the Government of India and if any section in our country demands abrogation and takes from their hands to fulfil these demands, whether the Union Home Ministry is prepared to call it as anti-national? Come out with this statement. No hiding with the words, no mincing with the words, enough is enough. The second thing is the last paragraph. I quote:—

"Any political demand supported by violence is against the law and Constitution of the country. Any attempt to go beyond the norms established by law and the Constitution will undermine the democratic set up of the country."

Why any? Why taking recourse to this kind of third person? Why is he fighting shy of stating this type of violence, this type of activity which is being carried on in the name of G.N.L.F. is against the Constitution, is against the country. So, I want to know specifically from the Union Home Minister and again I say, no mincing of words, whether he considers it a separatist demand? Thank you.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman Sir, I do not want to vie with the hon Members sitting opposite so far as trading the words are concerned. Sir, today, towards the end of the day, my respected sister Smt. Renuka Chowdhury wanted to put certain words into my

[Shri Buta Singh]
 mouth. I would have accepted such speech from my sister but how could I accept words which I have never said. Some press reports carry and she wants me to eat up all those words. I am sorry, Sir, I cannot take those words. Similarly, if I have to analyse the clarifications of most of the hon. Members they amount to almost the same thing. Sh. Dipen Ghosh said, Why should I talk in third person. Sir, there is no first person before me. The State Govt. must produce it. All that State Govt. asked for was two things which Mr. Chitta Basu wanted me to tell him how am I helping the State Governments? They asked two things. One was that there should be a talk on the Indo-Nepal Treaty by the Principal of the Government College Kurseong on various aspects of Indo-Nepal Treaty. It seems earlier the Government of India Ministry of Information and Broadcasting did not entertain the request and we intervened, we got this relayed on the All India Radio. It was a very good talk keeping the spirit of nationalism. We intervened on the asking of the State Government. Second request received from the State Government was about certain paramilitary forces and the central police and we complied with the demand of the State Government. There is no third thing pending before us. Yes, about Nepali language, my sister asked me why such a simple thing is not being considered? I wish, these issues were so simple. Now, the thing is already Nepali language is used as an additional official language in three hill sub-divisions of Darjeeling, Kurseong and Kalimpong of West Bengal. Nepali also is the Official language of the State of Sikkim. Facilities for instructions through the medium of Nepali for the study and development of Nepali literature and language and for the use of Nepali for official purposes also exists in areas where Nepali is prevalent. Nepali language has been recognised by the Sahitya Academy also. Facilities for instructions through the medium of Nepali both at the primary stages and secondary stages are available in the State of West Bengal. Secondly, the University of Calcutta, North Bengal and Burdwan have arrangements for teaching of Nepali at graduate

level. In Assam Nepali is recognised as a medium of instruction up to the Middle Standard. Gauhati and Dibrugarh Universities have provision for teaching Nepali at the graduate level. Facilities for the study of Nepali are also available in the Universities of Patna, Bihar, Bhagalpur and Varanasi. The Indian School of International Studies at New Delhi which has the status of a university has staff specialising in the study of Nepali and it arranges instruction in Nepali language wherever there is demand.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, he should not beat about the bush. *(Interruptions)* My question was about its inclusion in the Eighth Schedule *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Renukaji, you will kindly agree with me that if you open the Pandora's box, there will not be just one Nepali language; there will be dozens of languages, dialects and sub-dialects as you find even in a State like Bihar. It will be making fun of the Constitutional provisions. All that is required is to serve the language, to enrich the language, to allow the language to grow. I do not think, after the names of universities that I have mentioned in my reply starting from West Bengal, Sikkim, Assam and Bihar, there will be any purpose served, except allowing the tendencies to weaken the unity to grow further. The Government are of the view that inclusion of more languages in the Eighth Schedule would create other repercussions and reactions. Therefore, it is the endeavour of the Government to develop the cultural and literary heritage of all the languages irrespective of their inclusion in the Eighth Schedule. So it is exactly the development of the language which will matter. What is the point in just having the satisfaction of having included it in one Schedule or the other? I would like to know from the hon. Members what special thing will accrue to the Nepali language simply because it is in the Eighth Schedule. Therefore, our concern should be the development of the language. The cultural heritage or the development of the language is more important than its formal inclusion in the Eighth Schedule.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It is a question of Constitutional recognition of a language that is really agitating the minds of those people and the Minister is against it. It is a question of Constitutional recognition of the language.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: He wanted me to spell out the Government stand on this. *(Interruptions)* I have spelt out the stand of the Government. *(Interruptions)*

Now, Sir, again my hon. friend, Shri Dipen Ghosh, is not agreeing with me on the words, I am sorry...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You say you consider it anti-national.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Much has been read into the press reports, specially *Jugantar* and other papers. I have not seen them. I am not able to read *Jugantar* because I do not know Bangla bhasha. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I can present a copy to you.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Even if you present it to me, I will not be able to read that Bangla bhasha; I am not that lucky. I made it very very clear—I thought it was beyond any doubt or interpretation—that we will not do anything beyond and over the head of the State Government. I do not know what else the hon. Member would like me to say. Some names have been brought into the discussion. Unfortunately the name of a very senior politician, the Governor of a State...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Not a politician, but a Governor.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Earlier a politician of West Bengal, a former Chief Minister of West Bengal, a former Minister of the Government of India—can I say all that? Therefore, unnecessarily, that name is sought to be brought in, I should say, for political reasons. Why are you disturbing somebody who is attending to a very very serious problem of the nation in one of the border States? Why do you want to drag in his name unnecessarily?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Why does he not issue a denial in the newspapers?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Why should he?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: When the Governor's name has been dragged into a newspaper and made controversial then the Union Home Ministry should issue a press denial.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: It is just like asking a person if he has stopped beating his wife?...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: As if people don't beat their wives?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: If he says 'Yes' then that means he has been beating his wife. If he says 'no', then he is in deeper trouble. That is what I have submitted to the Members—some of them are senior to me in age, senior to me in experience—don't try to read too much because press reports are capable of making a man into something and making something into a man.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: One point: How many of us have access to first hand information as you do? Then what is the source of information that we can rely on and to come and speak in this House? Naturally that has to be the press. I can understand one paper reporting wrongly, I can understand two papers reporting wrongly. Is there a conspiracy of the entire press against the Congress-I?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: There should be some finality. When I have categorically stated on the floor of this august House, after that at least, that story should have been treated killed...

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Your party...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Subrata Mukherjee openly stated that... *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please listen to the Minister's reply.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: What can I do if the tiger is determined to eat up the lamb and he says, yes, yes, you might not have abused me but your forefathers had abused me? Now I have made it very clear, there is no truth in that story which has been read by Mr. Das Gupta. Now, if you still want to beat me—of course, somebody in the Congress-I in Darjeeling might have said something or might not have said some thing—there can be no end to this argument. Therefore, my submission is let us put an end to this. As I said the other day and I am repeating it today also, we would not like to do anything over the head of the State Government. And also it is not my habit to pass on the buck to someone else. Let me tell you, if anyone wants to pass on his buck to me, to us, we are ready and we are quite capable of treating it. But I will not pass on the buck if it belongs to me. So, don't try to misunderstand. If it has happened in a particular area, it can happen in another State. I would also like to clarify another thing. I have never said that in the States where there is a non-Congress-I rule, there is no law and order. I never said that. For one thing, if certain sections of our people living in a particular area—I come from Rajasthan and if people of a particular part of Rajasthan have a grouse—if they have a grouse that the desert areas are neglected, in other States people of hill regions have a grouse that their hill areas have been left backward because sufficient development has not taken place, if such complaints come and if people organise themselves and say something, surely it is the duty of that State Government, whichever State it is, to see that that kind of backwardness, that kind of underdeveloped situation, is eradicated, and the Government of that particular State should take steps to see...

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Is that the case?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He wants abrogation of Indo-Nepalese treaty which he has mentioned.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee and Mr. Ghosh, please hear me, I am saying generally. (Interruption) But if

you want, I can definitely go into it but. . .
(Interruption)

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Just one interruption. What we wanted to know is: Can we equate the kind of movement that has been generated there with what you are referring to? On a mere suggestion that there are foreign hands, it has taken certain forces which have to be firmly handled? If you say that this is like the grievance of one State, etc...

SHRI BUTA SINGH: All that I can say at this stage is let the State Government pick up courage and let them put it to us, we will stand by the State Government. We can deal with them as firmly as they would like us. Have we failed at any time? We sent so many clarifications to the State Government. We have yet to receive a reply. Let them make up their mind. I propose to meet the honourable Chief Minister of West Bengal and discuss this issue. And, Sir, it is a very serious issue and it is not an issue pertaining to that particular region. It has its repercussions elsewhere also. So, I am not here to take a stand, to take a narrow stand, that it is a party thing or it is a regional thing. But, definitely, we will discuss it with the honourable Chief Minister and we will discuss with the State leaders also including Chitta Basuji and other political parties. We should all get together and see that this issue gets resolved and it should not be taken as a narrow political issue. I have stated very clearly that anything that goes against the law of the land and goes against the Constitution of India should be dealt with firmly and no separatist tendencies or anti-national tendencies should be allowed to raise their heads.

SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH Buta Singh, what is your reaction to the demand for a separate Nepali State? That is my categorical question to you. How do you consider this?

SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH (Maharashtra): He has already said that anything that goes against the Constitution of India is something which will not be tolerated. He has made it clear. What more do you want?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, you had your say and he has answered all the points. Now, Secretary-General to report a message from the Lok Sabha.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Research and Development Cess Bill, 1986

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Research and Development Cess Bill, 1986, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 28th July, 1986."

"The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Law and Order problem in Darjeeling District arising out of the agitation by the Gorkha National Liberation Front on the 27th July, 1986, cont.

SHRI BUIA SINGH: Sir, I want to say something.

I still say that we have not spoken anything about the Indian National Treaty. In our opinion—this is the interpretation of the Treaty—it is this very clause, clause 7, which gives them the procedure of this status, and if this is about that I do not know where they will stand. They will have no *locus standi*. It is only this clause which gives them the *locus standi* to move about and to live here, and the other people who are by birth nationals of the Indian Union have got all the rights.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House now stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at forty-two minutes past seven of the Clock till eleven of the Clock on Tuesday the 29th July, 1986.