

Shri Dipen Ghosh. The Minister will read the answer because the statement has not been distributed to Members.

Separatist movement in Darjeeling District (West Bengal) by GNLf

*1. SHRI DIPEN GHOSH:†
SHRI CHITTA BASU;

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state;

Ca) whether Government are aware that the Gorkha National Liberation Front (GNLF) has been carrying on a divisive and separatist movement in Darjeeling district (West Bengal) and also mis-interpreting clause 7 of the Indo-Nepal Treaty and has also given a call for observing the ensuing Independence Day as a "Black Day"; and

(b) if so, what steps Government are taking to check the anti-national activities of the front?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI BUTA SINGH): (a) and (b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

The Gorkha National Liberation Front have been demanding the creation of a State of Gorkhaland within the Indian Union and also the abrogation of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty of 1950. Article 7 of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty Grants certain reciprocal privileges to Nepali citizens in India and Indian citizens in Nepal and does not adversely affect Indian citizens of Nepali origin. The demand for the abrogation of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty is, therefore misplaced.

2. According to report available it appears that the Gorkha National Liberation Front has a programme of boycotting the Independence Day

celebrations on August 15 and instead would be resorting to the hoisting of black flags and wearing of black badges on that day

3. The law and order problem created by the agitation of the Gorkha National Liberation Front have to be handled by the State Government. The Central Government will provide Central parliamentary forces and other appropriate assistance requires by the State Government in this regard. The Chief Minister of West Bengal met the Union Home Minister at Delhi on 6-8-86 and it was decided by them that the Central Government and the State Government would fully coordinate in dealing with the situation and that forces weakening the unity and integrity of the country would be dealt with firmly.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Before I put my supplementary arising out of the statement just now read out by the Minister of State for Home Affairs. I would like to draw your attention and through you of the entire House to a particular fact that on 23rd December 1983, Mr. Subhash Geisingj President of Gorkha National Liberation Front, had addressed a memorandum to his Majesty. King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah of Nepal endorsing copies of that memorandum to the heads of various foreign countries including the President and the Prime Minister of India. A copy of this memorandum was released to the press on 21st March, 1985, I am not going to read the entire text of that memorandum. But in order to frame my supplementaries, I may please be permitted to quote certain excerpts. If I cross two minutes limit...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will excuse you.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Thank you. Sir, First of all. I quote one particular excerpt wherein it has been stated that "even 36 years after Bharat Independence, the settled ethnic race of the Gorkhas of more than 6 millions is living as degraded human beings in every part of the country in

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Dipen Ghosh.

India." Thereafter, saying certain other things, it is stated that "under such cruel pressures of racial segregated atmosphere and direct denial Of justice, liberty, equality, fraternity, etc. etc., the Gorkha National Liberation Front had to be formed to meet the cruel challenge of a series of apartheid and genocide crimes done by the State and the Central Government of India since Bharat Independence. This was the purpose of the formation of the Gorkha National Liberation Front that was mentioned in this Memorandum, that is the apartheid and genocide crimes done by the States and the Central Government of India.

Secondly, Sir, I again quote from another part:

"Just after three years of Bharat independence, the Indo-Nepal Treaty of 21st July, 1950 and the British-Nepal Treaty of 30th October, 1950 also did virtually nothing to repair the damaged fate of the said Gorkhas and *vis-a-vis* their ceded land and territories, and revived exactly the same damaging terms and conditions of the above said treaties and agreements of the then British Government and Nepal. And such an inhuman act of these two merciless treaties has directly violated the very principle of right of self-determination proclaimed by President Woodrow Wilson in his 14-point programme on 18th January, 1918, etc. etc."

Then, Sir, having stated this, he said again in the Memorandum:

"As such, seriously keeping in view the above mentioned unpardonable historical crimes against humanity and still unresolved question of the very political existence or future status of the said Gorkhas in the Indian Union, the above three responsible signatory counts rise—Nepal, Bharat and Britain—have been urged to abrogate the said existing Indo-Nepal and British-Nepal Treaties of 1950 and 1941—R.S.

further adopt fresh new treaties for a permanent political settlement of the said victimised Gorkhas as per the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and also confirm accordingly the future status of their ceded land and territories."

Sir, in view of this, in the light of this statement made by the Gorkha National Liberation Front to the king of Nepal endorsing a copy of it to the Heads of our Government at the Centre, I want to know whether the Government still considers, as it has been stated in this statement, that the demand for the abrogation of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty is (merely) misplaced and whether the word 'misplaced', is misplaced really and the word 'mischievous' should be used replacing the word 'misplaced'. This is my first supplementary, Sir. Now, part (b) of my supplementary ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will give you another chance.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is related to this, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. It is an important issue. I am allowing you.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Part (a) of my first supplementary is this; The word 'misplaced' has been used. I have quoted from the Memorandum which the Gorkha National Liberation Front has stated. And this document, I think; our Home Ministry must be in possession of. In the light of this statement made by the Gorkha National Liberation Front, whether the demand for abrogation of this Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty should be construed only as misplaced or mischievous. This is one.

Secondly, in the statement it is said that they are demanding the creation of a State of Gorkhaland within the Indian Union. In the light of the statement made in this memorandum, does it not betray the exact intention of the Gorkha National Liberation Front

that the present demand of a State within Indian Union is nothing but a cover of seceding from India and having a separate Gorkhaland out side of India? I want to know whether the Government considers it to be a secessionist demand.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, I am sure you will not permit me to comment on the observations made by the hon. Members through the reading Of that memorandum which is baseless. He wanted me to say whether we would still call the abrogation of treaty as misplaced. *(Interruptions)* I can only adj t₀ that it i_s not only misplaced but also uncalled for and mere is no basis...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No basis.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, this is a treaty between two sovereign countries and any reconsideration, review Or replacement has to be between two sovereign countries. Therefore, no jrganisation, no individuaal can brjnp in this element of abrogation. It has to be between two sovereign countries and so far we have not—eithy the Government of India o^r the Government of Nepal—come ^lo this situation^ and the treaty is there. I do not have to spell out this treaty because the relevant clauses have been discussed in this Hous_e earlier also and the hon. Members are quite aware these two clauses, the clause 6 and the clause 7, are instrumental j_n giving certain privileges to the people of Nepal of Nepali origin and the> Nepalese people in this country and the Indian people in that country have reciprocal privileges which are being enjoyed by the people of both the sovereign countries and there has not been any question on that. Therefore, it will bfe uncalled for if I have to respond to the supplementary which the hon. Member has stated. No individual, no organisation other than the two sovereign countries can touch the treaty. *(Interruptions)*. I am at th« moment answering the supplement ary of Mr. Dipen Ghosh. In case you have anything to ask I will l>e only too happj to answer your supplemen

tary after I have replied to Mr. Ghosh. The hon. Member has asked whether the demand for G^ikhaland, which is described by the GNLF as a demand within the Indian Union, is being supported. If I can really read the intentions of those who are making this demand, it j_s difficult for me. Let the State Government bring out whether they have any information before them. Only then -an we consider that thing. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Please wait. I am going to allow a few supplementaries.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Si^ my supplementary was very specific, namely, whether the Govprmnt in the light ,_of what has been stated in this memorandum, considers that the demand for the creation of a separate State within the Indian Union i_s a cover for ultimately seceding from India and creation of a separate State outside India, because the intention of the GNLF is very clear in the Memorandum that their complaint is about ceded land and territory and that is why they have made a Memorandum \o the Nepali King that the previous position should be restored. The right of self-determination they have demanded. That was my first supplementary, which the hon. Home Minister has not replied to. The other thing which I specifically wanted to know in the light of what has been stated in this Memorandum is whether even the demand for abrogation of the treaty is not simply misplaced,, but whether it is considered as mischievous that also I ■wanted to know. That reply has not come forth from the Union Home Minister. Will he please, first of all, specify it, then I will put my second supplementary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Prime Minister.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: No, Sir. I have got to make a statement in the Lok Sabha.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, it will not be proper to impute motives but what I have said is that we do not consider

this demand for the abrogation of the treaty as called for. M does not lie. Therefore, how will it improve the situation if I have to call so many namss •which the hon. Member wants me to do. I cannot do it. Let the State Government give its appreciation and we will discuss with the State Government.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What is your appreciation?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: One appreciation is that the treaty cannot be abrogated by any individual or organisation other than the two sovereign States. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Before I put my second supplemental I want to give an explanation because the Minister of Home Affairs knows that when the Chief Minister of West Bengal met him, I was also present in that meeting, and he was given the appreciation of the Chief Minister of West Bengal. It is not that he was not given the appreciation. It is in the estimate of the Chief Minister and the Government of West Bengal that the demand of abrogation of Indo-Nepal Treaty is mischievous, is anti-national. So, it is not that he does not know the appreciation of the Government of West Bengal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What the Home Minister said was that it cannot be abrogated; this treaty between the two sovereign States cannot be abrogated. That is what he said.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: My specific question was over the word 'misplaced' and whether the word 'misplaced' should be replaced by the word 'mischievous'.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is your view: you can say.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: My problem is that there was a complete agreement between me and the Chief Minister. I do not know why the hon. Member is trying to upset the arrangement which we have worked out.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: No, I am not trying to upset this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have opened the door for a large number of supplementaries.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: My second supplementary is again basing on the memorandum submitted by GNLFF to the King of Nepal with copy to Government of India. Copy of this memorandum was endorsed to His Majesties the Kings and Her Majesties the Queens of different countries in the world, including Bharat, Nepal and Great Britain, for seeking rightful opinion and their helping hands to raise this burning ethnic issue of Gorkhaland in the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations and before the International Court of Justice and European Commission on Human Rights. So, Sir, this Gorkha National Liberation Front has sought.—it is clear from this memorandum—helping hand from foreign countries to raise this issue in the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations and in the International Court of Justice. In the light of this, I want to know whether the Central Government considers this particular action as anti-national.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: The so-called memorandum was never entertained and we just rejected it out of hand; it does not lie here.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: My question is whether you consider it anti-national.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: When we said we do not accept it, there is no question of further comments on it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You tell me, if an organisation stationed in India... (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You asked his opinion and he said that he has rejected it. That is the end of it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But whether he considers it anti-national act.

i MB. CHAIRMAN: You are asking for Minister's opinion he said he has rejected it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Should I construe that he is dodging it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Chitta Basu. His name is first.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, on the statement made by the hon. Minister I want to draw your attention to paragraph 2. Paragraph 2 of the statement does not contain all the facts. Whatever it contains, it is very inadequate and also selective. Therefore, it is necessary for the House to know, in brief, some of the very relevant facts in connection with this movement. GKLf gave a call for 108 hours' bandh which ultimately resulted in violence. They burnt copy of the Indo-Nepal Agreement of 1950. They have given a call for boycotting the celebration of the Independence Day, tomorrow and to raise black flags as a mark of black day.

'The declared Gorkhaland will be established by 1987 by all means'. They have approached, as has been mentioned by Shri Dipen Ghosh, certain foreign countries and the U.N. Lastly, Sir, they have made an appeal to the Gorkhas in the Indian Army to extend their support to this movement. Against these facts, some very important and significant aspects emerge. Those significant aspects, to be very brief, are: one ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question please.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, you have yourself admitted that this is a very important question. I will be very brief. Don't worry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question now.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Three aspects of the question are involved. One is, the genesis of the movement. The second aspect is, the present character of the movement. Third is, considerable political and administrative fallout of the movement. Having regard to these aspects of the question, may I know from the hon. Minister whether the Government of India would consider the whole

movement in all its political aspects and is prepared to take certain measures at the political level to contain this movement which is based on highly emotive and ethnic consideration? In this regard, will the hon. Minister make it very clear that the domain of the State Government is the question of law and order. But the political aspect which I have mentioned falls within the domain of the Union Government. Would the Union Government exercise the authority within its domain to take appropriate action and consider this movement in totality, the total effect of this movement as anti-national, separatist and prejudicial to the interests of the nation, to the unity and integrity of the country? Will the Government take appropriate action to prevent any dangerous fallout in other parts of the country.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, the Government is aware of the genesis of the GNLf. (Interruptions). Sir, as far as the Government of India is concerned, on the basis of the discussions with the Chief Minister of West Bengal held on the 6th of August 1986, there are no differences between the Government of West Bengal and the Government of India regarding the present character of the movement and there are no differences about the possible administrative fallout which the movement is likely to cause. In fact, I would most respectfully invite the attention of the hon. House, one sentence in the statement released after the meeting. I quote:

"It was decided that the Central Government and the State Government will fully co-ordinate in dealing with the situation and it was decided that the forces weakening the unity and integrity of the country will be dealt with firmly."

I can only hope and I believe this to be true, although some doubt is sought to be cast, that the Government of West Bengal, will also stand by this statement and together we will deal firmly with any force weakening the unity and integrity of the country.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Sir, it is fantastic and extraordinary to go through the memorandum and it is a clear case of violation of all those things which we, as a nation, stand for Sir. I expect there is perfect coordination between the Government of India and the Government of West Bengal on this. I hope there is no difference of opinion in the measures taken by both the Government to see that this threat is eliminated. What pained me most was, why the Government of India has not so far condemned this kind of a threat openly. This is an anti-national act. In the face of boycott of our Independence Day and the threat of hoisting black flag, why, I want to know, the Government of India has not taken steps to see that such things are not there tomorrow. It is not the first time. I remember, when in Kashmir a black flag was hoisted by certain extremists, it set the whole House into high-temper. Why is such a thing happening again not receiving the kind of attention, the kind of denouncement on the part of the Government of India and also on the part of the West Bengal Government?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, as the previous hon. Member mentioned, the movement is based on demands which have an ethnic and motive in appeal. But then by repeatedly referring to a memorandum which we have rejected and we reject today, I most humbly appeal, please do not give any status to that memorandum. That memorandum is not a political charter, it is not worthy of comment, we rejected it then and we reject it now. As far as hoisting black flags...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAIPAYEE: That memorandum was given to you in 1983.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: As far as hoisting black flag and protests are con-

cerned, these have to be met politically. You cannot deal with the movement, which says we will hoist black flags, as a mere law and order problem. It is, therefore from this point of view that we say that the Government of India and the Government of West Bengal stand together in this matter. Why should we try to draw any difference between the two Governments? All of us owe a duty to ourselves and to the country to meet this movement politically and we will meet it politically. Let us not reduce it to a mere law and order problem. It is to be met politically and we will meet it politically.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : समाजवादी,
मुझे ताज्जुब है कि इतने गंभीर मामले पर सरकार की ओर से किस तरह के जवाब दिए जा रहे हैं। 1983 में सो-बाल्ड मैमोरेंडम दिया गया, 1985 में यह मैमोरेंडम प्रकटित हुआ। सरकार को उसी समय यह मैमोरेंडम मिला। क्या सरकार ने सो-बाल्ड मोरखालैंड लिबरेशन फ्रंट के नेताओं को बुलाकर उनसे इस बारे में बातचीत की? क्या उन्हें चेतावनी दी कि इस तरह के मैमोरेंडम में भारत सरकार पर नर-संहार का आरोप लगाना बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जाएगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस मामले पर पहले ध्यान दिया गया होता तो वहाँ पर यह क्यों मौजूद आती? वहाँ हिंसात्मक उपद्रव हो रहा है जिसमें मौलियाँ चला रही हैं, लोग मर रहे हैं पंजाब में इस तरह की गलती पहले हो चुकी है आज उस मैमोरेंडम की चर्चा की जाए या न की जाए, यह कोई महत्व की बात नहीं है। सवाल यह है कि जब इस तरह का घातक मैमोरेंडम सरकार के ध्यान में आ गया तो रोकथाम की कार्यवाही क्यों नहीं की गयी? क्या सरकार के पास इसका

संतोषजनक जवाब है ? या जवाब यह है कि दार्जिलिंग में कांग्रेस आई० इसमें जुड़ी हुई है और राजनीतिक कारणों से उनके खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की गई, न उनसे जवाब-तलब लिया गया, न उनको चेतावनी दी गई।

श्री भजन लाल : मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ला एण्ड आर्डर की प्रॉब्लम स्टेट की है...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not the Minister yet. You may be made Minister later. Now the Minister has to reply.

श्री बूटा सिंह: सभासति जी, मुझे इस बात का दुख है कि बाजपेयी जी जैसे वरिष्ठ नेता ऐसे राष्ट्रीय महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न को भी पार्टी स्तर पर लाता चाहते हैं जबकि पश्चिमी बंगाल में वहाँ की सरकार और वहाँ की कॉलिंग पार्टी और कांग्रेस पार्टी इस बात पर सहमत हैं। उनमें कोई अन्तर नहीं है। हमारी मुख्य मंत्री जी से बात हुई है, वहाँ की बाजपेयी जी से बात हुई है। अभी तक मेरी जानकारी में कोई ऐसी सूचना नहीं आई जहाँ से ऐसा आभास भी हो कि कांग्रेस (आई०) ने राजनीतिक दृष्टि से ऐसा माना हो कि यह ऐसे लोगों का साथ दे रही है। मैं समझता हूँ बाजपेयी जी शायद अखबारों में छपे हुए प्रोमेगण्डा से प्रेरित हो कर यह बात कर रहे हैं। उनको मालूम नहीं है कि यह वस्तु-स्थिति नहीं है।

दूसरे आपने मेमोरैंडम की बात कही कि 83 में मिला और 85 में छपा भारत सरकार ने बात क्यों नहीं की, क्यों नहीं बुलाया। आप बड़े उदार हैं, बड़े मेहरबान हैं। हमने तो बात करने का प्रयास भी नहीं किया तो भी पूरे बंगाल की प्रेस और पूरी मार्केसिस्ट पार्टी हमारे पीछे पड़ गयी कि

आप उनसे क्यों बात कर रहे हैं। (व्यवधान) हमने यहाँ इसी सदन में कहा कि यदि कोई भी स्टेप हमें लेना होगा, बात करनी होगी या कोई इन्टरवेंशन करना होगा तो हम राज्य सरकार के माध्यम से उन्हीं की सहायता से करेंगे। आज भी हमारा यही स्टैंड है। हम राज्य सरकार के सहयोग के साथ ही इस समस्या का समाधान करने के लिए तैयार हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अब आप समझ रहे हैं कि दाल में कुछ काला जरूर है।

श्री बूटा सिंह : बाजपेयी जी को यह मालूम नहीं है कि यहाँ तो दाल ही नहीं है काली कैसे होगी।

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Sir, the Minister has admitted, in his statement that the Gorkha National Liberation Front has been demanding the creation of State of Gorkhaland within the Indian Union. But he is completely silent about the reaction of the Government towards this demand. Sir, the source of my question is the Indian Express dated 22nd May 1986 and my question is: Is it a fact that Mr. Geising, the so-called leader of Gorkha National Liberation Front, some time back sent a telegram to the Prime Minister warning of bloodshed in Darjeeling if the unconstitutional West Bengal Government does not quit the area of the Gorkhas forthwith?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it a fact?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, I have no information about a telegram sent by Mr. Geising to the Prime Minister. Therefore I cannot answer that question.