

[Dr. Bhai Mahabir]

from that, I think, there is need for keeping our powder dry. We should have full faith in the friendship and good behaviour of all our neighbours. But "Trust in God and keep the powder dry" has been a sound motto. I would like to know if we are keeping our powder dry enough and whether on the occasion of the visit of the Chinese Foreign Minister we would take up all these things and seek a satisfactory assurance from them on this matter.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, at the meeting of the Prime Minister of China and our own Prime Minister at Belgrade, there was hardly any possibility of going into details. It was a brief meeting in the nature of a courtesy call. She met so many foreign dignitaries within those few hours that in the very nature of things, all these details could not be gone into. In general a topic which came under discussion was the question of normalising relations. This is all we know about the meeting; from the report this is all we get. But the other matters, the deeper aspects and the more important and more obscure aspects were not gone into. Naturally when we start normalising relations, as I have just submitted, normalisation in this case means removal of all the causes which have made our relations abnormal. That is quite a comprehensive picture which I have presented and that takes into account all these aspects.

Now, so far as the ICBM is concerned, we have taken China's capacity into account in our defence preparedness exercises. This is a short statement from our side. I would be grateful if I am not asked to elaborate it further.

About the foreign hand, Sir, a statement has just been made by the Home Minister yesterday and I think I would not like to add anything to it. The statement, as it stands, should

be allowed to stand. It was made advisedly as it was and I would not like to add to it.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, I wanted to know if the absence of any mention of Afghanistan in the joint communique had any significance...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I will make a statement on my visit to the Soviet Union. This will be covered in that.

The **VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA):** There are still many names of Members before me who want to participate in this discussion. This will be taken up after 3 o'clock. Now the House stand adjourned for lunch up to 2 o'clock.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-eight minutes past twelve of the clock.

The House reassembled, after lunch, at three minutes past two of the clock, The Vice-Chairman (**SHRI A. G. KULKARNI**) in the chair.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING APPROVAL OF PROCLAMATION ISSUED UNDER ARTICLE 356 OF THE CONSTITUTION IN RELATION TO STATE OF ASSAM—contd.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, may I draw your attention to one very serious thing?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Just a moment. Let me apply my mind to what is to be done and then you draw my attention. Let me tell the Members, the Business Advisory Committee has given one hour for the discussion. So let us complete the discussion and then see.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश):
शगर डेड़ घंटा होगा तो क्या आसमान गिर जायेगा . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA (Uttar Pradesh): Yesterday it was decided in the House that all those who have given names will speak. This was the consensus of the House...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I know that. I am calling Mr. Kalraj Mishra.

Mr. Shahi, whether it is one hour or two hours, whether heavens fall or not, all that we will see. First let us start with Shri Kalraj Mishra.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Sir,...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Mr. Bhattacharya, first please take your seat. I am on my legs...

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I wanted to know from you whether the Business Advisory Committee can change the consensus of the House. Yesterday it was decided that those who have given names, they, will all speak. Now you have announced that only one hour will be given. I wanted a decision on this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I understand what you are talking. Please sit down. I am calling Mr. Kalraj Mishra...

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal): I am not speaking anything on the debate on Assam I rise to speak about the killings that have taken place in Tripura...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Madam, may I request you, let us proceed with the debate first. We will then think of those matters.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Sir, I was making my submission to you. My submission is I am not at all arguing with you...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Has it to do anything with the discussion on this?

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Yes, discussion not only of this, our fundamental rights and privileges as Members of Rajya Sabha of which you are the custodian just now. If it is not allowed to be discussed or a decision is taken to that effect, our fundamental democratic right as Members of Parliament is completely gone and the entire Parliamentary Democracy will totally collapse. I will draw your attention to this and request you to do something about it...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): About what?

SHRI KALYAN ROY: In regard to our right to ask questions and get replies from the Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I will take up whatever you say. But listen to me. First let me complete the business and then I will take up your point. Why are you worried? Mr. Kalraj Mishra...

श्री कलराज मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

मान्यवर आसाम की समस्या आज देश की एक बड़ी समस्या के रूप में हमारे सामने उभर कर आयी है। इस संबंध में सदन ने इसके पहले भी सारे देश का ध्यान आकर्षित किया था। सरकार से यह अपेक्षा थी कि जिस तरीके से माननीय सदस्यों ने अपने सुझाव रखे थे उसके आधार पर उस समस्या का समाधान निकलना चाहिए था लेकिन श्रीमन मुझे बड़े दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जहाँ समस्या का समाधान ढूँढना चाहिए था वहाँ वह न करके आज जैसी एक दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण घटना घटित हुई कि जो लोग आसाम की समस्या को लोगों के सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहते थे ऐसे आसाम के जनता विधायक जो यहाँ धरना दिये हुए थे, उनको गिरफ्तार किया गया। मुझे कहते समय बड़ा दुख होता है कि जहाँ

[श्र. कलराज मिश्र]

सबके सहयोग को लेकर आसाम की समस्या को, राष्ट्रीय समस्या समझ कर उसका समाधान ढूँढना चाहिए था ऐसा नहीं किया गया। यह भी, हमारे कुछ मित्रों ने कहा है कि आसाम में जो आंदोलन चल रहा है, आसू के द्वारा जो आंदोलन चलाया जा रहा है यह हिंसात्मक स्वरूप धारण किये हुए है इसमें हिंसा की गंध आती है। मैं, श्रीमन् आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग किसी पार्टी के नहीं थे किसी राजनीतिक संस्था से संबंध रखने वाले नहीं थे ऐसे लोगों ने वहाँ जाकर सर्वे किया है। मैं इसमें गांधी शांति प्रतिष्ठान का उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ। उनकी जो एक रिपोर्ट है उसमें बड़े स्पष्ट तौर पर यह बताया गया है कि यह आंदोलन गांधियन टेक्निक को अपनाकर चल रहा है और यह किसी वर्ग विशेष का नहीं है किसी क्लास विशेष का नहीं है, सम्पूर्ण आसाम के लोगों ने इसको उभारा है इसको चलाया है, इसको मैं पढ़कर सुना देना चाहता हूँ :

Gandhian techniques of satyagraha and non-cooperation were adopted literally by millions of Assamese and other residents in the State to register their protest in what is indubitably and truly massive people's movement involving men, women and children, urban and rural, rich and poor, scholars and illiterates, bound together by a common sentiment of burning emotions.

ये श्रीमन् किसी राजनीतिक दल से संबंधित लोग नहीं थे। वर्गीज के नेतृत्व में गांधी शांति प्रतिष्ठान की तरफ से सर्वे करने की दृष्टि से एक डेलीगेशन गया हुआ था उसमें उन्होंने इस प्रकार की रिपोर्ट दी है। बड़े दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदया जब चुनाव दौरे पर जगह जगह भाषण कर रही थीं उन्होंने बिहार में पटना में जो भाषण

किये हैं, जिनका उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ इसमें उन्होंने स्पष्ट तौर पर कहा है कि यह आंदोलन, अराष्ट्रीय, एंटी नेशनल है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्रकार की भाषा का प्रयोग करना केवल आसाम की जनता के सेंटीमेंट्स के साथ विश्वासघात ही नहीं है बल्कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के साथ करोड़ों लोगों की भावनाओं के साथ विश्वासघात करने की कोशिश की गयी है। मैं वह आपको पढ़कर सुना देता हूँ। बिहार में पटना में प्रधान मंत्री का चुनाव भाषण हुआ था उसमें उन्होंने कहा। यह 'स्टेट्समन' में निकला हुआ है, 28 तारीख का है।

"The Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, today refuted the allegation levelled by the Gana Samgram Parishad, that she had a hand in the current communal flare-up in Assam, reports UNI. She, however, said that the agitation had generated a sense of insecurity and terror among the minorities in the State. Addressing a large gathering on the first day of the two-day election tour of Bihar she said that the Assam movement was out and out anti-national."

अब श्रीमन्, मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार से जबकि गैर-राजनीतिक दल के लोगों ने भी वहाँ जाकर सर्वे किया और रिपोर्ट्स दी और यहाँ भी कल कुछ हमारे कांग्रेस (आई) साथियों ने बहस करते समय कहा कि असम मूवमेंट वही लोग चला रहे हैं जो देश के हित को देखना चाहते हैं। उस सन्दर्भ में प्रधान मंत्री जी का यह कथन, मैं समझता हूँ कि राजनीतिक भावना से प्रेरित है और यह नीयत को साफ करता है कि वास्तविक तौर पर वे उसका समाधान नहीं ढूँढना चाहतीं।

जहाँ तक आन्दोलन की आवश्यकता का सवाल है, मैं उल्लेख करना चाहूँगा

महात्मा जी के उस वाक्य का, जबकि 1944 में उनको एक असमी डेलिगेशन मिला था। उस समय उन्होंने कहा था।

The delegation came to discuss the question of immigration. In reply, Gandhiji said: "You have referred to the problem of unrestricted Muslim immigration into Assam under the patronage of Sadulla Ministry. The Assamese people should never accept this policy. If unrestricted immigration into Assam, into a small province like Assam, from the neighbouring province is allowed to continue and if, as a result of this, the existing people are likely to be reduced to a minority within the State, be they have a right to satyagraha."

श्रीमन्, मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि गांधी जी ने भी सत्याग्रह करने की उस समय बात की थी, यह देख कर कि कहीं असम आगे चल कर के कुछ लोगों के समूह का अड़्डा न बन जाए और उस प्रकार राष्ट्र-विरोधी गतिविधियाँ वहाँ चालू न हो जाएँ। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने 27 जून, 1952 को जो भाषण दिया था, मैं उस सम्बंध में आपको बताना चाहूंगा। उसमें पंडित जी ने संसद् में कहा था:

"...that Pakistani infiltration into India had been continuing." He said: I believe much of this infiltration took place in the first five years of independence when the border was not adequately guarded. Probably it will be difficult now to deal with the illegal immigrants who came before 1952. We might, therefore, fix 1952 as the date of our inquiry."

मैं, श्रीमन्, आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि गांधी जी से लेकर जवाहरलाल नेहरू तक सब ने इस प्रकार की समस्या के बारे में चिन्ता व्यक्त की है और पंडित जी ने उसी बात को कहा है जो

हमारे आसू के साथियों ने जिन्होंने आन्दोलन अपने हाथ में लिया है, जिन्होंने मांग की है कि फारेनर्ज के डिटेक्शन, आइडेंटिफिकेशन की डेट 1951 को मानना चाहिए। उसी को आधार वर्ष बनाना चाहिए। एन० आर० सी० को उसका आधार बनाना चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Mr. Mishra, your time is up now.

श्री कलराज मिश्र : हम महत्वपूर्ण बातों पर बोलना चाहते हैं। मैं दो मिनट में खत्म करने की कोशिश करूंगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Within a minute you will have to complete.

श्री कलराज मिश्र : श्रीमन्, मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो आसू की मांग, यानि जिन्होंने असम मूवमेंट को चलाया है, जिन्होंने असम के जन सामान्य को आंदोलित किया है अपने हितों की रक्षा के लिए और पूरे हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से उनकी मांगें हैं कि चुनाव के पहले असम की मतदाता सूची से सभी विदेशियों के नाम हटा दिये जाएँ। यह पहली मांग है।

दूसरी मांग—राष्ट्रीय रजिस्टर ई० सन् 1951 और मतदाता सूची ई० सन् 1952 के आधार पर सभी विदेशियों को असम से निकाल दिया जाए।

तीसरी मांग—असम में रहने वाले जिन लोगों को पश्चिम बंगाल, त्रिपुरा और अन्य राज्य सरकारों ने नागरिक प्रमाण-पत्र दिये हैं उन्हें रद्द होने के लिए असम सरकार को अधिकार दिया जाए।

चौथी मांग—मतदाता-सूची से नाम निकाल कर.....

[श्री कलराज मिश्र]

अर्थात् इस प्रकार से उनकी दस मांगें हैं ।

श्रीमन्, प्रोफेसर डी० पी० चट्टोपाध्याय ने यह कहा था कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने 5 मांगों को मान लिया है और उस के बाद भी यह आंदोलन चलाया जा रहा है । मैं श्रीमन्, कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार से छात्रों से और गणसंग्राम परिषद् से वार्ता हुई थी, उस वार्ता के अंदर डेट का कोई उल्लेख नहीं किया गया था और बाद में जब वे चले गए तब कहा गया कि 1971 को हम बेस ईयर मानेंगे । मैं समझता हूँ, उस वार्ता की भावना के विपरीत इस प्रकार की घोषणा की गई है । मेरा स्पष्ट रूप से कहना है कि इस वास्तविकता को समझ कर कि आम की समस्या वास्तव में सारे देश की समस्या है, तभी इस समस्या का समाधान हो सकता है । अगर किसी भी राजनैतिक दुर्भावना से प्रेरित होकर समाधान करने की कोशिश की जाएगी तो कभी समाधान नहीं हो सकता है ।

श्रीमन्, मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ । अभी असम में एक दूसरे प्रकार के आंदोलन ने हिंसात्मक रूप धारण कर लिया है और उस संबंध में भी बताना चाहता हूँ कि अखिल अल्प-संख्यक छात्र परिषद् के द्वारा जो प्रोसेशन निकाला गया, बारपेटा के पास, वहां बड़ा जबरदस्त उपद्रव हुआ, कई लोगों की जानें गईं । उस संबंध में "हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स" में छपी रिपोर्ट पढ़ देता हूँ और उस प्रोसेशन में जो लोग थे उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी नेता श्रीमती गांधी हैं । उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि हमको अपने हितों की रक्षा करनी चाहिए और अपने हितों की रक्षा करने के लिए हम यह प्रोसेशन निकाल रहे हैं । मैं यह उद्धरण पढ़ना चाहता

हूँ, हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स, मई 28 के अखबार से—

"A couple of bearded peasants, marching in a huge procession from the countryside towards Barpeta town on May 26, was asked if they were students, 'No, we are not, but we have been organised by the Assam Minority Students Union' was the answer. Asked 'who is your leader', they unhesitatingly said: 'Mrs. Gandhi is our leader'. She told us that was the only way in which we could safeguard our interests', they added..."

श्रीमन्, मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ... (Time bell rings)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): No, you have got no time. I have given you ample time—five minutes more than you were entitled.

श्री कलराज मिश्र : श्रीमन्, मैं...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): That is all right. Mr. Bagaikar.

श्री कलराज मिश्र : श्रीमन्, मैं सदन के माध्यम से यह मांग करना चाहता हूँ कि जिसप्रकार से यह काउंटर मूवमेन्ट चलाया जा रहा है, मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से विनम्रतापूर्वक निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि उस को अविलम्ब समाप्त करने की दिशा में कदम उठाएं क्योंकि उन के लोग इस में लगे हुए हैं...

(Interruptions)

वे कोशिश करें । क्षमा करें, कल्याण राय जी मैंने आपको इन्टरप्ट नहीं किया । मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि जो भी इस प्रकार के प्रोसेशन आयोजित किए जा रहे हैं उनमें कांग्रेस-आई के प्रेसिडेंट तक ने भाषण किया है—जेलेश्वर नामक स्थान है—वहां पर प्रोसेशन निकाला गया (Time bell rings)

वहां उन्होंने भाषण दिया उनका नाम श्री ललित कुमार डोले है जो कांग्रेस (आई) के स्टेट प्रेसिडेंट हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष (श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी) :
श्री बागाईतकर ।

श्री कृष्णराज बिश्र : श्रीमन्, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं इस आंदोलन को बदनाम करने के लिए इस प्रकार का काउंटर मूवमेंट किया जा रहा है (Interruptions) मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI) : You should take your seat now. Mr. Bagaitkar... (Interruptions) This will not go on record... (Interruptions) Mr. Bagaitkar. You have got ten minutes, Mr. Bagaitkar.

श्री सदाशिव बागाईतकर (महाराष्ट्र) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो चर्चा दो दिन से हम इस सदन में कर रहे हैं उस में, जहां तक असम की परिस्थिति और तथ्यों का सवाल है, वह हमारे सामने उपस्थित हैं । सवाल यह है कि लोकतांत्रिक परंपराओं में विश्वास करने वाली सरकार किस ढंग से इस समस्या का समाधान करना चाहती है । पहली बात मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहूंगा कि सरकार ने जो कदम अभी तक वहां उठाए हैं वे सारे कदम सिर्फ आंदोलन का दमन करने की दृष्टि से उठाए हुए हैं और लोगों के मन में और असम की जनता के मन में जो भय है, जो क्रोध है, उन के मन में जो डर की भावना है, उस को दूर करने का यह उपाय कतई हो नहीं सकता, इसलिए मेरा यह निवेदन है कि असम में जो समस्या है उस के बारे में गृह मंत्री जी और प्रधान मंत्री जी अलग अलग आलाप कर रहे हैं । गृह मंत्री कह रहे हैं :

"We shall not allow this thing to go on. The situation is critical. We shall take adequate measures to curb the situation."

प्रधान मंत्री का भाषण हुआ कांग्रेस दल के सम्मुख जिसमें उन्होंने कहा :

I am not wedded to a particular cut-off date.

अब इस सारी परिस्थिति में हम यह समझना चाहेंगे कि सरकार का सही रुख इस में क्या है । जब आप यह कहती हैं कि : "I am not wedded to a particular cut-off date".

तो फारेन मैशनल्स को डिटेल् का नैका काम शुरू करने में सरकार को क्यों अप्रति है । बट आफ डेट के बारे में अभी अभी जो मेरे मित्र ने उल्लेख किया वह हाउस के सामने आ चुका है, उसको दोहराने की जरूरत नहीं है, लेकिन एक तथ्य मैं समझता हूं जानबूझ कर सामने रखा नहीं जा रहा है और वह तथ्य यह है कि पंडित जी का कथन था कि '52 तक जो पाकिस्तान के नागरिक आये हैं उनको तलाश नहीं का जा सकता लेकिन '52 के बाद जो आये हैं उनको तलाश का जा सकती है । लेकिन बांग्ला देश के साथ 25 मार्च, 1971 में जो मैत्र का पैक्ट हुआ है मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या उसमें हम लोगों ने यह मंजूर नहीं किया है कि 25 मार्च, 1971 तक जो बांग्ला देश से या ईस्ट पाकिस्तान से लोग हिन्दुस्तान में आये हैं उनको वापस लेने की कोई जिम्मेदारी बांग्ला देश की नहीं रहेगी ? क्या इस तरह की बात उस पैक्ट में है ? कल मेरे मित्र बिपिन पॉल दास और चट्टोपाध्याय जी बोले । मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि जब यह पैक्ट सदन के सामने आया मालुमात के लिए तब क्यों नहीं आप लोगों ने ग्राब्जेशन किया अगर इस तरह की बात उस पैक्ट में है तो आगे चल कर आसाम में उस के गम्भीर परिणाम होंगे । यह स्थिति नहीं बतायी जा रही है । 1952 का सवाल ही कही आता है । 1951 की जो मांग विद्यार्थियों ने की है उसको क्या इसलिए नजरन्दाज किया जा रहा है क्यों कि यह पैक्ट, यह अन्डरस्टैंडिंग बांग्ला देश के साथ है और उसके कारण उन सभी लोगों

[अ. नंदाशिव बगईतकर]

का बोझ हम लोगों को डोना है। अगर डोना है तो मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूंगा कि वह सारा बोझ अकेले आसाम के लोग क्यों ढोयें। आसाम की जो आर्थिक स्थिति है, आसाम के विकास की जो समस्याएं हैं उनकी मालुमात सरकार को है हम लोगों को है। आज उन लोगों का बोझ अकेले आसाम को डोने के लिए कहा जा रहा तो यह शर्म की बात होगी। सरकार को सभी लोगों को, विशेष कर जो सम्बन्धित लोग हैं, उनको विश्वास में लेकर इसका कैसे हल निकाला जा सकता है इसके बारे में सोचना चाहिए।

मैं उदाहरण देकर बताना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे मामले हिन्दुस्तान में ही उठते हैं यह बात सही नहीं है। कुछ साल पहले इंग्लैंड में स्काटिश और वेल्श नेशनल्स की आटोनोमी को लेकर आन्दोलन हुआ था लेकिन आपसी बातचीत द्वारा वेल्श और स्काटिश लोगों को ज्यादा आटोनोमी देकर समस्या का समाधान किया गया। लेकिन यहाँ 30 साल में जिस समस्या के समाधान की संवैधानिक और कानूनी जिम्मेदारी सरकार की थी उसको मजबूत कर दिया गया और आसाम के सामने वह सारी समस्या रख दी गयी है। उसकी जिम्मेदारी आसाम के लोगों की कैसे हो सकती है? सरकार ने अपनी संवैधानिक जिम्मेदारी नहीं निभायी। '51 का उल्लेख है। उसके बाद कई बार इस की चर्चा हो चुकी है। चालिहा जब मुख्य मंत्री थे तब उन्होंने सरकार को चेतावनी दी थी। '74 में वहाँ के स्टूडेंट्स ने सवाल उठाया था। वह कहना कि यह समस्या अचानक खड़ी हो गयी बिल्कुल गलत है। सरकार ने अपनी कानूनी और संवैधानिक जिम्मेदारी नहीं निभाई जिस कारण आज आसाम के सामने अस्तित्व का संकट खड़ा हो गया है। इस लिए मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप

आसाम की समस्या की और अधिक ध्यान दीजिए।

आज त्रिपुरा में जो हुआ है उस के ऊपर आप को सोचना है। सारे नार्थ-ईस्ट के जो राज्य हैं और आसाम हैं इन को हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रखने की दृष्टि से हमको सोचना है। आजादी के आन्दोलन में यहाँ के लोग हमारे साथ थे और इन्होंने कुर्बानियाँ की। आसाम के लोगों की जो मांग है वह राष्ट्र हित में है और सरकार की संवैधानिक जिम्मेदारी है जिस की पूर्ति सरकार को करनी चाहिए।

यह कंफ्रेंशन ब्रतम करना है तो सरकार को बिना किसी विलम्ब के यह फैसला करना चाहिए कि जो फारेन नेशनल्स हैं उन को सब से पहले डिफाइन किया जाए। उन को देश से या आसाम से बाहर निकालने का काम बाद में हो सकता है। गोस्वामी जी ने कल यह कहा है, वहाँ के आन्दोलन के समाधान का इस के बाद रास्ता निकाला जा सकता है। आखिर में, चूंकि समय कम है इस लिये एक चीज साफ शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ। मेरे मित्र विपिन पाल दास जी यहाँ बैठे हैं। उन का भाषण मैंने सुना। 20, 25 साल पहले जब वह सोशलिस्ट मूवमेंट में हमारे साथ थे तो उन्होंने एक छोटी सी किताब लिखी। शायद उन को नाम याद हो—“नागा प्राबलम”। उस में उन्होंने क्या लिखा है इसका स्मरण वह करें। जिस तरह से आज वहाँ फौज का इस्तेमाल कर के नागा समुदाय, मीजो समुदाय या आसाम समुदाय को कुचलने का प्रयास हो रहा है उस से अलगवावादी तत्वों को बढ़ावा मिलेगा, जैसा कि नागालैंड में हुआ। सरकार एक तरफ मीजो और नागालैंड की समस्या को लेकर बात करने के लिये तैयार है और मुझे खुशी है कि लालबंगा के साथ या मीजो लोगों के साथ वह बात करे, लेकिन अगर उसी के साथ आप इंटरजेंट लोगों के साथ भी बात करेंगे

तो वह अच्छी बात नहीं होगी और उस के घातक परिणाम हो सकते हैं। तो मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ आज पूरे नार्थ ईस्ट अंचल में हिन्दुस्तान से अलग हो जाने का खतरा खड़ा हो गया है। आज बंगला देश में त्रिपुरा के लोगों को गुरिल्ला वार-फयर की ट्रेनिंग दिये जाने की खबरें आ रही हैं और त्रिपुरा के घटनायें और असम का आंदोलन पूरे नार्थ ईस्ट अंचल को हिन्दुस्तान से अलग किये जाने के और इंगित कर रहे हैं। यह खतरा हमारे सामने है। तो यह जरूर है कि इस समस्या को राजनीतिक दृष्टि से न देखा जाय बल्कि असम के समस्या को तुरन्त हल किया जाए और उस का इलाज निकाल कर जो खतरा खड़ा हुआ है उस का समाधान किया जाये। मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार इस तरह तुरन्त कदम बढ़ाये और जो आर्मी भेजने या स 0 आर 0 पी 0 भेजने का काम है या जो दमन का सरकार का खर्चा है उसे सरकार छोड़े। यही मेरा निवेदन है।

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam): Sir, my friend, Mr. Bagaitkar, has referred to my book written some 25 years ago on the Naga problem entirely out of the context. I must make it absolutely clear that in that book, I totally opposed, I condemned the Naga demand for sovereign independence. That must be kept in mind.

SHRI SADASIV BAGAITKAR: What is the impact on the problem? Why do you forget that? That is what I am...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Mr. Bagaitkar, you have made your point and he has clarified his point. That is all.

SHRI K. C. PANT (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, today Assam is in flames and the flames are spreading to other sensitive areas in the North-Eastern Region. It is a situation which causes grave concern. It is a national problem. What we

have to ask ourselves today is: What are the priorities in the situation? When one's house is on fire, the first thing is to put out the fire. Then one can go into the causes of the fire and one can apportion the blame. But, at the moment, the fire has to be put out. And if the fire is not put out quickly, then the danger of the fire spreading is very serious. And I think no-right-minded person in the country can contemplate the situation that may arise in that case.

Sir, the North-Eastern Region of our country has had its own peculiar problems. I think it is necessary to have a feel of these problems. It is, perhaps, not possible, sitting here, to understand the strong sense of local identity in that multi-lingual region with its many languages, many cultures. It is, perhaps, not possible from here to fully understand the sense of isolation and neglect, the feeling that economic development has not kept pace with the requirements of the region. I am not saying that this is peculiar to the North-East. But, I would submit that in view of the geographical position of the North-East, in view of the peculiar emotional background that has been generated by the assertion of local identities, by insurgency in several pockets, we have to handle this situation with understanding, with sympathy and with sensitiveness. What has happened in Tripura today? It is amazing, Sir, that in a State where tensions and frictions have existed—but have been handled peacefully all along—today suddenly violence has erupted on such a large scale that 300 people are dead. Neighbours have killed each other. People who have lived together for decades have been at each other's throats. This is also true of Assam. Our sympathy goes out to all those who have suffered. But the need today here is to find a solution and a solution can only come by negotiations. There is no other way to find solutions. They are our people whether they are Assamese or Bengalis or Hindus or Muslims. They

[Shri K. C. Pant]

are our people and we have got to find a solution within a very short period.

I listened to Shri Makwana's speech with great attention. There was no sense of urgency in it. It was a perfunctory speech. There was no feeling for the volcano of emotions that is erupting all over the North-East and, I am sorry to say, he did not give any indication of the Government's mind on the main issues and the approach of the Government to these issues. Had he done so, I feel that the debate would have been even more purposeful and the debate would have come up with more concrete ideas. As it is, the debate has been of a very high order and I am very glad that the Prime Minister is here because I found that at least on one point there was common ground between a strong critic of the agitation and a strong supporter of the agitation. Shri Bipinpal Das said that he disapproved of the agitation now and it was in the context of his position, a courageous speech. I do not want to go into the rights and wrongs of it but it was a courageous speech. Now, I listened to the speech of Shri Dinesh Goswami, a strong supporter of the movement, very carefully. He said that if the proposals made by Shri Bipinpal Das in his letter to the Prime Minister were accepted by the Prime Minister, then the agitation could be called off. It was a positive concrete statement. I feel that the main obstacle in starting a dialogue is the lack of any common ground on which to begin. There is no common ground. Everybody wants that there should be a dialogue. But they cannot meet because common ground is not being found. But here is the debate in this House, as I said, in the speeches of these two Members, one finds common ground and I would like to suggest to the Prime Minister that if such common ground is found, why not make it the basis for discussions and this would be a very concrete and posi-

tive contribution of this House to the solution of this problem? Sooner or later, some common ground will have to be found. Sir, I do not think that the approach of the big stick is going to solve this problem. The Home Minister at various stages has been making warlike noises. I think force has to be used when it is necessary to protect the minorities. But I do not think war-like noises help and I do not think that wielding the big stick and talk of display of force helps in these situations. Force must be used when it is necessary but one must always remember that ultimately the solution has to be through negotiations. It cannot be otherwise. (*Time bell rings*). Sir, I am afraid...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I have got only ten minutes for you. Now seven minutes are already over.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I have had very close links with Assam and the north-east and it is in anguish that I speak here today; you must understand the anguish.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I can use this yardstick for every Member. Anyway, please go ahead.

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Gujarat): Sir, we surrender our three minutes.

SHRI K. C. PANT: The Home Minister said it is a family affair. He has talked of the students in sympathetic terms. I found today, but at the same time he says that display of force was necessary and he says that there is a foreign hand. He says that minorities are in fear. None of us wants minorities to be in fear. There are certain fundamentals on which we do not compromise but an agitation which has been carried on for nine months is in itself extraordinary and we cannot brush it aside. Do we not recognise the strength of the feelings behind it? Are they not our people? And then, if we recognise the strength behind the feelings of

those people in Assam, then we have got to see, we have got to understand that in such situations, with the best of intentions on the part of those who lead such agitations, as the time goes on, anti-social elements, perhaps anti-national elements, try to take advantage of the situation. What should be our approach? Either we can dub them all anti-national and throw them into the lap of those who are really anti-national or we can try to wean them away from such elements who are anti-national, who are communal, who are trying to exploit the situation in a wrong way. I am afraid if we wield the big stick, we will succeed only in throwing these reasonable elements into the laps of unreasonable elements whose activities we object to, the foreign hands we speak of. Therefore, I think an attitude of sympathy is absolutely essential and I think in this situation the Government has to take the initiative also. It is not a one-sided thing.

If we remember that the issue of foreigners has to be isolated from all the other issues that have got involved, and if we concentrate on that, then the problem becomes more manageable and if we concentrate on that, two points come up. One is the identification of foreigners. We have to have a machinery in which all have confidence. Sir, I am afraid, I just do not agree with the Assam Students Union's approach that they will indentify and deport the foreigners. It has to be done by a machinery in which all have confidence. At the same time I cannot agree with those who say that there has not been enough infiltration. Why is there a problem then? The problem is there and it has got to be understood; it has got to be recognised. And even Mr. Ramamurti said that three lakhs of people have been detected and deported in the last 20 years. So, the problem does exist, and it is no use sweeping it under the carpet. Once we accept that a machinery has to be set up after that the question

comes as to what we do with those who have been identified. There is the proposal of Shri Bipinpal Das and if the Prime Minister reacts to it, that can form the basis, as I said earlier.

Now, Sir, the Government has made some mistakes. I must refer to that because it is such a sensitive matter and I do not think that if it is allowed to drift any further if it is going to help any of us. Firstly, there is the Governor's offer of 1967 as the cut-off date. This has created an avoidable confusion and the impression is that the Central Government must have approved the Governor's offer and because of this, 1971 has not been as firm a date as one would have liked it to be. And this has created a reaction in Assam and the Governor has lost his credibility. Sir, the person handling the situation there has lost credibility.

The second thing is, as the climate was improving for talks and negotiations, the big stick was wielded. I refer to the 18th of April when, without any incident, curfew was imposed in Gauhati. Is this the way to tackle the situation? Suppose some incident had taken place, I could have understood it, but without any incident taking place, what is the justification for imposing curfew? There are people who are trying to handle the situation; there are others, non-political people, who have stepped into this situation to try to ease it. How can they persuade anybody if the Government wields the big stick? What is the meaning of display of force? Is this the way to handle a situation like this? Sir, the situation which was defreezing, because of this blunder, again froze, and thereafter, the parting of ways came. This is very unfortunate.

Sir, I personally think the Bengal blockade was a mistake. I know that it reflected the benuine sentiments in Bengal. But at a time, when one was trying to control a develop-

[Shri K. C. Pant]

ing situation, it aggravated it. Then, Sir, the Prime Minister is here. I know she knows the area. I know she has done a lot for this area. But in this case, she had been introduced into the negotiations at a stage when it was not ripe for her introduction. The result was that she had to go to Assam and come back empty-handed. She is the last court of political appeal, and to both sides, she would have been the last court of appeal. To introduce her into this situation at this moment, in my view, was a wrong step and this only complicated matters.

Then, Sir, there is the question of violence. Some of my friends said that there was little violence. The point is not little or great. The point is, there is fear, there is apprehension, in the minds of the minorities. We have to take note of it. Yesterday, a Senior Member from Assam spoke about the freedom struggle. He talked about 1921, 1931, 1940 and 1942. He said that even in those movements, there were cases of violence. I would submit to him with all respect that when there was violence, it was condemned by Gandhiji. In this case, I would have been happy if the Assam Students Union leaders had condemned the violence, outright, on minorities and others. If they had condemned violence as such, I think, it would have helped those who are trying to see that the situation improves quickly.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Gandhiji withdrew the movement once.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Yes. Once, he withdrew the movement. We should recognise that the problem of refugees is a problem which has been left over by partition. I do not want to go into the history, into the legal and constitutional aspects of the problem. You are not giving me time. I think, it is a fact of geography that certain States had to

share a larger burden of partition, the aftermath of partition, than others and, I think, if, in finding a solution to the Assam problem some of the other States could come forward to help by taking some of these foreigners, who are identified, into those States, it would be good. This should be a national obligation. I realise the difficulties. I think, the States will have their difficulties. But still, I would make this submission in all earnestness in order to try to sort out this problem to the best of our ability.

Sir, there is no question of the unity and the integrity of India being jeopardised. I think, in our country, the sense of local identity has to be reconciled, with the sense of Indian unity. These are two separate things. One should never bring them into confrontation. I think, both have to come together. I think, so far, in fact, India has succeeded very well in harmonising local identities with national integrity, and in Assam also, this has got to be done. Sir, there can be no compromise with communal and parochial tendencies, particularly, when parochial tendencies, beyond a point, create a chain reaction. This we all realise. In each of the States, where we are working on the ground, there are these tendencies and we have to curb them. This is not peculiar to Assam alone and this we have got to understand. (*Time-bell rings*). Sir, I shall end very soon. Obviously, no quarter can be given to secessionist tendencies.

Now, Sir, the question of majorities and minorities has been raised. It becomes involved in politics. I am afraid, there is a lot of politics in this. But one should remember, majorities in one State are minorities in another. There is no absolute majority in India. Let us remember that even in respect of Tripura majorities in Tripura are minorities in Assam. We have to protect the rights of the minorities. The Centre

also has an obligation in this respect. But we have got to understand the sentiments of all. Even in Assam, in the Cachar agitation, we had to respond to the sentiments of both the Bengalis and take into account the sentiments of the Assamese and finally a solution was found. Sir, it is playing with fire, this whole question of pitting the majorities against the minorities. It is an explosive situation in Tripura and I feel that in Tripura as well as in Assam the essence of the matter is to sort out the matter quickly. I am practically done. I have pleaded for understanding of the real problems, of the real fears. I know Assam has passed through a long period of turbulence. I know the hill people have passed through turbulences. When the people of the hills wanted to assert and have their own administrative units, the leaders of Assam reacted in a statesman-like manner, and several States were formed. But now today the Assamese have fear of being swamped.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): That is all. I will call the hon. Minister now.

SHRI K. C. PANT: In the end, Sir, may I say that I would ask the ASSU leaders, I would appeal to them to call off the agitation, because there is economic loss to the country and to the State? And because it is a border area, because of the peculiar vulnerability of that border area. I think it is all the more necessary that we must create conditions in which the problem can be resolved peacefully. The whole country is watching, and I would appeal to the Government to create conditions in which this can be done quickly. Time is of the essence and it is time that we are now losing. Sir, we should not in this House accuse anybody of lack of patriotism. I feel very sorry when from any section of the House any Member speaks of any section of the country being unpatriotic. We must not question the patriotism of

any section of our people. We have to live together. Assam is a beautiful tapestry of Bengalese, Assamese, hill people and others. We have to see that it is not torn as under. We have to preserve it with all our might.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Yes, Mr. Makwana.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, what happens to us?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): The Business Advisory Committee...

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, for all these three days we have been waiting here for our change... (Interruptions)

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Now you are giving another decision. Yesterday it was the consensus of the House that everybody will speak. Now the Business Advisory Committee has come in. If you say that the Business Advisory Committee can change the consensus of the House, it is all right. (Interruptions).

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, we must be heard.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I would listen to all your submissions. Let me first finish the programme that has been given by the Business Advisory Committee. After that if you want to continue with the discussion, I have no objection. (Interruptions) But the Prime Minister has to intervene, Mr. Makwana has to speak. You just wait. Let me call Mr. Makwana.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir,...

SHRI K. C. PANT: Is he intervening or replying to the debate?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Mr. Makwana is making an intervention and the Prime Minister will also be intervening.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to all those who have participated in this debate, especially because all of them have expressed clearly that everybody is one with the Government so far as the integrity and unity of this country is concerned, right from the first speaker, Shrimati Purabi Mukherjee, to the last speaker, Shri K. C. Pant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he replying to the debate?

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: I am replying.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Mr. Vice-Chairman says that he is intervening.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): I have also given my name. What about my name?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I will clarify the position. (*Interruptions*). You just take your seat, I am making an observation which will satisfy all the House. The Business Advisory Committee is represented by all the parties. They have taken certain decisions. As hon. Members of this House we have to cooperate with the Chair to implement those decisions. I have already accommodated two more members. There is, I know, one friend, Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan, who never speaks in the House. I am feeling very sorry for him. I promised that I will allow him today. But now since this is the decision of the Business Advisory Committee, I have not allowed him. I know the feelings. Let us hear Mr. Makwana and, if need be,

the Prime Minister, and then I will again take the sense of the House.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: What do you say, Mr. Vice-Chairman? Will that be proper? How can the sense of the House be taken after the Prime Minister has spoken? Yesterday, Mr. Advani . . .

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gujarat): From your earlier observation, it seems that the Union Home Minister is to reply to the debate. If the Union Home Minister is to reply to the debate, it would perhaps be in the fitness of things if the House has the advantage of listening to the Prime Minister first.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Mr. Advani, you are a very experienced parliamentarian. You were the Leader of the House. You know the decision of the Business Advisory Committee.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I do not know.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): It was announced by the Chairman here. (*Interruptions*) Please listen to me.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: You must listen to others also. (*Interruptions*) Don't decide things like that. Take into account the background.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Please resume your seat. When I am on my legs, you have to take your seat first. That will not go on record.

(*Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee continued to speak.*)

श्री बुद्ध गिरि मौर्य (ग्रामधर प्रदेश) :
श्रीमान्, मेरी वास्तविकता का प्रश्न है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): You just wait.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: On a point of order, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): That is the practice. The Business Advisory Committee has to decide. The Business Advisory Committee in its wisdom has decided this. The Chairman has announced that business in the House.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: My point is that it is for the Government to decide who replies to this debate. If the Union Home Minister is to reply to the debate, then perhaps if the Prime Minister intervenes just now, the House would be at an advantage. If Mr. Makwana is replying, then there is no intervention.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH): I want to say that the Prime Minister has the right to reply also. You are a senior parliamentarian. You know it very well.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: If the Prime Minister wants, she can reply; I have no objection.

SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH: Mr. Makwana will reply to the debate. Prime Minister would like to add some more points.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, on a point of order regarding your announcement. It is a very peculiar thing, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that after the reply of the Prime Minister the debate may continue!

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Prime Minister wants to say something. Let us hear the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI-MATI INDIRA GANDHI): I think we are talking at cross purposes. The hon'ble gentleman is saying something on one point—that he wants to speak on this. Others are debating on whether I should reply, or whether my

colleague, Mr. Makwana, should reply. Now I have no objection in replying. But I have not been able to attend the debate at all. Usually I try to be here for at least half the time, but this time I have not been here. That is why I think it is more proper if he replies to it. But usually people ask me to speak anyway. This is why I came here so that I would add some points, especially as some hon. Members have thought it fit to say things about me which do not have basis in fact. I have no objection in speaking before Shri Makwana, but according to my previous experience, later on the Home Minister may not be allowed to speak at all. This was the reason why I said I would rather add than speak.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: From the point of procedural propriety, it would be better if the intervention comes before the reply. It is just from the point of view of procedure. Therefore, if the Prime Minister intervenes and Mr. Makwana speaks later, it would be fine. There is no question of not allowing the Home Minister to reply.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I am on a point of order. My point of order is regarding what you have said, regarding the procedure. I am not as experienced a parliamentarian as the Vice-Chairman. But the Vice-Chairman has said that after the reply to the debate has been given, I will take the consensus of the House whether the debate should continue. In my two years of parliamentary life this is the strangest statement emanating from the Chair. That is one aspect. The other aspect is whether after the Government has replied to the debate, the debate can continue. Yesterday Mr. Advani, myself and others had talks with the Leader of the House, Mr. Mukherjee, whether it should continue and whether those who could not participate on the preceding day—because yesterday there was little time left—will be given an opportunity to participate.

[Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee]

Now it was agreed that it would be extended. My point is whether it is the Business Advisory Committee which decides as to who will speak and who will not . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): All right, please sit down, Mr. Maurya, what is your point of order?

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य : श्रीमन्, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो कुछ अभी कहा है उससे मैं यह अंजा लगाता हूँ कि राज्य गृह मंत्री जी डिबेट का उत्तर दे रहे हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Mr. Maurya, instead of taking the time of the House, will it satisfy your point of order as the Prime Minister is intervening?

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: That is all right.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): The Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Sir, as I said earlier, I have to apologise to the House for not being able to be present here. But I have read through the resume of the speeches which have been made. There is nothing very new that one can say on this subject. We are all deeply concerned about what is happening in Assam and what is happening in Tripura. Although the two are connected, they are two different problems, different motivations, and so on. So far as Assam is concerned, I am not going into all the points. I just want to comment on a few things which have been raised. There is no doubt about the gravity of the situation. My friend, Shri K. C. Pant, gave the example of a fire. How do we put out that fire? That has been my concern. One honourable Member, Mr. Kakati, said that although I had given only

twenty minutes to the students in Gauhati. I had given three hours to the minorities. This is how misunderstandings crop up. I have seen the students on three different occasions and only in Dispur I was a little short of time. Even then I did see them for more than twenty minutes. But previously I had met them for quite long periods, for as long as they wanted. After that the Home Minister spent hours with them. Again and again certain Members have said there should be a dialogue, there should be negotiations. We have not stopped the dialogue. We have taken the initiative in arranging these meetings. In fact, Mr. K. C. Pant contradicted himself. First he said there should be a dialogue; then he said the Prime Minister should not have been introduced into it. I was not introduced . . .

SHRI K. C. PANT: There are many levels of dialogue.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I know. But the students insisted that they wanted to see me. Should I reply 'no', I do not want to see you, and give them an excuse to say that she is not seeing us and therefore we cannot agree to anything? They wanted to see me and therefore I met them. Their first request was: will you come to Assam? Naturally I said, 'yes, I shall come to Assam'. Maybe, it was wrong of me. But it was a little enough to accede to. But first we met the Opposition leaders, this the students held as a grievance. It was also said, that as I was going out of the country and yet could not find time to visit Assam; this shows that I am not serious about the problem. I did not go with much hope of any solution, because gradually I was coming to understand that there was a deeper motivation. I am not accusing the students. I do not think that this is a students' movement. They are in it but they are being used as a facade. They are sincere in what they want. But there are other undercurrents. It is not possible to pinpoint them exactly. But they are there. And the proof

of it is, which I think the Home Minister mentioned in the other House and also Shri Makwana, that on several occasions they have agreed to certain things or they themselves have put forward a formula to which we

have agreed. But after an hour 3 P.M. or so they phoned and said, "No, this cannot be done."

Therefore, it did seem as if somebody else was prompting them. When the students meet me, it is as if it is a deputation from some foreign country because they insist on the conversation taking place through an interpreter. At the last meeting in Delhi it was clear that the interpreter was not interpreting me properly because we also had an Assamese-speaking person. We found that the interpreter was leaving out large chunks of what I was saying and when we pointed this out, he assured us, "I am just going to do it; but listen to this student first". Somehow, in a roundabout way what I said was not fully conveyed. This is not terribly important, but it does give an inkling. Now I have digressed from the main thing. So, although I had meetings in Dispur with AASU and with Gana Sangram Parishad, the only long meeting was with the representatives of the political parties. I did not look at my watch and so I do not know how long it was; but, as hon. Members here are all in politics, they know that we tend to speak more than any other group or any other profession in the world. So that was a longish meeting and that put my entire programme out of gear. So for Nowgong I had very little time left. One hon'ble Member has alleged that I spent three hours with the minorities. Actually, the total time I spent in Nowgong was 40 minutes. Some time was taken in going to and fro the helipad and in the rest of the time I met several deputations apart from having a talk with the Governors' Adviser. All this was in 25-30 minutes. I certainly met a deputation of the minorities also, but I doubt if they had more than five or six

minutes, the same time as the others. I have read that some leaders, not here in the House but outside, have alleged that there is something mysterious about this meeting and some deal was made. Now it was not a private meeting. The Government people were sitting there. As we had all missed our lunch, in the meantime some people were trying to bring tea etc. The room was so small that while I was meeting one delegation, one delegation was in the process of being hustled out and another one was trying to force its way in. So there was some confusion. Nobody can say that it was a private meeting. It was as public as if sitting outside.

Now nowhere have I called the students anti-national. It is very laudable effort on the part of Shri Pant to say that no one in this country is anti-national. Then who is bringing out the posters? Who is saying, "Get out, you Indian dogs". All I have said in my public and private statements is: why can't those who are in favour of an amicably peaceful settlement condemn such actions? There has been no condemnation. I put this to the students also. And when I talk about the minorities, I do not mean merely the religious minorities but linguistic and provincial, and many of the people whom today the Assamese are considering foreigners. A very pertinent point was made in the other House today: What does the Government mean by foreigners. The real meaning of foreigners is those people who are not Indian citizens but are citizens of another country. But here we have a very special situation. On one side is whatever was said before the creation of Bangladesh. But once Bangladesh came into being, the sort of atmosphere created did change the situation. Many refugees came and at that time we accepted them. There is no secret or otherwise pact between Mujib and myself on this issue, but some talks and letters were exchanged between our then Rehabilitation Minister, Shri Khadilkar, and his

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

counterpart on the other side and it is true that they agreed that only from 1971 onwards will we ask people to go back. But to say that I am not willing for negotiation is not correct. There has been no confusion in my mind or in my words. I have said very clearly that I am not committed to any date. How did we say 1971 to start with? We had a meeting of the leaders of the Opposition parties in Parliament. They are the ones who suggested that we should stick to 1971.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Along with the Assam party leaders.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Along with the Assam party leaders. Everybody did not entirely agree. One person did not agree. One person stayed quiet. But all the other stressed 1971. Afterwards we wanted to know whether the students were willing to move from 1951 at all. They were insisting on 1951 and nothing else. This was the question. It was the Governor's idea that he probe their mind. On his own he suggested 1967. But he made it clear that he had not discussed the date with us. He was first trying to find out whether they were willing for a spirit of give and take. They rejected it. Once they rejected it, there was no question of our considering that date. We were told that they were sticking to 1951. Have I given any date to them? Only at that time. When I found that the students were regarding it as a hardening of our attitude, I said, "Let us forget about it. Do you want the work to begin or not?" We cannot begin deportations today of persons from 1951, even if Government were to agree. Government has not agreed but, even if we were to agree, we cannot do this. Physically impossible. Therefore, I said, "If you want this problem to be solved, let us make 1971 the starting date, not the cut-off date but the starting date of deportation. And

my argument was that there was no controversy about this date, either with the Opposition leaders or Bangladesh or anybody else. And also I said that along with this, anybody else who should have been deported earlier or who was deported according to earlier orders or if he was on the list of being deported and either not been deported or had gone and returned, then, he should also be sent back. That was my proposal to them. It is not because I am saying so myself but I do think this is a very fair proposal. I said, "Do not think that I am trying to gain time or use it as an excuse to force you to end your agitation. Therefore, while this deportation is going on, simultaneously we will go into all the other questions. But you withdraw the agitation for the simple reason that it is not possible to have negotiations when here is anger and fear in the minds of the people." It is not just that the minorities are a little agitated. They are in such fear of their lives that you have only to look at their faces, you do not even have to listen to what they say.

I am not interested in who goes and gives reports. And particularly regarding the institution that has been mentioned, a lot can be said into which I do not want to enter. The matter had come up in the previous session of Parliament about their donations from outside. So, we are not interested in their opinion in these matters. In fact, we do not even know what their intention was.

The agitation has not been non-violent. Again and again the students repeat that it is non-violent. But it is not only Bengalis who are being killed, it is not only the other minorities who are being killed but the people of Assam are also being killed. People who have no other connection with any place ever, have said that they are forced to be in the agitation because they dare not say that they are against it. If I name

them, their lives will be in danger. I have their names. This is the situation.

What happened at the very beginning of the agitation? I have got to remind you that at the very beginning, the agitation started in July, 1979 or round about that time. It had gone on for many months before we came on the scene. That is no excuse for us. I am just pointing it out because sometimes Members have a short memory. At the beginning of the agitation—this has been given by one of the groups who came to meet me—the members of the AASU guided the foreigners' eviction operation at Phukong near Gauhati, where two tribal cultivators, Habib Ram Boro and Debu Ram Boro, descendants of the Lachet Soldiers who defended Assam during the Ahom rule from aggression, were brutally killed. This is just one example; there are others. I do not want to go into them. Now, our argument with them has been on the definition of a foreigner? People who have adopted Assam as their State for hundreds of years, are they foreigners? May be Bengalis still wear saris, but they have made Assam their home. They have helped in its development. But if there is propaganda "You throw out these people, you will acquire the land, you will get the jobs", naturally the movement will become popular. But it is not a thing to be encouraged. In fact, it is not going to work in that way either, as we have seen in other situations. We have had previous experience of such agitation on a smaller scale. It does not help in giving greater employment. Greater employment can only come through greater development.

With the students we spoke also about development programmes, about economic programmes. Government of India have formed a special Ministers' Group and also a special Secretaries' Group and we are willing to immediately take programmes in hand. But do they want any

of the programmes to start now? I put a small proposal. Our Health Ministry approached me that there is a special, virulent type of malaria which affects only that part of the world, that is from Assam and a belt right across Asia perhaps up to Cambodia. It is fortunately not in the rest of India. I said, "Carry on with your agitation, but let this anti-malaria programme go on in your State so that people are not affected." They were not willing. I said, let us send a team or two, which as a small token, because they cannot go into every village, and to destroy the larvae you have to go to every village, spray every pond and so on. Now when our team went, an Assamese official is reported to have said that he did not want their interference. He said, "Do you know whom you are talking to? You are not talking to an Indian. You are talking to an Assamese citizen." Again this is only one example. There are worse ones which I do not want to say here. This is the situation. This is the atmosphere created by the agitation. Are the students in control? I do not know. I honestly cannot say that they are in full control. Shri Pant rightly said that we should separate those elements who are sincere and who are bothered about the grievances of the Assamese people from the others. But no effort is being made for this. No separation at all is visible between those people. We know what happened to a person who works in a bank, for instance. He is an employee; he does not own it. He was asked by two girl students to close down the bank. He said, "Well, I am just an employee. It is my job and I may risk my job if I close down." Then the Assam Police came and said, "You close it down or else we will see." What could he do? He closed it down. That is not a non-violent way. And it certainly was not the students' agitation which was closing it down; it was the force of the police. And a large part of the Assamese Government machinery is behaving in a similar manner. The

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

Governor tried very sincerely. No body could have been more accommodating than he was. And this is why he is in trouble. In the other House they were all shrieking for his removal. He is in trouble, because he thought he could separate the two elements, the genuine ones from those who are openly being anti-Indian. This is not hidden. Their posters, their slogans, their talk with people—this is not hidden.

Now, our figures of the dead is 150. But I am told by some groups that 510 people are missing, mostly of the minorities and they believe them to be dead. I do not know whether it is so. An instance was given that on the midnight of the 28th, AASU volunteers—there were some people who had been beaten up and were in hospital—took away an injured boy from the hospital and murdered him by extracting his eyes and crushing his knee and elbow joints. They also did not leave the heart in the body. The body was returned home by the police personnel the next day. There are other such instances. Is this non-violence? Even then we say we do not have closed mind...

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): Have you got them verified or are they just allegations?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It is an allegation. You can also verify it.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Because, what you say is very serious.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not giving it as my statement. I said these are some of the incidents that are being brought to our notice. There are others who are dead. We know they are dead. I met the relatives of some of them. If they are alive, you produce them. That is all I can say.

Again, I would like to tell the honourable member—who made that statement—that I did not have a single meeting in Patna district. He was talking about a speech I made in Patna. I may tell him that I did not have any meeting in Patna...

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: How does it come here?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: He referred to a speech supposed to have been made in Patna. This is not so. He can easily verify it. I did not go to Patna. Surely a visit cannot be hidden. Either I went or I did not go...

श्री कलराज मिश्र : 28 तारीख को आप ने बिहार की चुनाव सभाओं में भाषण दिया था पटना में। यह "स्टेट्समैन" में आया है। यह एक नेशनल न्यूज पेपर है।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी अगर आप समझते हैं कि अखबार की बात हमेशा सच होती है तो आप किसी दूसरी दुनिया में रहते हैं।

श्री कलराज मिश्र : लेकिन इस को गलत तो नहीं कहा जा सकता।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : उन्होंने तो अखबार को कोट किया होगा, लेकिन The fact remains that I did not go to Patna.

Furthermore, I have never said the movement itself is anti-national or that sort of a thing. I do not know whether it was the same member or another who repeatedly quoted me as having said, that it is an out and out anti-national movement. I have always said that there is a segment which seems to be anti-national. As far as I know, others have not condemned them. This is my grouse against them.

As I said, so far as we are concerned, the dialogue is on, we still are and always will be willing for talks. We

are interested in finding a solution. There is one other point I want to make. It is understandable that the Assamese should be sensitive to the question of their identity as every group is. And we in India have encouraged this. We do not want everybody speaking the same language, everybody having the same religion; we do not want to regiment people. We have always believed in diversity strengthening unity instead of weakening unity. But are these Assamese boys equally sensitive to the desire of the tribals to keep their identity? Shri Pant is aware of this. (Interruption) It is because they are not willing. And the same thing is happening now. Within Assam the tribal people originally went along with this movement but now they feel that they are the ones who are going to be crushed, their language will be lost, their personality erased. This is what is happening...

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: What about the refugees?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: There are many other things. Now, the number of people injured—2000; the number of persons rendered homeless—more than 20000; arson, more than 3500 houses or huts burnt; about murder you have heard of Dr. Moitra of Oil India. Then, Shri Ni-yogi of Arunachal Pradesh, he just gave a lift to a few students in a truck and he was murdered on the way. One lady, an Oriya lady, was asked to pay money. By the way there were a lot of forcible collections. This old lady was asked to give money. Either that old lady did not have money or she did not want to give money; so they cut off her nose and she bled to death. Many people are still untraced.

Naturally we have to go by the Constitution. We have to see that there is no great burden on Assam. Everybody agrees. But how do we relieve that burden? I must say to the credit of the students, when I

put these problems to them, they did pause and think about them. As I said even if we wish to remove them, people, where are we going to take them? Which State will they go to? How are the arrangements to be made? It is easy just to talk about 51 or 61 or any date. It involves a lot of other considerations. While this atmosphere is there, it is not going to work even with regard to industries. Suppose I go to a businessman today and say "you put up an industry". Will he put up one in Assam in this atmosphere? The Assamese will ask: "Who is this foreigner who has put up this industry?" I am not talking in the air. I had such a conversation.

It is easy to support an agitation without seeing all its consequences. There is the question of refugees. Those who are born in India are Indian citizens. What about their old parents—old father and old mother? Can we say: "Their names are not in the citizenship register and therefore throw them out". Where are they going to go? When we say we are going to move all those people, are we going to shoot them dead? How are you going to deal with them? These are not statistics. These are men, women and children. Unless you look at it from the human angle and unless you find out who are the people involved, how are you going to solve it? The problem cannot be solved just by talking about it. You have to come to the table with a calm attitude. I think you can ask the students. I have always spoken to the students like a mother, wanting to help them individually, as a group and as a State. Whenever I have talked to them they were on the point of saying 'yes'. This is with regard to the starting day of 1971. I put it to Assamese professors and to Assamese lawyers. I asked them what more could I have done? They said: You are right. But we have no choice and must join processions. A situation has arisen where we seem to be going round and round. The

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

extremists may be a very small segment. Outsiders may be playing a role. Outsiders, as we know, do not work through foreigners coming here. They work through the local people. This small segment is getting the upper hand over this agitation. This is what is bothering me. I am not doubting the sincerity of the Assamese people. Nobody wants their language to be submerged. Nobody wants their culture to be submerged. As I said to them, it is not by shutting your mind that your personality grows. It is by contact and meeting other people and so on. What is India's strength? As sung by Iqbal, how has Indian civilisation, of all the civilisations of the world, survived thousands of years? Because we have kept our doors open; because we had adopted new ideas, welcomed them, absorbed them and sometimes changed them into our own. This is what has helped us. We never said: This is India, nobody should come here. When we lost to the foreigners it was at times when we shut our minds and did not take to new technology. Then we became weak. When we accepted people we grew stronger. I am not saying that more and more people should come into Assam. I am not saying that. But the attitude of being against everybody is not helping them. This is what has created the problem earlier with the tribals. It has come up again. Only yesterday I had a group of tribals to see me. They were just as excited as others with regard to their rights. They say: What has happened to our language? Why should we learn Assamese? If the Assamese were not taking a chauvinistic attitude, these people also would not have felt like this. They were talking Assamese; they were learning that language. Therefore, you have to see how all these things in that context react on other people. If they say 'we stick to 1951' what do we do? Is it physically possible? Some of you have experience of administration. Is it physically possible to start doing

from 1951? It will take years and years before you get anything done. If we start with 1971, we can start immediately. This was what I suggested. But they say: We do not want to hear 1971. Let it be a few years back. But when they say 'only 1951', then the doubt does come in my mind whether they are serious about solving this or not serious.

There is no contradiction between my thoughts and what my colleague, the Home Minister has said we both feel that there are times when a firm attitude has to be taken. If you had met the minorities or the tribals or the other people, you would have a better realization of the situation. By minorities I mean not only Musliims, they were also Hindus of different States, they were Nepalese. The Nepalese have another problem because, until 1976, we had allowed them to come in. We never told them that they could not come. They say, "How can you apply 1971 to us? If you want to throw us out you can at the most start from 1976." So, if you talk to them, you will understand the real feelings. The longer an agitation of this sort continues, the more it is in the interest of those who are not for India's strength and welfare. We all know that there are such elements in the world, not just against India, but against other developing countries. Are we going to encourage them? I am not going to play politics. I have mentioned in one or two of my speeches about the Jana Sangh and the RSS who now call themselves the BJP. Anyway to me they remain the Jana Sangh and the RSS, no matter what new name they assume. They are encouraging the movement. The statements by Mr. Deoras and others are very clear on this. Nobody has denied them. A few speeches were made here strongly supporting the movement. I am not making any kind of division, I mean, not division, but distinction.

श्री कलराज मिश्र : मूवमेंट को सपोर्ट करना क्या कोई एडीनेशनल है ।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : मूवमेंट के दो भाग हैं और दूसरे भाग को किसी ने कभी अलग नहीं किया। यह मैं कह रही हूँ।

श्री कलराज मिश्र : मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने नाम लिया आर०एस०एस०, जनसंघ और देवरस जी का और दूसरे बाकी लोगों का नाम नहीं लिया। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बाकी लोगों ने जिन्होंने मूवमेंट को उचित समझा और सपोर्ट किया उनका नाम आपने नहीं लिया। कांग्रेस (आई) के कुछ साधियों ने सपोर्ट किया है।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : सपोर्ट करने का कोई तरीका होता है। मेरा विचार यह है कि जिस प्रकार से आपने सपोर्ट किया उससे कोई स्थिति सुधरी नहीं है। यह मेरा विचार था। यह मैंने खुलेतौर से कहा है।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आपने कहा कि हमने, देवरस जी ने स्टेटमेंट से गलत तरीके से मूवमेंट को सपोर्ट किया। वह शब्द तो बताइये जिससे यह पता लगे कि हमने गलत तरीके से सपोर्ट किया Tell me one word. What is that word? आपने कहा है कि हमने गलत सपोर्ट किया है। मेरा यह कहना है कि और लोगों ने भी सपोर्ट किया है लेकिन उनका नाम आपने नहीं लिया, तो यह बताइये कि कौन-से ऐसे शब्द हैं जिनके आधार पर आप कहती हैं कि हमने गलत सपोर्ट किया है।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : यह कोई एक शब्द से सपोर्ट नहीं होता।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : तो पूरा अखबार बताइये।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : मैं अखबारी रपट मैं विश्वास नहीं करती।

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: You can make as many allegations as you want. (Interruptions).

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : आपकी दूसरी राय होगी जो मेरी राय थी वह मैंने कही। इस समय जो पंत जी ने कहा कि हमने वहां कपयूँ लगाया उससे ये चीजें बढ़ गईं, मुझे भी ऐसा लगता है कि जब समय ठीक हो रहा था तो इस प्रकार की स्टेटमेंट हो गई, जिस कारण से उसको बढ़ावा मिला।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : कुछ तो बताइये।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : मुझे कोई शब्द याद नहीं है और न ही मैं यहां कोई अखबार लेकर आई हूँ।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : एक वाक्य ऐसा नहीं मिल सकता जिस पर कोई आपत्ति हो। लेकिन हम सब के लिये स्केप गोट बन जाते हैं। हम तो जो कहते हैं करते हैं। सोच-विचार कर बात कहते हैं। जो बात कहते हैं ठीक कहते हैं।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : मैं कह रही हूँ कि आप सोच-विचार कर कहते हैं।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : राष्ट्र विरोधी जितनी कार्रवाई हो रही है उसका कभी हम समर्थन नहीं कर सकते। उसकी निन्दा करते हैं।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : मुश्किल यह है कि आप जो कहती हैं उसका सबूत कोई नहीं देती ... (Interruption)

माननीय सदस्य : बैठ जाइए...

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : यह आदमी जायदाद नहीं है। मैं नहीं बैठूंगा...

(Interruptions). I have a right to ask for explanations.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir, may I ask for a clarification from the Prime Minister?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Mr. Mathur, explanations and clarifications have already been asked for.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: May I ask for a clarification?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): If she is ready, I do not mind.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir, the Prime Minister has used the words, "chauvinistic attitude of the Assamese people". I will beg of her not to use these words because these will naturally hurt the sentiments of the people of Assam, because there is crisis of confidence between the Government and the people of Assam and these words may take the negotiating table farther away. I do not want to join issue with the Prime Minister. She has referred to various acts and reports. I do not want to refer to them because that will lead to another debate. But, unfortunately, there seem to be some allegations which are not confirmed. For example, I may point out to the Prime Minister the Phulon incident. It was the Government which went to drive out the unauthorised people and two persons were killed who belonged to the Communist Party and who died because of the police firing. They were going into the unauthorised land. Sir, I do not want to go into details. What I am trying to say...

(Interruptions) I do not want to enter into any controversy. What the hon. Prime Minister has said is that so far as 1971 is concerned there is no dispute between the Assam Students' Union and so on and so forth... (Interruptions) I think there is some measure of agreement after 1971. May I point out to the hon. Prime Minister that it is not that students' union is being used as a facade, because the students are non-political, the people of Assam have reposed confidence in them in leading this movement for the last 8 months. If the students become a facade, the movement could not be carried even for a single day. From what I heard from the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister is of the view that the matter can be settled within the parameters of the Constitution of India. If that is so, then the first available document is the National Register of 1951. I know that persons who have come in 1951 cannot be deported; they can also not be thrown out. What I am asking is, is it possible for the Government of India at least to agree to identification from 1951, and so far as the people from 1951 to 1971 are concerned, it may be that some may have to be regularised, and so on? These questions can be discussed at the negotiable table as to what we do with these people. I feel, Sir, that there is a meeting point in which both the Government and the sponsors of the movement may proceed. If I am correct, it is not that the Government has thrown this suggestion out. The Prime Minister may not comment or commit on it. But will the Prime Minister keep this in mind, because I think, taking into account the very serious situation in the north-eastern region, this may be the meeting point and a decision can be taken within a few hours.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The Register is not a very authentic document.

About the word I used, which has been objected to by the hon'ble Member, I am prepared to withdraw that.

I do not mean it in the sense in which the hon. Member is taking it. I was specifically talking of the language at the moment. Sometimes in trying to promote Hindi... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): No interruptions, please.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: My point is, if you insist that people should learn Assamese it is resisted. Just as the hon'ble friend opposite objected to Hindi. (*Interruptions*) I do not know whether since joining the Janata Party, he has learnt it or not... (*Interruptions*)

Therefore, I have no objection in withdrawing that word. I am prepared to agree to anything, provided that the lives, limbs and property of the so called minorities are safe-guarded and their fear is removed. While fear is there, even if the agitation stops, it will not be a normal situation. And fear also makes people react.

There is another point he made—about the minorities who called me their leader, I do not know what they said. They may have said it. But I had no information about their procession or what they were going to do, until it took place. To me they expressed the fear that their lives were in danger and that we must send impartial people... (*Interruptions*)

Another point made was that once the AASU tried to identify foreigners themselves they turned out to be genuine Indian citizens, with one exception. Everybody is so excited there... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: To bring normalcy there must be some meeting point. What I suggested was...

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The farther back you go, the longer it will take to be effective. That is why we advised to start from '71 and in the

meantime, we can talk and see other meeting points. That would give assurance to all of their safety and the genuine citizens are not going to be thrown out.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I do not think this debate will allow me an opportunity to argue.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You may come and argue with me separately.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: You may keep it in mind. You may also have a meeting with the Members of Parliament of the North-Eastern regions.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am ready to meet anybody separately, in groups and in every possible way.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: May I submit to the Prime Minister one thing? I do not know. The Prime Minister may not have said it very consciously. But I think the observations she made about Gandhi Peace Foundation amount to a very serious insinuation, in the present context, against two patriotic gentlemen, Mr. George Verghese and Mr. Radha Krishna who had been to Assam lately and who had tried to see whether there can be any meeting ground between the leaders of the agitation and the Government. I have been in touch with them...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): These are personal opinions. You may have some opinion.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I spoke about the Foundation and not about any particular persons.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It is in that context. They are not here. They cannot protect themselves.

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I have a mind

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

to give five minutes each to many Members. After that, Mr. Makwana will reply and we will finish with the discussion.

(श्री रामेश्वर सिंह) : उत्तर प्रदेश श्रीमन्, प्रधान मंत्री जी की भावनाओं से सारा सदन सहमत है कि इस देश की अखंडता और सुरक्षा बनी रहनी चाहिए लेकिन पंत जी ने एक सवाल अपनी...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अरविंद गणेश कुलकर्णी) : इसको जवाब हो गया है ।

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: Sir, we are satisfied with the Prime Minister's reply and the manner in which she tried to project the problem and its possible solutions. When I spoke I started by saying that the partition of India took place not for Bengalis alone. It was for the freedom of this country that it took place. Now, you allow these refugees to suffer and to be termed as foreign nationals. Is there no guarantee under the Constitution with regard to this thing?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: We have said on an earlier occasion that this question is separate.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Now, everybody wants to have a clarification. Yes, Mr. Rasheeduddin Khan.

(Interruptions)

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated): You can allow me to speak. But as long as you are in the Chair, you have to make some arrangement to ensure that the man who is called upon to speak is heard. This thing is going on everyday. I have also to learn the art standing on my head.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Everybody wants to have a clarification from the Prime Minister. She has replied. The reply is over. There is no system of asking for clarifications from the Prime Minister. (Interruptions) Mr. Jha, you please take your seat. There is no convention in the House to call for a clarification from the Prime Minister when she has already spoken. Anyway, I am trying to accommodate you and I am giving you an opportunity. Why don't you co-operate? Yes, Mr. Hegde. (Interruptions)

SHRI M. R. KRISHNA (Andhra Pradesh): You are changing your ruling. You stick to something definite. You have called Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Karnataka): We expected that the Prime Minister would throw some new light on the problem, would make some positive suggestions to solve the problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: No speech, please.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: I would like to seek a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister on only two points.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Mr. Hegde, you are talking about what? The Prime Minister has intervened in the debate. She has tried to reply to every objection that was taken. So, I don't think I can allow your clarification. I am sorry. What do you want, Mr. Rameshwar Singh?

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, मेरा कहना है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी इस बात को तो बताएं कि त्रिपुरा में कांग्रेस (आई) के लोगों ने कल जो लूटपाट की है...

(Interruptions)

(उपाध्यक्ष श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी) :
यह कोई प्वाइंट नहीं बनता है।

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA (Assam): Sir, I am only seeking a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister on one point. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I have no objection... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I think the Prime Minister is not in a position to reply to every clarification. (*Interruptions*)

Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan, you proceed.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: I am prepared to speak as long as you are able to control the House. You please control the House. (*Interruptions*) These two gentlemen are not allowing anybody to speak for the last two days. As you are well aware, Sir, my name is fairly top of the discussion of the list from the very first day. Day after day, I have listened very patiently to these people who have spoken on every item under the sun without knowing anything. (*Interruptions*) Sir, you have accused me that I am not speaking. I am prepared to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): You go ahead now.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: First and foremost, I would like to submit about the procedural matter something which should be examined carefully by the Business Advisory Committee. You have in this House a very strange category called 'Others'. People like us who are not members of any party are all omnibusly categorised under this strange term 'others' and when it comes to the allocation of time, you give inordinate time to Members of all the parties who go on repeating the same

point, and we 'others' who belong to a wide range of spectrum of opinion do not get any time. I am happy, you have mentioned about it yesterday. I do not speak as often as others do.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): That is why I called you to make your point.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: You are asking me to speak after the main speech of the Prime Minister is over.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): The Minister is going to reply.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: Before the Home Minister replies I have to make some submissions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Yes, make them.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: Sir, the current problem of Assam which ought to be considered as problem number one on the political agenda of the country. Unfortunately, the opposition parties have been playing politics in this regard. The initiative which was taken by the Prime Minister as soon as she assumed office has not been adequately responded to by the parties which were till the other day in power. When the Assam agitation started these were the people who owned up the whole problem. First of all, I would like to suggest, let us not play politics on a problem of such major implications, which will endanger the very survival of democracy, the plural polity. It is an important aspect. When we talk of Assam, when we talk of the North-Eastern frontier, when we talk of the wonderful land of the seven sisters, we are talking of an area where indigenous and not so indigenous conspiracy of circumstances has taken place. Without naming names, it is true that certain parties which are otherwise categorised as national parties have been harping on dissensions within linguistic groups and racial groups and religious groups on the plea that the identity of India

[Prof. Raisheeduddin Khan]

will be weakened if this socio-cultural diversity is recognised and maintained. This group is still playing foul.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri R. R. Morarka) in the Chair]

This is the time when international destabilisation forces are again active. We have heard the Minister of External Affairs on this whole problem in the morning. Immediately after this debate is over, we will again take it up. At a time when the international destabilisation process is on, at a time when we are conscious that Assam is physically linked with the rest of India merely by a small stretch of land, because of the colonial exercise on the artificial partition of the country, about which we have reconciled, and also because we have the experiences of 1951, 1962 and then again of 1971, unless we take some cohesive position on Assam, there is the possibility of weakening of Assam, there is the possibility of the secessionists elements taking the upper hand. Nobody is talking of chauvinism in Assam. Nobody is talking of the main movement being led by secessionists. But is it possible to overlook the fact that at a time when the whole of South-East Asia and South Asia is passing through destabilisation, when the international collusion of forces is taking place, when our own indigenous forces are acting as if to gain the upper hand in politics, in the federal apex, that sometimes they are prepared to undermine the very structure of national identity. Is it possible to own up the ramifications in Assam? That is what the Prime Minister has said. Can we do it without taking a partisan view because in this country we have a large spectrum of opinion starting from the country's corterie of the right reactionaries and obscurantist to the lunatic fringe of the left, which sometimes articulates regional problems as if they are the be all and end all? The corterie of the right has a very narrow view. Let us overlook our ideological spectrum at least on one major issue,

which is at the moment number one of the national agenda and requires all the polemics to be removed. We should concentrate our energies on seeing how to settle it.

Sir, the identification of foreigners is not an easy proposition. The term 'foreigners' has been defined in terms of the international law. The term 'foreigners' is also defined in the municipal law. Are we making a distinction between the refugees from adjoining countries which have come into our land with the concurrence of the Government of the day? Are we making a distinction between migrants from other States of India? A variety of reasons, partly of policy and partly of economic compulsions, have worked in Assam in order to enrich Assam. Are we to distinguish between infiltrators and others. All these problems are not simple problems. Modalities of definitions will have to be worked out. But in order to work out the modalities of critical terms, we have to have a negotiating table. How can we have a negotiating table when a certain section of the AASU and the Gana Sangram Parishad makes overtures and lays emphasis on things which are alarming. I am speaking as a friend of Assam because I am an Indian; I am a patriot and I consider Assam to be an integral part of India. These expressions and these policy postures do not contribute to amicable negotiation. How do we solve the problem? Are we asking the Prime Minister and the ruling party to compromise on each of the demands of AASU and Gana Sangram Parishad? Is it the position? Are we taking the position that every aspect of the agitation in Assam is rightful? The neglect of the Congress Government which is there should not be overlooked also. And I would like to accuse the Government, I would like to accuse the Congress Government of the last 30 years. I would not like to accuse the usurper Janata Government which was anyhow an abnormal Government, a conglomerate which could never become even the agglomerate, this conglomerate which was incapable of

becoming an agglomerate, the usurper of power by force of circumstances. I would like to accuse the 30 years of Congress rule for mismanaging the whole problem of Assam by neglect and oversight.

Sir, India has got the largest tribal population in the world, a factor which I would like to underline. No other territorial sovereignty has as much of a tribal population as India, ranging from primitive nomadic tribe to sedentary tribe, whose ethnic tribes are different. We have not taken a Melting Pot approach of Americans who have eliminated the Red Indians. We have taken a plural approach. The Prime Minister was right in mentioning that socio-cultural diversities in India are to be reconciled with political integration. But are we to compromise political integration by over-emphasis on socio-cultural diversities? We have reconciled both. It can only be done at a negotiating table and it can be done by withdrawal of the agitation as my friend, Mr. Bipinpal Das, has correctly mentioned. That serves its purpose. It has now reached a counter-productive stage. It is dysfunctional now. It is now playing into the hands of the enemies of Assam and the enemies of India. Let the agitation be withdrawn. Let the leaders come; let the leaders be released from jails. Let all parties sit down, including the BJP. Let there be no attempt at dilatoriness or setting out conditions that we are prepared to sit only if this is done or that is done. Let there be no condition. Negotiating table is there, and the main items to be settled are well known. Now the elections are over. Elections to State Assemblies and elections to Parliament are over. All party-equations have been stabilised and after stabilisation of party equations, what is required now is the cohesive solution of the Assam problem, because development of India economically as a model of new change on the one side and stability of this whole region on the other, are dependent on what role India plays,

because the situation is again flaring up in the South-East Asia and elsewhere. Therefore, let us not overlook the fact that international conspiracy of circumstances is there. These are some of the things which I wanted to mention because I did a lot of home work as an old teacher and as an old student would do, day after day. And I would sit down and would like to end up by a strong protest, not against the ruling party as much as the opposition. They do not allow any other person to speak. On every issue, whether it is Question Hour, whether it is Calling Attention, that is the position. Now on Calling Attention today on the U.S.-China collusion, Dr. Bhai Mahavir spoke on Afghanistan and he took 15 minutes on Afghanistan . . . (Interruptions) and this gentleman stands up on every issue...

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, Is my hon. friend speaking on the subject? Let him not accuse others... (Interruptions)

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: I am also capable of shouting. I am also a Pathan and I can outshout all of them. (Interruptions)

Sir, I can also shout in order to emphasize that they should allow others also to speak. I would like, sometimes, to be in peace. I can also act. I have not lost my temper. I have my cool, but since the language of temper is understood here, I can also speak the language of temper. (Interruptions)

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, may I make a personal explanation? (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): No. It is not necessary.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR. He has castigated the whole opposition, as if castigated the whole opposition, as if the persons sitting on the other side are all angels. He says he is in cool temper. (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: (Karnataka): Sir, I am on a point of order. The hon. Member has said that people in the opposition speak irrelevantly. I do not think, it is for him, as a senior Member, to say that everybody in the opposition speaks irrelevantly. He may be a Professor, a very learned man, a very great intellectual, which we do not claim to be. But I do not think it gives him, in any way, a superiority complex, to say that people in the opposition talk nonsense. I think, this is an uncalled for remark, which he should withdraw. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: Sir, may I make a personal explanation?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): No. I am sorry, you must sit down, please sit down. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARI SHANKAR BHABHERA (Rajasthan): Sir, what is the relation between this and the debate on Assam? (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): I would request hon. Members to sit down, when I am on my legs. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): Sir, I have a submission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRI R. R. MORARKA): This is not time for any submission. I have called Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee. He will take five minutes. Then, the hon. Minister will reply. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I thank you very much for the five minutes given. After having made many interruptions—for which I must also feel ashamed—I have received just five minutes to talk on a very complicated problem, on which my friends in the 'others group, other friends, utilised more than half-an-hour. Now, this is something against which Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan had to make a

comment. This comment might have been made in an unfortunate manner. But that apart, I would appeal both to the treasury benches and the opposition, and to the Chair, kindly to see to it that in the allotment of time, some attention is paid to the cases of those who are non-party men. Now, to the point. Naturally, the pattern has to go. But I would begin from a point which is sought to be made by my good friend, Mr. Goswami. This was the question of security of Assam. In dealing with it, he suggested that it may be that, very shortly, Bangladesh would demand a referendum on where Assam should remain.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I did not say that. You have heard wrongly.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I am saying as I heard it. The records may be compared. This question has been repeatedly raised that what compelled the agitators in Assam to launch the agitation is the problem of security which has been created in this area. My submission is, had it been so, that would have been the responsibility of the Government of India to take initiative in the matter and perhaps we cannot complain that any of the Governments, whichever party had ruled over the country during all these years, were not security conscious. The dimension of problem is a bit different. As the Prime Minister was trying to explain, what do we mean by foreigners? A precise definition, perhaps, is necessary.

After bouts of successive riots in Assam, the problem has 1 P.M. taken a different dimension.

The problem of foreign nationals has been put forward, perhaps, deliberately because of certain sympathies that might be evoked. By saying that the foreign nationals are swarming that region, perhaps they are trying to gain the sympathy of certain parties. But then I agree that a solution has to be found not through confrontation, not through the Essential Services Maintenance Ordinance, not through the Preventive

Detention Act, not through the army or the CRP. If there is a communal riot, if there is an attack on the minorities, if a large segment of the population is living under constant fear, I think that situation has to be met firmly, but as Prof. Chattopadhyaya was saying the other day, the core of the problem has to be understood and has to be dealt with understandably.

Now I am coming to the concluding portion, the way in which a solution could be found. Solution cannot be found by going back to the history of the 13th century, by going to the Yandaboo Agreement, or by going back to history of 1905 or 1926 as Mr. Hedge did. I have the booklet with me which is published by the All Assam Gana Sangram Parishad. They have begun right from the beginning of the 20th century (*Time Bell rings*) Then what is the real crux of the problem. What is the object of the entire history of migration. That won't help. My humble submission to the agitators, to their supporters in this House and to all others would be that both the sides must take into consideration the realistic and objective picture of what they want. The agitators must not take shield behind the question of foreign nationals. They must clearly state that Assam is a multi-lingual State. It was known as the ethnic museum and we know, Assam is not what it was even after independence days. It was a formation of five tribal states. Plain tribals and hilly tribals, all of them were living within the geographical boundary. (*Time Bell rings*) They are clamouring for protection therefore, these problems are still there. There is a Cachar district, a portion of Golpara. (*Time Bell rings*) A large number of people speaking different languages are living there. The leaders of the movement must clearly state their attitude towards these various segments of the population residing in Assam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Please conclude now.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Then there is the question

of the infiltrators from across the border, the question of identifying them and I have seen the demand put forward by AASU and the Gana Sangram Parishad that 1951 should be the sacrosanct cut off date. If we accept this, it is recognised that a solution to the problem of detection and deletion of the names from the electoral rolls and deportation will be found....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Professor, you must conclude please.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I am concluding in two minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Not two minutes. You must conclude now.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE:....within the framework of the Constitution of India, including the citizenship laws and election laws. At the same time, there is another law which is there: "Provided that nothing in this section shall apply to any person who, on account of civil disturbance or the fear of such disturbance in any area now forming part of Pakistan, has been displaced and has left the place of residence in such an area and who has been subsequently residing in Assam". These are facts which should be borne in mind.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Prof. Bhattacharjee, I request you to please conclude.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: The minorities should be given protection. At the same time, you must remove their apprehensions in clear and unambiguous terms without indulging in subterfuge. If that is done, I am sure a solution can be found. At the same time, all of us should stand united in the face of the serious situation that has been created in the entire North-Eastern region

[Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee]

which is a real danger to the security of India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): The hon. Home Minister, Shri Makwana.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: How can he reply after the Prime Minister has spoken?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): That may be your view. Please sit down.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I understand that in the morning the Government made a commitment in the House that apart from the reply to the debate, they will make a statement.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: I will make it.

Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has dealt with all the points raised here in the House. Practically she has replied to all the points raised by the hon. Members. Though she was not present, she has covered all the points. And it will be unwise on my part to reiterate the same thing. She has said what the Government is going to do and she has also explained the policy of the Government in this House. So I don't think I should add anything. I would request the House, after these clarifications, to pass the Resolution moved by me. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Now I put the Motion before the House. The question is:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 12th December, 1979, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Assam for a further period of six months with effect from the 12th June, 1980."

The Motion was adopted.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Arrest of some M.L.As. of Assam at Boat Club in New Delhi

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): Sir, at about 10.45 A.M. on 11-6-1980, 28 persons were arrested at the Fafi Marg—Rajpath Crossing for violation of prohibitory orders under Section 144 Cr.P.C. A case FIR No. 326 under Section 188 IPC at Police Station Parliament Street has been registered.

Out of the 28 arrested persons, 17 are MLAs from Assam including Shri Golap Borbora, ex-Chief Minister of Assam, and Shri Dulal Chandra Barua. The remaining 11 persons are from the Yuva Janata. Their leader, who has been arrested, is Shri Vikram Singh. The 28 persons courted arrest peacefully.

It may also be mentioned that the 17 MLAs had been sitting on dharna since 9th June, 1980. This was converted into a 24-hour fast on 10th June. Today, they courted arrest. They are being produced before the Metropolitan Magistrate, Parliament Street today.

Sir, I have got the latest information that they were produced before the Metropolitan Magistrate who admonished them, after which they were released.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—

The Chinese Military Tie-up with USA and Japan posing a Grave threat to Peace and Security of Asia in General and India in particular—

contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): The House will