

dated the 8th March, 1965, publishing the Income-tax (Third Amendment) Rules, 1965, under section 296 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 [Placed in Library See No. LT-4119/65]

RESULT OF ELECTION TO COFFEE BOARD

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri K. Madhava Menon being the only candidate nominated for election to the Coffee Board, he is declared duly elected to be a member of the said Board

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO DR S CHANDRASEKHAR

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN I have to inform Members that the following letter dated the 18th March, 1965, has been received from Dr S Chandrasekhar, from California

"I am sorry I am unable to attend the Rajya Sabha session I shall be grateful if you can grant me leave of absence for this session"

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Dr S Chandrasekhar for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

No hon. Member dissented.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Permission to remain absent is granted

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION CONCERNING STATEMENT *RE* ALLEGATIONS AGAINST CERTAIN CHIEF MINISTERS AND OTHER MINISTERS OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. I have to inform Members that under rule 172 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of

Business in the Rajya Sabha I have allotted two and a half hours for the consideration of motion concerning the statement regarding allegations against certain Chief Ministers and other Ministers of State Governments.

THE ARMED FORCES (SPECIAL POWERS) CONTINUANCE BILL, 1965—continued

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदया, विदेश मन्त्री जी ने यह प्रस्ताव रखा है कि सशस्त्र बल (विशेष शक्तियाँ) विनियम, 1958 को और अवधि के लिये जारी रखने वाले विधेयक पर विचार किया जाय। प्रस्ताव पेश करते हुए, विदेश मन्त्री जी ने नागालैण्ड की भी चर्चा की है और यह आशा प्रकट की है कि समस्या का शांतिपूर्ण समाधान हो जायेगा। मैं उनकी इस आशावादिता में हिस्सा बांटना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन कुछ बातें नागालैण्ड की समस्या के सम्बन्ध में ऐसी हो रही हैं जिनकी ओर सदन को और सरकार को जागरूक रहना होगा। जो विधेयक विदेश मन्त्री जी ने पेश किया है उसके अनुसार हम अपनी विशेष पुलिस को कुछ सरक्षण देने जा रहे हैं। लेकिन नागालैण्ड में युद्ध विराम होने से पहले कुछ ऐसी घटनाएँ घटी हैं जिनसे यह सन्देह पैदा होता है कि क्या सचमुच में हम नागालैण्ड में काम करने वाली अपनी पुलिस को कोई सरक्षण देना चाहते हैं।

मुझे एक घटना के सम्बन्ध में जानकारी है। गोली वर्षा बन्द होने से कुछ दिन पहले बागी नागाओं ने रिजर्व पुलिस के एक दस्ते पर हमला किया और उस हमले के परिणाम स्वरूप 7 पुलिस वाले मारे गये। बाद में पुलिस को पता लगा कि बागी नागा एक गाँव में इकट्ठा हैं और वे हमले की तैयारी कर रहे हैं। अपने अफसरों से इजाजत लेकर पुलिस का दस्ता उन बागी नागाओं को पकड़ने के

लिये गया । लेकिन बागी नागाओं ने मुकाबला किया, गोली चली, और उसमें 7 बागी नागा मारे गए । होना तो यह चाहिये था कि जिस पुलिस ने दक्षता के साथ, दृढ़ता के साथ, अपने कर्तव्य का पालन किया उसको शाबाशी दी जाती, लेकिन हुआ यह कि 32 पुलिस वाले जिनमें दो पुलिस के अफसर भी हैं, गिरफ्तार कर लिये गये । वे पिछले चार महीनों से जेल में पड़े हैं और उन्हें कोहीमा की अदालत में ले जाया जाता है, उनके हाथ में हथकड़ी डाल कर, और सड़कों पर खड़े व्यक्ति उन पर फबतियां कसते हैं, उन पर ताने मारते हैं । यह किसने आदेश दिया कि पुलिस वालों को गिरफ्तार किया जाय ? यह किसने तय किया कि पुलिस वालों ने जो कुछ किया अपने कर्तव्य पालन के लिये नहीं किया, बदला लेने के लिये किया ? क्या उन पर मुकद्दमा चलाने से पहले गृह मन्त्रालय को लिखा गया ? यह स्पेशल पुलिस फोर्स गृह मन्त्रालय के अन्तर्गत है । मगर जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है, मुकद्दमा चलाने से पहले कोई इजाजत नहीं ली गई । नागालैण्ड की सरकार ने उन्हें गिरफ्तार करके मुकद्दमा चला दिया । जो जवान कठिनाइयों के बीच नागालैण्ड में अपने कर्तव्य का पालन कर रहे हैं, क्या ऐसी घटनाओं से हम उनका मनोबल बनाए रख सकते हैं ? क्या नागालैण्ड में शान्ति स्थापित करने का यह कोई प्रभावी तरीका हो सकता है ?

मैं चाहता हूं कि विदेश मंत्री महोदय इस घटना पर पूरा प्रकाश डालें ? क्या वह हमारे पुलिस दस्ते, रिजर्व फोर्स को संरक्षण नहीं दे सकते हैं ? क्या उन्हें सामान्य अपराधियों का तरह हथकड़ी डाल कर कटघरे में खड़ा किया जाना है और वह भी इसलिए कि वे अपने कर्तव्य का ठीक तरह से पालन करते हैं ? जिस बिल को लेकर हमारे 203RSD—3.

विदेश मंत्री जी आये हैं, उस बिल को लाने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी ?

मैं चाहता हूं कि नागालैण्ड की समस्या शान्ति के साथ हल हो, लेकिन शान्ति किस कीमत पर खरीदी जायेगी, यह स्पष्ट होनी चाहिये । शान्ति मिशन के सदस्यों के बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कहूंगा । जयप्रकाश जी महान देश भक्त हैं, यद्यपि उनके और मेरे विचारों में मतभेद हैं । मैं समझता हूं कि वे आदर्शवाद की इतनी ऊंची उड़ान ले रहे हैं कि उनके पैर वास्तविकता की धरती से ऊपर उठ गये हैं । लेकिन व एक गैर-सरकारी व्यक्ति हैं, उनके प्रयत्न मैं समझ सकता हूं । मगर शान्ति मिशन में आसाम के मुख्य मंत्री भी शामिल हैं । क्या वे व्यक्तिगत रसियत से हैं या सरकारी रसियत से ? क्या वे जो वादा कर रहे हैं वोह सरकार को अप्रत्यक्ष रीति से बांधता नहीं है ? मुझे यह पढ़ कर ताज्जुब हुआ कि जो बागी नागाओं की तथा कथित पालियामन्ट है उसमें श्री चालिहा ने ऐसा भाषण दिया जो आपत्तिजनक है । मैं उस भाषण का एक अंश आपके सामने रखता चाहता हूं ।

“Addressing the so-called Parliament on Wednesday, Mr. B. P. Chaliha said that the Peace Mission's proposals in regard to voluntary participation of Nagas in the Indian Union should not be regarded as settlement. Mr. Chaliha said that the Peace Mission fully recognised the Nagas' right to self-determination. He said that the Peace Mission wanted the Nagas to exercise that right in favour of participation in the Indian Union for the sake of peaceful settlement.”

शान्ति मिशन नागाओं के आत्म निर्णय के अधिकार को स्वीकार कर रहा है, शान्ति मिशन इस बात को स्वीकार कर रहा है...

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: (Andhra Pradesh): Within the Union.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : नहीं, दोनों में फर्क है। उन्होंने पहले अधिकार मान लिया है और कहते हैं कि आपको अलग होने का अधिकार है। फिर बाद में कहते हैं कि हम चाहते हैं कि आप अपने इस अधिकार का उपयोग भारतीय संघ में शामिल होने के लिए करिये। अगर बागी नागाओं ने पीस मिशन की इस प्रार्थना को मानने से इन्कार कर दिया तो? हम भारत के किसी भी हिस्से में रहने वाले वर्ग का, वर्ग समूह का, यह अधिकार कैसे मान सकते हैं कि उसे भारत से अलग होने का हक है? आत्म निर्णय का अधिकार देश को मिलता है देश के हिस्से को नहीं? अगर हम बागी नागाओं का आत्म निर्णय का अधिकार मान लेंगे तो फिर काश्मीर का क्या होगा? पहले अधिकार मानना और फिर यह कहना कि आप भारत में शामिल होने के लिए इसको प्रयोग में लाइये हास्यास्पद है क्योंकि अधिकार का अर्थ यह होता है कि उसको उपयोग करने का अधिकार भी उसमें शामिल है। अगर हम बागी नागाओं का यह हक मान लें कि वे भारत से अलग हो सकते हैं, तो हमने उनका अधिकार भी मान लिया है कि वे चाहें तो भारत में शामिल न हों। यदि वे न शामिल हुए तो उस समय शान्ति मिशन की स्थिति क्या होगी?

नागा हमारे भाई हैं। हम भाईचारे के सिद्धान्त के आधार पर भारतीय गणराज्य में उन्हें बराबर का साझीदार बनाना चाहते हैं। मगर हम भारत के किसी भी हिस्से को आत्म निर्णय का अधिकार नहीं दे सकते। आत्म निर्णय का अधिकार पूरे भारत को प्राप्त है, भारत के किसी अंश को, भारत के किसी भाग को नहीं। शान्ति मिशन एक खतरनाक खेल खेल रहा है। मैं उनके इरादों पर संदेह नहीं

करता। लेकिन शान्ति मिशन को ऐसे वादे नहीं करने चाहियें, जो हमारे देश की एकता को, अखंडता को, और नागालैण्ड की समस्या को भी और उलझा दें।

महोदया, मुझे एक शिकायत संसद् सदस्यों के उस प्रतिनिधि मंडल से भी है जो नागालैण्ड की यात्रा के लिए गया था। इस सदन के भी बड़े सम्मानित सदस्य इसमें शामिल थे। उन्होंने एक रिपोर्ट तैयार की है और वह रिपोर्ट सदन की मेज पर रख दी गई। वह पार्लियामेन्टरी डेलीगेशन नहीं था। उस प्रतिनिधि मंडल के सदस्यों का चुनाव न तो राज्य सभा के अध्यक्ष या उपाध्यक्ष, न लोक सभा के स्पीकर की राय से हुआ था? वह एक सरकारी प्रतिनिधि मंडल था। लेकिन उस प्रतिनिधि मंडल ने जो रिपोर्ट दी है उसकी भाषा को लिखने में सावधानी से काम नहीं लिया गया। प्रतिनिधि मंडल ने लिखा है, मैं कोट करना चाहता हूँ और जो प्रतिनिधि मंडल के सदस्य हैं, वे उस पर विचार करें। पृष्ठ संख्या 5 पर जो 11 परिच्छेद है, उसमें कहा गया है:

“The Delegation reports that suspension of firing has been beneficial both to India and Nagaland”.

“इंडिया एण्ड नागालैण्ड” यह शब्द कैसे प्रयोग हो सकते हैं? रेस्ट आफ इंडिया एण्ड नागालैण्ड हो सकता है, “इंडिया एण्ड नागालैण्ड” नहीं। फेडरल नागालैण्ड गवर्नमेंट का भी जो उल्लेख किया गया है वह भी इन्वर्टेड कामाज में नहीं। या तो “सो काल्ड फेडरल गवर्नमेंट आफ नागालैण्ड” करना चाहिये था या “फेडरल गवर्नमेंट आफ नागालैण्ड” इन्वर्टेड कामाज में रहना चाहिये था। हम अगर नागालैण्ड को भारत से अलग मान लें, हम अगर उनकी फज्रल गवर्नमेंट का किसी प्रकार की क्वालिफाईड कलाज लगाकर उल्लेख करें, तो इससे गलतफहमी होगी कि

जो हमारे लिए नुकसान कर सकती है ।

मैं एक बात कह कर खत्म कर दूंगा और उसको संसद सदस्यों के प्रतिनिधि मंडल ने भी माना है कि युद्ध विराम होते हुए भी बागी नागा हथियार इकट्ठा कर रहे हैं, लोगों को डरा रहे हैं, धमका रहे हैं और उनसे जबर्दस्ती टैक्स वसूल कर रहे हैं । मैं प्रतिनिधि मंडल की रिपोर्ट के परिच्छेद 10 की ओर सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ :

"The Delegation felt, perturbed about the reports that the hostile Nagas were moving about freely with arms in villages. In fact, we ourselves witnessed about six hundred Nagas dressed in grey uniform almost similar to the Indian Army uniform armed with 303 rifles, sten guns, bren guns and mortars, etc, outside village Khizwana. There were also reports of forced collection of money from peaceful villages and forceful recruitment of school boys and young men to Naga Home Guards and of a batch of 1700 strong Nagas going to Pakistan to smuggle arms."

अब सरकार कहती है कि बागी नागा पाकिस्तान जा सकते हैं, वहां सैनिक शिक्षा ले सकते हैं, उस पर कोई रोक नहीं है । रोक खाली इस बात कि है कि पाकिस्तान से हथियार नहीं ला सकते हैं । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो सीज फायर एग्रीमेंट हुआ था उसमें यह बात खाली क्यों रख दी गई? अगर बागी नागा बढ़ी संख्या में पाकिस्तान जायेंगे, फौजी शिक्षा लेकर आयेंगे, तो फिर वह सचमुच में शान्ति लेकर आयेंगे, तो फिर वह सचमुच में शान्ति चाहते हैं इसके बारे में संदेह पैदा होता है ।

महोदया, अगर वार्ता भंग हो गई, मैं हूँ कि वार्ता सफल हो, मगर राजनीति

में सदच्छा काम नहीं करती, हमें वास्तविकता का सामना करना होगा, अगर बागी नागाओं से बातचीत विफल हो गई तब क्या रवैया होगा तब वे आज से कहीं अधिक शक्तिशाली होकर निकलेगे । हम उन्हें अपने प्रयत्नों द्वारा नैतिक और भौतिक समर्थन प्रदान नहीं कर सकते । मुझे विश्वास है कि मैंने जो प्रश्न उपस्थित किया है इस बिल को पास करने से पहले सदन उसका जबाब चाहेगा ।

SHRI M. VERO (Nagaland): Madam, the House should be aware that this Bill is not a very usual one because practically we are going to give power to our soldiers to fight our own people who are now on the way towards us and though we know all these things yet the House is bound to adopt the motion because of the circumstances prevalent in the country. So there is no alternative. However, I must request the Government of India and the House that even if power is granted to the armed forces, it should be used carefully and let us be guided by the highest ideal of national integration so that the Bill we are going to pass today will bring a bright and happy future for the country. Therefore may I once again remind hon. Members that especially in this time of negotiations let us be careful and look forward to the peace that is coming ahead?

I am not going to take much time of the House. Thank you, Madam, for having given me this time to say a few words.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, ever since this problem came before the country and this House we on this side of the House have been insisting that the problem should be solved in a political manner and time and again we have stressed that the solution of the problem lay not in a clash of arms or a confrontation of arms but in finding ways and means of talking to them—the hostile

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Nagas as they have come to be known—and bringing them into the political fold that we all share today. Fortunately, events have moved in that direction and there are peace talks going on. We have our reservations with regard to the manner in which some members of the Peace Mission sometimes have spoken but by and large we have extended our good wishes to all constructive efforts for bringing about a peaceful solution of the problem. That is an outstanding event and I think on this occasion it would not be right for us to assume a posture of narrow jingoism or otherwise an aggressive attitude. I know that the problem is not easy of solution because on the one hand you have the wrong ideas and wrong leadership which have misguided those compatriots of ours, the Nagas, and on the other, you have their fears and apprehensions understandable in the context of the life which we all live. I well remember that some years back, in this very House, the late Prime Minister Nehru spoke on the subject after he had a very exciting and interesting visit to the Nagaland and notwithstanding the fact that the Nagas, some sections of them, were engaged in some kind of hostile activities he had all sympathies for them and he spoke, as far as I remember, with human sympathy in this matter. Later on events moved in a negative direction and what was individual action here and there developed into large-scale operations engulfing quite a substantial part of that area. Naturally in such a situation the Government had to deploy its forces and equip them with some extraordinary powers. Even so as we gave them the powers we insisted that the powers should not be used without care and circumspection and that a solution should be sought through talks and negotiations in a peaceful way. Today after bitter experience, I believe, on both sides, those who fought on the side of the hostile Nagas and those who went from the side of the Government of India, we have come to the conclusion that more vigorous efforts should be made to bring about a peaceful solution of the problem. Naturally we would

welcome such efforts and we would wish them to be successful in the near future.

Mention has been made here of the parliamentary delegation. First of all, I have no quarrel with this delegation. By and large it has given a good report. It is not good just because a colleague of mine in the other House, Prof. Hiren Mukherjee, has signed it. It is good because the fundamental approach finds a proper expression here although there have been minor mistakes by way of omitting certain quotations or not using the words 'rest of India'. But such a generous man in such matters as Mr. Vajpayee is takes exception to these minor errors on so fundamental a question. After all they were writing a report about their tour of the Nagaland and it is presumed Nagaland is not outside our country; it is part of India. Supposing somebody had written a report about Bengal and India nobody would have accused him of doing something which is utterly obnoxious, repugnant to common-sense or unacceptable to Parliament. Such errors in human life do occur.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): I would like to know whether it was an error or a way of thinking; it makes all the difference.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is very difficult—there were 14 Members—to go into their way of thinking. I find it was a fairly heterogeneous group.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Only the Leader has signed the Report, not the others.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know, the leaders sometimes have a way of thinking of the rank and file and I think Mr. Vajpayee thinks along that line. I agree. Well, the signatories are Mr. N. G. Ranga. I do not think one who knows everywhere in the Himalayas which part of the territory is ours would not be knowing that Nagaland belongs to India; I refuse to believe it. He is concerned with territorial integrity. Certainly, it is not a matter of political propaganda. If

he shows such concern with regard to the India-China border, I take it here also he has that in mind. Then Mr. Hem Barua, another very extremist in this matter, and he will not make a mistake. And Mr. Hiren Mukherjee also should not have made any mistake and Mr. A. P. Jain knows about this. Therefore I do not think there is any basic error in the fundamental approach. If anyone thinks that Nagaland is outside India, certainly he is open to question and his attitude and expression should be taken exception to, I agree. But I think we need not make much of this in the present situation. Personally, I would like people to be very careful when they write documents. Personally I take a little care when writing, not when speaking. I am very particular when I write because I know that spoken words are forgotten. They disappear; the written words remain and they are the concentrated expression of one's thought. At least they are liable to be taken that they carry the concentrated expression of one's thoughts. We are a country of demagogues, and . . .

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN (Uttar Pradesh): Here what you speak is written down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member is under the illusion that our posterity is going to waste their time in reading what we say in this House. You may be under that illusion. Had I thought, Madam Deputy Chairman, his children and children's children would be spending their time reading the speeches he and I make, then I would certainly be a little more careful. But our boys and girls are more intelligent than what we take them to be. I am afraid a house may be constructed with the volumes of parliamentary proceedings but there will be few perhaps to read them because other work is waiting for them. Therefore I agree with that part of it and I am sure if it had been pointed out by Mr. Vajpayee or anybody, the quotation would have been rightly made and the word 'rest' would have been brought in. I have no doubt about it. Mr. Vajpayee here, if I may say so, is a very dear

friend of mine; politically we are poles apart. But friendship sometimes in parliamentary Benches oversteps political frontiers and yet the frontiers remain. Here Mr. Vajpayee takes up an attitude, a somewhat aggressive attitude, which 'I say here is not called for. What is said here, perhaps through the newspapers, not through the proceedings, will be read in Nagaland.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN: The question is whether you beat Mr. Vajpayee or he beats you in taking up aggressive attitudes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member has beat both of us.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please be brief, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. There are others who want to speak; otherwise we will have to cut the lunch hour.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore I say that we should be careful.

It is quite clear that the solution is not going to be found through military means. Neither it is desirable because if you bring about a solution by force of arms, this solution is not well founded. In the nature of things certain negative things remain inherent in the solution and they again come out in the open. Therefore, a political solution is very important in this matter and I think we should all help.

As far as the Parliamentary Mission is concerned, I do not know how it was chosen. The first paragraph of this Report says:

"The Prime Minister, through the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, was good enough to sponsor a delegation of the following Members of Parliament to Nagaland . . ."

I do not know, but were you consulted?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He had not been consulted. Mr. Mukut Behari Lal, I understand, has also not been consulted.

I have not been consulted. I do not know how it was sponsored. Therefore, I raise an objection to this in point of principle. If you choose an all-Parties Parliamentary Delegation, there should be proper consultation.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Delegation of Members of Parliament.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This, again, is like 'the rest of India' and other things. It is enquiry and investigation trouble. I am not quarrelling with the Report of the Parliamentary Delegation to Nagaland. Call it the delegation of Members of Parliament. Whether you call it a delegation of Members of Parliament or a Parliamentary delegation would not make much difference to the layman. I say, therefore, that it was necessary for the Prime Minister and his aide, namely, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, to consult others and then choose the personnel of it. I have no quarrel with any of these people who have been chosen, but then this is not the right thing. It should not be taken for granted. Here the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs had been advised by the Prime Minister to choose a delegation and there he sits in some room in this particular building . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, on a point of personal explanation, Mr. Bhargava did approach me for a person to be chosen for Nagaland.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Prof. M. B. Lal is lucky.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sorry you have to wind up. We have got other speakers, too.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It will continue. No time has been fixed for this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But I have told you to be brief and to the point. Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is all right, but why are you assuming this

thing? It will continue a little. I will finish it. He says he has been consulted. I am sorry and I stand corrected. But Mr. Bhargava is sitting here. He is a member of the delegation. He consulted him. I do not know whether he was consulting on behalf of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Anyhow, some consultation had taken place between two Members. Maybe, Mr. Hiren Mukerjee was also consulted, but will that be consultation?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Of course, it will be.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, it is not right. Therefore, I say that this is a point to be remembered for the future. Mr. Swaran Singh has spoken the last words, I think. I support him and he has now come here. He has said in the last paragraph: We wish success to all peaceful efforts. I also wish success to them. I think the political leadership must be in command of the situation. There might be some provocations coming from some misguided Nagas there or some people behind them. When the situation is being handled, there may be certain aggressive elements there on the side of the hostile Nagas who may not like this peaceful approach. They may like to indulge in aggressive provisions and indulge in conflicts again. I hope that the Government will not give any quarter to such provocation, will not play into such provocation, but pursue its peaceful efforts, notwithstanding the provocations, whether they come from the side of Pakistan or from any other quarter or internally from the camp of the hostile Nagas. Let the peaceful approach be the real approach and effective approach and politics has to be put in command of the entire situation so that we come to an agreed and proper settlement, when the brave Naga people will be back to the bosom of our beloved land as co-partners in the making of our country.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Madam Deputy Chairman, so far as this Bill is concerned, I do not think there are two

opinions. I join with my friends representing Nagaland in saying that I have no doubt that, while exercising these powers, every caution will be used and the powers will be exercised only in cases where they are needed.

So far as some of the problems that have been taken up by the hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee, are concerned, I would submit that so far as this delegation is concerned, notwithstanding the inclusion of Mr. Chaliha, it is absolutely an informal and private effort. The Government is not bound or committed in any way whatsoever. I think the Government have the fullest authority to decide according to the best interests of the country. At this critical and delicate stage I would request the hon. Member and other Opposition Members not to say anything which would even, in a remote manner, prejudice the peaceful efforts that are being made by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and other friends. This matter has been going on for the last seventeen years. I entirely agree with my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta —with whom I hardly agree . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why are you afraid of saying that you agree with me? When I agree with you, I agree with you and I am proud of it. Why are you saying 'hardly'?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I submit let us give this Peace Mission the fullest opportunity and let us give our best wishes to this Peace Mission.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

I. REPORTED OCCUPATION OF A CERTAIN AREA OF INDIAN TERRITORY IN SOUTH BERUBARI BY THE PAKISTAN ARMY AND THE CONTINUED FIRING ON COOCH-BEHAR BORDER BY EAST PAKISTAN RIFLES

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we continue, we will take up the Calling Attention Notices. Mr. Sen Gupta.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to (i) the reported occupation of sixty bighas of Indian territory known as Kajaldighi area in South Berubari by the Pakistan Army and the seeking of shelter by about 10,000 Indian citizens of that area in different parts of Jalpaiguri and Cooch-Bihar districts, and (ii) the continued firing on the Meckliganj sector of Cooch-Bihar district on the Indo-Pakistan border by East Pakistan Rifles.

Madam, I also understand from the "Ananda Bazar Patrika" yesterday that mortars supplied by SEATO were used by Pakistan. I also want an answer to that.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Madam, on 22nd March a report was received from the West Bengal Government that personnel of the East Pakistan Rifles were massed opposite South Berubari in Jalpaiguri District. It was reported that there had been rumours in the area that the East Pakistan Rifles were about to organise raids on South Berubari since its transfer to Pakistan was being delayed by India. It was further reported that on 3rd March some members of the East Pakistan Rifles had crossed the Sui River in Jalpaiguri and had trespassed into the adjacent Indian territory. The East Pakistan Rifles threatened some Indian nationals who were cultivating land there and claimed that the territory was Pakistan's. When the West Bengal Border Police reached the area, the East Pakistan Rifles men fled and crossed over into Pakistan territory. Although the intrusion was easily vacated, the East Pakistan Rifles were reported in some strength, on Pakistan territory, opposite South Berubari. At one time it was even feared that they would make an attempt at sustained intrusion into Indian territory in that area.