

attention to a matter of urgent public importance in these terms:

Under rule 215, I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"Whether it is a fact that 14 hostile tribesmen who belonged to terrorist party of N.E.F.A. were killed and several were wounded on 15-9-1955 by Indian soldiers near Lhoshyepu and Khokiye in south-east corner of Tuensang Frontier Division."

Shri Raghunath Singh is not here at the moment, but the hon. Prime Minister wishes to make a statement on this.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I am called upon to make a statement under rule 216. The hon. Member concerned is not here, but I should like nevertheless to make a statement for the information of the House. This is in regard to certain developments in the North East Frontier Agency.

On the 18th August I made a statement in the Lok Sabha in regard to the situation in the Tuensang Frontier Division. In this I had stated that a battalion of the Army had been sent to the Southern sector of the Tuensang Division to deal with some organised armed gangs which had concentrated in one or two fortified villages in the south of the Tuensang Frontier Division, adjoining the Naga Hills District. These gangs possessed fire-arms, including automatic weapons.

The troops sent there cooperated fully with the Assam Rifles platoons as well as with two or three platoons of the Assam State Armed Police which were put under the overall command of the Army Force Commander. They found that the organised armed gangs had concentrated in fortified positions in the villages of

Leshyepu and Kheikiye. Both these positions were reached on the 10th September last. As a result of the military action that took place then, it is estimated that forty hostile tribesmen were killed and about thirty were injured. Our casualties were two killed and one injured.

It is understood that the ringleaders of the hostiles came from the Naga Hills District of Assam.

Reports have been received that hostile bases have been set up in some other parts of the Tuensang Frontier Division. This matter is under investigation and it is possible that the Army troops will be retained in the Division to undertake one or more additional specified tasks. Co-ordinated action is being taken by the Assam State Administration and the NEFA Administration to bring the affected areas under full control. The necessity to retain troops in these areas will be judged from time to time.

I might add that recently yesterday or the day before we received further information—that has appeared already in the Press—which indicates that a large number of people in those areas have themselves got rather tired of being harassed by these hostile elements and have themselves taken action against them. For instance, a few days ago in certain villages around Noklak, people from 15 villages themselves attacked the hostiles, as a result of which about 14 of the hostile tribesmen were killed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): On a point of submission, the question relating to the visit of the Commerce Minister to Dalmianagar involves a question of honour of the two Ministers. I, therefore, feel that the hon. Prime Minister would be pleased to repudiate categorically any nexus, implied, suspected or apprehended between the Ministers on the one hand and Shri Ram Kishna Dalmia on the other.

Bill

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is unnecessary and nothing is involved. The hon. Prime Minister has already said that there is absolutely no foundation for that, and the question ought not be interpreted to mean any such thing.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of information, may I ask whether Government has had the hardihood to disregard the peremptory but sound advice given by the hon. Speaker on the 5th of this month regarding the amendment of the Constitutional provision in respect of quorum? I am reading from the official transcript.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. If any Member wants to make any suggestion or motion, he will kindly intimate to the Speaker. He need not go to the Speaker's room. I will bring it here tomorrow, if I find there is something to be brought up before the House. The proceedings of the House ought not to be interrupted. Many things have to be done by the hon. Members, by the Government and by all of us concerned. This is not a matter which can be brought up before the House. Let him write to me. I will consider if it could be allowed to be brought before the House in the form of a motion.

INDIAN TARIFF (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934."

The motion was adopted.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I introduce* the Bill.

RIVER BOARDS BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion on the motion for concurrence in the motion of Rajya Sabha for reference of the River Boards Bill to a Joint Committee.

Originally three hours had been allotted for this motion. Half an hour was deducted yesterday towards the discussion on the point of order raised yesterday. Out of the 2½ hours, 1 hour and 20 minutes were availed of yesterday. This would mean that the discussion on the motion will conclude by about 1-40 P.M. today, that is, after 1 hour and 10 minutes from now, when the motion regarding economic policy will be taken up for which 10 hours have been allotted.

The Private Members' Business will be taken up at 4-30 P.M. As already decided, the House will sit up to 7 P.M. today.

The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the motion moved by Shri Gulzarilal Nanda on the 29th September, 1955.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Dist.—South): The Bill under discussion appears to be a Bill which is more or less persuasive than directive. This Bill depends more or less on the will of the provincial Government to join in this measure. I find that the two Bills read together are of the same nature and to some extent try to solve the problem of inter-State disputes and river valley projects. But I find a great difference here. In clause 11 of the Inter-State Water Disputes Bill, I find there is no appeal to the Supreme Court or any other court. A similar provision is not made in the River Boards Bill. Here also, if a dispute is decided after arbitration, similar powers should be given. Otherwise, there will be a loophole left for a State to go to some court. Here also in clause 22 (4) it is said that the decision of the arbitrator, shall be final. So far

*Introduced with the recommendation of the President.