

and secondly, they should refer the whole matter for the opinion of the Supreme Court under article 143 of the Constitution. We are not satisfied with the Law Minister's advice. We know the Law Minister gives wrong advice.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have received the notice. I will pass it on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Only when you give me the chance, I shall present the case on behalf of what I have said pointing out how a gross violation, impeachable violation of the Constitution has been committed by the head of a State. I should like to know how he is going to deal with this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN . If you propose to say it on a future occasion, I will pass that on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I will challenge the Leader of the House who is a former Chief Justice of a High Court to face this question. Let it be debated in this House. I shall prove before the House how the Rajasthan Governor has violated the Constitution.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I have much, too much respect for the House and I assure my hon. friend that when the Chairman passes on the notice, the Government will give it due consideration.

#### THE ARMED FORCES (SPECIAL POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL, 1966

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH) : Sir, I move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Regulation, 1958, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

While making this motion, it is not my intention to make any long statement. I would like to inform this honourable House that the current extension of this Act expires on the 4th April, 1966. It is now proposed to provide that this should continue for one year more. The second point that I want to mention at this stage is the fact that whereas at the present moment this Regulation is not applicable to the

Tuensang District of Nagaland and it applies to two districts, Mokokchung and Kohima, now it is intended that the Regulation should be made applicable to the entire State of Nagaland. These are the two provisions of the present Bill which I have moved for being taken into consideration.

Sir, the principle of the Bill has already been accepted and the sole question for consideration at the present stage is as to whether the situation in Nagaland is such that an extension of the provisions of this Act is necessary or not. I would most strongly urge upon this House that the situation in Nagaland is not such according to which it could be said that a legislative measure of this nature is not necessary. Now there may be a difference of opinion as to how it is being handled, what should be the other way of handling it. But it is a fact that the situation in Nagaland is such that one could not say that there is no necessity of giving these powers to the Armed Forces which may be called in aid of the civil authorities.

The other day I had occasion to report to this House, I think, in answer to certain questions and the Prime Minister herself made a statement here after her talks with the underground Naga leaders, and it was reported to the House that there was a likelihood of a further meeting between the representatives of the underground Nagas and the Prime Minister some time in April. A meeting took place some weeks ago and a report was made to this honourable House about that meeting between the Prime Minister and the representatives of the underground Naga leaders. As everyone knows, Mr. Chairman, there is peace at the moment. It is no doubt disturbed occasionally but, by and large, conditions of peace do prevail there. And as one shrewd observer has said, a large number of people living in Nagaland have acquired a vested interest in peace. There is a vast majority of people there who are interested in maintaining peace.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Who is that shrewd observer ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Which shrewd observer ? One of the representatives of the Government and also some representatives of the party which is in

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

power there. There is an elected Government there and there Mr. Shilu Ao is the Chief Minister. Some of his colleagues met me some time back and said that by and large everyone is acquiring a vested interest in peace. That area was subjected to all types of restrictions, curfews and the like and I think, after several years people in Kohima saw lights during night and there is a growing awareness amongst the people there that peace should be maintained. It is true that there are sections amongst the Naga people themselves who do not appear to be fully reconciled to the peaceful way and there are occasional branches of the understanding and the agreement according to which peace prevails. But on the whole any large-scale clash or the like has generally been avoided.

It is very difficult to say as to whether the current efforts that are being made to find a peaceful solution of the problem would succeed or not. But it is worth continuing that line of action because the alternative to that is a conflict of a very serious nature where our own people will suffer. When I say our own people, Nagas are Indians and they are our own people and therefore we should not regard them, by even indirect methods, as outsiders. And I am sometimes disturbed when some of the hon. Members here or outside describe the Nagas as loyal Nagas or as not loyal Nagas. Their loyalty is to the country and there may be some who may not at the moment be agreeing to observe the conditions of peace and be devoted to find a solution by peaceful means. But we should not forget that they are our people, they are our brethren and they are Indians, and it is in that spirit that we should try to remove their misunderstanding and should continue to adhere to the peaceful means.

Whereas this effort will continue, it is very necessary, in case there are large scale violations of the conditions of peace, that steps have to be taken by the Government there which is established by law and by Constitution, to cope with the situation and in that contingency, the Armed Forces have to be called in aid of the civil authorities. Then the Armed Forces should have certain authority which is sought to be taken by the provisions of this Act. There

is nothing new, this has already been there, and the present proposal is that these powers should be extended by another year. These powers also are not something very peculiar or drastic, these are the normal functions of having the right to arrest without warrant in certain cases, having the right to disperse people who might be unlawfully collecting, having the authority to destroy places which might be used for illegal or for aggressive purposes or to effect search without a warrant if there are any reasonable grounds of suspicion that the place might be used for illegal or for unlawful purposes.

These are very necessary powers and the Armed Forces should have these powers if they have to function effectively in aid of the civil authority.

Thank you very much.

The question was proposed.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir, before you call upon any hon. Member to speak, may I just ask for a clarification from the Minister so that the discussion will be more on the right lines? May I know whether Shri Jaya Prakash Narain has taken back his resignation or any attempt is made to see that he takes back his resignation and further whether any attempt is made to dissuade Rev. Michael Scott to continue in this Peace Mission. These are the points.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, I had occasion, I think, to make a statement here some time back that suggestions had been made to Shri Jaya Prakash Narain that he might withdraw his resignation. Now, the origin of his resignation, I hope, is known to this honourable House. He thought that the underground Naga leaders were unhappy about a certain statement which he made and on that score, Shri Jaya Prakash Narain thought that there was no need for staying on if one of the parties doubted his *bona fides*. That was essentially a matter for those who had raised certain objections about the functioning of Shri Jaya Prakash Narain to convince him that he still continued to enjoy their confidence. I clarified the position that we would be very happy if he withdrew his resignation but it is essentially a

matter for his conscience and also for those against whom it is directed; it is not directed against the Government but directed against the representatives of the Naga leaders there.

On the second issue about Rev. Michael Scott, the position is that he is there as a person who is acceptable to the Church leaders. They had persuaded him to function as a member of the Peace Mission. He is not a nominee of the Government, and we continue to deal with the Peace Mission as it is. And so long as the activities are such as are not so openly opposed to the Indian interest and if he cannot make us commit, we ourselves have not made any suggestion that he should no longer function there.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** May I ask a question ?

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** I think we should proceed with the debate.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** He said Michael Scott was not a nominee of the Government but he is a nominee of the Nagas. If another country's citizen, not of our country, became a nominee in our internal peace talks of this kind, do I understand that the Government's approval and endorsement was not sought and he was just imposed ?

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** The Government has been dealing with the man . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Dealing with is all right but he is a nominee.

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :** There is no question of imposition. It is true that he is not a national of India, but there is no question of any impropriety here if one party thinks that somebody can represent them or put across their viewpoint, you should treat him as a sort of their advocate or some such thing. We should be liberal enough not to invoke our nationalist ideas in this respect. I value them. But I do not see any impropriety. We may not like his activities.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** My purpose is served with this.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL** (Gujarat) : I have listened patiently to the speech of the hon'ble Minister. All special

powers are not a happy occasion. Naturally one would not feel very happy about giving special powers here. But if the situation in the Nagaland and the areas roundabout is such that the Government feel called upon to ask for these powers, I suppose this House will willy-nilly agree to them. But before we agree to them, we would like certain clarifications.

Sir, I would draw your attention that only a few days ago a question was asked. I think it was answered by the hon. Mr. Dinesh Singh. There was a demonstration by Naga hostiles who tried to celebrate their independence day. The hon'ble Minister said he had no information. Sir, I think the House, when it is called upon to give such special powers, should be shown more confidence. It is very difficult for me to believe that Mr. Dinesh Singh was unaware of this. We know that very often Government is aware of things but officially they say they are unaware.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** He gave the reply when the thing had not happened; the demonstration had not taken place. He said, "I do not know". It might have happened on the 22nd or the 23rd. He gave the reply on the 21st.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL :** Surely the Government would be aware that some attempt is being made to hold a demonstration and they should have told us, "Yes, they have heard that some such demonstration is sought to be staged. The Government is aware and the Government will take whatever steps are necessary to meet the situation" instead of beating about the bush. There is too much beating about the bush. In all this the Government should come forward in a straight-forward manner as to what they want to do.

Sir, I rise on this occasion to point out the failure of the Ministry of Defence for all these years. Is it going to be repeated again ? It happened on the Chinese border when we were told, "Not a blade of grass grows". When questions were directed that roads were being built in the Himalayas, the reply was, "It is all barren land. Why do you bother ?" And this has brought Peking right to our border. They have occupied so much of our territory because of the folly of not listening to the warnings that had come forward. Is it the same thing that is taking place ?

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

Sir, the former Defence Minister who was an advocate of that policy has had to go. But can anyone say that that policy has gone, and also that the tentacles of that Defence Minister are still not working in the Defence Ministry itself? We want to be assured, Sir, that that is not happening.

Sir, I understand that frequent transfers are being made. I understand that certain blue-eyed boys of the former Defence Minister are being posted on civilian production jobs. They get the pay of active Army service plus a deputation allowance, and of course the extra retirement benefits when they retire. I would not be averse to giving this to the people who have done good service to the country in the time of crisis. But if this is being done repeatedly on a large scale, what happens? Production falls. The reports of the Public Accounts Committee about the ordnance factories are before us. Making of bath tubs and coffee percolators and photo enlargers in ordnance factories has been talked about in this House so often. I need not repeat. Is this still being followed. I would like to know. The putting of army men just to give them cushy jobs on production work would result in the same thing instead of putting technically-qualified people, trained people, who are useful in production, whether it is Defence or civilian thing; it is detrimental to the interest of the country. It would be particularly so in the case of the Defence department.

Then, of course, the background, the affinity of the Defence Minister is well-known. If people of that affinity are going to be in charge of our defence works, where do we stand, Sir? Yesterday, we heard the Defence Minister's statement in the other House.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Are we dealing with the Defence Ministry?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The Defence Minister is asking for special powers and I am asking whether we can give them these powers under such circumstances. I am asking the House to decide whether we can give them these powers if this is the condition.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But the Defence Minister has changed.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The Defence Ministry does not change. The Defence Minister changes. I am sorry the

Ministry has not changed. I would like the Ministry to change its colour radically. That is what I am trying to impress. Unfortunately, I have not been able to make myself sufficiently clear to the hon'ble Member. Sir, with your permission, to prevent such misunderstanding, I hope you will allow me to elaborate myself in detail on this point. I was just going to wind up. What I am trying to say is . . .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: He is making a suggestion. Perhaps the hon'ble Member would like to reserve this when the Budget comes here for discussion. These are very valuable things and probably my colleague, Mr. Chavan, will be in a better position to satisfy the hon. Member. I am just making a suggestion for his consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not preventing you from taking the line that you are taking because we are giving rights to the Armed Forces. But you need not elaborate if your friend, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, is not very well informed or has not understood what you say. I think he has understood.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: May I also point out, through you, to the hon'ble Defence Minister that this House does not discuss grants Ministry by Ministry, and if I do not take this opportunity, I would lose the opportunity. The Budget Discussion in this House is over, if I may point out.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The hon'ble Member must have made similar observations at that time.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: No, Sir.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: If he has missed the bus, Sir, would you like to give him another lift?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: And I am pointing out to the Minister of External Affairs and the Minister of Defence that they are likely to miss the bus and let down the country very badly. I am sorry to say, Sir, they are trying to obstruct me in this manner. We have heard what is happening on the Rajasthani border today. Where is the Tashkent

spirit to which the hon'ble Minister was a party? Let him take heed. Let him take the warning that this country has to remain alert and prepared.

There is no better precaution than to be prepared, to be alert to meet any eventuality. Why is the Minister afraid or is shirking the position and is afraid to say so? If he is so, let us know about it, but I am pointing out the facts which are big dents in our Defence and I would demand that we be assured that this is not taking place. I was pointing out the fact that a large number of people, at least a significant number, may not be wholesale, of army people not suitable for Defence work are being pushed on to civilian jobs which they are not fit to hold. Is it not a fact that some people from the Armed Forces and from the Air Force who are not required by the Air Force are being put on such production jobs for which they are not qualified? If the production work suffers and they, benefit by getting promotions and a larger retirement benefit, is it in the interests of the country? This country needs better production. Are we assured of that? There have been doubts raised in this House again and again about some of the Defence equipment. Is it not necessary to take a completely new look at it? Whether we are getting it from America or Russia or anywhere else, grave doubts have been expressed about the MIG project. Of course the Government is going ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I had the impression from your earlier remarks that you wanted to support the granting of these additional powers. Your argument probably will go against it.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The House should remain alert and be warned against. We do not want to obstruct the Government in taking the necessary steps if it wants to but we want to be assured that the power we are granting is to be properly used and the Defence Department itself is doing its job properly, is vigilant to many of the features that appear evident to us. If we are not properly informed I would stand corrected, if the Defence Minister comes now or later on and corrects us. Is this not happening and for whose benefit?

M36RS/66—3

These are briefly some of the points that I wanted to state. I was not going to take a long time but I think these are very necessary points to which the attention of the House should be drawn. When these matters come later on on another occasion or perhaps to the P.A.C. usually the matter is too late in coming. The matter comes to the P.A.C. two or three years after the matter has happened and, therefore, I thought it was in the interests of the country that the matter should be raised at the first and the earliest opportunity. We do not get enough time in the Budget discussions to go into the subject Ministry by Ministry. Therefore I restricted my speech on the Budget mainly to the taxation proposals of the new Finance Minister. We do not get the opportunity that the other House has of discussing it Ministry-wise and therefore I crave your indulgence to offer these remarks and I hope the Minister who is here and his colleague the Defence Minister who is not here now will take the opportunity to clarify the situation for the benefit of this House and for the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, some eight years ago this measure was brought before this House with a view to dealing with an extraordinary situation created by the outbreak of hostilities in that particular region of our country and at that time we made it very clear that whereas we should not be opposed as such to giving certain powers for the use of the Armed Forces where normally civilian authorities should dominate, there should be always constant effort on the part of the Government to seek a political solution of the problem and I think it has been by and large agreed that the solution of the problem lies fundamentally/politically, in finding ways and means for a political understanding. Now again we are extending not only the life but also the area to be covered under this measure. Naturally in this connection I would like to make a few observations, with regard to the political aspect of the matter without which we cannot properly assess as to how much military forces are needed, as to what extent the military forces would be required, as to whether the employment of such forces or the deployment of such forces is helping always the promotion of a political approach to the problem that we have

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

before us. The first thing I would point out here is that we are deadily opposed to Rev. Michael Scott being in the Peace Mission at all. Only a few minutes ago the Minister for External Affairs informed the House that Rev. Scott was an advocate of the hostile Nagas. Now again we find that he is sitting also as a peace-maker and a judge. If he is an advocate of the hostile Nagas, certain things follow. One is, that he is a foreign national who must have got certain connection or who must have identified himself with the Naga hostile cause including the cause of their separation in such a manner that he would be regarded as a trusted man to put up the case of the hostile Nagas. So far the hostile Nagas have not abandoned their demand for an independent Nagaland. It follows therefore that Rev. Scott, unless he is a false advocate, is there to press the demand for an independent Nagaland or to put it mildly, to bargain on the basis of that demand since he is an advocate. Now how is it that in a matter where certain internal problems are being discussed between Indian nationals, whether they be officials or non-officials, a third party is brought in in order to put up certain cases which are outside the bounds of the Constitution because nobody in India in a court of law can get up and say that a part of India should be declared as independent, not even in a court of law. If that would be a thing outside the field of the Constitution, how is it that Rev. Scott has been commissioned to participate in the guise of a member of the Peace Mission to put across that case and press for it? I would like to have some satisfactory answer to it. Secondly who gave him visa to come here or permission to remain within this country? Certainly the Nagas did not give it. This must have been done as indeed it has been done by the Government of India. Therefore directly the Government of India is a party to an unconstitutional impermissible, improper arrangement in which a foreign national is imported into the discussions between the nationals of a given country and what is more, to act as an advocate. You might say: 'Cannot we get the services of Mr. D. N. Pratt of the English Bar to appear in the Supreme Court?' But there is no analogy here. Here it is not something which is before a court of

law. Here is a political negotiation going on between political elements where the normal rules of law and the procedure or the arrangements within the British Commonwealth as far as law is concerned do not arise at all. Here how is it that Rev. Scott is allowed to function in the capacity in which he is functioning today? That brings me to the other aspect of the problem. I think we have always maintained and I do still maintain even at this hour that the Naga problem is partly the creation of the British and the British interests are there behind it. Whatever Rev. Scott or others may say, everybody who knows the origin of the problem knows that the British was encouraging. Not only did they take Phizo there and gave him asylum but they also gave him British citizenship and also in many ways they have been in the past, systematically helping and instigating the Nagas to press forward their demand for independence and separation. In fact they do not recognise that it is part of India.

There we know very well that Rev. Michael Scott had an important part to play. He seems to be running with the hare and hunting with the hound. He comes and tells the Nagas "Go and press for your demand for independence, and demand for separation, in the sense that you get recognised as an independent Nagaland". And he comes to the Government of India at Delhi, goes to Assam and other places in order to pose as if he is a peace-maker between the Indian side or the Government side on the one hand, and those who are called hostile Nagas, on the other hand. We have never known a comparable example of such double dealing in political matters, and the Government of India has been so cowardly in such matters that it does not even have the courage to tell Rev. Michael Scott that we do not require his services, that we shall deal with the Nagas directly in our own way—and they are according to the normal rules of discussion, subject to political considerations—and that he need not be there in this country at all. May I know whether at any time this suggestion was made to Rev. Michael Scott? And Rev. Michael Scott has been responsible in no small measure for muddying the waters. But for him the discussions would have progressed much better, and the need for use of the military

would perhaps have been less. I say 'less' because the more politics succeeds in such matters, the less becomes the need for extra-political, or military measures. Even the Foreign Minister said the other day that some of the statements of the Rev. Michael Scott were not helpful to India, or not friendly to India, and that he had some serious objection to some of the statements made by Rev. Michael Scott. Now in our country if somebody says something about China or Pakistan, he is put in detention under the D.I.R., because he is a security risk. But when Rev. Michael Scott comes here as an instrument of British imperialism, and says things which are patently contrary to our national interests, which are a clear provocation to the Nagas to persist in their unfortunately tragic and wholly wrong attitude, which come in the way of bilateral talks developing between the Government on the one hand, and certain sections of misguided citizens of our country. I think the Government not only does not do anything but extends to that gentleman, the Rev. Michael Scott, all facilities and amenities. Now I should like to know why that is so. I think the main thing now for us again to press here is that Rev. Michael Scott should be packed out of this country. There is no need for him. You can deal with everybody. You can deal with Punjab, you have dealt with us in Bengal and shot down fifty people for asking for food. You have dealt with people in Delhi. You have dealt with us in Kerala. You are dealing with yourselves also, in the Congress Party, when you quarrel, behave like hostiles towards one another. Why can't we then deal with the Naga problem by eliminating Rev. Michael Scott entirely from the scene?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :** We do not deal with the Communist leaders when they quarrel among themselves.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I think you have made your point about Rev. Michael Scott clear. You have made it repeatedly and you have made it very forcefully also. Can you now proceed to something else?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Now he said about the Communists. How does the communist come?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :** That was the reply I gave there.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I do not wish to be sidetracked by this Government which is functioning on sidelines. Why should I be sidetracked? Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of communists and non-communists. Here is a national issue: I think you have disgraced our country. People abroad do not understand what is happening. In England British propaganda has made it known to the world that they are not part of India, that India wants to forcibly keep them within the country, bring them within this country and that, therefore, their man, Rev. Michael Scott, has come to offer his good offices to the Indian Government and the Nagas so that, between the two, an understanding, some kind of a solution, could be found. Now that is the position. Therefore I say this is all wrong.

Then with regard to Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan, the Peace Mission is very important in the context. Now, well, the Nagas do not like it. So we do not like Rev. Michael Scott.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** We are not dealing with personalities and politics here.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Sir, if you refer to the debates when originally the Prime Minister initiated it in this House, you will find that ninety per cent of the time was taken in discussing the political context of it. Otherwise why should we have this Bill? What for? They came and asked for power for one year. Now it is eight years and they are still extending it. We should like to know how the political matter is being handled. At that time we were told, "Let us have the power for a year. We are developing a certain political approach, and soon this will not be necessary." And now again we are told that they are extending it. Therefore Government should answer as to how political matters are being handled, and unless we can question this thing, we cannot go into the merits of the Bill, and the merit or demerit of the Bill lies in the fact of their treatment, political treatment of the entire subject. Now here is no Defence Minister sitting. It is a Bill pertaining to the Armed Forces, but the Bill is put forward here, brought up here by the Minister of External Affairs. Now that in itself is evidence that the matter

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

is political, that it is not a defence matter. Therefore we would ask the External Affairs Minister some questions, or we would like to raise some questions in this connection.

Now, Sir, I was coming to Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan's statement. I do not wish to say very much, because he is our national and an eminent citizen of our country. If any peace mission is there and if he is associated with it, we are naturally very happy. May be that we do not agree with him on certain points, or a certain line of approach. But the fact remains that he is an eminent Indian, which cannot be denied. Therefore, well, he was there. Now we find that he is out of it, and Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan has made a statement. What does he say in this statement? He says he feels that the parties have lost confidence in him. The hon. Minister told us that the party in question are the Naga hostiles. I should like to know how did that happened. If I put it that Rev. Michael Scott was the responsible party for it, will it be denied? If I put it to the House that one of the reasons why some Naga hostiles—not all—took an unkindly and uncharitable view of the role played by Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan was that Rev. Michael Scott was instigating them, will it be denied? Because Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan would certainly be interested in persuading the Nagas to ways of peaceful settlement, he would certainly see that they do not seek to go out of our country. Now naturally, with such a personality on the Peace Mission, such an attitude and approach would gather strength and moral force, and Rev. Michael Scott, I suspect and presume, saw to it that Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan's work there was made extremely difficult, so much so that he would resign. And he had resigned. Such is the situation. Was there any investigation on the part of the Government as to how the thing happened? Are we not entitled to know in the context of such measures as to why a man like Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan found it extremely difficult to continue when he had taken a lot of initiative in this matter, at times running against the public opinion of the country? Am I to understand that he took a frivolous decision and acted light heartedly in

this matter? Or am I to presume, from the circumstances of the case, that there must have been some overriding serious considerations which compelled Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan to bow out of that Mission, or leave that Mission? We have not had yet any satisfactory explanation. Therefore I should like to have that.

As far as Mr. Chaliha is concerned, he too comes into it—I do not know what he is doing. He seems to be the elusive Pimpnel of this Mission—very difficult to say.

I can understand the Naga problem. I can understand the Rev. Michael Scott. I can understand Shri Jaya Prakash Narain. But the little one, Mr. Chaliha, I can never for the life of me, understand what he is doing here. These are matters to be explained.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

Then we find that Mr. Gundevia was associated with this mission initially when he was in the External Affairs Ministry. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you know I do not have any strong preferences for any officials. I do not know Mr. Gundevia at all. I might have seen him in some party, but I do not know him. But suddenly we find in the midst of discussions Mr. Gundevia was removed from this place and taken to Rashtrapati Bhavan as Secretary to the President. Was it not possible to delay this a little? Or was it not possible to find another Secretary? Was no other Secretary available? Or even if he had to be brought in, was it not possible for the Government to make a request to the President in order to get Mr. Gundevia directly associated with the work of this Peace Mission because of his experience in this matter? Mr. Vice-Chairman, personal knowledge is very very important in such matters. And you do not develop personal knowledge or personal touch overnight. You work with the people and then you come to know the trend or way of their thinking and come to some kind of personal acquaintance with them. And then you evolve your approach. You cannot just handle this in the same way you transfer a luggage from one carriage to another. That does not happen. But you see, Mr.



Gundevia was suddenly removed. I do not say that he has been demoted. He has been given a very high position. It is not a personal matter that I raise. But I think in this matter this manner of handling the thing does not help the progress of the talks.

Now I come to the other side. Some people have been opposed to the direct talks between the Prime Minister and the Naga hostiles. Very well, but there should be direct talks in such matters. And I am glad the Prime Minister has had such direct talks. If we think that there should be a political settlement and not a punitive or military settlement, then at least there should be direct talks between the Government and these other parties, in this case, the so-called Naga hostiles. I think the Government should have taken this initiative much earlier. One reason why Government did not take this initiative was their wrong assessment of the situation, and perhaps interference of Rev. Michael Scott and people like him. Now, talks are good. I think the House should support such talks for the simple reason that it is only by talks that we come to any political settlement, that we can arrive at a political settlement. We cannot arrive at a political settlement at the point of the gun. It is impossible. You can shoot a person. You can kill a person. You can blow away human lives. You can devastate Naga homes. You can blow them off. But that way we cannot have a political settlement or a settlement that will be an enduring settlement by any stretch of imagination. Therefore, it was very right on the part of the Government to have started political negotiations. But this time because of some opposition to this kind of direct political talks between the Government and the Nagas the Government is falling off. This Government seems to be afraid of everything on earth, except democracy, I suppose. Except democracy, it is afraid of everything. The moment these talks were taken up some people raised a howl and said, "You should not go and you should not have talks with the Naga rebels. It was all wrong." And immediately the Government is on the defensive. They have started stepping back. Why step back? Why not march ahead? Shrimati Indira Gandhi may be going to the United States—no-

body knows why she is going to the USA—and because of that you cannot continue these talks? I do not know why she is going there. Perhaps she wants to meet President Johnson. Perhaps she wants some help. Anyway, whatever it is, let her go. I am not interested in her going to the United States of America because I know it is useless. It is just waste of money, petrol wastage and foreign exchange loss. Anyway, let her go. But the External Affairs Minister could continue these talks. He is a great talker, I am told. He has been to Pakistan and the Pakistanis, I am told, are tough customers. And we are told that he was a match to such touch customers and he knew how to deal with them. So he can deal with the talks here also. They are your own citizens. Why these talks should not be continued I do not know. I say there should be no show of force. If you show military force then things become difficult. The presence of the military does not create the climate for a political settlement. I am not blaming the military. But the logic of the present position has to be faced. If you go on talking and at the same time there is the military on this side posted here and there, then certain incidents can take place and they come in the way and the extreme elements among these people are always in a position to excite the people's feelings and raise their prejudices and these come in the way of the promotion of successful talks. Therefore, you must realise that as far as possible, the military should be in the background and the civil authority should be in the forefront. And in the civil authority, political leadership should be given the foremost rank. That is how I understand the problem. But here I find there is a hotchpotch arrangement with military, police, Rev. Scott, Jaya Prakash Narain—now he is out—and also many Ministers, so many of them. So one does not know where things begin and where they end, where Sardar Swaran Singh, begins and where Sardar Swaran Singh ends, or for the matter of that, where Chavan begins and where Swaran Singh ends. We don't know. We don't know for that matter where Rev. Michael Scott ends and where people like Jaya Prakash Narayan or comparable people begin. We do not know. It has been a terrible confusion.

AN HON. MEMBER : They are confused.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes, I agree they are confused. The Government is confused. I have never known a Government suffering from so much confusion as the present Government does. It does not know what to do. They should listen to us and they should proceed to deal with this matter in a proper manner, in a proper way.

The question was raised about the Nagas there having some republic day celebration. Proper information should have been given. I am not saying anything. It may be there or it may not be there, but at least they should have the proper information. They do not have proper information. In the newspapers we read that the Nagas are having their independence or republic day celebration or some such thing. The Government should tell us whether this news is true or false and what exactly is happening, because the Government should have such information in order even to make a political assessment of the situation and to judge the cross-currents in Nagaland and to judge the political trends there. Well they have nothing. Their Intelligence has completely failed there. I have got a letter, Mr. Vice-Chairman, from these areas, including the Mizo areas, to show that the Intelligence people there are having a good time. And that is about all. Let them have a good time, subject to the law of the land, I have no objection.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi) : Whose letter ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Let them have a good time, I have no objection. But if you put them there for your Intelligence purposes, then they should supply you with proper intelligence. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you know at the time of the Assam language riots the Central Government said they did not have information. That is one thing. Then in Assam at the time of the Mizo trouble when everybody knew that in Shillong and other areas certain things were happening, the Government itself had no proper information.

Or if they had the information they did not divulge it to the House. Subject to the rules of secrecy they could have done it. They did not do that. They do not have information about what is happening in Nagaland also and that position remains even now. That is why the Minister of External Affairs could not tell us what was happening and he could not give us certain information about the alleged republic day celebrations.

This is how it is done. Then they have the military. The only thing on which they rely on, apart from the Peace Mission, is the military. Therefore, their political evaluation to my mind, does not seem to be very sound. It has to be objective, and in order to have an objective political evaluation of the situation you must have the necessary information and there they are lacking. It is quite clear from what the hon. Minister has said. Therefore, I say that from every point of view, they are not handling the situation properly.

There is the demand for amnesty and unfortunately there is some delay. I know some of our comrades met at Hazaribagh jail some of those people. They are nice young people and they realise that things are not right. Anyhow the point is raised and you are delaying the amnesty. Now we were told that the amnesty question would be considered. Now they would not do it quickly. If you think that the political situation has now reached a stage when certain unilateral political step has to be taken in order to improve the situation and impress upon the Nagas who are in favour of a peaceful solution and if you think that the political amnesty of the Naga prisoners is one such step then you should not delay; you should announce it and make full capital out of it in your propaganda and in developing new approaches to the Naga hostiles who have still to be brought to reason and made to see that what they are doing is wrong and to seek ways of peace.

Sir, I can continue after lunch.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : No, we are sitting till 1.30 because we want to have more speakers and I hope you will help me in giving opportunity to other speakers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Don't put that on me.

Therefore I say this. If you think that a step has to be taken, take it. I know that there may be an element of risk in it from your administrative point of view but then I do not think that the risk is such that it outweighs a positive political consideration. That is why I ask the Government to take such a step.

As far as the Peace Mission is concerned, I should like you to consider one point. If Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan is not there, if we do not have a strong Indian element in the Peace Mission in the non-official sector of it, well, I do not see as to why we should waste our time on such a Peace Mission which is only to the advantage of the Rev. Michael Scott and the extremist elements among the Nagas. Therefore it is necessary—I am not saying, wind up the Peace Mission or do any such thing immediately—that you should consider as to whether the position of the Peace Mission has not qualitatively changed as a result of the fact that Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan is out of it. If you think that it has changed qualitatively its character then you are called up to do certain other things. If you do not think so, then it is a different matter. That is the point I should like to stress.

Finally, Mr. Vice-Chairman, all I would like to say as far as the military approach is concerned is, I do maintain that this entire question of the tribal people or the hill people is not a military question at all. A solution has to be found politically and herein comes the question of autonomy within the framework of our Constitution. Perhaps at the time when we drew up our Constitution we did not have this thing in mind. They were distant problems; they did not agitate the minds of those who were engaged in formulating the Constitution of the country but today after fifteen years of our Constitution life has told you that this problem needs special and comprehensive attention. Our Constitution in order to be a live one must answer the urges, needs and political aspirations of those tribal people and the hill people. Now this is the burning question. Previously ten years ago the question was the reorganisation of the States which you

initially resisted and you ultimately reorganised the States. And now after ten years of reorganisation of the States you have conceded the very just demand for the formation of bilingual Punjab on the language basis. At that time that was a problem but today it has been done and the political map so far as linguistic States are concerned has been drawn up and completed or will be completed shortly. Now another aspect comes up as a problem. There are many tribal people. They are not stagnant people; they are a living population, a living civilisation. They live in this world where ideas and views spread. Words carry those things like the seeds and these ideas reach them. Today they hear many things over the radio and otherwise also which was not open to them, say, 20 years ago or 30 years ago. Therefore in this context naturally the most human and sympathetic attention should be paid to the tribal problem. The Naga problem is not an isolated problem. It was thought to be an isolated problem separated from the entire problem of the northeastern region from the problem of the Garo Hills, Mizo Hills and very many other hills problem and sought to be solved in this manner. We find today an echo of this problem but I do not for a moment support at all those who are demanding independence or secession. They are misled but they are good people. They are simple people. They have plenty of hopes, plenty of frustration, plenty of human feeling, plenty of grievances and complaints but not enough political education and enlightenment or a sense of perspective in order to understand what is good for them and what is bad for them. That is why today we want a political approach to be developed so that it answers not only the urges and feelings, it not only gives them assurances against their grievances and complaints but also holds out before them a perspective in which they can shape their future as they like retaining their own special way of life, special culture, special customs and usage, special modes of life and all the rest of it. That is very very essential and therein comes the need for political leadership and I hope that if we evolve such an approach today, then naturally the moral weight of such an approach will be felt not only by those to whom we are addressing such an

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

approach but also by others. Therefore I do maintain that the Naga problem and the problems that have arisen emphasize furthermore the need today for a proper political approach which may necessitate an amendment of our Constitution. I do not think the problem of the tribal people or of the hill people can be solved without amending the Constitution and we can amend our Constitution. Life is greater than the Constitution; people are greater than the Constitution. If we want to maintain national harmony, the national integrity as we call it, we must not mark time; much less much we fall behind. We must move with the times; we must answer the promptings of the day to day life of the vast millions of people and the masses of the people who live humiliated and neglected in those hills and mountains, and who naturally sometimes develop certain wrong ideas and become vulnerable to some wrong propaganda also. Therefore I say that the time has come for the Government of India to start discussing the major question of what we are going to do with tribal people, with the hills people specially. There should be an overall approach in this matter in the context of which naturally the Naga problem will also come in but the Naga problem has underlined it; the Mizo outburst has emphasized and underscored it for the second time, and I hope that this would be borne in mind. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am opposed to this kind of reactionary approaches. Sometimes I find some hon. Members here getting up and demanding, 'Go and bomb the Nagas; mount your guards on them and hit them right and left; wage war against them.' We hear such things as if they are aliens. That is not how a democratic set-up, if we pretend to be so, ought to face the problem or try to solve it. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I should like the problem to be taken in hand in a statesmanlike manner and a solution found in a political way through mutual consultations, understandings, drawing up on past experience, bitter and good, and also looking forward to the future with confidence.

Democracy has to be dynamic. Democracy, larger than the Constitution, has to respond to the needs of the time and enlist support by taking from all. Unless

we do so, we shall be bogged up today with the Naga problem or the Mizo problem tomorrow and we shall be seeking only military power, the Armed Forces, and ultimately, we will end up in a situation which I shudder to think. Once again I implore the Government that this political approach should be developed in all directions, should be many-sided and all the political Parties in the country should be directly and openly associated with the solution of the Naga problem in a political manner. The Rev. Michael Scott should be given the first available plane to go back to his country and remain there and not to come here till we have settled our Naga problem, till we have the Nagas as a part of our country, contented, happy, claiming as much as we do to be constituent of the Indian Republic or the Indian Union. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Gujral, I hope you will not follow Mr. Gupta.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Sir, it is difficult to follow him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If he had followed me, he would have joined the Communist Party.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Rightist or Leftist ?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : If I had followed Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I would have found myself in very difficult company, because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, in his speech just now, has chosen to criticise everything alive. He appreciates everything that is dead. If a person serves in a delegation he does not like him, but the moment he leaves it, he appreciates him. I have found Mr. Bhupesh Gupta criticising Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan in the most drastic language that he uses, when he was a member of the Peace Mission, but since Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan has decided to resign or has resigned from it, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta today has decided to champion his cause very much. I am sure Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan, when he reads the debate, will be very happy that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has appreciated his efforts after all. Similarly, unfortunately, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta chooses to criticise Mr. Chaliha and others he does not choose to ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No, no. I said I do not understand what he is doing.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Because everyone who is doing something is never understood by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta understands only those who do not do anything or do not participate in anything or when he understands action, he understands action of the type which is now exhibited in Calcutta. Anyhow, that will be taking me away from the issue that is under discussion today. I wish Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had confined himself to the issues and if he had done that he would have contributed somewhat to the general tenor of the debate. I am very happy that he has appreciated that the Prime Minister has taken upon herself the task to discuss directly with the Naga delegation and I think in this some of us do support the appreciation which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has given. I am glad that after all, after such a long period, it has been realised that if Nagas are our own people, if they need to be understood, if they need to be appreciated, then they must be treated as such. Sometimes when criticism is offered by some friends here as to why the Prime Minister has chosen to talk to them direct, they do not understand that it is the Prime Minister's first responsibility to talk to her own people directly, to understand their problems, to understand their difficulties, to understand their apprehensions, to remove their doubts and to bring them round to the point of view for which this country stands. That is why it is very unfortunate that sometimes in the heat of the moment we do like to treat Nagas as if they are alien to us and whenever we placed for drastic action against them, we forget that it is a democratic country where everyone is equal. A Naga, who lives in Nagaland or a Punjabi who lives in Punjab or anybody else, who has a political problem to solve, has an equal right to be understood and to be heard. If in regard to the Punjab situation we could hold long discussions and arrive at a satisfactory solution, then it is also necessary that we give equal time, understanding and appreciation to the people of Nagaland, try to understand their difficulties and also solve their problems. Last year I was also one of those who had the good fortune and opportunity of joining the delegation of

Members of Parliament, who went to Nagaland. I say so because it is very seldom that such an opportunity is offered. I definitely remember that yesterday in one of my questions I had raised the issue : Why is it that more Members of Parliament are not afforded such facilities to go to Nagaland to understand, appreciate, study, see and assess the situation for themselves? Last year when the delegation went there, it consisted of Members from all Parties and it does not happen very often, that after looking at the problem from various angles, from different angles and approaches, we come to a common solution. We submitted our report which was a joint one, in which all Parties participated, because we felt that we were first Indians and then later on belonged to any political Party. We came to a common approach. Not only that. The Report of the Parliamentary delegation was appreciated even by the Rev. Michael Scott, about whom Mr. Bhupesh Gupta talked so much. And I would only read to you his reaction in one of his letters, which was circulated Members of Parliament and others. Commenting on the delegation's Report, he said :

"The Report of the Members of Parliament who visited Nagaland from Feb. 5, 1965 will be greatly appreciated by the Naga people. The spirit which prompted them to visit the country and the friendliness which they everywhere conveyed brought home to the common folk they met another side of India and her attitude towards Nagaland in a way which nothing else has done in the seventeen years since Independence."

We might differ from the Rev. Michael Scott on many things, but on this I hope neither Mr. Bhupesh Gupta nor any other friend in the Opposition would differ, that there is this peaceful, democratic side of India, which other people in India must know and understand. Therefore, I plead again and again that not only this understanding is necessary. Sir, sitting here, in the abstract we may judge it is also necessary that people should go there, stay there and ask these people to come out in good numbers to see how India looks like, what India cherishes, what values we work for, and tackle it on the basis of understanding. I pointed out about the visit of the Parliamentary delegation. What did the Parliamentary delegation do?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : It was a delegation of Parliamentarians sponsored by the Government.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Well, technically I am willing to accept the amendment that you have suggested, because that does not make any difference, unlike the Punjabi Suba issue, which is a different issue. What I am trying to say is this. When Members went there, what did they see ? They saw basically that after all the cease-fire, the peace, was doing good. It was doing good because it was creating an atmosphere of understanding. It was doing good because the common man was no longer harassed either by the hostiles or the Armed Forces. The common man felt that he had a place in the life of India and that it could be said realistically that Nagaland was a part of India. When we are claiming that Nagaland belongs to us we equally claim that the people of Nagaland belong to us, that they are part of us. This understanding did create a great deal of appreciation. For about two years now, since the cease-fire has come in Nagaland, we have found that the forces of peace in Nagaland have grown. Certainly the Nagas have realised that they have a vested interest in peace itself. Increasingly they have come to realise that through peace developmental activities can be carried out. Since the interior has been very much opened up, they are realising that peace is in their own interest, as much as it is in our interest. Among every set of people, there are certain sections which can be disturbing, but should we condemn the whole area or the whole community because some people are mischievous ? We do hear sometimes that a train has been burnt here or a bomb has been thrown there. Does it mean that we shall condemn the Nagas as a whole, or we shall condemn the movement as a whole ? In this I am sure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and other friends will support me. When disturbances took place in Calcutta, we did not condemn every Bengali. When the Panipat incidents took place we did not condemn every Punjabi. We did try to sort it out, to see who is wrong and who is right. Therefore, to try to use the word 'Naga' as if he has committed a crime is wrong. A criminal is a criminal, whether he is in Punjab or in Nagaland.

Therefore, a criminal must never be given a respectable name or of belonging to such and such community. It is a very unfortunate trend in our country that whenever we want to condemn somebody we try to or tend to condemn the whole community or the whole area or the whole group or the whole movement even. Even in the communist movement, when the disturbances in Calcutta took place, it may be easy to prove that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta did not burn any trains. It was done by somebody else. Therefore, why condemn all of them ? Let us condemn those who did it and not hang Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for the crimes of others. I would, therefore, commend that it is necessary that the violent elements in Nagaland should be strongly put down, but at the same time, the new era of understanding negotiation and appreciation, which has opened, should not be blocked.

Sometimes in our haste we try to impress here, when a train is burnt or bombed, that we should stop the cease-fire, start shooting, kill everybody, eliminate the whole of the Nagas, as if that will solve the problem. Sir, that only shows how alien we are to the problem itself. That shows that it is not only that the Nagas have not considered themselves as a part of India but we also have not understood that the Nagas are a part of India. Therefore, a more understanding attitude must take place.

Sir, much has been said about the Peace Mission. I do not like to go into detail about what the Peace Mission has done. But one thing the Peace Mission has done, and I would only quote from the report of the M.Ps. Delegation which went there. I quote what they said about the Peace Mission :

"The Delegation would like to record its sense of appreciation of the efforts of the Peace Mission who have been responsible for bringing the hostiles into the open and creating conditions for discussions between the representatives of the Government of India and of the hostile Nagas."

If the Peace Mission has failed in everything, at least they have made this singular achievement that they have brought the

hostiles from the jungle to the conference table, which by itself is a big thing, and circumstances had been created today when you had the underground Naga delegation in Delhi to talk to the Prime Minister. I think we must appreciate that effort.

Another thing Shri Bhupesh Gupta forgets is how the Peace Mission was formed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I did not criticise the Peace Mission.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : The Peace Mission was formed on the initiative of the Baptist Church, and whether we agree or differ with the Church as a whole, we must appreciate that they have made a contribution in creating some understanding. Any apprehension or doubt on the functioning of the Peace Mission will set back that movement of understanding. Let us understand that after a great deal of difficulty the Nagas have reposed confidence in those people. Let us not shake it. It will take time to create an atmosphere of understanding. It will take time to make them understand that we mean goodwill to them, that we do not mean ill to them, that we mean to treat all of them as equal partners in this great democratic set-up of India, that any such small things which irritate us will give a very serious setback to the whole situation. Please permit me five minutes to develop my point. There is time for everything. There is a time when we may have to kill; there is a time when we may have to wound. But there is also a time when we have to talk and understand. I think after a long army operation that time has come and let us not lose it. We must discuss. We must understand. We must negotiate. We must be considerate, and we must be also lenient. We must know how to adjust. A rigid imperialist attitude sitting in the capital and saying : "These are my terms; take it or leave it; if you do not accept it, you face the bullet" will never pay any democratic country. We in India cannot afford it. In our hurry sometimes we do try to solve the problems from Mizoland to Kashmir . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Via West Bengal.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I feel that more contact points should be created with the Nagas. Somebody mentioned here about

radio. Do you know, Sir, that in the whole of Nagaland there are very few radios and most of them are out of order and the transmitter there is so weak that in an average village they cannot hear what India is saying ? They are cut off from the radio. The newspaper does not reach there even in three days, and even if it does, it talks of Shri Bhupesh Gupta which encourages them to do further disturbance. Therefore, you please create more contact points, create more points of understanding and let more people go from here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why do you bring in Bhupesh Gupta ? Those newspapers carry news of your bribery and corruption.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I have so much admiration for Shri Bhupesh Gupta that I cannot forget him. Sir, I would like to say that the Government must take positive steps not only for negotiation and discussion but for sending more people from here, more Members of Parliament and more journalists to see things and study for themselves; they must go and see things for themselves. Let more people come out of Nagaland; let students come here; let social workers go there so that they understand that part of India and we know what is happening in that part of India. That is the only way in which you can understand those people's problems. I am glad that Shri Bhupesh Gupta has mentioned about the hill problems of India. I hope the Pataskar Committee report will come out soon and that it will make some positive contribution.

Before I sit down I would only say one word that there should be a planned design in our approach, and that design should aim at understanding. It must be through more contacts, it must be through more understanding, and above all in this House and in the press we must avoid heavy peroration which can possibly create in those people the impression that we only mean to suppress them, that we do not mean to understand them. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The House stands adjourned till 2.30.

The House adjourned for lunch at twenty-six minutes past one of the Clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the Clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, क्या यह आश्चर्य की बात नहीं है कि एक ओर तो शांति वार्ता चल रही है और दूसरी ओर सशस्त्र सेनाओं के विशेषाधिकारों की अवधि एक और वर्ष के लिये बढ़ायी जा रही है? मैं वर्तमान विधेयक के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ। लेकिन, जिस ढंग से शांति वार्ता चल रही है उससे मेरा मतभेद है। इस विधेयक के द्वारा जो नागालैण्ड का एक ज़िला इन विशेषाधिकारों से अलग था, उसे भी शामिल किया जा रहा है। क्या यह इस बात का संकेत नहीं है कि जिस एक हिस्से में अभी तक बागियों की गड़बड़ नहीं थी और जहाँ फौज को विशेषाधिकार देने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ी थी, अब वहाँ भी गड़बड़ बढ़ गई है और इसलिये फौज को विशेषाधिकार दिये जा रहे हैं। वैसे भी शांति वार्ता के चलते तोड़-फोड़ की घटनाएँ हो रही हैं, हिंसा की घटनाएँ हो रही हैं, उपद्रव मनीपुर में भी फैल रहा है। अभी तक मनीपुर इस प्रकार की हिंसात्मक गतिविधियों से अछूता था, लेकिन अब बागी नागा अपने क्षेत्र का विस्तार कर रहे हैं। यह भी शिकायतें हैं कि जो शांति हो गई है उसका लाभ उठाकर वे भरती कर रहे हैं, हथियार जमा कर रहे हैं, लोगों को ज़बर्दस्ती टैक्स देने के लिये मजबूर कर रहे हैं। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि शांति हो गई है तो कुछ लोगों का शांति में एक लगाव पैदा हुआ है, वे चाहते हैं शांति रहे। इससे मैं इनकार नहीं करता। जो लोग दबे हुए, छिपे हुए बैठे थे वे खुले में निकल कर आए हैं यह अच्छी बात है और हमें इस बात का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि यह शांति स्थायी हो जाय। लेकिन हमें सावधान रहना होगा कि क्या आज की शांति की अवस्था का लाभ उठाकर भूट्टी भर बागी लोग—सब नागा उनके साथ नहीं हैं—अपनी स्थिति कहीं इतनी मजबूत तो न कर लें जो भविष्य में हमारे लिये संकट पैदा करें। महोदय, जब नागालैण्ड का अलग राज्य बना था, पंडित जी उस समय जीवित थे,

उस समय यह आशा प्रकट की गई थी कि पृथक् नागालैण्ड के राज्य के निर्माण के साथ नागा प्रदेश में शांति हो जाये। वह आशा पूरी नहीं हुई। अब फिर वार्ता चल रही है। क्या इससे बागियों को प्रोत्साहन नहीं मिलता। मीजो क्षेत्र में जो घटनाएँ हुई हैं उनकी ओर से हम अपनी आंखें बन्द नहीं कर सकते।

एक पहलू और भी है जिसकी ओर मैं विदेश मंत्री जी का ध्यान दिलाना चाहूँगा। केवल इतना ही कहना काफी नहीं है कि नागा समस्या का हल भारत के संविधान के चौखट के भीतर होना चाहिये। यह बात बार-बार दोहरायी जा रही है। अच्छी बात है हम किसी को संविधान से अलग जाकर भारतीय गणराज्य से पृथक् होकर अपना राज्य बनाने की छूट नहीं दे सकते, लेकिन क्या इस सवाल पर हमारा दिमाग साफ है कि भारतीय संविधान की चौखट के भीतर हम कहां तक जाने के लिये तैयार हैं? संविधान के अंतर्गत एक ऐसी व्यवस्था हो सकती है जिसमें किसी राज्य को, किसी प्रदेश को, केवल तीन विषयों के लिये केन्द्र से सम्बद्ध रखा जाय, बाकी के विषयों में उसको छूट दे दी जाय—वह रक्षा के लिये, विदेशी मामलों के लिये, संचार के साधनों के लिये केन्द्र से संबंधित हो और बाकी मामलों में वह अपनी स्वायत्तता का उपभोग करे। तब भी वह भारत का भाग होगा, तब भी वह संविधान के अंतर्गत होगा। अगर बागी नागाओं ने यह मांग की, तो भारत सरकार की प्रतिक्रिया क्या होगी? मैं नहीं चाहता कि सरकार इस प्रतिक्रिया के बारे में आज घोषणा करे, मैं सिर्फ इतना कह रहा हूँ कि सरकार को अपना दिमाग बनाना होगा। अगर हम एक क्षेत्र में इस तरह की मांगें मान लेंगे तो ऐसी मांगें और क्षेत्रों में भी उठ सकती हैं।

श्री जयप्रकाश जी ने कहा है कि अगर नागालैण्ड को अलग झंडा दे दिया जाय तो इससे उनको संतोष हो जायेगा। मुझे इसमें संदेह है। बागी नागाओं के जो प्रतिनिधि नई दिल्ली में आए और यहां जो उन्होंने वक्तव्य दिये उससे मुझे बड़ी निराशा हुई है।



मेरे मित्र भूपेश गुप्त आशावादी हो सकते हैं, मगर मैं यथार्थवादी होना चाहता हूँ—समस्या का राजनैतिक हल निकालना होगा लेकिन हम कितनी दूर तक जा सकते हैं इसके बारे में हमारा दिमाग साफ होना चाहिये, क्योंकि प्रश्न केवल नागालैण्ड का नहीं है अन्य क्षेत्रों का भी है। भारत की एकता, भारत की अखंडता, यह समझौते का विषय नहीं हो सकती। सरकार एक बार मन में तय कर ले उसे कहां तक जाना है, एक लक्ष्मण रेखा खींचे, और उसके बाद दृढ़ता के साथ, परिस्थिति का मुकाबला करे। मुझे इस सरकार से शिकायत है कि न तो वह बगावत को दमन से दबा सकती है और न ही असंतुष्ट लोगों को प्यार से जीत सकती है यह दोनों कामों में विफल रही है।

नौ साल तक सेना नागालैण्ड में काम करती रही मगर उसे खुली छूट नहीं दी गई। जब तक उसके ऊपर हमला न हो तब तक वह गोली न चलाये, इस तरह के आदेश दिये गये जिसकी वजह से उसके हाथ कमजोर हैं। आज भी शान्ति वार्ता का पर्व चल रहा है तब भी सरकार अपना दिमाग स्पष्ट नहीं कर सकी है। शान्ति मिशन के बारे में बहुत-सी बातें हुई हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब सरकार का भूमिगत नागाओं के बीच प्रत्यक्ष सम्पर्क स्थापित हो गया था तो शान्ति मिशन की आवश्यकता नहीं करनी चाहिए। श्री जयप्रकाश बाबू के त्यागपत्र के बाद शान्ति मिशन की उपयोगिता भी कम हो गई है। आसाम के मुख्य मंत्री का भी इसमें रहना मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। वे भले आदमी हैं और कभी-कभी लगता है कि जरूरत से ज्यादा भले हैं। भले भी हैं और भोले भी हैं। वे मुख्य मंत्री हैं, वे अधिकार पर बैठे हैं। उन्हें इस शान्ति मिशन के झमेले में नहीं फँसना चाहिये। माइकल स्काट के बारे में तो शायद सभी का एकमत है कि उनसे हम कहें कि अब उनकी सेवाओं की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

महोदय, मुझे आश्चर्य है कि अभी कल जब कोहिमा में तथाकथित रिपब्लिक डे—सो काल्ड

रिपब्लिक डे मनाया गया था, उसमें सर माइकल स्काट भी शामिल थे। मुझे आश्चर्य है कि यह दिवस मनाने की छूट कैसे दी गई। उनसे कहा गया था कि शहर में नहीं आ सकते हैं, मगर शहर से थोड़ी दूर रहकर अपना दिन मना सकते हैं। और सो काल्ड प्रेजीडेंट जिन्होंने कहते हैं सलामी ली थी, सो काल्ड नेशनल फ्लैग फहराया और सो काल्ड सोंग गाया गया। हमारे मित्र श्री भूपेश गुप्त कहेंगे कि उन पर बम बरसाए जाएं, यह किसी को सलाह नहीं देनी चाहिये। मैं यह सलाह नहीं दे रहा हूँ। मेरा सिर्फ इतना ही कहना है कि यह संकेत भविष्य के खतरे को बतलाता है। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि यह सरकार फिर से असावधानी में पकड़ी जाय और कहीं ऐसा न हो कि यह सरकार फिर से अपने ही बनाये हुए जाल में न फँस जाय। मैं इस समय विदेश मंत्रीजी को ताशकंद घोषणा की याद नहीं दिलाना चाहता हूँ। कल उन्होंने स्वयं ही लोक सभा में कहा था कि पाकिस्तान न तो ताशकंद घोषणा के अक्षर का पालन कर रहा है और न ही उसकी भावना का पालन कर रहा है। मुझे इस बात की पहले ही आशंका थी, लेकिन वह पहलू अलग है। नागा प्रदेश में रहने वाले हमारे भाई हैं। वे बहादुर लोग हैं और हमें उन्हें अधिक-से-अधिक खुश करने के लिए तैयार रहना चाहिये। लेकिन एक रेखा कहीं खींचनी पड़ेगी कि हमें जितना जाना है उसके पार नहीं जायेंगे। अभी सरकार ने अपने दिमाग में इस तरह की रेखा नहीं खींची है, इसमें मुझे संदेह है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि वार्ता चलाने से पहले आप इस तरह की रेखा खींच लीजिये।

महोदय, मुझे ताज्जुब है कि जब भूमिगत नागाओं के नेता आये थे तो फिर नागालैण्ड में जो सरकार है, उसके मुख्य मंत्री, उसके प्रतिनिधियों को क्यों नहीं बुलाया गया। बैठक में वे भी शामिल होने चाहिए थे। जिन्होंने भारत की सहायता की, जो भारत भक्त हैं, देश भक्त हैं उनकी हमने उपेक्षा कर दी है

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

और उनकी उपेक्षा के पीछे हम बागियों में बातचीत कर रहे हैं। जब मैंने इस बारे में प्रश्न किया था तब कहा गया था कि वे कर्टशी काल के लिए आये थे और शिष्टाचार के लिए प्रधान मंत्री जी से मिले थे। लेकिन अगर शिष्टाचार में श्री माइकल स्काट रह सकते हैं, तो क्या नागालैंड के मुख्य मंत्री श्री आओ नहीं रह सकते? बातचीत में नागालैंड की सरकार और उसके प्रतिनिधियों को भी शामिल करना जरूरी है क्योंकि हम बगावत को इतनी कीमत नहीं दे सकते कि जो हमारे साथ हैं वे समझें कि हम साथी रहे गलती की, हम भी बगावत करते तो अच्छा रहता। कोई भी सरकार इस तरह की भावना पैदा नहीं होने दे सकती है। यह विधेयक विशेष अधिकार चाहता है और आज की परिस्थिति में विशेष अधिकार देने के अलावा कोई विकल्प नहीं है। लेकिन अधिकार किस तरह से काम में लाये जा सकते हैं, नागा प्रदेश में जो परिस्थिति पैदा हुई है उसके संदर्भ में सरकार को अपनी नीति बनानी चाहिये। धन्यवाद।

**श्री ओम् मेहता (जम्मू और काश्मीर):** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो स्पेशल पावर्स एमेन्डमेंट बिल यहां पर लाया गया है, उसको मैं सपोर्ट करता हूं और अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि यह ठीक वक्त पर लाया गया है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि कोई भी यह नहीं चाहता है कि नागाओं के खिलाफ ताकत का इस्तेमाल किया जाय जिससे वे खत्म हो जायें या तबाह हो जायें। नागा लोग बहुत बहादुर हैं, वे हमारे भाई हैं, इस मुल्क के रहने-वाले हैं, हिन्दुस्तानी हैं और उन्होंने इस मुल्क की रक्षा के लिये कई दफा बड़ी-बड़ी लड़ाइयां लड़ीं। लेकिन जब यह बिल आया तब मैंने सोचा कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि जिस तरह से सीज फायर हुआ है अगर उससे हालत ठीक होती तो इस तरह के बिल लाने की जरूरत नहीं होती। इस बिल के जरिये

हम दो जिलों में आर्मी को अख्तियार दे रहे हैं जिसका मतलब यह हुआ कि दूसरे इलाकों में भी हालत ठीक नहीं है।

इस वक्त नागाओं के साथ हमारी बातचीत चल रही है और मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूं। मैं चाहता हूं कि हर एक चीज जो है वह बातचीत के साथ फैसला की जानी चाहिये। लेकिन कहीं ऐसा न हो कि जो बातचीत चल रही है उसके कॉम्पलाज में वे लोग पाकिस्तान न चले जायें। जैसा कि अभी हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि वे कई जगहों से पाकिस्तान गये, वहां उन्होंने ट्रेनिंग ली और फिर वापस आ गये। हमारी जो वहां पर सिक्योरिटी फोर्स हैं उन्होंने उनको दाखिला होने से रोकने की कोशिश की। इसलिए मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि इस समय जो ब्रीदिंग टाइम मिला है इससे वे लोग ज्यादा ताकतवर न हो जायें क्योंकि अभी-अभी जो लड़ाई हुई है उसके बारे में मैं अखबार पढ़ रहा था जो इस तरह से है :

**"Naga army not to enter Kohima—**

The underground Nagas have agreed to keep their army away in a village about three miles from here until they celebrate their republic day on March 22. The decision was the result of hectic efforts by Peace Mission observers."

तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि कोहिमा में हमारी गवर्नमेंट है और एक आजाद मुल्क की आर्मी वहां पर कैसे आ सकती है। कोहिमा जो कि हमारे मुल्क का हिस्सा है, जहां पर इस वक्त नागालैंड की गवर्नमेंट है, अगर वह इस तरह की नागा विद्रोहियों को इजाजत देती है तो बहुत अफसोस की बात है। क्या हमको वहां पर से इस तरह की खबर नहीं आई थी कि कोहिमा में बागी लोग इकट्ठा हो रहे हैं? मैं मिनिस्टर साहब की तबज्जो इस बात की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूं कि काश्मीर में भी पहले बागी वहां पर आ गये थे ताकि वहां पर बगावत की जा सके। लेकिन अभी हाल में नागा बागियों का एक डेलिगेशन यहां पर प्रधान मंत्री से मिलने

आया था। यह बात अच्छी हुई कि बातचीत के जरिये इस मामले को तय किया जाय बनिस्वत बैटल फील्ड के। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि अगर वे लोग बातचीत के जरिये यह मामला तय करेंगे तो सब के लिये अच्छा होगा। लेकिन जब उनको यहां पर रिसेप्शन दिया गया तो उसका डाइरेक्ट रिजल्ट यह हुआ कि मीज़ो हिल्स में कुछ लोगों ने हमारे खिलाफ बगावत कर दी। इसलिये ऐसा न हो कि जो हमने वहां मीज़ फायर किया है उसको हमारी कमजोरी समझा जाय और दूसरी जगहों के ट्राइब्स भी यह कहें कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया से जब भी कोई काम करवाना हो तो हम ताकत के बलबूते पर वह काम करवा सकते हैं। यह ठीक है कि पीस मिशन जो है वह हमारे और नागाओं के बीच में एक लिंक है और उसने यह कोशिश की है कि पहले जो लोग बात करने के लिये तैयार नहीं थे उसको उसने मजबूर किया है और वे आज हमारे साथ बात कर रहे हैं और हो सकता है कि कोई हल निकल जाय और यह जो मामला है यह हमेशा के लिये सेटल हो जाय। लेकिन मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि माइकेल स्काट जो हैं वे एक ऐसे आदमी हैं जो यह समझते हैं कि नागालैंड आजाद हो कर रह सकता है। असल में उसके पीछे उस साम्राज्य का हाथ है जिसने इस मुल्क को तक्सीम किया और जो यह चाहता है कि काश्मीर इंडिपेंडेंट हो, नागालैंड इंडिपेंडेंट हो और हिन्दुस्तान कमजोर हो। इसलिये मैं अपनी हुकूमत से यह अज़ंदास्त करूंगा कि वह इस तरह तबज्जह दे और वैसा ही नहीं हो जैसा कि काश्मीर में हुआ कि कुछ लोगों ने काश्मीर में जा करके चन्द आदमियों को भड़काया कि वे प्लेबिसाइट की आवाज़ लगायें। उसी तरह हो सकता है कि नागाओं को भड़काया जाय और यहां पर पारलेज़ का ढोंग रच कर यह कहा जाए, कि हम आपस में बातचीत कर रहे हैं और इधर दूसरी जगहों से हथियार ला करके उनको ताकतवर बनाया जाय, मजबूत बनाया जाय ताकि वे

किसी वक्त बगावत कर सकें। जयप्रकाश नारायण जी हमारे बुजुर्ग हैं और कई दफा जब उन्होंने काश्मीर के मुताल्लिक स्टेटमेंट दिया तो उस वक्त हम उनके खिलाफ भी रहे और यह कहा कि उनको इस किस्म के स्टेटमेंट नहीं देना चाहिये। शेख अब्दुल्ला और उसका ग्रुप जो कि वहां बिल्कुल माइनारिटी में है, वह भी इसी किस्म का नारा लगाता है कि हमें हिन्दुस्तान से जुदा हो जाना चाहिये, हमें इंडिपेंडेंट हो जाना चाहिये। उसके मुताल्लिक जब उनके स्टेटमेंट होते थे तो उस वक्त भी हम कहते थे कि उनके स्टेटमेंट ठीक नहीं है। लेकिन आज वह भी पीस मिशन में इस्तेफा दे रहे हैं क्योंकि वे समझते हैं कि पीस मिशन में जो हमारे दूसरे दोस्त हैं या होस्टाइल नागाज़ हैं वह हमारी कुछ बातों से इत्तिफाक नहीं रखते हैं। उन्होंने यह कहा था कि जो सहूलियतें वह चाहते हैं वह हम दे सकते हैं लेकिन इसी सूरत में दे सकते हैं कि वे हिन्दुस्तान का एक हिस्सा रहें और यहां के शहरी बन कर रहें। यह मैं मानता हूं जैसा कि मेरे दोस्त गुजराल साहब ने कहा कि हमें चाहिये कि वहां के जो लोग हैं उनको यहां लाया जाय ताकि उनको मालूम हो कि हिन्दुस्तान में डेमोक्रेसी है, यहां पर किसी किस्म की पाबन्दी नहीं है और जिस किस्म की आजादी वे चाहते हैं, वह उनको हासिल है। वहां के स्टूडेंट यहां आयें, वहां के यूथ्स यहां आयें, वहां के लेबरर यहां आयें और वहां के दूसरे आदमी यहां आयें। उसी तरह से यहां से भी जर्नलिस्ट और दूसरे लोग वहां जायें और वे वहां की प्राबलम्स को अच्छी तरह से समझने की कोशिश करें और अगर उनको इकोनामिक सहूलियतों की ज़रूरत हो, कारखाने लगाने की ज़रूरत हो या दूसरे किसी तरह के डेवलपमेंट की ज़रूरत हो, तो उनकी तरफ गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की तबज्जह दिलाई जाय। यह ताज्जुब की बात है कि वहां पर रेडियो नहीं है। यहां एक एक गांव में पब्लिसिटी डिपार्टमेंट के रेडियो दिये गये हैं

[श्री ओम् मेहता]

तो फिर नागालैंड में क्यों नहीं रेडियो दिये गये हैं। वहां पर हर किस्म की पब्लिसिटी का सामान दिया जाना चाहिये और उनके लिए खास ब्राडकास्ट रखा जाना चाहिये, चाहे वह कलकत्ता से रखा जाय, चाहे दिल्ली से रखा जाय जिसमें उनको बताया जाय कि हम क्या चाहते हैं। इस तरह से उनको नजदीक लाने की कोशिश की जाय। आखिर में नागाज जो है, वे हमारे भाई ही हैं और सुबह का भूला हुआ अगर शाम को वापस आ जाय तो उसको भूला हुआ नहीं कहा जाता है। इसलिये हो सकता है कि अगर हम उनको सही बातें बतलायें तो वे ठीक हो जायें। लेकिन इससे पहले जरूरत इस बात की है कि इस मामले के पीछे जो साम्राज्यी चाल है उसको खत्म किया जाय। आज फीजो साहब वहां बैठ करके स्टेटमेंट देते हैं कि नागाज को आजाद करना चाहिये। हो सकता है कि माइकेल स्काट साहब यहां पर आ करके हम से मीठी-मीठी बातें करते हों और वहां नागाज से कुछ और कहते हों। जब वे यहां आये और कई मेम्बरान पार्लियामेंट से मिले तो मैं जहां तक समझ सका वह यही समझा कि उनका इरादा यह है कि नागालैंड जो है वह एक इंडिपेंडेंट स्टेट होनी चाहिये और उसका कोई खास ताल्लुक हिन्दुस्तान के साथ नहीं होना चाहिये। तो इस किस्म के जो लोग हैं और वे जिस किस्म का काम कर रहे हैं, उससे हमें खबरदार रहना चाहिये। लेकिन अगर पीस मिशन से जय प्रकाश नारायण जी रिजाइन करते हैं तो उसको दुबारा फार्म करके उसमें कोई ऐक्टिव आदमी रखिये। गुडेविया जी जो प्रेसिडेंट के सेक्रेटरी हैं, उनको फिर इसमें वापस लाया जाय। इसके अलावा पीस मिशन को रीवांस्ट्र्यूट करके यह बातचीत जो है, इसको जल्द खत्म किया जाय क्योंकि जो सस्पेंस होता है वह बहुत खतरनाक होता है। उससे कहीं ऐसा न हो कि हमारे दुश्मन ज्यादा ताकतवर हो जायें और उस वक्त फिर आपको मिलिट्री इस्तेमाल करनी पड़े और दुनिया यह

कहे कि आप रेप्रेशन कर रहे हैं। इसलिये मैं यह कहूंगा कि इस पीस मिशन को ऐक्टिव-वाइज करके इस मामले को जल्दी से जल्दी खत्म किया जाय। यह अच्छी बात है कि वे अप्रैल में आ रहे हैं। वे आ करके प्राइम मिनिस्टर से मिलें, बातचीत करें और अगर कांफ्रेंस टेबल पर यह मामला तय हो जाय तो यह बहुत ही बेहतर होगा। अभी कुछ दिन पहले उनका एक डेलीगेशन यहां पर आया था और वह प्राइम मिनिस्टर से मिला था, लेकिन मुझे यह देख कर बहुत अफसोस हुआ कि वहाँ जो इस वक्त हुकूमत है, वहाँ पर जो लोग हुकूमत कर रहे हैं उनका कोई नुमाइन्दा यहां मौजूद नहीं था। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि उसको बातचीत में शामिल कर लिया जाता, लेकिन अगर उसको बुला लिया जाता तो उसको यह पता लगता कि उनमें हमें कांफिडेंस है। जो यहां पर बात करने के लिये आये थे वे अपने आपको फेडरल गवर्नमेंट आफ नागालैंड का रेप्रिजेंटेटिव कहते हैं। वे नागाओं के एक ग्रुप से ताल्लुक रखते हैं और उनको यह इजाजत क्यों दी गई कि वे फेडरल गवर्नमेंट के रेप्रिजेंटेटिव के तौर पर आप से मिलें। इसके साथ-साथ वह नागाज जिन्होंने हमारा साथ दिया, जो इस वक्त वहां पर हुकूमत चला रहे हैं, शासन चला रहे हैं, उनको क्यों न हम ज्यादा ताकत दें ताकि उस ताकत से वे वहां पर अच्छी तरह से काम कर सकें। इसलिये मैं चाहूंगा कि इस सिलसिले में हम जो भी डिजीजिन ले उसमें उनको असोशिएट करें ताकि बाद में उनको यह कहने का मौका न मिले कि हमने इनका साथ दिया और इन्होंने हमको लेट डाउन कर दिया। यह एक चीज है जिसके मुताल्लिक मैं हुकूमत को खबरदार कर देना चाहता हूं कि जब भी कोई डेसीजिन नागालैंड के मुताल्लिक लिया जाय तो उनको उसमें असोशिएट किया जाय। इसलिये जो ऐसे लोग वहां हैं जिन्होंने हमारा साथ दिया है और जो इस वक्त भी हमारा साथ दे रहे हैं, जैसे मिस्टर शीलो आबो वहां के चीफ मिनिस्टर हैं या वहां के

पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं, उनसे हम वक्तन फवक्तन मिलें, उनसे बातचीत करे और उनकी ड्यू इम्पार्टेंस दें। मैं यह भी बना देना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ की हुकूमत के साथ वहाँ के ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोग हैं और जो लोग वहाँ बसावन कर रहे हैं, वे बहुत कम हैं, लेकिन उनको एक्सटर्नल सपोर्ट मिल रही है। पाकिस्तान यह चाहता है कि किसी न किसी तरह से उनको मदद दे करके हिन्दुस्तान के बार्डर पर गड़बड़ कराया जाय। इसके अलावा जब वे दिल्ली में आते हैं तो उनको रिसेप्शन दिया जाता है। अगर उनको पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर रिसेप्शन दे तो कोई बात नहीं है। लेकिन जब उनको जे० जे० सिंह रिसेप्शन देता है तो मेरे दिल में यह खयाल आता है कि यह वही जे० जे० सिंह है जो जब काश्मीर गया था तो उसने शेख अब्दुल्ला और उनके साथियों को बहकाया था जिन्होंने बाद में प्लेबिसाइट का और इस मुल्क से अलग होने का नारा बुलन्द किया था। तो यह खयाल होता है कि कहीं उसी तरह की साजिश यहाँ भी न की जा रही हो। इसलिये उनके जो डेलीगेशन यहाँ पर आये उनको ऐसे लोगों के हाथों में न जाने दिया जाय जिन्होंने अपने आपको साम्राजियों के हाथ बेच दिया है और जो कि हर वक्त यह चाहते हैं कि यह मुल्क कमजोर हो और उन मुल्कों के साथ शामिल हो जो इसको गुलाम बनाना चाहते हैं।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** Would you like to speak for one minute, Mr. Jagat Narain ?

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :** May I put a question to the Minister of External Affairs ? Is it a fact that it was the Governor of Assam who allowed the hostile Nagas to celebrate the Republic Day ?

**SARDAR SWARAN SINGH :** Sir, I would suggest that this matter I will cover not in this casual manner but I will give complete information when I reply. It will be better.

36RS/66—2

# **MOTIONS RE (i) REPORT OF THE INDIAN AIRLINES CORPORATION AND (ii) REPORT OF THE AIR-INDIA**

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I move :

"That the Twelfth Annual Report of the Indian Airlines Corporation for the year 1964-65, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 10th December, 1965, be taken into consideration."

I also move :

"That the Twelfth Annual Report of the Air-India for the year 1964-65, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 10th December, 1965, be taken into consideration."

**THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT, AVIATION, SHIPPING AND TOURISM (SHRI N. SANJIVA REDDY) :** Can we take both of them together ?

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA :** I gave notice of these motions separately but they have been listed together. So I move them together.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** The Minister can reply to both together.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA :** Sir, Air-India is undoubtedly one of the best air services of the world. When I initiated a discussion on the report of Air-India last time in 1963, I said :

"These two public sector companies are companies of which anybody could be proud. Anybody could be proud of these because they are well-managed and they make profits. Any Indian should be proud of these two companies, particularly Air-India because the services that it offers, the consideration that it shows to its passengers are such that not only Indians but any foreign tourist who happens to travel by Air-India has a word of praise for it."

That is still true of these two companies but for the fact that the industrial relations in these two companies have indicated a marked decline and the deterioration has been such that during the last few weeks one does not know when the Indian