

tribals in the Mizo Hills and in Nagaland lent also the tribals in other parts of the country are not satisfied with our Government. I feel that the world should not have that impression and all possible efforts should be made to deal with the question of the welfare of the tribals properly so that the tribals may also feel that all possible efforts are being made for their advancement and the world also may be able to realise that we are doing what we can in this matter.

I would rather wish and request the Government to consult the Dhebar Commission's Report in this connection and would advise the Government to take into consideration seriously those recommendations and implement them. Those recommendations have been made not by any Opposition party but by a Commission appointed by the Government headed by a person who is a very responsible man of the ruling party, one who had been President of the ruling party for some years. I, therefore, feel that this attempt should be made. I do feel, Sir, that the whole question should be so dealt with that the whole of India and the entire world may be satisfied that the tribal people, who are poor, have received justice at our hands and they are under our full protection.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We are only at the notice stage. We have spent quite a lot of time. No further discussion, please. I hope the Minister will convey the feelings of the Members to the Home Minister.

The House stands adjourned till 2-30 p.m.  
The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.

THE ARMED FORCES (SPECIAL POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL, 1966—*contd.*

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, in India we have one common citizen-

ship. The people of Nagaland are citizens of India and, as such, are entitled to the Fundamental Rights guaranteed under the Constitution. They are entitled to all necessary facilities for their advancement. India as a whole is poor but the people of Nagaland are poorer even than the rest of India. They, therefore, need special attention of the Government of India. It is the duty of the Central Government to promote their welfare and advancement to the extent possible so that they may march ahead towards prosperity and towards equality with the rest of their countrymen. For that a peaceful atmosphere is necessary. Progress is possible in an atmosphere conducive to peace. It is, therefore, regrettable that a section of Nagaland, popularly known as underground Nagas, instead of promoting peace, instead of striving for peace, happiness and prosperity, have started a conflict which is denying to the people of Nagaland that peaceful atmosphere which is so necessary for their advancement. I am sure that in spite of their disruptive activities the Government will not deter from taking such steps as might be necessary for the welfare and advancement of the people of Nagaland. I hope these underground Nagas will also realise that a closer association with India is necessary for the good of the people of the State concerned. Whatever their ideas might be, it is not possible for any Indian Government to endorse the idea of complete freedom involving severance of relations. Even if they attained complete independence, in the modern world the people of Nagaland will not be allowed peace. Nagaland will then become a centre of international intrigues situated as that region is.

It is really regrettable that the Church had begun to take keen interest in the civic affairs of the people of Nagaland. That Christian Church must realise that their co-religionists constitute an insignificant minority in India and that the good of their co-religionists does not consist in organising the political life of India on the basis of religious faith or religious fraternity. Their good consists in promoting secular civic life, secular nationalism ensuring equality to all citizens of India irrespective of the faith they profess. Their good consists in the evolution of secular civic culture indepen-

[ Prof M. B. Lal. ]

dent of religious faith and religious considerations. I would, therefore, wish that the way the Y. M. C. A., early in the twentieth century, advised their co-religionists to take part in the public life of India as Indian citizens, the Christian Church in Nagaland, will advise the people of Nagaland to be one with the rest of India to link up their destinies with the rest of the country and to work for their cultural advancement and to seek their welfare in the welfare of the whole country. The way the so-called Republic Day was celebrated has naturally caused considerable distress in the country but what is much more deplorable is the contradictory statements made by the Minister of External Affairs, the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs and the Prime Minister in the other House on the question of the celebrations of the so-called Republic Day by the underground Nagas. Due to these contradictory remarks and observations, we, the Members of Parliament, as well as the citizens of India do not know what the actual condition was and what actually happened and I feel that a very categorical and clear statement is needed to assure the people of India that the Government of India and its subordinates were in no way responsible for the celebration of the so-called Republic Day in Nagaland. The way Michael Scott associated himself with these celebrations, the way he endorsed a letter sent to our Prime Minister with regard to the future of the negotiations have clearly indicated that Michael Scott is not engaged in the Peaceful Mission, the way he wished us to believe, and I have no doubt that if Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has lost the confidence of the underground Nagas, Michael Scott no more commands the confidence of any section of the rest of the Indian people. Some may say so publicly; others, for diplomatic reasons, may not be so pronounced in their expressions. Obviously it is not possible for India to agree to the reference of the question of Nagaland to the Security Council and to allow that question to be entangled in power politics in the Security Council.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh):  
Nagaland is a part of India.

PROF. M. B. LAL : As is pointed out by Dr. Sapru, Nagaland is a part of India.

The problem of Nagaland is an internal problem of India and if there are differences between the Government of India and a section of the people of India, those differences will have to be resolved in India itself. The idea of reference to a foreign power as a mediator cannot be accepted. I personally feel that there is no more any place for the Peace Mission in this matter. Of course, an important member of the Peace Mission, Mr. Chaliha, is the Chief Minister of Assam, adjoining Nagaland. He commands the confidence of a great majority of the people of Assam and, I should say, the general respect of the entire country and he has every right to think over the question and to exercise his own impact on the decision of problems concerning Nagaland and, therefore, when I say that the Peace Mission has no place, I do not deny Mr. Chaliha his right to have his say with the Government of India and also to address the entire people of India on the question of Nagaland if and when necessary.

Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is a respected, distinguished citizen of India. He has served the nation for years. He played a prominent role in the freedom movement of the country and he has also every right like every other citizen of India to exercise his own impact on the decisions concerning India. In the end, while it is not possible for us to say that there should be no negotiations or no talks between the Government of India and the underground Nagas, we must also remember the duly constituted Government of Nagaland. Nothing should be done that may give an impression to the persons loyal to the duly constituted Government of Nagaland that they are being ignored and that those who are defying the authority of India are being pampered. I, therefore, beg to submit to the Government that at every stage of the talks and in every decision concerning Nagaland, the Chief Minister of the duly constituted Nagaland Government should be consulted and due weight should be given to his views and his ideas regarding the solution of the various problems with which Nagaland is faced. Faced as we are with the attitude of defiance of a section of the people of Nagaland armed to the teeth, it would not be possible for us to deny to this Government the extension of the duration of the law under consideration.

All the same, I will feel that while it is our duty to resist the defiance of authority, to resist violence against the duly constituted authority, it is also our duty to go ahead with welfare of the people because, ultimately, the people of Nagaland can be assured of our goodwill only through our efforts for promoting their welfare.

**श्री जगत नारायण (पंजाब) :** वाइस-चेयरमैन महोदय, यह जो बिल बजीर साहब ने पेश किया है, यह बिल नानकांट्रोवशियल तो है मगर इस बिल को पढ़ने के बाद आदमी यह महसूस करता है कि नागालैण्ड में हालात नार्मल नहीं हैं, इसीलिये यह बिल हुकूमत वहां पर लागू करना चाहती है। सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि यह जो डी० आई० आर० है, यह जो इमर्जेंसी है, क्या यह बिर्फ बंगाल के लिये है, पंजाब के लिये है, बस्तर के लिये है और क्या यह नागालैण्ड के लिये नहीं है और क्या यह हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा नहीं है। अभी सभू साहब ने कहा कि नागालैण्ड हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है। अगर वह हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है तो जब कोहिमा के पास बागी नागाओं ने अपनी आजाद हुकूमत का झंडा लहराया उस वक्त आपकी यह इमर्जेंसी और आपके यह डिफेंस आफ इंडिया क्लस कहां चले गये? यह एक सवाल है जिस का मैं चाहूंगा कि बजीर साहब जवाब दें। यह एक निहायत जरूरी चीज है और इसलिये जरूरी चीज है कि अगर आप इमर्जेंसी मुल्क में लागू करते हैं तो वहां पर जो लोग देश के खिलाफ बगावत करते हैं, उनको आप कैसे टालरेट करते हैं, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रही है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि वहां पर एक पीस मिशन है और पीस मिशन के एक मेम्बर, जो हमारे देश के एक बड़े सरकदा नेता हैं, उन्होंने उसको छोड़ दिया है क्योंकि बागी नेताओं को उनके ऊपर एतबार नहीं रह गया था। अब जो माइकेल स्काट साहब हैं वे विलायत चले गए हैं और वहां से हिन्दुस्तान

सरकार के खिलाफ बयान दे रहे हैं। फिर भी वह पीस मिशन चल रहा है और मुलाकातें जारी हैं, लेकिन मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है कि अब पीस मिशन का मतलब क्या है।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** माइकेल स्काट तो अभी हिन्दुस्तान में ही हैं।

**श्री जगत नारायण :** यहीं होंगे, लेकिन बयानात उनके विलायत के अखबारों में छपे हैं जिसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि एक दूसरे देश को मध्यस्थ बना लें। अब सवाल पैदा होता है इस बात का कि आप क्यों निगो-शिफ्ट करते हैं पीस मिशन की मार्फत। उनकी मार्फत निगोशिफ्ट करने की आप को कोई जरूरत नहीं है। वहां पर नागालैण्ड की एक बाकायदा गवर्नमेंट बनी हुई है, वह निगो-शिफ्ट करे, न करे, आप क्यों यहां पर डाइरेक्ट बातें करते हैं। वहां का जो चीफ मिनिस्टर शीलू आओ है उसको यहां बुलाया जाय और उसके थ्रू बातचीत की जाय। उसके ओवर हैड जो सेंटर यहां पर बातें करता है, वह कुछ मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। इसलिये मैं यह समझता हूं कि इस वक्त माइकेल स्काट का किसी किस्म का एतबार करना और उसके साथ जो पीस मिशन बना हुआ है उसको एतबार में लेना और उससे बातचीत करना, यह सब ठीक नहीं है और यह सब आपको खत्म कर देना चाहिये। आखिर कितनी देर तक आप पीस मिशन की मार्फत बातें करते रहेंगे। जिस तरह से आज नागालैण्ड में बगावत हो रही है और नागालैण्ड वालों ने अपनी फेडरल हुकूमत बना ली है, अपनी फौज बना ली है, उसी तरह मीजो लोगों ने बगावत की, अपनी हुकूमत बना ली, अपनी फौज बना ली और सारा कुछ बना लिया। उसके मुतल्लिक नन्दा साहब ने लोक सभा में यह बयान दिया :

"Nanda rules out talks with MNF Leaders, Pindi's involvement being studied."

[श्री जगत नारायण]

एक तरफ जहाँ तक मिजो की बगावत का तालुक है जो उनकी गवर्नमेंट बनी हुई है उसके साथ आप बात करने को तैयार नहीं हैं लेकिन दूसरी तरफ जो बागी नागाओं की गवर्नमेंट बनी हुई है उसको आप यहाँ इन-वाइट करते हैं और उनसे बातचीत करते हैं, यह दो तरह की बातें मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रही हैं। बस्तर में जो बाक्या हुआ और जिस की आज यहाँ काफ़ी देर तक चर्चा हुई, उसके मृतालिक मध्य प्रदेश के चीफ मिनिस्टर ने कहा है कि बस्तर में उसी तरह की बगावत हुई है जिस तरह की नागालैण्ड में हुई है या हो रही है या जिस तरह की बगावत मीजो हिल्स में हो रही है। अगर उसी किस्म की बगावत बस्तर में हुई तो वहाँ पर आपने पता नहीं कितने आदमी भून कर रख दिये और कहा यह गया कि वे अपने महल में मुर्दा पाये गये। जो लोग वहाँ पर मारे गये उनको चाहे आपकी पुलिस ने मारा, चाहे आप की फौज ने मारा, चाहे वे किसी तरह से मारे गये, लेकिन वहाँ जो कुछ हुआ वह सरकार की तरफ से हुआ और कहा यह गया कि वे अपने महल में मरे हुए पाये गये। अब सवाल यह है कि आपने जो रास्ता यहाँ पर अख्तियार किया, वही रास्ता आप नागालैण्ड में क्यों नहीं अख्तियार करते हैं। यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। वहाँ आप उनको इजाजत देते हैं कि वे अपना झंडा लहराये, अपने ऐलानात जारी करें, और फिर आप उनको यहाँ बुलाते हैं और उनसे बातचीत करते हैं, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। जब इंग्लैण्ड पर मुसोबत आई और चर्चिल वहाँ के वज़ीर आजम बने, तो चर्चिल ने यह कहा था कि मैं वज़ीर आजम इसलिये नहीं बना कि मैं ब्रिटिश एम्पायर को खत्म कर के रख दूँ। लेकिन मुझे आज ऐसा नजर आ रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान का अपना कोई एम्पायर तो है नहीं, यह सिर्फ आजाद हुआ है, लेकिन जो मौजूदा बजारत है वह आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता इस देश के हिस्से बांटती चली जायगी और

उनको चीन और पाकिस्तान के सुपुर्द करती चली जायगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बड़ी गलत डेंटेंसी है। इसलिये आप यह फैसला करें कि अब हमें किसी पीस मिशन के धूँ बात नहीं करनी है और जो ला आफ लैण्ड है उसको अच्छी तरह से लागू करना है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि ऐसा करने में आप सख्ती करें जुल्म करें, लेकिन आप को वहाँ ला आफ लैण्ड जरूर लागू करना चाहिये। वैसे आप देखिये कि पंजाब में अभी हाल में कितने अत्याचार हुए जिनके बारे में मैंने उस दिन बताया और अब बस्तर में जो अत्याचार हुए हैं उनको सुन कर रोंगटे खड़े हो जाते हैं। यह सब आप वहाँ न करें लेकिन कम अज कम वहाँ ला आफ लैण्ड कायम करने की कोशिश करें। जो हालत आप की आजकल है वही अगर आगे भी रहे तो नागालैण्ड आज भी अलाहदा है और कल भी अलाहदा मुल्क बनेगा।

मैं बड़े अदब के साथ एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। ताशकन्द मुआहिदा के सिलसिले में हमारे वज़ीर साहब ने यहाँ पर बहुत कुछ कहा कि वह एक बड़ा आगस्ट फैसला है, एक हिस्टारिक फैसला है। आपको याद होगा कि उस वक्त मैंने भी यह कहा था कि आपको यह गलतफहमी है, पाकिस्तान कभी उसको पूरा नहीं करेगा। आज तीन-चार दिन हुए जब वज़ीर साहब ने लोक सभा में कहा कि पाकिस्तान इस मुआहिदे पर अमल नहीं कर रहा है और न अमल करने को तैयार है। इस तरह वही बात हुई जिस के स्वदेश का इजहार इस हाउस में किया गया था और लोक सभा में भी किया गया था। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि ताशकन्द मुआहिदे को सामने रखते हुए आपने पाकिस्तान के साथ कुछ मुआहिदे किये हैं, कुछ मुआहिदे करने की कोशिश की है और आप पाकिस्तान को साथ ले कर चलने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं और उसी तरह का मुआहिदा आप नागालैण्ड से करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन आप याद रखिये

कि जिस तरह आप का कोई मुआहिदा पाकिस्तान के साथ आगे नहीं चला है, उसी तरह से नागालैण्ड के साथ भी कोई मुआहिदा कामयाब नहीं होगा। आज हालत यह है कि जो बागी नागा हैं वे पाकिस्तान और चीन के उकसाने पर सारा काम कर रहे हैं और आपका जितना बार्डर है, काश्मीर से लेकर आसाम तक, वह सारा खतरे में पड़ा हुआ है। मैं आपको चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि जिस ढंग से आज आप बातचीत कर रहे हैं उससे आप सारे हिन्दुस्तान को खतरे में डाल रहे हैं। आप इस गलतफहमी में न रहियेगा कि पाकिस्तान आपके साथ सुलह करना चाहता है। जिस तरह से उसने अपना नेशनल डे मनाया, वह आप के लिये चेतावनी है। आज जिस तरह से वहाँ चीन के प्रेसिडेंट आये हुए हैं और जो वे ऐलान कर रहे हैं कि अगर पाकिस्तान की लड़ाई हुई तो वे उसकी पूरी मदद करेंगे, उससे आपको किसी काम्प्लेसेंसी में नहीं रहना चाहिये। इसलिये आपको हर तरह से तैयार रहना चाहिये और ला आफ लैंड को नागालैण्ड में अच्छी तरह से लागू करना चाहिये। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि आप तमाम रास्ते छोड़ दें और वहाँ हुकूमत करने की कोशिश करें और राइट मैथड से हुकूमत करने की कोशिश करें। अगर आपने वहाँ सुलह सफाई से काम करने की कोशिश की, तो यह इलाका आज भी अलाहदा है और फल भी अलाहदा होगा। आज आप देखिये कि पंजाब में क्या हो रहा है। आज वहाँ संत फतेह सिंह यह एलान कर रहे हैं कि अगर पंजाबी सूबा बन जायेगा तो हम इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को वहाँ जरूर बसायेंगे। अब आप पूछिये कि संत फतेह सिंह इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को बसाने वाला कौन है। तो जिन लोगों से आप इस तरह की बातें करते हैं वे यह समझने लगते हैं कि हम ही हुकूमत हैं, स्टेट की हुकूमत कोई हुकूमत नहीं है, केन्द्र की सरकार कोई सरकार नहीं है। हमारे बजीर वहाँ जाते हैं और संत फतेह सिंह से मिलते हैं, इसलिये वे समझते हैं कि हुकूमत हमारे हाथ में आ गई है।

इसी तरह से नागालैण्डवाले यह समझते हैं कि असली हुकूमत हमारी है और शीलू आओ, जिस को आपने वहाँ का चीफ मिनिस्टर बना रखा है, उसकी कोई वैल्यू नहीं है। तो ऐसा कर के आप हिन्दुस्तान के टुकड़े करते चले जायेंगे और आखिर में वही हालत हो जायगी जैसी कि मुगलों के राज्य में हुई थी कि दो-दो जिलों की रियासतें बन गई थीं। कोई आपका मुख्य मंत्री बात सुनता है, कोई नहीं सुनता है, दिन-ब-दिन सेन्टर कमजोर होता जा रहा है। आपको कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि सेन्टर मजबूत बने, आप मजबूत बनें, मजबूत बन कर हिन्दुस्तान के हस्से बिखरने की कोशिश न करें, हिन्दुस्तान को इकट्ठा करने की कोशिश करें, तब जाकर आप मुकम्मिल तौर पर एक मजबूत हिन्दुस्तान बना सकेंगे।

इसलिए अब जो खदसा है, जैसा लिखा है, "Pakistan cancels all leaves of army personnel" यह खबर छपी है अखबारों में कि पाकिस्तान ने अपने तमाम फौजियों की लीव को कैंसिल कर दिया है। अब आप समझ लीजिए कि वह क्या करना चाहता है, उसके इरादे क्या हैं। हालत क्या है? मित्रों से जो आदमी निकाल रहे हैं, वे भी पाकिस्तान में जा रहे हैं, जो नागा हैं, वे भी पाकिस्तान जा रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान से ट्रेनिंग लेकर आए थे। यहाँ पर हाउस में सवाल उठा था कि जो बागी नागा पाकिस्तान से ट्रेनिंग लेकर आने वाले हैं क्या आप उनको दाखिल होने देंगे। आपने उन्हें दाखिल होने दिया। आपके चीफ मिनिस्टर चालिहा साहब ने बयान दिया है कि कोई एक लाख घुसपैठिए आसाम में दाखिल हो गए हैं। इसी तरह बर्मा में दाखिल हो गए हैं, नागालैण्ड में दाखिल हो गए हैं। इसकी रोकथाम क्या है? इसकी कोई रोकथाम नहीं है और यह रोकथाम तब तक पूरी नहीं हो सकती जब तक आप निगोशिएशन करते रहेंगे। अगर उनको बुलाकर केन्द्रीय सरकार बातचीत

[श्री जगत नारायण]

करेगी तो वहाँ के लोग यही समझेंगे कि असली ताकत तो उन लोगों के हाथों में है जिनके साथ केन्द्रीय सरकार बातचीत करती है।

मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि इस मामले में जो आप विल लाए हैं मैं उसके हक में हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि आप पीस मिशन के साथ बातचीत करना बिल्कुल खत्म कर दें, आज ऐलान करें इस हाउस में हमारा उसके साथ कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है और माइकेल स्वाट को अगर वह आपके इलाके में है तो बराए नवाजिश उसको टिकट देकर विलायत भेज दीजिए।

आपको याद होगा, वाइस चैयरमैन महोदय, उस वक्त आप आल इंडिया कांग्रेस के सेक्रेटरी थे, उस समय मैं आसाम और नागालैण्ड गया, 15 मील और आगे गया था जहाँ पर एस० डी० एम० का अपना कोर्ट लगता था। मैंने आकर रिपोर्ट दी थी, शायद आपको याद है या नहीं कि वहाँ पर इसाईयों का इतना प्रचार है कि आप उसका मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं। उस वक्त श्री जैरामदास दौलतराम आसाम के गवर्नर थे मैं वहाँ गया था, एक एजुकेशन कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी। मैंने आकर पंडितजी को भी बताया था कि ये जो ईसाई हैं इनका इतना प्रचार है कि ये नागालैण्ड में आपको हुकूमत नहीं करने देंगे, सारी रिपोर्ट मैंने आकर दी थी। 1954 की बात है; आज दस साल गुजर गए। मैं फिर अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ बड़े अदब के साथ कि आप हिन्दुस्तान को इकट्ठा रखने की कोशिश कीजिए। इस तरह से लोगों को उत्साहित न कीजिए कि जो कल तक बागी थे, आज भी बागी हैं, जिनके साथ आपका हमेशा झगड़ा चलता है कांग्रेस के प्लेटफार्म से भी, उनके साथ, उनको बुलाकर—अपने आदमियों को नजरन्दाज करके—बातचीत करके उनको ताकत दें तो यकीनन हिन्दुस्तान के टुकड़े होंगे और ये टुकड़े हिन्दुस्तान के लिए बहुत बुरे साबित होंगे।

इन अल्फाज के साथ मैं समझता हूँ कि इसे लागू किया जाय और पीस मिशन के साथ बिल्कुल बात न कीजिए, उसको खत्म करने का ऐलान कीजिए। यही हिन्दुस्तान के लिए बेहतरीन चीज है। बहुत बहुत शुक्रिया।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have always been in favour of a peaceful and generous solution of the Naga problem. I am not, therefore, disposed to take the line that the Peace Mission should be wound up. But there are certain things which have got to be made clear to those who have been doing the work of this Peace Mission. I have read some of the statements which Rev. Michael Scott has lately been making in regard to the Naga problem and the Peace Mission generally. Now, I am free to recognise that Rev. Michael Scott has a very good record to his credit in Africa and that he is a humanitarian and he can be regarded as a good humanitarian worker. But I am afraid that he has not been displaying that sense of responsibility which is expected of a person who is working on a delicate mission such as the Peace Mission. And it has become, therefore, incumbent on the Government to make it clear today that there are limits beyond which it is not possible for this Government to go. We cannot look upon the Naga problem as an external problem. We have to look upon the problem of Nagaland as an internal problem. The people of Nagaland are bound to us by various ties. They are first class citizens of India and we want them to enjoy all the rights of first class citizens. There is a legitimate government in Nagaland which cannot be ignored. But we do not wish to ignore the hostile Nagas also because we wish also to appeal to their better instincts and it is for this purpose that revered persons like Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Shri Chaliha have been working. At the same time, the Nagas must be left under no illusion. They must be told or they must be made to understand that it is not possible for Rev. Michael Scott howsoever influential he may be in certain humanitarian circles, howsoever great his services may have been for certain humanitarian causes, to make the Naga issue an international issue. It is not international issue and it will never

be allowed to become an international issue and he must dismiss the idea that India will entertain the proposition that it should be made an international issue. That is inadmissible.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, we would have liked to have had Mr. Phizo and the Government of India was prepared to hear Mr. Phizo and his case. But Mr. Phizo did not care to come and it is not the Government's fault and it is not the fault of the Peace Mission that trouble still persists in Nagaland. But we have to bring peace to that part so that it may become a prosperous part of the country, so that the people there may be able to develop their culture and their traditions in their own way.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this discussion and I am particularly happy to note that there has been no opposition to this Bill. This is quite in consonance with the situation as it prevails in Nagaland. There may be difference of opinion as to how the situation should be handled and opinions have been expressed on that issue from various sections of the House which are not quite identical. There are gentlemen like Mr. Sapru and several others who feel that we should continue to pursue our efforts to find a peaceful solution of this vexed problem. There are others, notably Shri Jagat Narain, may be others also, who are of the opinion that we should adopt a hard line, should give up any hope of a solution by peaceful means and that we should ensure that the rigour of our security mechanism should fall with full vigour and we should thus find a solution of the problem. These differences in approach may be there but it is significant that there is no opposition to the adoption of the Bill. I take it therefore that it is the unanimous desire of this House that these powers should be given and that the Bill should be adopted. I am grateful to the House for the understanding that has been shown on this basic question which is really the important question and, if I may add the relevant question before the House. M38RS/66—

Normally, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it would have been enough for me to take note of this unanimity and I could leave it at that but I have no intention to do so because I want to acknowledge with gratitude some of the observations and the correctness of ideas that have been thrown up as a result of this discussion. I would not make any long speech. I would make very brief observations on some of the points that have been raised. It is necessary for me to take note of those points as this is a matter about which there has quite naturally been a great deal of interest in this House, in the other House, in the country, amongst all thinkers and it is very helpful therefore if we take note of some of the important points that come up either in the House or outside, in Press comments and the like. I will, Mr. Vice-Chairman, with your permission, therefore, very briefly mention some of the points that have been raised here.

Sir, mention has been made of the resignation of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and along with this the functioning of the Peace Mission, the role of Shri Chaliha, Chief Minister of Assam, who is a member of the Peace Mission, the way that Rev. Michael Scott has functioned and also the general handling of the political situation. These are all important matters, some of them topical, some of them long-range. I had occasion to clarify Government's attitude on the resignation of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and I would reiterate that Government would be happy if Shri Jayaprakash Narayan could be persuaded to revise his decision to resign from the Peace Mission. I have also mentioned publicly that this idea of resignation is directed against the hostile Naga leaders because Shri Jayaprakash Narayan thought, as a conscientious leader that he would find it difficult to function on the Peace Mission if the hostile Nagas did not have confidence in his functioning. The provocation for this arose from certain statements that had been made by the hostile Nagas criticising a very realistic statement made by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan reminding those who among the hostile Nagas are for taking a hard line, that the Government of India is not supine and that it will be wrong for those who, among the hostile Nagas, are bent upon continuing the tempo of tension,

[ Sardar Swaran Singh. ] to misunderstand the desire of the Government of India to resolve the matter by peaceful means. To my mind that was a very realistic statement and I do not see why anybody should have taken umbrage to this but some of the hostile Nagas criticised this statement of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Shri Jayaprakash Narayan thought it proper to dissociate himself from the functioning of the Peace Mission. This is in the highest tradition of public service and public reaction by an outstanding Indian leader. One may not always agree with his analysis or with his approach to the problem but there is no doubt that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan occupies a special position in our country.

Now, I wish, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that voluntary reaction of Rev. Michael Scott would also be somewhat on the same lines after hearing the great deal of criticism from various sections of this House and also from important public men in the country. It is not for me to go into those details but very cogent reasons have been given from both parts of the House, from the Opposition benches as also from this side, while criticising certain actions of Rev. Michael Scott. Whatever further attitude Government may adopt in this is a different matter about which I will clarify the position a little later but initially I would leave it for Rev. Michael Scott to consider as to whether he would also like to consider his position in the same background in which another outstanding member of the Peace Mission, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, thought that he must act, after seeing the reactions of the Naga hostile leaders.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, mention has been made of the meeting of some underground Nagas organised on 22nd March, 1966. Prof. Mukut Bihari Lal said that there was some confusion on account of some seemingly different statements on this issue. I would like to repeat his very sentence when he said that Government should make a categorical statement saying that Government is in no way responsible for the celebrations that were held on the 22nd March, celebrations which were organised by the underground Nagas. I have no hesitation in endorsing every word of this and I am prepared to say this anywhere.

here, in the other House, outside, because that is nothing but bare truth. The Government is not at all responsible for the celebrations or the meeting that they had. There was some feeling—I do not know what could be the basis of that feeling—that the Government had in some way facilitated the holding of this meeting or had acquiesced in the holding of this meeting. As soon as Government got the information that the underground Nagas were planning to organise their so-called celebrations, that there was some likelihood of some armed persons being used to organise the meeting, that there would be an arms display there, the underground Nagas were left in no doubt about the Government's reaction to any such proposal. It was made clear that Government would never tolerate any such meeting. This will be a clear violation of the terms upon which the agreement for the cessation of hostilities took place. It would mean that a large number of Nagas would pass through various villages, towns, etc. with arms and that is completely against the peace terms. Even the display of arms in any meeting itself will be opposed to both the letter and spirit of the agreement. So, for a variety of reasons, there was no question of the Government ever being responsible for the so-called celebrations.

About the celebrations also, I would like to say that on this date or round about this date, it was for the first time that they had held this meeting. I agree with Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, as he has publicly said, that this should not be regarded as anything more than a meeting, however high sounding may be the nomenclature adopted by the organisers of the meeting. It is true that the circumstances there are such that even such meetings or such a getting together does create an unsettling effect. Certainly it is opposed to the spirit of peace, which is sought to be strengthened there after the cessation of operations. And for a variety of reasons I would like to clarify the position; we were opposed to the holding of this meeting, particularly in the manner in which they were planning to organise it, when they indicated their intention to have the so-called celebrations.

Now, I entirely agree with hon. Members, Shri Sapru and Prof. M. B. Lal and some



other Members who have mentioned about these soundings—if I may use that expression—to the effect that there could be some outside authority or outside individual in any form directly or indirectly to take a hand in finding a solution to this problem. I want to make the position quite clear that Nagaland is part of India. In Nagaland, there is a government established by law, according to the Constitution and it is functioning. It was constituted as a result of elections, which were held in accordance with the Constitution and the procedure approved by Parliament. That Government is the sole authority to run the affairs of Nagaland. We continue our endeavours to persuade that group of people who are, no doubt, in a minority, who do not accept this position and who have been continuing to keep up their agitation and keep up their conflict. We will continue to persuade them to accept the position, which is absolutely unalterable, that Nagaland is a part of India and that any solution of this problem, which we are anxious should be arrived at peacefully, has to be found by India and there is no question of any mediation or any reference to any outside authority, official or non-official. On that score we are absolutely clear. As soon as this statement was published in the Press, and to which reference has been made by three hon. Members today, we made the position quite clear. In fact, we had made that position quite clear even earlier, that is, there is no question of any mediation or any outside agency, official or non-official, taking any hand in it and that this is a matter entirely between the Government of India and the people of India.

PROF. M. B. LAL: Any reference to the Security Council ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: There is no question of any reference to the Security Council. It is not a matter which can be referred to the Security Council. It is purely an internal matter.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: It is wholly domestic matter.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: It is purely a domestic matter and there is no question of its being taken to any outside M  
38 RS/66—6

authority. I am pretty certain, and I speak with a certain amount of experience of these institutions, that the Security Council or, in fact, any other international authority cannot ever dream of assuming jurisdiction or even of entertaining any complaint on that score from any quarter whatsoever. We should not have any such idea in our mind and there is no question of our accepting any outside authority to be put in there in a matter which is entirely, basically and essentially a domestic matter.

Mention has also been made about Mr. Shilu Ao. As I have said, he is the Chief Minister of the State and I want to dispel any feeling, if there is any such feeling, that in the talks that are taking place we are short-circuiting him or that he is not being kept in the picture. This is entirely incorrect. In fact, in the initial stages, when the talks started, I think about a year and half ago, there was some objection by the hostile Nagas saying that they would not like Mr. Shilu Ao to be included in the delegation, which was having talks with them. We made the position quite clear that it was for the Government of India to decide the composition of the delegation and that we would not accept any suggestion on that score and would not accept any objection that the hostile Nagas or their leaders might have in this regard. Mr. Shilu Ao is kept fully in the picture. In fact, I will not be giving out any secret if I were to say that he himself is firmly convinced that the restoration of peaceful conditions and the cessation of operations against the hostile Nagas has created a very powerful urge in the minds of even those Nagas who had some latent sympathies for the hostile Nagas. Their sympathies are now more in favour of continuance of peace and for finding a peaceful solution of this problem. There has been a distinct shift in the thinking of even those who were wavering a little on the side of established authority, established constitutional and legal authority. So, it would not be correct to suggest at all that Mr. Shilu Ao is not being kept fully in the picture.

This, Mr. Vice-Chairman, covers almost all the points and before closing, I would like to say only a few words. A suggestion has been made and we should take note of it and particularly my friend, Shri Jagat

[Sardar Swaran Singh. ] Narain, has said that the Government of India should adopt a strong policy and we should ensure that there should not be any disintegration of the country, that the forces which are going towards disintegration should be strongly dealt with. I fully agree with him, but how do we apply this principle? In the solution of our internal problems, we have had, as a last resort, sometimes recourse to the use of governmental authority, sometimes even to the use of force, and it is against that use of force that Shri Jagat Narain reacted and criticised the Government. At the same time, he says that we should use all possible force and authority to stop it. Now, wherever law and order is disturbed or a situation arises where force has to be used, it has to be used, though Government has never any pleasure in using it. But we have to decide our responsibility if we have to use force. We should always have a distinction between the two, *i. e.*, when we are dealing with our own people and when we are dealing with outsiders, who may be hostile to us. When we are dealing with our own people, whether they are from Punjab or Nagaland or Mizo Hills or from any other part, we have to combine our determination to resolve the issue without the use of force as far as possible, and with the use of force if inevitable. It will be wrong for us to adopt this high and mighty attitude that we will not talk with anybody when we are concerned with our own people and that it is only by wielding the big stick that we can resolve all those problems. This is too strong a temptation for any Government to resist and if a Member of the Opposition makes that suggestion, well perhaps governmental machinery may be only too anxious to catch at that and to wield the heavy club. Whereas we will never have hesitation to use force where the use of force is inevitable, we will continue to carry on the governmental affairs of this country in such a way that we can carry the Government in the true democratic spirit of governing by consent and governing by discussion so that we can have the maximum of goodwill of our people and not always use the heavy hand to control the situation.

Let us not confuse these purely internal problems. Nagas are our own people. Some of them are misguided. Some of them

have taken wrong notions. Some of those notions have been probably generated in their minds on wrong advice. We should counter that on all our fronts, and we have been dealing with the situation which was essentially a disturbed situation and we have to use our security forces to handle the situation. Perhaps Shri Jagat Narain is not aware that we had to deal with the situation militarily for several years, eight or nine or ten years; then we arrived at an agreement and the State of Nagaland was created. Still a small section did continue their illegal activities. This is an effort which is being made to persuade that minority also to give up their opposition to the basic fact that Nagaland is part of India. If somehow or other these peaceful means do not succeed, that does not mean that the normal use of governmental authority will not take place. That is inevitable, but this effort of trying to find a satisfactory solution of this problem by peaceful means is something which is worth trying and should not be spurned. We should continue to make a serious effort and should try to find a solution by persuading these Naga hostile leaders that their future lies in remaining in this big family of India as a whole. Whereas every Naga who is an Indian is as dear to us as any other Indian from any other part of the country, they should also feel likewise, and we should also feel towards them that way. This is the effort that is being directed. I know that it is not an easy matter particularly when we are dealing with groups of people who may have acquired arms from sources which are always on the look-out to create difficulty for us. These sources are located outside India, and it is a difficult task to persuade these people to see the path of reason when all these forces of instigation and forces of support from outside are there; but if we succeed in this, it will be a major achievement. If we do not, then the inevitable other course that is open to us will be there and we will have to deal with the situation. But we are hoping that that contingency will not arise. Let there be no misunderstanding on that score, and it is unfortunate if some people think that the Government of India, who sometimes talks to those people who are opposed to them, is adopting this course from any weakness! This is the genuine desire to persuade those who might be opposed to their thinking by peaceful means.

Whether it was Sant Fateh Singh or even the group of leaders in whose group Shri Jagat Narain was associated at the time when the unfortunate incidents in Punjab took place about which he made a reference, the Government of India talked to Shri Jagat Narain and his other colleagues who were at one time considered to be associated with the conditions which unfortunately took a bad turn in Punjab; similarly they talked to others, Sant Fateh Singh or his representatives. So, this is the general policy that we adopt, and you cannot say "We are opposed to Government, so you talk to us," if there is another person who is opposed to Government, "do not talk to him." This is not a very helpful way of looking at problems. We should always make a distinction between internal problems and problems where we are concerned with outside neighbours. A reference has been made about the situation in relation to China and Pakistan. This matter has been discussed so very often that I will not say anything on that score. We have been dealing with this problem also, I believe, in an effective manner always trying to adhere to the principle of resolving all the disputes even with neighbours by peaceful means but at the same time upholding our dignity, upholding our honour and the integrity of our country and I am sure that this policy will continue to be adhered to.

PROF. M. B. LAL: Sir, one clarification I wish from him. I have suggested that in the midst of conflict and negotiations we will continue to march ahead with our welfare programmes for the improvement of the conditions of the people of Nagaland in their interest as well as in the interest of the country as a whole. I think the Government is doing all that it can in this connection also.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I agree with this observation of the hon. Member, and we are doing our best to improve their Condition.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Shri M. P. BHARGAVA): The question is :

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

*The motion was adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clauses 2 to A were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

### THE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1965-66, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This Bill arises out of the Supplementary Demands of Rs. 188-33 crores voted by the Lok Sabha on March 21, 1966 and the expenditure of Rs. 147-13 crores charged on the Consolidated Fund of India, as detailed in the Supplementary Demands for Grants presented to the House on February 25, 1966. The total amount indicated in the printed booklet of Supplementary Demands for Grants was Rs. 335-66 crores as assessed up to the middle of January 1966. However, as a result of information that has since become available, the additional requirement under Demand No. '100-Atomic Energy Research' during the current year is now estimated at only Rs. 6 lakhs instead of Rs. 26 lakhs shown in the booklet. This is because the requirement of Rs. 20 lakhs for housing for the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research which was provided for under Demand No. '100-Atomic Energy Research' will now be met from another Grant in the Capital section. As savings are available under the Grant in the Capital section, no additional funds will be required on this account. The total amount