

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MAT-
TER OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE

THE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH MR T
C G STACEY GAINED ENTRY INTO
SHEIKH ABDULLAH'S RESIDENCE
AT OOTACAMUND

SHRI A D MANI (Madhya Pra-
desh) Madam, may I, with your
permission, call the attention of the
Minister of Home Affairs to the cir-
cumstances under which Mr T C G
Stacey, a British national gained
entry into Sheikh Abdullah's resi-
dence at Ootacamund?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA) Madam,
at 7.30 A.M. on the 10th May, a
foreigner who gave his name out as
Pegg met the Collector of the Nilgiris
at his residence and requested permis-
sion to see Sheikh Abdullah on the
plea that he was an old family friend
and that he happened to be in Ooty
staying with Peirce Leslie
Company. The Collector asked him
to give a written application on
which orders could be passed after
due consideration. The foreigner
said that he was in a hurry as he was
leaving the next day and that he had
no time to give a written application
and wait for orders. He said that he
would give a note for Sheikh Abdullah
which the Collector promised to send
to Sheikh Abdullah. He then left the
Collector's residence and went in a
taxi to the house in which Sheikh
Abdullah is staying. When questioned
by the sentries at the entrance to the
compound he informed them that the
Collector had given him permission to
meet Sheikh Abdullah. The sentries
accepted his version and permitted
him to enter the compound. He met
Sheikh Abdullah and had breakfast
with him. In the meantime, the
police officer in charge appeared on
the scene and noticed the visitor. He
immediately made inquiries about him
with the sentries. He also verified the
facts with the Collector and found that
the story given by the foreigner was

incorrect. He requested the foreigner
to accompany him, and on being asked
his name and other details the foreig-
ner gave a story that was at variance
with what he had told the Collector.
The foreigner said his name was
Stacey, that he was a British national
and that he was staying in Woodlands-
Hotel at Ooty. On being questioned
why he had made an incorrect state-
ment in respect of his name and place
of his stay in Ooty and why he met
Sheikh Abdullah when permission had
been refused by the Collector, he had
no satisfactory reply to give. All this
aroused suspicion about his identity
and his *bona fides* and it was consid-
ered desirable that his identity should
be established beyond doubt. He was,
therefore, arrested under Section 54 of
the Criminal Procedure Code for mak-
ing a false representation about his
identity to officers. He was transfer-
red to Coimbatore jail.

It has been established that the per-
son is Mr Thomas Charles Gerard
Stacey, a journalist connected with
the Sunday Times of London. He had
visited towards the end of April last,
and the Pakistan High Commission in
London had made arrangements for
his 'reception' and to ensure that Mr
Stacey's stay in Pakistan was 'com-
fortable and fruitful'. The visit was
apparently in connection with the
Rann of Kutch issue.

We have issued orders under the
Indian Foreigners Act requiring Mr
Stacey to leave India forthwith and not
to re-enter thereafter, and the order
will be served on him tomorrow.

SHRI A D MANI Madam, may I
ask the Home Minister, what are the
terms and conditions under which
Sheikh Abdullah is being detained?
The Home Minister said just now that
Mr Stacey informed the Collector of
Ootacamund that he wanted to send a
note and the Collector promised to
send that note to Sheikh Abdullah if
one was received by him. This morn-
ing we have read in the papers that
Sheikh Abdullah attended a cinema

show, purchased about Rs 500 worth of articles, etc. If this is the kind of detention that the Home Minister has in view for persons who have intrigued with Chou En-lai, quite a large number would stand in the queue before him requesting to be detained. May I ask whether Sheikh Abdullah is permitted to have free conversation with any person at Ooty, whether he can correspond with any person he likes, whether the same terms which are now being imposed on left Communist detenus have been imposed on him?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA

Madam shall I listen to all the questions first and answer them together?
(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN They want one by one

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA All right, I will answer them one by one

The terms of the order on Sheikh Abdullah placed on his restrictions that he shall not communicate with any person except through the said Deputy Inspector General of Police—this was at the airport—and except through the said Collector while residing within the municipal limits of Ootacamund. Therefore he cannot communicate with anybody except through, which means except with the permission of, these persons and of course it was decided that he would be free to move about within the limits of Ooty which means that he can go about but subject to these restrictions that he cannot communicate with any person except with the permission of the Collector.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V PATEL (Gujarat) We would like to know whether the Home Minister or the Government is certain as to how Sheikh Abdullah is going to be treated. Is he treated as a respected foreigner or a respected person who has just come back from Europe and finds the heat of this country

unbearable and therefore has been transferred to Ooty where the heat and the circumstances are more favourable and bearable to him. Is he in detention? Is he a prisoner? What is he? The Government seems to be still hesitating in their mind as to what to do with him. We would like to know what exactly the Government considers him to be, what his status is and how they want to treat him.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh) He is a Shahanshah.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V PATEL We are aware that this Government had kept Sheikh Abdullah as a prisoner for five years and he was being prosecuted by an eminent counsel who is a Member of this House. Somehow the Government decided abruptly to withdraw the proceedings after so much expenses. Then he was set free and do you know what happened then? After that he was given special permission to go abroad and he was given foreign exchange six times the normal amount given to a Member of Parliament in one term. On his return to this country he was immediately arrested and his movements were put under restrictions and he was transferred to Ooty. We are not sure what the Government's intentions are and we want to know what exactly the Government is doing. Is he being treated as somebody who has behaved in an unpatriotic manner, somebody whose freedom is a matter of concern to the safety of this country, somebody who has plotted with the enemy, who has collaborated with the enemy who has been an aggressor against this country and for this reason the Government is treating him with a little suspicion? The Government does not seem to be decided; what is the Government doing? Either he is a friend of the country and you treat him with consideration and respect as if he is an Indian. If he is guilty, he must be treated according to the law of the land.

AN HON MEMBER He is a Kashmiri Muslim, not an Indian

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA Regarding the sentiments expressed in respect of the activities of Sheikh Abdullah there is no difference in outlook, we share the same feelings. I agree there, we do not like at all, we intensely dislike what he has been doing. He is an Indian and therefore we . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) But he says he is a Kashmiri Muslim

(Interruptions)

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA About the question of his being spared from the heat what we want is to avoid his creating heat anywhere else where it is not required. Madam, we have a certain purpose in view. We want to see that that purpose is fulfilled. Other things are not of that importance. Whether he remains within the restriction on his movements as we have prescribed now or they may be even more tighter, these are things which we have to consider in relation to what view we take of the situation at the moment. I think so far as that purpose, the main purpose is concerned, we dealt with the matter promptly and effectively. Sheikh Abdullah was placed out of danger's reach. I believe, and this consideration will be kept in view all the time. So far as what he did was concerned the question was what is the position. The position is that he has been placed under restriction so far as his movements are concerned, and this is a reasonable view taken of that. There are other considerations to be squared with it in achieving that object. Yet if he is allowed to remain in Ooty in conditions which are comfortable conditions, let us not grudge him that as long as the main purpose is secured, that is, we will not allow him to be any source of danger to our country and its security, and we will take all steps that are necessary and we are taking

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar) I would like to have from the Home Minister some more details about the antecedents of Mr Stacey. Particularly I would like to know if he is the same gentleman who wrote a very nasty article probably in April regarding our late and beloved Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Then I would also like to know why the Government is considering to deport him without taking any legal action against this gentleman who has misrepresented himself and tried to break the law of this land.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA Regarding the latter part of the question we consulted the Madras Government. The arrangements for security, etc., are in their hands. They have taken all that into consideration and come to this conclusion. We agree with them. I am quite sure that this is the same gentleman, I believe who is responsible for those deplorable writings which are, to say the least, not at all in conformity with truth or objectivity. But this is where I leave that matter.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA Let us not be told that it is for the Madras Government to decide what action to take. I would like to know what is the advice of the Central Government. If not, why is the Central Government not taking steps in the matter to see that this man is tried for all the offences he has committed. Why not the Central Government, the Home Minister, issue a directive that this man should be tried before a court of law instead of giving instructions that he should be deported? I would like to have a clear clarification on this point from the Home Minister.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V PATEL If he is clear, he can give it. He is not clear in anything.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA The hon Member may have his notion of what he should do, but we are also

clear about our duty as to what is appropriate in the circumstances. This gentleman, whatever it is, has expressed his regret and apology for what he has done. That is one part of it. And we have to weigh all the circumstances as to whether it is a matter for prosecution or whether letting him, that is, serving an order for deporting him will meet the needs of the situation. We feel that this is the right course that we have taken.

(Shri A. B. Vajpayee stood up)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vajpayee.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, on a point of order. In fairness those Members who have given the calling attention notice should be called first.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I do not mind.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: But we do.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. Mr. Arora.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I know whether this suspicious character, Mr. Stacey, has been asked to give an unqualified apology, and whether the Government has taken care to get and has got an undertaking from him that he will not publicise what transpired at his interview with the Sheikh? Except for an undertaking and apology only, may I know if the British High Commission in India does not give a guarantee that the undertaking will be honoured?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: That kind of undertaking is out of the question.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Why is it out of the question? He has defied the authority, had a talk with Sheikh Abdullah and has given him an opportunity to publicise what happened in that interview.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: He has apologised and also he has given a written statement in which he has stated all that transpired between him and Sheikh Abdullah. Therefore, that is the basis of whatever he can say, and now we know what he has said, he has himself stated what passed between them. Certainly it will not be possible for him to say anything different.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I want to raise three small points. It has been reported that this Mr. Stacey saw Sheikh Abdullah first at Madras airport. Are we to understand that no security arrangements were made at Madras airport? At Palam airport photographers were manhandled and they were not allowed to take photographs of the Sheikh. May I know why this British journalist was not prevented to meet Sheikh Abdullah at Madras airport? Secondly, is it not a fact that this journalist was with Sheikh Abdullah for thirty minutes inside the bungalow . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Forty minutes.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: . . . and his presence was not detected either by the security police or by the district authorities? Will it not be correct to presume that there were no security arrangements whatsoever? Thirdly, is it a fact that the Government has decided to withdraw the criminal case under the pressure of the British High Commission? If not, why has he not been prosecuted and punished for cheating and impersonation? What prevents Mr. Stacey from writing whatever he likes when he goes out of India?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: On whether he met Sheikh Abdullah at Madras, as far as the movements of this Mr. Stacey are concerned it does not appear that he could have done that.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: It has been reported in the press. Let him find out.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: It does not appear so from the record that I have. I will have to check it up. It does not appear to be so. Regarding the arrangements for security, there are all the time four sentries, there are also an inspector of police and some other staff.

AN HON. MEMBER: In their houses.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Just the sentry at that time was at the gate. I believe there was a loophole and this has been tightened. It has been tightened and now further instructions have been issued so that such a thing should not be possible hereafter.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Why has the criminal case been withdrawn?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: As I said, the Government concerned there and ourselves having weighed all the factors in the situation have come to this conclusion, but there has been no pressure of any kind from the British Government or anybody or the British High Commission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I invite the hon. Minister's attention to the *Hindu* of Wednesday, the 12th. It is stated here that Mr. Stacey had with him some papers and some Pakistani currency notes and clippings from the *Daily Telegraph* of London relating to the recent developments in Indo-Pakistan relations, and there are other things also in this paper. The hon. Minister has admitted that he is the man who wrote such scurrilous and objectionable articles. How is it that he was allowed to come into this country. I know that when British citizens come here, naturally they do not need any visas. But at the same

time when correspondents come to this country, a certain permission from the Government is necessary to function. May I know whether in this particular case, Mr. Stacey applied for such permission to function as the correspondent of the *Sunday Times* and, if so, why this permission was given. We assume that the Intelligence Department knew that he had written such articles. This is number one. Secondly, why was he there, I should like to know. Since the articles had been written and brought to the notice of the House, I presume they were within the knowledge of the Government. When this gentleman arrived from Pakistan, certainly he arrived at an airport he was not smuggled into this country. I should like to know whether any watch was kept on him ever since he landed at an airport in India from Pakistan? If so, what are the results of this thing and why was he not followed up to Ootacamund where he went? Well, he had written some articles, he has said it. Now, the hon. Minister said that the case is being withdrawn . . .

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: No question of any case being withdrawn.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whatever it is, here . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: A criminal case has been registered.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You arrested him not for the sake of fun. You arrested him because you thought that he committed a certain offence, whatever it is. You say that he would be deported. Yet, the circumstances of the case suggest that he was here as an intelligence agent in the guise of a special correspondent as Mr. Patterson of the *Daily Telegraph* was earlier. Why in such a case is he not being held here for further interrogation and examination of the papers and other documents that he may have in his possession and also for making it known to the world that he

has behaved in this manner? Why suddenly in a hurry is he being allowed to get away from the country when, on his own admission, he has said that he impersonated, gave a false name to a Magistrate, committed an offence, and having committed that offence committed another offence when he met Sheikh Abdullah in violation of the restrictions and regulations? I should like to know why this favoured treatment is being given to Mr. Stacey in this manner and why he is not taken as a case for security investigation, because we must find out as to who was operating through Mr. Stacey. He cannot be an intelligence agent on his own, he must have come here with a plan from Pakistan. And according to the report from the paper currency notes and documents and so on were there to establish some liaison and other things. We cannot believe what he says at the first instance to our police officers or other officers. Why therefore is he not being held, prosecuted and kept in custody till the Government is fully satisfied that they have reasonably done everything to elicit all possible information from this gentleman?

I take, it, Madam Deputy Chairman, that the hon. Minister has relaxed in this matter in allowing this intelligence man to go away from the country because of pressure. He may not admit it and he knows and perhaps he fears that if he holds him in custody here there will be an uproar in the British Press and the British Government might take exemption. Now, the British Government is answerable as to why one of its subjects behaved in this manner in our country, abused the hospitality and committed a crime. It is the duty of the Government to find out everything from him,—call him to account and certainly prosecute him and let him face the consequences of law for having done something which is most objectionable and which more than meets the eye.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: He was arrested immediately and that does not signify any very tender treatment. As to what his other doings were and what he possessed, Madam, I assure you that all that has been done and we know everything that he had.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Tell us.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: It is not necessary for me to give the whole list or the inventory. These are matters

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But did he have any Pakistani currency?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: These are matters which will have to be dealt with in a manner which is consistent with the other objects that we have in view and our duties. I do not think hon. Members here will ask me or expect me to give the whole inventory of the things that were found with him. We have them, and it is out of that

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Maybe, you found

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: It was from the seizure of certain articles from him that I was able to tell the House as to what kind of help he received from the Pakistan High Commission there and what kind of reception he had and what kind of expectations they had of him. (*Interruptions*). That is true. Therefore, we know all this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That shows a great conspiracy, a *prima facie* case.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: We know all that. We are taking all that care to find out exactly what he was here for. And every undesirable journalist from any part of the world, we do not send people to watch him all along the route when they enter into this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You take it. . . .

SHRI GURUDEV GUPTA (Madhya Pradesh): The hon. Minister has said that Mr. Stacey has given an undertaking and that he is satisfied with that. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he will place on the Table of the House the undertaking or the apology given by Mr. Stacey and also publicise it through the papers in our country and also abroad so that the whole fact is brought before the public. Secondly, I would like to know whether the Government of India will take a security from the British High Commissioner about the character and good conduct of Mr. Stacey and that he will not publicise the interview that he had from Sheikh Abdulah.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is a British intelligence man.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: His further conduct is a matter for his own country when he leaves here. And as far as the publicity for the apology is concerned, I believe that what has been said here is enough publicity for whatever . . .

* SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: He has given an apology, that is quite enough.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman . . . (Interruptions).

شہی عبدالغنی (پنجاب): نندا

جی سے میں صرف تین باتیں جانتا چاہتا ہوں کہ شہی عبداللہ نے جب وہ دیہ سے باہر گئے تو کیا ہمارے ہوم منسٹر صاحب کو یقینی ہے کہ انہوں نے ہمیش کے ساتھ غداروں کو کرنے کے لئے پاکستان والوں کے ساتھ کوئی ایسی اسکیم بنائی کہ جس سے کشمیر جو ہمارے دیہ میں ہے

وہ ہمارے دیہ سے چھن جائے۔ اگر انہوں نے ایسا کیا تو پھر کیا ہمارے ہوم منسٹر ان پر مقدمہ چلا کر ان کو مناسب سزا دینے کی کوشش کریں گے۔ اور اگر ان کی صرف سرگرمیاں ایسی ہیں جن کے لئے سرکار یہ سمجھتی ہے کہ وہ ملک کے لئے ہانی کر ہو سکتی ہیں تو پھر کیا وہ ضروری سمجھتی ہے کہ ان پر ایسی پابندی لگائے جس سے کہ وہ اپنی زندگی جو ہے اس کو بھی اچھی طرح سے نہ گزار سکیں۔ تو میری درخواست یہ ہے کہ انگریز جرنلسٹ جو ان سے ملا اس کی اور شیخ عبداللہ کی کیا باتیں ہونیں۔ کیا ان میں کوئی ایسی بات پائی جاتی ہے کہ شہی عبداللہ نے ان کے ذریعہ کچھ کے بارے میں یا کشمیر کے بارے میں یا کسی اور جو ملک کے لئے ہانی کر بات ہو سکتی ہے اسی کے بارے میں کوئی پیغام دیا ہو۔

† [श्री अब्दुल गनी (पंजाब) : नन्दाजी से मे सिर्फ तीन बात जानना चाहता हूँ कि शेख अब्दुल्ला ने जब वह देश से बाहर गये तो क्या हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहिब को यकीन है कि उन्होंने देश के साथ गद्दारी करने के लिए पाकिस्तान वालों के साथ कोई ऐसी स्कीम बनाई कि जिस से काश्मीर जो हमारे देश में है वह हमारे देश से छिन जाए? अगर उन्होंने ऐसा किया तो फिर क्या हमारी होम मिनिस्टर

उन पर मुकदमा चला कर उनको मनासिब सजा देने की कोशिश करेगी ? और उनकी विफ सर्ममियां ऐसी हैं जिनके लिए सरकार यह समझती है, कि वह मुल्क के लिए हानिकार हो सकती है, तो फिर क्या वह जरूरी समझेगी कि उन पर ऐसी पाबन्दी लगाए जिससे कि वह अपनी जिन्दगी जो है, उसको भी अच्छी तरह से न गुजार सकें। तो मेरी दरखास्त यह है कि ग्रेज जर्नलिस्ट जो उनसे मिला उस को और शेख अब्दुल्ला की क्या बातें हुईं, क्या उन में कोई ऐसी बात पाई जाती है कि शेख अब्दुल्ला ने उनके जरिए कच्छ के बारे में या काश्मीर के बारे में या किसी और जो मुल्क के लिए हानिकार बात हो सकती है, उसके बारे में कोई पैगाम दिया हो ?]

श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा : जो कुछ स्टेट-मेंट है, उससे ऐसा कुछ नहीं मानूँ होता है कि ऐसी कोई बातें हुई हैं।

SHRI GURUDEV GUPTA: What is the harm in placing it on the Table of the House?

श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा : मेरे पास और कोई इन्-राइटिंग में यह चीज नहीं है। अब, सरसमियों की जो बातें हैं जो कि मुजिर हो सकती हैं, जिससे इस देश को नुकसान हो सकता है, हानि हो सकती है, उनको रोकने की गर्ज में ही, इन्फे से ही यह किया गया। इसके अलावा और भी कुछ करने की जरूरत है तो किया जायेगा। तो इस में हमारा इरादा बिल्कुल पक्का है कि कोई भी बात ऐसी नहीं होने देंगे, कोई भी बात नहीं होने देंगे, जिससे कि काश्मीर के बारे में जो हमारी नीति है, उसके अन्दर कुछ भी बुरा असर पड़ सके।

شہری عیدالغلی : یہ جواب نہیں
دیا کہ آیا ان کے قابو میں ایسی
بات ہے کہ پاکستان کے ساتھ مل کر
اس قسم کی کوئی چیز، کوئی بات
بہرحال کی کوئی کوشش ہوگی، اس
کو روک سکیں۔

†**श्री अब्दुल गनी :** यह जवाब नहीं दिया कि आया उनके काबू में ऐसी बात है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ मिल कर उस किस्म की कोई चीज, कोई बात भेजने की कोई कोशिश होगी, उसको रोक सकें।]

श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा : यह कभी बर्दाश्त हो सकता है कि ऐसा हो और हम उसके लिए पूरी कार्रवाही न करें।

कुमारी मनिबेन बल्लभभाई पटेल (गुजरात): जब इस तरह से एक अखबार का प्रतिनिधि वहाँ जा सका और शेख अब्दुल्ला से आधा घंटा बात कर सका, तो क्या सरकार ने उनके पास जो आदमी रखे है उन की मेवा-शुश्रूषा के लिए वे आदमी ही जो कि उनके पास से बाहर आते जाते रहेंगे, खबर नहीं भेज सकते, अगर आप सिनीमा जाने देते हैं, बाजार जाने देते हैं, तो किस प्रकार की रुकावट उनसे नहीं मिलने की, बात नहीं करने की कर सकते हैं, यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है। आप किस तरीके से उन पर रुकावट करना चाहते हैं, यह हम जानना चाहते हैं। आप भी जेल गए हैं, हम भी गए हैं, हमारे ऊपर बहुत पाबन्दी थी। लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि नौजवान लोग हमारे साथ थे और किस तरह से बाहर चिट्ठी पत्री भेजते थे और किस तरह उनके पास से बातें आती थी। इनको तो एक मकान में रख रखा है, घूम सकते हैं, कही जा सकते हैं, सिनीमा जा सकते हैं। सिनीमा में तो अंधेरा रहता है तब वह क्या कोई बात नहीं कर सकती है। तो किस प्रकार की रुकावट है, जरा इसको समझा सकें तो अच्छी बात होगी। एक अनुभव के बाद आप क्या मछली करते हैं, क्या जागरूकता रखते हो ?

श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा : जो बहन ने कहा वह बात सही है कि इसकी आजादी है और यह सम्भव है कि जब वह सिनीमा में जायें या और कुछ जगह जायें तो किसी से कुछ

[श्री गुलज़ारिलाल नन्दा]

कहना चाहें तो यह जो हमारा आर्डर है कि कलेक्टर की परमिशन के बगैर ऐसा न करें, उसका कोई खास मतलब उसमें नहीं रहता। लेकिन अभी यही सोचा गया—अभी की बात मैं इस वक्त कह रहा हूँ, ऐसी कोई बात जिस में कोई खतरा पैदा होता है, तो देखा जायगा लेकिन सब्जी लेने जायेंगे या फल लेने जायेंगे या और कहीं कुछ जायेंगे, जो कुछ कहना कहलाना था बहुत कुछ कह चुके हैं, लेकिन अभी जहाँ वह जाते हैं, उसके साथ आदमी रहता है। यह मैं आप को बता दूँ कि इस बात की खबर-दारी रखी जाती है कि जहाँ जहाँ जाय साथ में अफपर रहें। उस चीज का खयाल रखा जायगा, यह मैं आपको यकीन दिलाता हूँ। अभी तो थोड़े दिन हुए और यह बात आई और इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि बहुत ज्यादा सख्त उसके लिए इंतजाम किया जाय और भी कुछ डर महसूस होगा। यह महसूस होगा कि और तरीके से करने की जरूरत है, तो वह भी देख लिया जायगा।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Stacey should be held in custody. I think this is the demand of this House and will be the demand of the nation. He should not be allowed to go out.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to know from the Home Minister whether this gentleman was an accredited news correspondent in India.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I am not quite sure what his status here is. Here he has come on behalf of his paper, "Sunday Times" . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: On behalf of Pakistan.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: . . . and I think that in this country any journalist in that position can come without any special permission.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mami.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Home Minister should know that sometimes they use this cover for intelligence . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called Mr. Mani.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I want to put two questions to the Home Minister. One is about Sheikh Abdullah and one about Stacey. Now the Home Minister has been talking so far and discussing Stacey's conduct. Sheikh Abdullah was served with an order asking him not to communicate with any person without authorisation. Stacey, seeing Sheikh Abdullah wandering about in his lawns, sought his permission to come in. Sheikh Abdullah invited him for breakfast. Has the Government asked Sheikh Abdullah why he broke the order which had been served on him because Sheikh Abdullah is responsible for the fulfilment of the conditions of his detention. Has the Government of India so far asked Sheikh Abdullah as to why he defied the terms of the order which was served on him.

The second question is about Mr. Stacey. The Home Minister said in answer to a question from the Deputy Chairman that he does not know whether he is an accredited correspondent. This gentleman has been writing scandalous articles in the 'Sunday Times' about the performance of the Indian Army. I read an article yesterday in the 'Sunday Standard' that the Indian Army left their pyjama behind and ran away. I would ask the Home Minister whether our Indian High Commission in Pakistan did not report to the Government of India that this gentleman had left for India. The Government does not know who comes to India and who goes out of India.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: The information is that some such step was taken there in London . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What step?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Just listen. . . . and the assurance was given that this gentleman is being sent here in order to make up for the lapses which he might have committed in his earlier writings. That is the kind of information we received, that he was being sent here for this purpose. Now, he may have pursued other aims and those, as we have discovered, were not something which might create any gratification for us. It has created an intense feeling of dissatisfaction with what he has done.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is interference in our affairs.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Possibly the hon. Member is more concerned with interference. And he knows that we are not tolerant of interference.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a cowering fear. You communicate with the British when it comes to them in one manner. You treat Mr. Gopalan in one manner and Mr. Sheikh Abdullah in another manner.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Regarding Sheikh Abdullah the circumstances which have been indicated by the hon. Member are different from the facts that are known to us.

(Interruption by Shri A. D. Mani)

These are not the circumstances in which he entered there . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: The hon'ble Mr. Mani had said something. I am giving this information in relation to what he said. The circumstances were not what he said now. That is, it was not Sheikh Abdullah who had called him inside. That is not a fact.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then how did he enter?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: To the extent Sheikh Abdullah does not conform to the expectation, well, to that extent it is a question of considering as to what we should do about it.

SHRI A. D. MANI: On a point of information . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will get nothing more on this. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty seven minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 14th May, 1965.