

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA That you deal with

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Let him finish

SHRI B K P SINHA Now Madam Deputy Chairman, it is your duty as the custodian of the dignity of the House, to take notice of it and send *suo motu* this journal to the Privileges Committee

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE (Maharashtra) Can you give us the name of that newspaper?

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE Let the House know what paper it is

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA It is a good paper by all accounts and reveals such things I congratulate it It is the 'Patriot What did you expect? 'Hindustan Standard' Or do you want the 'Organizer' What else did you expect? (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Order, order

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH I do not know Madam as to what reply I could give to a suggestion of this type I agree with the expression of opinion by an hon Member here that I presume that every Member of this House is honourable and that, whether he takes lunch or dinner or goes to a reception in one embassy or another he is not likely to be influenced by such entertainments and that he will certainly do his duty That is the presumption upon which all our democracy is based and I would like to feel that way and I would beg of the Members also to feel that way that merely because we are entertained by somebody we should not be, I hope we are not at all influenced by these entertainments But it is for the hon Members themselves to decide as to what course they would want to take, whether they want to go to diplomat's parties or not But I would appeal to all sections of the House that even if they go to these dinners or lunches or receptions, they would project our India's viewpoint rather than be influenced by what others might try to sell to us And about this

matter whether any official of any Embassy has been in touch with hon Members of this House or the other House I have no information But if the hon Member can give me the information—he can give it to me privately because I do not want to embarrass him—and if there is any particular Member or any particular official who is concerned, I would certainly like to make enquiries, because I do not want any member of a foreign mission to try to influence our Members of Parliament or in fact any other citizen to any particular course of action because India's interests are the foremost and they should remain foremost with us

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN I think that is over now The House will sit through the Lunch Hour because we have to finish our legislative business and the Government business must go on

THE ARMED FORCES (SPECIAL POWERS) CONTINUANCE BILL, 1965

—continued

SHRI M P BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh) Madam Deputy Chairman, before I come to the Bill proper I would like to reply to the objections raised by Mr Bhupesh Gupta and Mr Vajpayee about the delegation that went to Nagaland They are confusing the issue and thinking that it was a parliamentary delegation

SHRI A B VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh) It was not

SHRI M P BHARGAVA Which was sponsored by the Presiding Officers of the two Houses or elected by the two Houses There are several ways in which delegation are formed and this particular delegation was formed on the request of some of the Members of the Opposition as well as of the Congress I may tell the House that a communication was received by the Prime Minister requesting that some Members of Parliament would like to go to Nagaland to study the situation Since conditions in Nagaland were peaceful, the Prime Minister thought it fit that such a delegation could go Thereafter it was

[SHRI M P BHARGAVA] decided that this delegation would consist of 12 Members of Parliament, 8 from the Lok Sabha and 4 from the Rajya Sabha. After the number of members of the delegation was decided on I was asked to contact the Leaders of the Opposition in this House and to give 4 names to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs—two from the Congress benches and 2 from the Opposition. I might tell the House that from the Opposition I got the name of Shri Lokanath Misra of the Swatantra Party and the name of Shri R S Khandekar of the Praja Socialist Party, and I named two people from our benches. Thereafter Shri Lokanath Misra surrendered his seat to his Leader, Shri M R Masani and therefore a change became necessary.

[THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE) in the Chair]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know the hon Member did all these good things. But one thing he said was rather conveying something contrary to what we had suggested. Does it mean that two Members from the two Houses are interchangeable? Can I offer my place to Mr Hiren Mukherjee and *vice versa*? I don't know. But this is what has been done.

SHRI M P BHARGAVA: Mr Bhupesh Gupta must have been fully and then he will know. If an hon Member of his Party or of the Swatantra Party wants to oblige his Leader in this or the other House, how can I deny it if he gives one seat in place of the Lok Sabha seat? And that is exactly what we did.

Now it has been said that it was a very heterogeneous group.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Is it not the general practice to consult the Leaders of the Opposition Groups?

SHRI M P BHARGAVA: How does the hon Member presume that they were not consulted? The Leaders of the Opposition of this House and the other

House were consulted and the representatives were taken on their recommendation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That was not the case. If you are choosing Members from this House, and the other House then it stands to reason that you consult the Leaders of this House and the other House. That is how it should be done. Or if you choose from Parliamentary Groups then you naturally address letters to the Parliamentary Groups.

SHRI D L SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): It was said just now that there was a quota of 4 for the Rajya Sabha—2 from the Congress and 2 from the Opposition. So these 4 were for the Rajya Sabha. When you found that after Mr Lokanath Misra relinquished his place in favour of Mr Masani it would be only three for Rajya Sabha, then was it not your duty to tell him that you could choose somebody else and not Mr Masani, because that would be encroaching on the quota of this House?

SHRI M P BHARGAVA: No, the quota for this House was not encroached upon. In fact the quota of this House was a little more than what it should have been. Actually if you scrutinise the list, you will know how many were there. So, that is how the delegation was formed.

Now the charge or the allegation was made that this was a very heterogeneous group.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please do not bring in that here and waste your time. I said that in some other context, that there were various shades of opinion there. In fact, I was saying that to support you.

SHRI M P BHARGAVA: Well, there may be people holding various shades of opinion and yet it may act in a homogeneous manner and that is exactly what has happened. They were representing various parties and that is what we emphasised in Nagaland—that this dele-

gation was comprised of people from all sides

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA It contained many shades of opinion. That is exactly what I wanted you to note. Thank you.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA This is how the delegation was formed and I am happy to state that they acted in a very homogeneous manner and they behaved everywhere as a team and they produced a report which was unanimous.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE But why was no Member of the Jan Sangh included in that delegation?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA I can only refer my hon. friend to his leader in the other House to find out from him what were the compelling circumstances and why his leader in the other House could not go. He can ask Mr. Trivedi.

Now, Madam, I come to the Bill. It is a very short Bill and if I were to call it a one word Bill it would not be very wrong. What it desires is that the seven-year period for the enforcement of the Special Armed Forces be extended to eight years. I would have been happy if conditions had been created by now for the non renewal of this Bill for another year. I do hope that it would not be necessary to use the provisions of this Bill for the period which is being extended. I have full confidence that it would not be necessary to talk or discuss this Bill any further next year. In the delicate stage of the present talks, the extension of this Bill for a year is necessary and as such I lend my support to it.

Coming to the situation in Nagaland, it cannot be fully understood unless we go a little into the past happenings in that part of our country. That part, during the British days, formed what was called Excluded Areas. There was very little communication between that side of the country and the rest of the country. In 1947, when the country became independent, due to lack of contact and understanding, certain situations developed there and they went on worsening for one reason or the other, so much so that in 1955, violence started in that part of our country and we were forced to take arms

against our own brothers there. In 1956, the military had to be called to restore law and order. The military had to do certain operations. When those operations were completed, on a political level general amnesty was announced in 1958. Again a situation developed and operations had to be resorted to in 1959 and they continued for some time. Then came the Chinese aggression in October and November, 1962. In October 1962 the military posted in Nagaland had to be withdrawn and the Naga hostiles got time to consolidate their activities and to move freely in that part of the country and to preach their own philosophy. There were some military operations in early 1963. There was again amnesty in July 1963. There were talks and on the 1st of December, the State of Nagaland was formed. The Bill creating the State of Nagaland was discussed in this very House and people had thought at that time that things would settle down and that everything would be normal in what is called Nagaland, a part of India, but unfortunately there were certain people who were being misled still and hostilities again started and we were having trouble till 1964. That is the background in which the Naga problem has to be viewed. At this stage I must thank the Church leaders who passed a resolution at Wokha in a conference suggesting the name of four persons for being formed into what they would call a Peace Mission. They were—the three members who are in the Peace Mission now, namely, Mr. B. P. Chahha, Shri Jaya Prakash, Rev. Michael Scott and Shri Shanker Rao Deo. Shri Shanker Rao Deo could not go there due to his ill health and the other three began to work as a team. Here I must pay a tribute to the Peace Mission which has really done good work, which has made it possible for the Nagas to move freely in that State and which has made it possible for a visit by Members of Parliament to that area. I am one of those who thought that the situation in Nagaland would have been very much different if this Parliamentary delegation had gone there ten to twelve years earlier. That was a much-needed thing because, as would have been observed from what I have said, there was practically no contact between Nagaland and the rest of India. Unless people

[Shri M. P. Bhargava]

understand each other unless people know the difficulties of each other, there is no scope for understanding and there is room for misunderstanding and if other people want to play it up they have then a rich field and this is exactly what has been happening there. By the efforts of the Peace Mission an atmosphere of peace has been established in Nagaland. It is called a temporary peace. I am one of those who stoutly support the proposition that this temporary peace should be turned into a permanent peace and that Nagaland and the Naga people should have their due place in the country.

Now, I owe an apology to the House and to one of our colleagues Shri Chandra Shekhar for a slight error which has crept in in the Report. Probably, Members would have noticed that the names printed in the Report show Dr. S. Chandrasekhar. It should have been Shri Chandra Shekhar and I do hope that Shri Chandra Shekhar would not mind and pardon me for this slight mistake which has crept in that Report.

Members would probably like to hear from us something about the visit to Nagaland but I do not think it is necessary at this time because I believe every Member has got a copy of the report of the Delegation and, therefore, I would not go into full details about this. I would like, however, to inform Members of the type of slogans which we came across in Nagaland. They were

'Nagaland for Nagas Indian Army withdraw. We want independence',
'Leave Nagas alone. Compromise with Federal Government of Nagaland'
'Go back Indian Army'

And at one place, I saw a curious board, which said

"Nagaland for Christ"

These are the sort of slogans which we came across and keeping these in the background I would implore the Members to study and then try to understand the difficulties facing the Naga people. If they have proper appreciation of their

difficulties I am sure they will not grudge some time being given to the Peace Mission for the peace talks. There has been a period of fifteen to sixteen years in which hostilities have continued and all this has to be effaced and a new chapter has to be opened. If hostilities had continued for fifteen years for establishing peace there has to be given at least fifteen months, if not more and therefore I would plead with the hon. Members to have a little patience and wait for the talks. These talks are always delicate and time consuming. One has to try and explain his position to the other party and understand the other party's position. In this connection, I would like to invite the attention of the House to paragraph 7 of the Delegation's Report wherein it is said

The Delegation is left with no doubt that the suspension of firing as from September 6, 1964, and its continuance has been greatly appreciated by the people as a whole.

I assure the House that wherever we went and whomsoever we came across, we found that there was a genuine desire for peace and people were sick of hostilities and that is one good point on which I base all my hopes for a future peaceful settlement. The curfew which had become part of daily life was lifted. The fear of sudden violence and uncertainty was moved. People were moving about and mixing freely. The Naga hostiles who had been living for long in forests returned to their villages and met their mothers, wives, brothers, sisters and children. There was reunion of families. The benefits of peace are welcome to the Nagas. There was a near unanimous desire for the prolongation of peace. The Chief Minister and a number of officials whom we met thought that the prolongation of peace was both to India's and Nagas' advantage. I might go further; the Chief Minister and the Ministers of Nagaland have been carrying on an onerous responsibility in difficult circumstances when brother was fighting the brother. They have conducted themselves with great patience and fortitude. They are men of

courage and conviction who have stood by India through rough times and have been careful about the welfare of the Nagas. The delegation felt heartened to hear their frank views and answers to questions put by the members. The Chief Minister had himself taken initiative in furthering the cause of peace. The Nagaland Ministry has been very helpful to the Indian Union during the progress of the peace talks and we trust that their fullest co-operation would be forthcoming in future also. Any solution of the Naga problem must be acceptable to all sections of the Nagas.

Now Mr Atal Behari Vajpayee raised certain points. About the delegation I have already dealt with. Then he raised the question of the policemen who are in prison. When we reached Nagaland this question was brought to us and we tried to find out all the facts. We came to know all the facts and when we came here I personally spoke to the Minister of External Affairs who is dealing with this problem to look into the matter and expedite the release of these people. But the difficulty is that the matter is *sub-judice*. They are being prosecuted in a court of law and once proceedings in a court of law have started they have to take their due course. I do hope that before long it will be possible for these people to get justice in the courts of law.

Before I end I would like to say a word about the Peace Mission people and in this connection I would like to invite the attention of the Members to one sentence in our Report.

"We regret to have to state that one of the members of the Peace Mission had been instrumental in publicising unconfirmed and provocative stories of alleged atrocities by the Army on the hostile Nagas. We impressed on the members to desist from such activities in future."

I only want to make one appeal here to this gentleman. The Peace Mission people are like Judges who are trying to solve a problem. A judge is not expected to side with one party or the other.

I would therefore appeal to the members of the Peace Mission to judge everything which comes before them objectively and come to their decisions and let it not be said that any of them was partial to this or that party. That is the only appeal I want to make in this House to the members of the Peace Mission. People here perhaps are not in a position to realise under what difficult circumstances the three members of the Peace Mission are working. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan may have his own views but nobody can ever doubt his patriotism or sincerity of purpose and I have no hesitation in saying that Jayaprakash Narayan is doing a fine work for the country and I would appeal to the hon. Members to give all support to him. As far as Shri Bimla Prasad Chaliha is concerned, he is one of those who had the privilege of administering Nagaland for some time. It goes to his credit that the people in Nagaland have shown full faith in him although he was working in very difficult circumstances and I do hope that nobody in this House will have any doubt about the role being played by the Chief Minister of Assam, Shri Bimla Prasad Chaliha as far as the affairs of the Peace Mission are concerned in finding a solution for the problem which has been there for so long.

SHRI K. DAMODARAN (Kerala) He has given the Nagas the right to secede.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA Well don't quote a sentence from here or there. The Peace Mission's proposals have to be looked at as a whole and if you read them as a whole you will come to only one conclusion that the Peace Mission wants to find a solution where the Nagas will have their due place in the Indian Union. I would like to make this appeal—let us forgive and forget. Utmost efforts have to be made to remove all the bitterness of the past. The forces of peace have to be consolidated. Bonds of friendship, faith and trust have to be created to achieve lasting peace. I would appeal to the Naga brethren to firmly grasp the hand of peace offered to them. I can assure them that Parliament stands for peace and for giving Nagaland its due

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

place within the Indian Union. May God guide us all who are brothers to the right path.

Thank you

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi): Madam, when the Bill was moved, it sounded so innocuous and non-controversial that I thought there would be no point in reiterating what we all believe in. It is somewhat surprising that the learned leader and a very responsible person, Mr. Vajpayee, brought in those things which had not better been brought in. The main point is, the situation in its entirety in Nagaland is delicate and in that delicate situation when delicate negotiations are going on, where it is a question of the sentiments of people and where a section of our population has been led to believe in a wrong path, every word written or uttered could create a wrong impression, create misunderstandings and it is exploited. Therefore, when Mr. Vajpayee, in all his sincerity, in all his honesty, raises a point on which he differs, the emphasis likely to be placed on these things is somewhat different. Whether it is a question of the trial of those soldiers—it is *sub judice* and I would not like to comment on that—or as sometimes we come across in newspapers a small incident overblown or taken out of context which is contradicted later on, the impression created is very different and it does great harm. I would draw your attention to a small incident which occurred some time back on the Nagaland-Assam border. The entire incident viewed now is entirely different from what was brought out in the earlier stage and that definitely causes misunderstanding. However small, the thing is seen through a magnifying lens and therefore our political maturity, our responsibility in this House is great. Even when something happens or something is done by those whose interests here or in Nagaland are against the creation of peaceful circumstances, we should be on our guard to see that we do not react in such a way that it does not behave our wisdom or our political maturity.

About the Parliamentary delegation's composition, etc I am not going to address myself, but Shri Vajpayee has mentioned one point about the recommendations of the delegation, that is why the words 'both India and Nagaland' were used rather than a different text. Now, I do not want to do any hair-splitting, but I think he will agree with me that the report has to be read as a whole. If you read the report as a whole, not one member of the delegation had ever any doubt about Nagaland continuing to be a part of the Indian Union or thought it to be anything else but as a part of the Indian Union. I would not like to go further into that. If any hair-splitting on account of English or on account of any legalistic expression is to be resorted to, I think it must not be looked into from that angle. I feel that the stage has come when in this country not only is it important for us to know more about Nagaland, its people and also their sentiments. It is also important, as I said earlier, that we must see to it that the peace which has come to that land after long sufferance, must continue. It is sometimes made out that peace might be utilised for something which may not be in the national interest. I submit, it is in our interests to see that peace is prevailing then government is functioning with developmental possibilities opening out and the trends of the talks continuing as they are I think it is in the interests of everybody in this country, including Nagaland, that peace must be permanent because it is in the permanence of peace that the better side of the Indian Union is seen. It is in the permanence of peace they realise that India stands for something which is valuable to everybody. It is in the interests of Nagaland and every other part of India to work together, to strive together, to struggle together to achieve something which is precious to us all. Sometimes it is said that we might hurry up the whole thing. I think it is a sign of impatience. The purpose today is to convince them and not to force them. Basically we must prove this fact that it is not only in theory that we say that they are our own people, but we must also show that they are our own people. For that patience is a must with a certain section of our people.

Therefore, we must try to wean them away from the wrong path by not shooting our way through, but by persistent, long talks, by patiently explaining and removing their doubts, if any.

Members of the Parliamentary Delegation and everybody else who had a chance of meeting them here, when some of them came here, had always emphasised that in our unity lies the progress of democracy and socialism, our secular character and the cause of justice. This has to be explained to them again and again and it is this face of India which they must see. Sometimes analogies may not be very much applicable, but I may say this that the tragedy has happened so many times in history that such talks have been prolonged for a long time. I would only draw your attention to the talks about Korea lasting a decade, talks about Austria lasting for ten years. If talks go on lasting for a long time I again plead that it should be no reason why we should suspend the peace talks. The delegation, which some friends have chosen to call as heterogeneous, to my mind, is a compliment because it is nothing but a good reflection of the composition of Parliament. It is in the heterogeneous character of the delegation as it is in the heterogeneous character of Parliament that the unity of India lies. They would think so. Members from different parties like the Communist Party, the Swatantra Party and the Congress were explaining to them in public as well as in private that their ultimate benefit and their own salvation was within the Indian Union. I think that was a convincing proof of it that it is not only one Party, the ruling Party or any section of the Indian Union which was trying to explain it to them, but it was the entire nation as a whole which felt that they have been misled by some misgivings.

I do not want to repeat but I only wish to pay my compliments to the Nagas as a whole for being lovable and brave, for being upright and honest and for doing what they felt was right and never trying to do something and say something different. They do not believe in saying one thing and doing another thing.

I must also pay a small compliment to the officers, both in the Army and outside, who are doing their duty there under hard circumstances. Particularly I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister here to the Frontier Service that is serving in that area of our nation. They are brave people drawn from all parts of the country. We were impressed deeply by the way they were serving there, whether he is the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner, or men running the secretariat. They are really a good cadre, through which much could be and has been achieved. It is unfortunate that the Nagas were divided into two for so long, but peace has done a lot to bring them together again. Shri Shilu Ao was able to travel along with his Ministers through Nagaland unescorted and when we met him in Mokokchung, he had travelled from Kohima to Mokokchung late in the night, because his vehicle had failed. Peace in the route was perfect and not a bullet had been shot since peace had been declared in Nagaland.

My friend, Mr. Bhargava, has explained the laudable role of the Peace Mission and I wish to join with him in that. The Peace Mission was formed and history has already been made. I would like to pay my humble homage to Mr. Chaliha and Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. They make us feel proud of them not only because they had been playing such a significant and heroic role in the freedom struggle of this country. Now, when the country met with a different type of circumstances these two people came forward and have done this. The rest of the country also knows what they have done as heroes. We are also proud of them, that two of our great citizens are so much respected, even by those who differ from us sometimes politically. Therefore, a great harm and injustice is done to them when in the press, or in the House sometimes, criticism is made about their role. I think it is very unjust to them. We do not appreciate under what circumstances they have to function. We try again to hair-split the Peace Mission's proposals. I would only like to submit to my friends that the Peace Mission's proposals have to be read as a whole, because even the hostile Nagas

(Special

[Shri I. K. Gujral]

have tried to split them into two parts and tried to take advantage of those clauses which suited them. The Peace Mission very bravely explained that their proposals were to be read as a whole. I am one of those who have every hope that good sense will prevail and very soon the Naga hostiles will come round that the proposals for peace will not only become permanent but they will also become active participants in the welfare of this nation. What they call their Parliament their so-called Parliament met at Wokha some time ago and they have not yet arrived at a decision. To my mind that is also one thing which would upset us because every group of political thinkers or workers try to act in a certain way. But I draw satisfaction from the fact that they have not rejected the peace proposals. Therefore when they have not rejected the Peace Mission's proposals the doors for negotiations remain open. We should wait and continue with the same patience which we have shown up till now. I think a prolonged peace which has also been demanded by the Nagaland Assembly unanimously a few days ago, should be conceded. It is in a peaceful atmosphere, in a prolonged peaceful atmosphere that, as I said earlier, not only the developmental activities will go on but also the halo of the underground Nagas will be lost. It is always the villagers who see them in *absentia* who tend to worship them. Once they see them in the open, once they try to see them clearly, I think we will be doing a good turn for peace. We should have a prolonged peace for a long time rather than do it in instalments month by month.

When this opportunity is lost, I also feel that they will get isolated because when the fruits of peace are seen people will start realising—and they have started realising—what India means and what joining India means. Therefore once you start the process of political thinking political debate in a group of people, the results are bound to be there. Wherever this delegation went we felt that even after three or four months of peace people had started saying openly and feeling that peace at any cost they must have

They have started feeling that the whole subject must be discussed and it was not out of hand that they were able to reject the Peace Mission's proposals. I feel that not only must peace continue but it should not be from month to month as has been demanded by them. I also feel and I submit that the hon. Minister might examine the possibilities of creating a better understanding between Nagaland and the rest of the country, and when I say better understanding I mean between people and people. It is very important that a delegation like the one that went last time in which I was also a participant should be repeated many times, so that more Members of this House and the other House have the opportunity of studying things at first hand. A press delegation also must go because here I must submit that unfortunately press has very little representation in that part of the country. Unfortunately they choose to function more from Shillong than from Kohima. Therefore, this is another thing that a press delegation must be organised and sent so that they can study things for themselves.

I would also like to say that more delegations from Nagaland must come to India not only of public men not only politicians but laymen who are interested in the welfare of that part of the country and see what is happening in India, and that way I am sure peace and understanding will be lasting. Also I feel that the hon. Minister might examine the possibility of giving a very substantial number of scholarships to students who come here and study. Above all I would suggest that the economic base of freedom must be considerably strengthened in Nagaland itself. Unfortunately for these ten years due to circumstances prevailing there it has not been possible to undertake developmental activities there on a large scale. The time has come when it must be done because—and I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this—one of the reasons we were told again and again why young men had gone underground was due to lack of employment potential. I feel that employment openings must be considerable and they should be offered jobs in every activity of

our national life so that they are absorbed in more constructive things in life

Before I sit down I should like to say, Madam, that our House should particularly keep three or four things in mind: that we are dealing with our own people, and therefore patience and understanding are necessary; that its proximity and accessibility to Pakistan and China is something which we should not ignore. Therefore, in settling this question the mischief that these two countries can possibly do and have done should always be kept in mind. I fear that some signs of Pakistan training the hostiles and also China trying to show its hand across the border are also visible, and I would like the hon. Minister to keep these things in view and to kindly see that with patience and understanding he solves the problem.

Madam, before I sit down I will not be doing my duty if I fail to offer my homage to the Ministry for the way they have handled Nagaland affairs. I feel that the External Affairs Ministry has shown tact, has shown foresight and has shown patience in dealing with this problem, and I wish all strength to them.

श्री चन्द्र शेखर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदया, वाजपेयी जी ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो भावना व्यक्त की है मैं उनका आदर करता हूँ। नागालैण्ड में हमारे 32 पुलिस के जवान जिनमें दो, तीन अधिकारी भी हैं, आज जेल के अन्दर हैं। उनको जेल में भेजने के पहले इन सारी बातों को ध्यान में नहीं रखा गया जिनको रखा जाना चाहिये था। ये लोग हमारे देश की सुरक्षा कर रहे हैं, जो कठिन जलवायु और दुर्गम पहाड़ियों में जमे हुए हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि हमारा परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय उनके मामले में जानकारी करेगा और इस बात की कोशिश करेगा कि उनको न्याय मिल सके। उनके साथ जो उचित व्यवहार होना चाहिये वह व्यवहार उन्हें मिलेगा।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ और और जिसके बारे में परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय से स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि पीस

मिशन जो काम कर रहा है, चाहे उसमें जय-प्रकाश नारायण जी हों, चाहे माइकल स्काट हों, चाहे चालिहा जी हों, उन्होंने इस काम को लिया है और इस काम को लेने में भारत सरकार की रजामन्दी है। वे लोग वहाँ पर जो काम कर रहे हैं वह भारत सरकार की रजामन्दी से कर रहे हैं और जिन कठिन परिस्थितियों में वे काम कर रहे हैं, जितना किया जाना चाहिये, उतना वे लोग कर रहे हैं। यद्यपि यह बात सही है कि पीस मिशन के एक सदस्य माइकल स्काट साहिब ने कुछ ऐसे काम किये हैं जिसका हम कभी भी समर्थन नहीं कर सकते हैं। लेकिन इसमें भी बड़े दुःख की बात यह है कि परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय के ऊपर नागालैण्ड की समस्या को चलाने की जिम्मेदारी है। अभी हमारे माननीय सदस्य श्री गुजगल ने इसके लिए परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय को बधाई दी है, लेकिन जिस तरह में परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय की कार्य करने की क्षमता है उसका देख कर मैं ऐसा समझता हूँ कि नागालैण्ड की समस्या को सुलझाने में एक मन्त्रालय कभी भी कामयाब नहीं हो सकता है। मेरा मतलब यह है कि जब कोई कठिन समस्या का समाधान करना होता है तो मन्त्रिमण्डल को और मन्त्रालय को मिल कर काम करना चाहिये और हर एक को इसके बारे में पूरी जानकारी होनी चाहिये। लेकिन आज परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय इस तरह में कार्य कर रहा है कि किसी कठिन समस्या का समाधान करना तो दूर रहा साधारण बातों का निर्वाह करना भी मुश्किल जान पड़ता है। जब मैं परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय के बारे में साधारण बात कहता हूँ तो मेरा कोई आक्षेप या कोई संकेत किसी अधिकारी की ओर नहीं है, मेरा संकेत तो मंत्रियों की ओर है। जिस तरह से परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय के मंत्री इस सदन में जवाब देते हैं उससे हमें आश्चर्य होता है। परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय ने जिस तरह का गुस्सा भर लिया है उसकी कार्यक्षमता को देखकर ऐसा लगता है कि वह कोई अच्छा उदाहरण औरों के लिए प्रस्तुत नहीं कर रहा है।

[श्री चन्द्र शेखर]

अभी पिछले दिनों नागालैण्ड की समस्या के बारे में जब चर्चा हो रही थी तब मैंने तीन बार माननीय उपमन्त्री महोदय का ध्यान इस ओर आकृष्ट किया था कि हिन्दुस्तान और बर्मा की सीमा के बीच आने जाने में कोई रोक नहीं है? दोनों सीमाओं की जो मिश्रित पापुलेशन है, नागरिक लोग हैं, क्या वे आ जा सकते हैं? मेरे तीन बार चेतावनी देने के बाद भी माननीय उपमन्त्री महोदय ने कहा कि ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है। लेकिन 7 दिन के बाद एक दूसरे सवाल के जवाब में उन्होंने कहा कि ऐसी परम्परा है। जब मैंने माननीय अध्यक्ष का ध्यान इस ओर आकृष्ट कराया, तो अध्यक्ष महोदय ने कहा कि इस मामले की जानकारी करूंगा और माननीय मन्त्री से कहूंगा कि वे इस बारे में सदन में वक्तव्य दें। लेकिन आज तक परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय की ओर से कोई वक्तव्य नहीं दिया गया है। आज भी जब मैंने परराष्ट्र मन्त्री जी का ध्यान एक सवाल की ओर खींचा और कहा कि मामला गम्भीर है, तो इस पर माननीय मन्त्री जी ने कहा कि इसमें गम्भीरता क्या है? मैं मानता हूँ कि वे सरकार के एक उच्च पदाधिकारी हैं लेकिन इस सदन के अन्दर जब कोई सदस्य एक बात कहता है तो उसका एक महत्व होता है। महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान उस प्रश्न की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिसको लेकर हमारे मन्त्री जी आज इस सदन में यह बिल लाये हैं। मैं यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय की काम करने की क्या क्षमता है। 19 तारीख को जब राज्य मन्त्री जी अपना बयान दे रही थी तो मैंने सवाल पूछा था और अगर आप इजाजत दें तो मैं उसको पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ :

"This question is very serious and I should like further clarification from the hon. Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs. Is it not a fact that the passport authorities objected to the procedure and they said that such passports should not be allowed to

Shiekh Abdullah and his entourage because they have not mentioned their nationality. The decision was taken at the highest level in the country and the rules of procedure for granting passports were waived by the highest men in the country. If so, what was the consideration and what was the political thing involved, because Sheikh Abdullah has been indulging in anti-Indian propaganda outside? Is it the intention of Government to grant passports by going out of their way to such persons who are indulging in anti-Indian propaganda? Is it the political expediency by which the Government is going to be guided?"

Madam, you were kind enough to seek further clarification.

माफ कीजियेगा, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, फिर आपने कहा।

"Is it the general practice that anyone could fill in the column in this vague manner?"

फिर जवाब श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन जी क्या देती हैं :

"No, it is not the general practice because the column specially asks whether you are a citizen by birth, by registration, by naturalisation, etc. Against that column Sheikh Abdullah and his party have written Kashmiri Muslims. The matter was referred to the Ministry. The Chief Passport Officer referred it to the Commonwealth Secretary, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. It is on their authority that the passport was granted."

मैं आपसे कहता हूँ, महोदय, कि यह इस सदन का अपमान है कि जान बूझ कर के परराष्ट्र मन्त्रालय के दो मन्त्री मिल जुल कर इस सदन की प्रतिष्ठा के विरुद्ध और इस सदन की मर्यादा का ख्याल किये बिना ऐसा जवाब देते हैं। जब

उन्से कहा जाता है कि अपने वक्तव्यों को सुधार लीजिये, तो हम को गम्भीरता दिखाई जानो है और हम को यह सिखाया जाता है कि कौन मामला कितनी जिम्मेदारी का है। मैं आपसे कहूंगा, महोदया, कि चाहे कोई विधेयक पास कर लिया जाय, चाहे कोई अधिकार इस परगण्टू मन्त्रालय को दे दिये जाये, इस निष्क्रियता इस अक्षमता इस अज्ञान के साथ अगर यह मन्त्रालय चलता रहा, तो परगण्टू का बड़ा समस्याओं को छोड़ दीजिए, यह नागालैंड की समस्या या कोई छोटी-से छोटी समस्या इस अज्ञान के वातावरण में, इस अक्षमता के वातावरण में अगर इस निष्क्रियता के वातावरण में कभी भी सुलझने वाली नहीं है। इसलिये मैं परगण्टू मन्त्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि वे अपने मन्त्रालय में कम से कम मन्त्री स्तर पर कार्य करने की क्षमता और कार्य करने की प्रणाली में परिवर्तन करें, यदि वे चाहते हैं कि अच्छी तरह से और सही ढंग से यह मन्त्रालय काम कर सके। धन्यवाद।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Madam Deputy Chairman, it is not my intention to go into any details I am very happy that the Bill before this honourable House has received almost unanimous support and all sections of the House are, I feel, for extending the life of this legislative measure by one year more. I personally would be very happy—and I am sure that the hon. Members of this House and in fact, the whole country would be very happy—if this matter gets resolved as a result of the efforts that are now being made to find a satisfactory solution of this problem and to realise that objective, every effort has to be made and all energies have to be concentrated, and that is what is being done at the moment. But it is necessary that the life of this Act should be extended by one year more so that necessary steps might be taken to curb any illegal or unlawful activities. And it is the normal duty and responsibility of the Government to take suffi-

cient corrective action, sufficient punitive action, to prevent any party or any person from indulging in any unlawful activity. From that point of view, there is nothing further for me to add because there has been almost unanimous support for this Bill.

In the course of the debate, the general question of the Naga situation, the efforts of the Peace Mission and the present conditions prevailing in Nagaland have been mentioned. In this connection, I would like to congratulate the Members of both Houses who went to Nagaland, even at some personal discomfort. They went round the various places, met many people and they have made their observations which are contained in the Report, a copy of which has already been placed on the Table of the Houses. The broad assumption made by the hon. Members of both Houses of Parliament is in favour of continuing conditions of peace in Nagaland, that efforts should continue to be made to find a satisfactory solution by talks, by discussion, that peace might be maintained there and conditions might be created which might infuse a new spirit in the minds of our Naga brethren, a spirit in which they feel that they have everything to gain by remaining, by continuing to remain, in India and that they might finally abandon any idea of a secessionist character. And in this connection, hon. Members, Shri M. P. Bhargava and Shri Gujral, have given a very clear elucidation of the conditions there and the efforts that are being made to find a satisfactory solution.

Now, two or three points only require some reply from me. One was about a case which is pending against certain members of the police force. This has been referred to by my friend, Shri Vajpayee, and it has also been mentioned by my friend, Shri Chandra Shekhar. This is a matter which is *sub judice* and it will not be proper for me to make any comments upon the merits of this case. The matter is being examined and looked into according to the normal pro-

[Sardar Swaran Singh]
cedures by the judicial tribunals or the law courts, and therefore it is not proper for me to offer any comments upon the merits of this case

The second point which Shri Vajpayee referred to was about the statement of Shri Chaliha. That has been amply replied to by Shri Bhargava and also by Shri Gujral that the dominant note, the central theme of the Peace Mission's proposals are that the Nagas, of their own volition, decided to continue to remain in India. That is the interpretation which is there and therefore there should be no misgiving or any doubt on that score

The third point that was raised was about the status of the Peace Mission. It is not a Government organisation although they are functioning with the permission of the Government. And the opinions that have been expressed by the members, at any rate by Shri Chaliha and Shri Jaiprakash Narayan are quite complimentary, and I would also like to add my own voice that the members of the Peace Mission have done a good work and we hope that their efforts will succeed and that peace will be restored on a permanent basis in this troubled part of our country whose people are a fine people a people who have got their own special culture. They are our own brethren. We have therefore to create confidence in their minds and win their hearts

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR, I feel, has been a little too hard on us and I would rather not reply to him but I would only appeal to him that in things of this nature which are difficult, delicate and complicated all efforts should be directed towards their solution and he should progressively forget that he used to sit in the opposition. Now he is a member of our party and he can afford to be a little less hard. But it is not our custom to say harsh things to members of our own party. So I would rather not reply to the rather trenchant criticism which he was good enough to level against me and my colleague. This matter was not relevant, but I did not want to object because that was a separate issue

altogether. In any case, I hope that he will be a little more generous and will bring about a little more of understanding than continuing to pursue these fruitless exercises which do not yield any results.

Thank you

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is—

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

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill

Clause 2 was added to the Bill

Clause 1 the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH Madam, I move

"That the Bill be passed"

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MOTION RE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST CERTAIN CHIEF MINISTERS AND OTHER MINISTERS OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Before we take up the motion may I inform the House that 3 hours have been allotted? But I shall call upon the Minister to reply at 5.30 P.M. Every effort will be made to accommodate those who have given their names. But I also would request those who participate in this debate to co-operate and see that they restrict themselves to the time limit

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) Madam Deputy Chairman, before I move the Motion I want to bring to your kind notice that the Prime Minister is not here in this House. Since his statement is being taken into consideration I expected that