

The Prime Minister has quoted me as saying that "he admitted to me that there were three groups, large groups with large numbers involved, within the Opposition who did not support their nomination. But he said you should not bother about these people". I am sorry to have to say that I did not say anything of the kind.

When I saw the Prime Minister at 11 A.M. on the 27th, I went specifically to plead with her not to make any nomination from among the Congress Party. I told her that I was authorised to negotiate this matter on behalf of all seven Opposition parties. When she mentioned that several people had been to her to say that they did not accept Mr. Kunte, I asked her to tell me who those people were. She said she was not at liberty to mention their names as they did not wish their names to be mentioned. I told her that this was very strange and requested her not to take any notice of such unauthorised persons. I assured her that Opposition unity was there and would, in any event be re-established completely by the time we met her at 5 P.M. that afternoon.

I am sorry that the Prime Minister also told the House that "the position last night was not at all clear" after all of us including Mr. Gopalan and Mr. Ananda Nambiar of the Left Communist Party, had specifically told her at meeting with her at her initiative at 5 P.M. that afternoon that the Opposition was completely united behind Mr. Kunte.

12.33 hrs.

ARMED FORCES (SPECIAL POWERS) CONTINUANCE BILL

Mr. Speaker: Shri Chagla.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhas Singh): On behalf of Shri M. C. Chagla, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to continue the

Armed Forces (Special Powers) Regulation, 1958, for a further period, be taken into consideration".

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) : संसद और सेना को एक किये दे रहे हो ।

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to continue the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Regulation, 1958, for a further period, be taken into consideration".

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा सुझाव है कि इस विधेयक को बाद में लिखा जाये और ख़ास को बहुत को पहले ख़त्म किया जाये ।

Mr. Speaker: We have one hour for this. Later we shall continue with the discussion on the Food situation.

श्री छटल बिहारी बाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कौन से मंत्री यह विधेयक पेश कर रहे हैं ? वह मंत्री कहां हैं ?

डा० राम सुमन सिंह : मैं श्री बागला की तरफ से यह बिल पेश कर रहा हूँ ।

श्री छटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : क्या श्री बागला ने इसको अधिकार दिया है कि यह उनको तरफ से यह विधेयक पेश करें या वह अपनी तरफ से पेश कर रहे हैं ?

डा० राम सुमन सिंह : कोई भी मंत्री पेश कर सकता है ।

Shri Ganesh Ghosh (Calcutta South): I want to speak on this.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Indrajit Gupta.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore): I would request you to send for the Minister. Otherwise, there is no point in speaking.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kandrapara): Since the Minister is not here, let the debate on the food situation be taken up first.

Shri Ganesh Ghosh: I want to speak on this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: We shall take it up now. The Prime Minister is also here.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: No Minister is to make a speech?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Who will reply?

Shri Namblar (Tiruchirappalli): Shri Ganesh Ghosh is already on his legs.

Shri Shri Chand Goel (Chandigarh): I want to submit that the suggestion made by Mr. Limaye be adopted, because in the absence of the Minister who is piloting the Bill, it will not be proper, because.....

Mr. Speaker: You are repeating what has been said. All the Ministers, including the Prime Minister, are here. I am sure they are going to take notes and will reply. Therefore, I call Mr. Indrajit Gupta.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I do not know who is going to reply to this debate, because he could authorise Dr. Ram Subhag Singh to move the Bill, but he cannot be authorised to reply to the debate I am quite sure.

Is it your wish that I should speak?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, because all of them are there, they will take notes, and one of them will reply.

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): As a matter of fact, Mr. Chagla should explain to the House why he is late.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): May I offer my apologies? I just thought that papers were being laid and that Mr. Masani had to make his statement. Therefore,

I came rushing and I am out of breath. I apologise to the House.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: This Bill seeks, in essence, to continue the special powers which were conferred on the officers of the armed forces to enable them, as is stated in the statement of Objects and Reasons, to aid effectively the civil power in the disturbed areas of Kohima and Mokochung of the Naga Hills and Tuensang area. That means that this Bill is a measure which seeks to continue to pursue a military solution of this problem. My contention is that it is regrettable that the first measure which this Government is taking immediately after the election is once again to seek not a political but a military solution of this problem.

We all remember that before the elections were held, the last round of talks between the representatives of the hostile Naga Government and the Government of India concluded some time in the last week of January. After those talks, it was stated on behalf of the Government of India that the air of mutual suspicion had blown over. This statement appeared in the press. It was stated on the other hand by a spokesman of the hostile Nagas that although they adhered to and would never give up their demand for secession and for a completely independent Naga State, nevertheless they would talk and continue to talk until a settlement was reached.

It seems that after the last round of talks was held, both sides had arrived at a position where they were quite eager and keen to see that instead of the resumption of hostilities, further talks and peaceful negotiations should be continued. I say this because it is well known that there are certain sections of public opinion in this country, certain quarters who are violently and publicly opposed to the periodical extension of the cease-fire truce. There are some people who keep on saying that such a cease-fire agreement is only helping the hostile Nagas to carry

on all sorts of activities under cover of this cease-fire, and they demand that a firm policy should be adopted by the Government of India, meaning thereby, I presume, that force should be used in a more determined way. But I would just ask the hon. Minister to share with this House his feelings as to whether this cease-fire agreement and the subsequent series of talks that have taken place have not, in actual fact, helped greatly to pacify the situation. In fact, instead of bringing new strength to the underground Naga hostiles, it has made their attitude somewhat more flexible. Those who study the Naga problem know in recent months there is evidence of the fact that some sort of difference of opinion or some division has been generated between what may be called the hard-liners among the underground Nagas who want the resumption of hostilities and those who are eager for a political settlement. There is evidence that among the rank and file of the hostile Nagas there is a keen desire now that there should be further peaceful talks so that some settlement can be reached. Even last November, a circular issued by the so called Federal government of Nagaland was widely publicised and it reads, *inter alia*, as follows: "While asserting that the Nagas maintain the position that there can be no question of any departure from their basic stand whatever may be the course of future talks, deadlock or no deadlock, there can be no other course than peaceful means". In other words, Nagas shall not choose the path of war. In other words, the situation at the moment, especially after the general elections in any opinion was particularly ripe for the Government of India to seize the initiative and for pressing forward on the path of reconciliation. During the last few months, there have been only some scattered and sporadic incidents of hostilities in an area which previously used to be so much disturbed and in this House too we had almost every day references to large scale activities taking place there. We all had hoped

that that phase is over. Only sporadic incidents are occurring in certain parts of that area. I am not taking about the Mizo hills at the moment. These incidents are in certain parts of Kohima district only and in Ukhrul area. There have been no recent reports of any major clashes; Government itself has not made any such allegation that the Nagas infiltrated into Pakistan or returned from there with arms and so on. In view of all these developments which I have narrated, perhaps they themselves have decided not to rely any further on Pakistani assistance as they had been doing in the past. It is a good thing. There is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that in these hostilities, the Nagas had received any kind of assistance from China. What I mean to say is that in the new atmosphere generated in this country after the General elections, which has been such a mighty and massive experiment in democracy, was it not a fit moment for the Government to come forward with a new initiative in the direction of further reconciliation and try to win over the Nagas as friends, as members of the great Indian family. I am sorry to say that instead of doing that, they are keeping quite. In the President's Address delivered to Parliament a few days ago, there is no mention even by accident—it cannot be by accident it must be deliberate—of the Naga problem. No appeal is addressed to the Naga people. On the contrary, they have come forward with this Bill after the general elections and this Bill speaks in the usual terms of the Armed Forces special powers; this is again handled by the External Affairs Ministry so that the whole world can know and the Nagas can know that we continue to treat them as an external problem as though they have nothing to do with our own family of the Indian nation. I am sorry that this kind of psychological atmosphere persists in the ranks of the Government. They have lost an opportunity for which the situation was ripe now, when they could have made an entirely new approach.

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

Therefore, I say that the psychological origin of this Naga revolt must never be forgotten by the Government. However grave provocation may be, it is essential to understand that this so-called rebel government is the child of continued and bitter and genuine also, I would say, feeling of frustration on the part of the Nagas. It is born out of years and years, long before Independence, of isolation, political, economic, social and moral isolation in which they were kept, through the deliberate propaganda against India carried on pre-eminently by British officials and non-officials. We all know that. That is the historical background fact of this problem. But the tragedy of the situation is that even in the 20 years since Independence we have failed to break this isolation and that is why this problem persists.

Things have been further complicated, I would say, by the fact that very bitter memories have been aroused among the Nagas by certain excesses and atrocities which have been committed; it is no use trying to deny them; they were committed at one time, not now. During the worst period, when the hostilities, were at their height, certain excesses were committed by the security forces in that area; in the course of their operations against the rebels, a very large number of innocent man, women and children, ordinary villagers, had to suffer. Whether it was justified or not, it is for the Government to say. But the memory of that remains, rankles, in the minds of the Nagas, and it will require a very special effort, almost a superhuman effort, on the part of India to erase those memories, to inspire faith and confidence in the minds of the Nagas and try to win them back into the great family of which they are definitely members, according to us.

Therefore, I would say that this task of reconciliation and the task of establishing permanent peace has never

in the past been and will never in the future be accomplished by relying on the bureaucratic State machinery. They may build a few roads or set up a school or a hospital here and there, but, however important that may be, the mere physical development of that area can never be a substitute for the complete emotional integration which is required before the Nagas can really feel that they are part and parcel of India. The fight has to be carried on not only in the jungles and the hills; it has to be carried on inside the hearts of every Nagas by us, to win the Nagas over, to re-inspire confidence, and it will not be done by this kind of studied negligence of their problem. I say it is studied negligence, by the mere fact that this kind of Bill, which is essentially a military measure, should have been brought forward by the Defence Ministry and not by the External Affairs Ministry in the first place. This kind of Bill is brought forward, may be it is necessary, for certain security reasons, but, at the same time, no Naga will omit to see that not a single mention was made about the Nagas in the President's Address. No appeal has been directed to them even in the new situation prevailing after the general election. Now new initiative has been taken for reconciliation, of pursuing further the path of peaceful negotiations, and in the first measure adopted after February, this Bill is talking about special powers for the armed forces, talking about it as though it is some external matter to India.

Therefore, I am very sorry that we have to make these points in order to show that the Government of India seems to have learnt precious little from the great changes which have taken place and which have been brought about by the people's verdict. That people's verdict is also an expression of the people's lack of faith in the way in which the Government has handled this Naga problem. Despite all the difficulties,

It is not to be dealt with purely as a problem of military security. It is basically a political problem and I hope the Government will address itself to that.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रश्न को एक तो भारतीय जनता की दृष्टि से दूसरे नागा प्रदेश और वहाँ के लोगों की दृष्टि से और तीसरे हमारे उत्तर-पूर्व इलाके की दृष्टि से देखना चाहिए। सब से पहले मैं भारतीय जनता की दृष्टि से एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस देश की सेना अन्दरूनी मामलों के लिए लगातार और बार-बार इस्तेमाल की जाती है वह सेना बाहरी हमलों में नाकाफी, नाकाबिल और कमजोर पड़ जाया करती है। जब किसी देश की सेना लगातार देश के अन्दर शान्ति स्थापन करने के लिए अपने ही लोगों के ऊपर गोली चलाया करती है तो फिर उस के हाथ और दिल परदेशी हमलावरों के ऊपर गोली चलाने में कुछ कमजोर हो जाया करते हैं। इसलिए सब से पहली बात जो इस सरकार को सीखनी चाहिए वह यह कि इस देश की सेना को जि ना कम हो सके अन्दरूनी मामलों में इस्तेमाल किया जाय। जिस तरीके से पूर्वोत्तर इलाके में लगातार सेना का इस्तेमाल चालू रखा है और केवल इस्तेमाल नहीं बल्कि उन के अधिकारियों को लगातार बढ़वाने की कोशिश कर रखी है उसे बन्द करना चाहिए। मैं तो सरकार से चाहूँगा कि उन के पास अपनेको हथियार है, पूरा साजीरात हिन्द पड़ा हुआ है पूरा जास्ता फौजदारी पड़ा हुआ है पूरे पांचो हथियार पड़े हुए हैं और वह जो चाहे कर सकते हैं। सिर्फ बड़े लोगों के लिए नजरबंदी कानून होता है साधारण आदिमियों के लिए तो पिछले 100-150 वर्ष से एक, एक नजरबन्दी की 107, 109, न जाने कितनी पड़ी हुई हैं तो वैसे अवस्था में कभी भी पुलिस, पलटन, सेना के अधिकारों की जो उनके पास प्रसारित होते हैं उन से क्या अवस्थाएँ बने नहीं चाहिए। इस सब

से भी मैं एक बात कहना चाहूँगा कि जब कभी किसी अधिकार को ज्यादा शक्तिवार देने का कोई प्रस्ताव आये तो बिल्कुल व्यवहारिक, स्वाभाविक और स्वयं स्फूर्ति की भावना से मन में एक बात जगानी चाहिए कि ऐसे प्रस्ताव को फेंक दो इस से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रखना चाहिए। यह हमारे अधिकारों को कुंठित करता है। यह हमारे देश को कमजोर बनाता है। विदेशी हमलावरों के सामने रद्दी पड़ जाता है। मैं एक बार यह कई बार कह चुका हूँ। मैं भी उस इलाके में दो, तीन बार गिरफ्तार किया गया सिद्ध जाने के कारण, जाने की इच्छा के कारण। सीमा तक गया और शूट से पुलिस ने मुझे गिरफ्तार कर लिया तब मैं ने कहा कि देखो मुझ जैसे निहत्थे आदिमी को, कमजोर आदिमी को आप आसानी से गिरफ्तार कर लेते हैं....

श्रीमती तरकेश्वरी सिन्हा (बाढ़) : आप और कमजोर ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कमजोर तो हूँ ही तरकेश्वरी जी अगर आप बगल में होती तो मैं भी शक्तिशाली बन जाता। इतनी ज्यादा गिरफ्तारी करते हो यानी देश के बाहरी हिस्से से आये हुए आदिमी को निहत्थे को गिरफ्तार करते हो तो फिर नतीजा होगा कि उत्तर से जब शक्तिशाली पलटन लेकर परदेशी आयेगा तब उस के सामने घुटने टेक देगी और बिल्कुल बही हुआ। तो पहली बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि घुटने टेक दिये और इस बेगर्मी से घुटने टेके थे कि इस सारे सदन को और मुझ को शर्म आती है। घुटने तो उन लोगों ने टेके थे लेकिन शर्म मुझ को आती है। इतना बुरा मामला हुआ या तो पहली बात तो मुझे यह कहनी है कि भारत को सेना को अन्दर जनता के ऊपर इस्तेमाल नहीं करने देना चाहिए न उस को बढ़ाने के लिए न उस के ऊपर गोली चलाने के लिए उस इलाके में। अब रह जाता है दूसरे नागा लोगों का मामला तो नागा लोगों

[बा० राय मथोहर सोहिया]

के मामले में श्री मुप्ता की बात का सम्बन्ध करते हुए कहना चाहूंगा कि मैं ने स्वयं राष्ट्रपति जी को जब मैं एक बार मणिपुर जेल में बन्ध था तो मणिपुर जेल में, मुझे उन लड़कियों के नाम मिले थे जिनके ऊपर भारत की सेना के लोगों ने बलात्कार किया था । मैं ने उन नामों को जनता को नहीं बताया लेकिन राष्ट्रपति जी को मणिपुर जेल से मैं ने वह नाम लिखकर भेज दिये थे । यह सब भ्रष्टाचार हो चुका है । यह भ्रष्टाचार हरगिज होना नहीं चाहिए । आखिर को यह मैं मानता हूँ कि भारत गता को अपने विद्रोही लड़कों और लड़कियों को सजा देने का पूरा अधिकार है और उसे सजा देनी चाहिए मगर उसे यह कभी नहीं भलना चाहिए कि वह लड़का है और वह मा है और इसलिए उस के ऊपर सजा किस तरीके की होनी चाहिए । साधारण तौर पर जो लोग विद्रोह करते हैं उन के ऊपर सजा होनी चाहिए और जो विद्रोह में नहीं लगे हुए हैं उन के साथ भ्रष्टाचार होना चाहिए ।

मुझे एक बात कहनी है कि जो विद्रोह करते हैं वह लोग इधर, उधर छाप मार कर जंगल में भाग जाते हैं । उन का सेना पीछा नहीं करती चबडाती है पुलिस वाले पीछा नहीं करते चबडाते हैं, साबते हैं जंगल है अंधेरा है त जाने कहा किस जगह फस जायेंगे । जब कभी कोई नागा भ्रष्टाचार पूर्वोत्तर के लोग बम फेंकते हैं, बस बल्य करते हैं, गोली चलाते हैं, सिपाही मारते हैं तो ऐसे मौके पर मुझे पूरा पता है भारतीय सेना भ्रष्टाचार पुलिस के लोग उन का पीछा करते हुए चबडाते हैं । वह जगहों में नहीं जाते और वह कहते हैं कि बड़ा हथ कैसे जायेंगे ? लेकिन जहाँ साधारण जनता आसानी से मिल सकती है, बसला उन के ऊपर चुकाया करते हैं यह हमेशा से प्रवृत्ति बली आई है इसलिए यह बिलकुल बन्द हो जाना चाहिए । मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि जब कभी कोई लोग बम, पिस्तौल, बलूक और बड़े बड़े विस्फोटक

वस्तुओं को लेकर भारत की सत्ता के ऊपर हमला करे तो उन को प्रायः सजा दीजिये । सजा दीजिये, खाली सजा देने के लिए नहीं बल्कि उन को भारत के अन्दर शामिल रखने के लिए लेकिन जब उन को सजा नहीं दे पाते हो, चाहे किसी कारण से हो, कमजोरी के कारण हो भ्रष्टाचार और किसी कारण से तो बदला दूसरे के ऊपर मत चुकाया करो । साधारण जनता के ऊपर बदला मत चुकाया करो । साधारण जनता को इन लोगों ने जो एक तरीका रखा है ललचाने का, प्रलोभन देने का, मैं पक्का नहीं जानता कि आजकल वहाँ पर उस इलाके में मजदूरी को क्या मजदूरी दी जाती है लेकिन मैंने सुना है कि सड़क बगैर बनाने के लिए दिन में ४ रुपया, ७ रुपया, ६ रुपया ९ रुपया और १० रुपये तक दे दिये जाते हैं यह सोचकर कि अगर हम वैसे ज्यादा बाट देंगे तो वह हमारे बड़े भक्त बन जायेंगे । यह उन्होंने न सिर्फ नागा प्रदेश में किया है न सिर्फ कश्मीर में किया है, न सिर्फ पूर्वोत्तर में किया है बाकी सब जगह किया है क्योंकि शायद उन का यह स्वभाव है सोचते हैं कि जब पैसा किसी को दे दोगे आदमी आखिर अपने स्वभाव से दूसरे के स्वभाव का निर्णय कर लेता है । पैसा मिल जाने पर जैसे यह लोग खुद खरा हो जाया करते हैं वैसे ही सोचते हैं कि उन इलाकों के लोगों को ऊंची मजदूरी दे देंगे तो फिर यह लोग खरा हो जायेंगे और हमारे भक्त बन जायेंगे । यह तरीका हमारी सब सीमाओं के इलाकों में बिलकुल गलत साबित हुआ है । लोगों का मन पैसे से नहीं लिया जाता, लोगों का मन जुल्म से नहीं लिया जाता । प्रलोभन और जुल्म यह इनके हथियार हैं । यह दो हथियार इन के हाथों से अभ्यक्ष महोदय प्रायः किसी तरीके से छिन-वाधे और दूसरे हथियारों को दीजिये । मैं सब में बड़ी बात यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि नागा इलाके में पैसा बांट भ्रष्टाचार के लोगों की

प्रकृति को लेने की कोशिश इस तरीके से नहीं करनी चाहिए जिस तरीके से उन्होंने राजस्थान और उत्तर प्रदेश में कुछ स्वतंत्र लोगों को बैसा बांट करके अपनी सरकार बनाने की कोशिश की है। यह सब जगह नहीं कामयाब हुआ करता। दो, चार, दस के लिए कामयाब हो जाय लेकिन जहाँ लाखों का मामला होता है वहाँ यह कामयाब नहीं हुआ करता। माननीय चागला साहब यह बात अगर समझ जाय तो अच्छा होगा।

इसी तरीके से मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूँगा इस नामा प्रदेश और पूर्वोत्तर इलाके के बारे में कि वहाँ के लोगों के दिमाग और दिल में क्या बातें घसी हुई हैं। इसी सदन में एक बार एक पत्रक रखा गया था सरकार की तरफ से जो मीडो के लालडोंग साहब ने हिन्दू ऐलिया के सुकण साहब को लिखा था। उस पत्रक से साफ़ साबित होता था कि यह लोग अपने को भारतीय समझते ही नहीं हैं। यह नामा वाले भी अपने को भारतीय समझते ही नहीं। यह समझते हैं कि हम लोग तो कहीं दक्षिण चीन से आये हुए लोग हैं। यहाँ बस गये हैं, परदेसी हैं, भारत से हमारा कोई सम्बन्ध है नहीं। जब इतिहास में इन को यही बात सिखाई जाती है तब कैसे आप इन के घन्दर नई भावनाएं जगा सकते हो? इस में सब से बड़ा हाथ रहा है अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यशाही का। अंग्रेजों ने इस देश को छिन्न-भिन्न करने के लिए राजकीय रूप से छिन्न-भिन्न करने के लिए उन्होंने इस की भावना के रूप में पहले छिन्न-भिन्न किया, अलग-अलग इलाकों को अलग-अलग भावना दे दी। देखो तुम लोग एक जाति के नहीं हो, तुम लोग कई बंशों के हो, कई कुलों के हो, कोई चीन से आये हो, कोई भिन्न से आये हो, कोई धरत से आये हो, कोई कहीं और से आये हो और उस सारे इलाके में आज भी यह घमण्डा-धंकी हुई है कि यह दक्षिण चीन से आये हुए लोग हैं।

13 hrs.

मुझे तो बड़ा ताज्जुब होता है कि अंग्रेज साम्राज्यशाही ने जो काम किया था वह अपने मतलब से किया था इस देश को तोड़ने के लिये किया था लेकिन की काम उन्होंने किया और फिर बाद में विदेशी पादरियो ने उस काम को बढ़ाया इतिहास की पुस्तकें इस ढंग से लिखी उस काम को इस सरकार ने भी चालू रखा है। इस सरकार की इतिहास की पुस्तकें भी इस ढंग की हैं जिस से इस देश के लोग कभी समझ ही नहीं पाते कि वे इस देश के हैं वह अलग अलग इलाकों के साथ अपनी समता अपने स्नेह अपने नातों को जोड़ लिया करते हैं। तो जब कहीं लाखों लोग अपने सम्बन्ध इस तरह से जोड़ लिया करते हैं तो उस सम्बन्ध को सुधारने के लिये इतिहास दूसरे ढंग से लिखा जाना चाहिए। इस को माननीय मंत्री साहब पहले नहीं समझ पाये थे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस पर बहुत हो चुकी है। मेहरबानी कर के आप यही मत कह दीजियेगा कि मुझे याद है। वह नहीं है। आप ने अपने राष्ट्रीय लोगों से इतिहास लिखाने के लिये कोई काम नहीं किया। न तो गौरव की गाथा गाने से काम चलेगा न निन्दा की बातें कहने से काम चलेगा। असलियत बतलानी पड़ेगी कि वह क्या है। आज इतिहास की असलियत बतलाई नहीं जा रही है। असलियत की बात यह है कि अब हमें अपनी कमजोरियों को देखना है।

मैं इस वक्त हिन्दुओं के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दुओं की बड़ाई की बात नहीं कहना चाहता। वह हिन्दू छोटा होता है जो हिन्दू धर्म के बड़प्पन की गाथा गाया करता है। मुझे इस वक्त उस की कुछ कमजोरियों को बतलाना है। सब से बड़ी कमजोरी यह है कि हिन्दू अपने को इतना निराला इतना ऊँचा समझता है कि किसी और के साथ सहकार करने में, उठने बैठने में, खाने पीने में, शादी विवाह करने में, सभ्यता है कि उस का मान कुछ

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

घट गया है। नतीजे क्या होते हैं कि इस नागा या पूर्वोत्तर इलाके के लोगों को ऐसा लगता है कि यह आदमी तो बड़ा घमण्डो है, यह अपने को बड़ा ऊँचा समझता है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ, हालांकि यह उन के दायरे का नहीं, बहुत बड़ा काम है, लेकिन एक बड़े देश के मंत्री बने हो, कि क्या खाली पलटन को इस्तेमाल करके काम करोगे या चाहोगे . . .

Mr. Speaker: It is past 1 O'Clock. He can continue his speech in the afternoon, if he wants. Otherwise, if he can finish it in a minute or two he can do it now.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं जल्दी ही खत्म करता हूँ, या फिर जैसा आप कहें।

Mr. Speaker: If he will take more time he can speak after lunch.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं यह कह रहा था कि इस बड़े देश को सम्भालने के लिये जरूरत है कि जरा बड़े दिल से सोचा जाये, छोटे-मोटे तरीके से काम नहीं चलेगा। मैं जानता हूँ, और आप यह समझ लेना माननीय मंत्री जी, कि जब मैंने हिन्दू शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया तो इस ढंग से किया कि आप को भी मैं ने हिन्दू समझ कर ही कहा है कि संकीर्ण बात कर के काम नहीं चलेगा। उठना बैठना, छूना छाना, खाना पीना अलगाव, यह बड़ी बुरी आदत पड़ गई है। किसी और की औरत लेने में हिन्दू को बड़ा मजा आता है, लेकिन अपनी बहन देने में ज्यादा घबराया करता है।

नागा और पूर्वोत्तर इलाके में आज बहुत सी बातें हुई हैं। एक चीज मैं और भी बतला दूँ कि जो भी यहां से लड़कियां या लड़के गये हैं और उन्होंने वहां सम्बन्ध

करने चाहे हैं तो आप ने रुकावट की है। इस वक्त में एक एक कर के किस्से नहीं बतलाऊंगा हालांकि बीसों मेरे पास हैं, लेकिन रुकावटें डाली गई हैं, और पूरा पूर्वोत्तर इलाका इतना खिगड़ा हुआ है कि अगर इस को एक व्यापक दृष्टि से नहीं सुलझाया गया, खाली पुलिस और पटलन वगैरह से ही इस को दबाया गया तो मैं आप से साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तो वह इलाका अलग राज्य की मांग कर रहा है भारत संघ के अन्दर, लेकिन बाद में मामले और आगे बढ़ जायेंगे। परदेश के लोगों ने आंखें लगा रखी हैं। और लोगों ने आंखें लगा रखी हैं। खाली चीन की आंखें नहीं लगी हुई हैं। मुझे तो ताज्जुब होता है कि अमरीका कम्बख्त वहां क्यों आंखें लगाये हुए है। चीन अमरीका और न जाने कौन कौन देश, रूप वगैरह सब आंखें लगाये हुए हैं कि कहीं यह देश टूटे तो हम को भी जरा झपटने का मौका मिल जाये। अगर इस इलाके को आप ठीक करना चाहते हैं तो इस बिल को आप वापस लीजिये और मेहरबानी करके वहां के दिल को और यहां के दिल को मिलाने के लिये कोई और तरीका अपनाइये।

Mr. Speaker: The programme for the afternoon will be as follows. Shri Ranjeet Singh will speak on the Armed Forces Bill and then the Minister will reply. Because, we have to begin the food debate after that. After the food debate, if there is time we will take up the discussion on the President's Address. Otherwise, we will take it up tomorrow.

Shri Ganesh Ghose: I also want to speak tomorrow on the Armed Forces Bill.

Mr. Speaker: But your name is not there in the chits that I have with me. Perhaps you are referring to the President's Address.

Shri Ganesh Ghose: No, Armed Forces Bill.

श्री सुवशीराज जाधव (बारामती) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने कूट के लिये कितने
घंटे दिये हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: It all depends upon the time taken today.

Shri Tulsidas Jadhav: Please give a whole day for it.

Mr. Speaker: I will give one more hour. Let us see the progress. If many of you want to speak on this and more time is given to it, to that extent the time at our disposal for the other discussion will be cut.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: There are very few Members who want to speak. You can allow one or two more.

Mr. Speaker: To that extent, you will lose time on food debate. Anyway, Shri Ranjeet Singh will speak and if anybody else wants to speak after him, I have no objection. But, to that extent, the time on food debate will be cut. After this Bill is passed, we will take up the motion on food situation in the country.

We will adjourn now and meet again after lunch at 14.00 hrs.

13.05 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at fourteen of the Clock.

[**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** in the Chair]

Shri Ranjeet Singh (Khalilabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this is the ninth year that this Act is being extended year by year. It is again a tragic affair that in spite of assurances that as soon as possible the entire problem would be given over to the Home Ministry, it is the Minister of External Affairs still moving the Bill. The very fact that this is being treated as a problem of the Ex-

ternal Affairs Ministry. I will request the indulgence of the External Affairs Minister; may the hon. Minister be pleased to hear; Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, you are not listening and he does not want to listen; what is the use of my speaking?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I beg the hon. Member's pardon.

Shri Ranjeet Singh: I crave the indulgence of the hon. Minister. My voice is the humble voice of the Armed Forces. I happen to be a representative of the army who has come into the Lok Sabha and I request that you would pay more attention now to the Opposition. There are people with personal experience of every department. You had an ex-guard of the railways tearing down the Railway Minister yesterday. So, I request you to listen to first-hand experience.

As I was saying, it is a tragic affair that the Naga problem, which started as a mere spark, was permitted to grow into a conflagration unmanageable. It was permitted to grow into this conflagration by the incompetence of the Government, by a recalcitrant attitude, by an attitude of murder and treason.

There was a group in Nagaland which demanded a separate State, separate from the Union of India. By no stretch of imagination could anybody believe that a patriotic government would concede this demand or would even negotiate with people who are demanding such a separate State and a break from the Union; but our Government gave quarter to those people and the problem kept on growing year by year.

You use the army; you extend the powers of the army, rather extend this Act, so that the problem may be finally finished but problem keeps on growing; the conflagration keeps on spreading to other areas also.

It is not that we do not support the Bill, but we say that it is not a

[Shri Ranjeet Singh]

problem that can be solved merely by the use of the Army. The entire idea of using the Army in such a condition is misconceived. When you use the Army in order to suppress a rebellion over such a wide area, you have to concede two factors, firstly, either you do not limit the powers of the Army at all and let it be treated fully as a military problem or you do not use the Army at all and use the other means at your disposal and treat the problem in all its aspects—political, economic and even religious. You are treating this problem as a problem of External Affairs. You are from that very moment creating a separatist tendency amongst the Nagas and while a section of the Nagas, while a section of what they call their Army goes about looting, raping and killing our men, you sit here in Delhi negotiating with their leaders. You might as well have negotiated with Man Singh, you might as well have negotiated with Tahsilidar Singh. They were at least patriots; they had offered their services on the borders to combat the Chinese and other enemies of India. It shows that they were patriots. They were not at least demanding a separate State, but they were indulging in the same kind of activities—violence—as Nagas. You took a firm hand, you took a firm decision and you suppressed them, you killed them, but here....

Shri Shivajirao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani) Whom is he addressing?

Shri Ranjeet Singh: When I say 'you', I mean the Government.

Shri Shivajirao S. Deshmukh: The rules of the House require that he should address the Chair.

Shri Ranjeet Singh: No that the rule is not known. When I look at the Speaker, I address him and when I look at the hon Minister, I address him. Of course, this is through the Chair. I hope the hon Member will understand the substance and

will not go merely according to the letter.

Mr. Speaker,—I mean him now—as I was saying, you have been treating this problem in quite a wrong fashion. You want the Army to suppress the Naga rebellion.

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I am new to the House and as my friend points out, this is my maiden speech, hence this mistake. When I said 'you'. I meant the Government.

The Government has been treating this problem not as a full military problem, not even as a full political problem. It has been treating this partly as a political problem, but using the Army to solve this political problem which is a very wrong use of the Army.

An hon. Member: What is the solution?

Shri Ranjeet Singh: I can give provided you are ready to listen and implement that solution.

The Nagaland borders our Arch enemy China. China is all the time propagating that the Nagas are descended from them Foreign powers are interfering with the solution of that problem. Here is one place where possibly the CIA is being used on a very large scale. The entire Naga problem has been created by Christian missionaries and still that problem is maintained by the Christian missionaries and our Government has taken no action against them. There are still foreign missionaries roaming about in that area. They are untouched by our own men. They are welcomed by the rebel Nagas. There are elements amongst the Nagas which are loyal to the Union and do not want to break away from the Union; they want their special rights; they want their special privileges as tribals and they want to be free to develop in their own way with their own culture. But there is this one-third of the population consisting of

and being led by Christians from foreign lands which is jeopardizing the security of the rest of the two-thirds of the population, and Government are hobnobbing with that one-third and not even with the full portion of that one-third but with a handful of that one-third, and thereby enhancing this problem by itself. At the same time, along with the fact that we have permitted the Nagas to be exploited by the Chinese we have permitted them to be exploited by these foreign missionaries as well as Pakistan.

Government know that the Nagas go to Pakistan, they are trained there in guerilla warfare and they are given arms from there and then they come back to India and continue their rebellion. Yet, Government accept an explanation from Pakistan that this is not happening. I hope that the hon. Minister of External Affairs will not give the same answer as the Home Minister has given in this respect; the Home Minister has accepted Pakistan's explanation or even if he has not accepted it, he has at least quoted it in the House meaning thereby that this was an explanation and this appeared to be enough of an explanation. When we know from the past record of Pakistan that they will be openly, secretly and clandestinely hostile to our nation on every occasion, why should we even ask them for an explanation? We have our own agencies through which we can stop this ingress and we can stop the exodus of the Nagas who are being trained in Pakistan. But we are not employing that machinery. Instead, we permit the problem to grow and then we ask a very inadequate force with very inadequate powers to quell that rebellion spreading over thousands of square miles in such a jungle area which is considered to be the most impenetrable area of the world. Over the same area, to tackle the problem

of the Japanese guerillas left behind the retreating Japanese Army, the Britishers deployed 16 divisions, and we have a part of a division only to accomplish that job. And this is what happens; troops have to be broken up, they are left without their officers and the bad elements amongst them indulge in excesses and then you shout hoarse that the Army has committed excesses, and that they are raping their own population. There are bad elements in every Army. Let me assure you from my personal experience that there are not so many bad elements in our Army as in other Armies of the world.

I have had an opportunity to see the other Armies of the world. I know that under similar circumstances, the chastity of not a single Naga woman would have been safe, if the American Army had been there or any other Army of the world had been there. I know that during the last war, when the South African troops were there, when the other troops of the British Commonwealth were there, they were indulging in such large-scale loot and rape. What has happened there at the hands of some of our Army people or Army men is indeed regrettable and this has happened only because isolated small batches of people were sent without officers to deal with great and insurmountable problems of which they did not have the grasp. After all, an ordinary soldier is an uneducated and politically unawakened man: he does not know whether he is dealing with hostiles or with rebels or with an enemy.

There is a difference between the three. When you are dealing with an enemy, you go all out; you have no hesitation in killing civilians, in bombarding villages and all that. When you are dealing with a rebellion of our own population, you use force just enough to deal with the situation. When you are dealing with unruly elements, you have to

[Shri Ranjeet Singh]

deal with them with more prudence. You even try to bring them round to your view. Our army, our soldier, is incapable of dealing with the situation politically. In fact, that is so with every army in the world.

Government send the soldiers there. They send them in inadequate numbers and give them inadequate power. After all, this Bill that is enacted gives them very little power over what they already possess. That a soldier can fire in self-defence is a right given to him as to any other citizen; that he can open fire for safeguarding government property is a right possessed by him here in the streets of Delhi as in the hills of Nagaland. All that they have said in the Bill that has been enacted is that when there is a hostile mob of more than 5 persons, a soldier is permitted to deal with them. How he has to deal with them is left to him. And when a section commander, a naik or havildar, uneducated, in most cases even illiterate, is left to deal with a situation of that type, it is very difficult for him to deal with it in the way it should be dealt with.

There is another aspect. The army has to deal with such problems from the angle of defence and from the angle of offence. You are taking purely defensive measures. You have to wait till you are fired upon before you can fire. In an area you may see a group of people assembling. You just cannot fire on them. They are not enemies. You have to wait till they open fire on you or till they indulge in hostile activities. Before you know where you are, you are surrounded on all sides. This is the peculiar problem in Nagaland. If Government have to deal with it militarily, they have to send at least two corps over there.

There is, to my mind, another problem created by this Government. We deal with a firm hand not the rebels in Nagaland but the nationalist there. There is one Rani Guedello over there

of whom I first read in Panditji's Autobiography. He has praised her greatly because she raised the flag of rebellion against the Britishers. In fact, it was a flag raised against the infiltrating Christian missionaries from abroad who were preaching to the Nagas even then that they were separate from the Indians of this land. It was this Rani Guedello who took up cudgels against them. She was encouraged by Panditji then. But what has this Government done? She was put in jail. Only last year she was enticed into peaceful territory and then clapped in jail. This is the way this Government treat the nationalist Nagas.

Here I will deal with another problem Dr. Lohia has raised. He talked of Hindu attitude and non-Hindu attitude.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is making a useful contribution. But this time is up. Let him conclude in a couple of minutes. I have to look to others also.

Shri Ranjeet Singh: For a problem that has latest 9 years, give me 9 minutes more. I speak from personal experience and I have some useful suggestions to offer to Government.

In Nagaland, the population consists of one-third Christians and two-thirds non-Christians whom the former call heathens, but who in actual fact, are Hindus. There was complete amity between these two communities, there was no religious problem over there till Rev. Michael stopped in. After having been turned out of Southwest Africa, he stepped into the hospitable Indian country. He found fertile ground here, because, unfortunately, such people always find a fertile ground in India. They are welcomed by the Government of India and given VIP treatment, even knowing that they are a nuisance. So, he came over

here, and he created these two communities and he led the Nagas and formed an army of the rebel Nagas, and we are still negotiating with them.

The solution to this is as follows: firstly, not to treat it as a military problem alone. Secondly, if you think that the situation has gone so far out of control and out of hand, if you cannot deal with this except with the help of the military, then, as you have done with the Mizos in certain areas, concentrate the widespread population of the Naga villages in certain areas, where they can be afforded adequate protection against this so-called Naga army. These areas should be fertile areas. Provide them with land, as you are doing to the Mizos, and then use the army for rounding up those who remain outside because then you can take it for granted that these are the rebels.

At the same time, try and seal the borders. How is it that a large number of Nagas are going to Pakistan, getting training there and coming back?

Above all, stop negotiating with murderers, with traitors.

My party—I have the authority of my party to say so—half-heartedly supports this half-hearted measure in the hope that there will be a full-hearted measure on the part of the Government in the near future and next year the problem will not exist and we will not need to extend these special powers by another year.

Deputy-Speaker: Now he should be conclude.

Shri Ranjeet Singh: Let me give the finishing touches.

I would request the hon. Minister and the Government to consider the political aspect, to bring them into your fold by concentrating the population from the widely spread areas of Nagaland, and by creating a depopulated area along the border.

After all, Pakistan has done it, there is no reason why we should not do it. And in that depopulated area, anybody moving about should be dealt with by our security forces. I hope the Government will consider this suggestion in order to save the fair name of the army. Either the army should be given full powers and adequate strength, or you should deal with the problem otherwise. The army is the last resort. When you resort to this last resort, you should be ready for a full measure, a full scale operation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Ganesh Ghosh. I would request hon. Members to finish in ten minutes.

Shri Ganesh Ghosh: Military operations by the Government of India have been going on against the Nagas for the last ten years. And the fact that the Government have today come up with this Bill seeking an extension of the period for using the country's armed forces against the Nagas is a candid admission by the Government and a clear demonstration, of the failure of the policy pursued by the Congress Government not only against the Nagas but against all the tribals in our country. The policy pursued by the Central Congress Government not only towards the Nagas but also towards all the tribal people smacks of the so-called civilising missions of the British and other colonialists which they themselves vauntfully called the 'white-man's burden'.

All along, the India Government have had a patronising attitude towards the tribal people of our country who strongly resent it. In 1952, we all know, that the Nagas demanded only a separate State for themselves within the Indian Union, just like any other State of the Union but the Congress Government imperiously turned down the request and refused their modest and just demand. After this, when they rose in rebellion and demanded complete independence, the Government of India without giving any

[Shri Ganesh Gho]

serious thought to the situation sent in the army and tried to suppress them; but the Army also did not prove much effective and a bitter struggle continued between the Army and the Nagas for a long time. In 1961 or 1962, in their belated wisdom the Congress Government created a separate State for the Nagas the Nagaland—and reluctantly conceded the earlier demand of the Nagas.

But unfortunately this also did not come as a result of the negotiations with the real leaders of the Nagas. The Congress Government negotiated with the people who were favourable to them but who were looked down as traitors to the Nagas and came to an understanding and agreement with them. Meanwhile because of the continued military operations and talks with such people the animosity, suspicion, bitterness and hostility between the Nagas and us grew. What could have easily satisfied the poor Nagas in 1952 did not satisfy them now. So continues the military operations. Once again, the fact that during the last one year the Congress Government had been negotiating with the leaders of the people in revolt conclusively shows the utter barrenness and incorrectness of the policy pursued by the Congress Government against the Nagas and other tribals. This only shows in clear relief the incorrectness of their approach.

Last year the Mizos were in revolt, there is serious unrest among the tribals in Assam. Some months back there was terrific unrest among the tribals in Bastar. What did the Congress Government do? It resorted to a brutal massacre there. Further, even when the Congress Government created a separate Naga State they did not think it necessary to bring all the Nagas together into that and put them all in one State. Large numbers of Nagas live in areas contiguous to the Nagaland. They live in overwhelming numbers in Manipur and in Assam. This is a sore point with them. Are we to believe that this is

a result of their lack of knowledge and inadvertence or a calculated and deliberate policy pursued by the Congress Government, which is the very same policy that the British practised in India earlier? As a result, the hostility between the Nagas and the Manipuris continues. The Nagas, the Mizos and other tribal people live in our border and it is particularly necessary in our own national interest that they should be a satisfied people. As a result of the foolish policy pursued by the Congress Government the tribals are in a state of ferment and unrest. The other day the hon. Minister of External Affairs stated here that the Congress Government would support the Tibetan question in the United Nations. I cannot understand with what face can our Government do that, when in our own country in our own border, we have the tribal problems and the people are being moved down there with brutal military force?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is high time that the Congress Government gave once more a very serious consideration to this whole tribal question. Pursuance of military operations is no solution to the problem. The prolongation of the military operations against them will not take us nearer to the solution. The only way to get a contented people is to negotiate with them and to come to terms with them. And that is why the military operation is no solution. I would ask the Government to reconsider the whole position. With these words, I stop. Thank you.

Shri B. N. Shastri (Lakhimpur): On a point of information. The hon. Member just now said that there are a good number of Naga people in Assam. May I know from the hon. Member, in which part of Assam there is a good number of Naga people? Will he inform me?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri B. N. Shastri: Could he tell us the number please?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please resume your seat.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, may I start by saying, to remove a'l misunderstandings, that we look upon the Nagas as our kith and kin, as much as we look upon the people of Maharashtra or Madras or West Bengal or Kashmir.

An hon. Member: Why do you deal with it in the External Affairs Ministry?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I shall come to that. There is a great deal of what my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta has said, with which I am in entire agreement. He said that the Naga problem cannot lend itself to a military solution. I agree with him. I also agree with my hon. friend, Shri Ranjeet Singh, whom I compliment on his maiden speech. He spoke as an accomplished parliamentarian. (An Hon. Member: Hear, hear). I agree with him that the army cannot solve a political problem. He is perfectly right. Again, Shri Indrajit Gupta said that we have to have peace with them; we have to make them reconcile to us and we must do what we can. This is exactly what we are trying to do. There have been five rounds of talks between our Prime Minister and the Nagas. There has been suspension of hostilities. We are not yet in agreement, but at least the very fact that the Naga hostiles and the Indian Government can sit across a table and talk is a very good thing. At least they can understand our point of view and we can understand their point of view.

Now, ultimately, we have got to follow the path of reconciliation, and I have every hope that in the very near future these talks which have been going on will ultimately result in a settlement. All that we are insisting on, and I am sure the whole House is part of India.

Shri Hem Barua: It is an integral part of India.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is, and it should be and continue to be. My hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta said that we have

done nothing to reconcile them. The very fact that we gave them Statehood, the very fact that we gave them autonomy which every State in India has, the very fact that we put them on the same level as Bengal, Maharashtra, Madras or Kashmir, shows that we look upon the Nagas with the same eye, without any discrimination, as we do the others.

An hon. Member: Let him take it to the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I will come to that. I would also like to refer to what my hon. friend Dr. Lohia said. He is quite right when he says that our history has been written rather badly. Our historians have not emphasised the fact that in our own country many cultures have come in and they have been absorbed and have become part of Indian culture. Therefore, if Nagaland has a separate culture, it has also to be absorbed into the Indian culture. One of the last things I did as Education Minister was to see that the history books are written from a national point of view. I am very glad that at least two books have come out—Ancient History and Mediaeval History—which have been written from a national point of view. I hope others books will also come out which will give our boys and girls a true picture of our history and not the picture as painted by the British rulers.

Mr. Indrajit Gupta said that the first act of the Government towards Nagaland is to introduce this Bill. He also said there was no mention about Nagas in the President's Address. I can assure him that the omission was not deliberate. I hope he will not say so, because it may be misunderstood in Nagaland. We have so many problems. It is impossible to enumerate each and every one of them in the Address. We tried to make the Address as brief as possible, because this is a short session and we have the proper session starting in May.

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

I want to clear a point raised by Mr. Indrajit Gupta which was referred to by another hon. member also, viz., why is this matter being dealt with by the External Affairs Ministry? May I give a short history of this matter? As far back as July, 1960, a delegation of the leaders of the Naga Peoples Convention met the Prime Minister and placed before him a 16-point memorandum. One of the points was that Nagaland should be kept under the External Affairs Ministry and not transferred to the Home Ministry.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma (Khammam): That was because Prime Minister Nehru was in charge of the External Affairs Ministry.

Shri Hem Barua: That matter came up before the House when Mr. Nehru was the Prime Minister. It was admitted on the floor of the House that it was because Nagas had faith in Mr. Nehru and as Mr. Nehru headed the External Affairs Ministry, they wanted Nagaland to be administered by that Ministry. Since Mr. Nehru's sad demise, I think this state of affairs should not continue. It should be shifted to the Home Ministry. It gives the impression that the State of Nagaland is an external part of India.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I accept that reason. Millions of people had faith in Nehru and I am not surprised the Nagas also had faith in him. That was one reason. Let us see what happened afterwards.

As recently as April, 66 we asked the Governor of Assam to obtain the views of the Nagaland Government regarding the transfer of Nagaland from the External Affairs Ministry to the Home Ministry. The Governor has intimated to us that the present Nagaland Cabinet have considered this matter and have recommended that there should be no change at present. Therefore, at present we are acting on the advice given to us by the Nagaland Cabinet. I assure the House that

there is no desire on the part of the External Affairs Ministry to keep Nagaland with it. I have got quite enough on my plate and I shall be very happy to transfer it to the Home Ministry. But this is the advice given to us by the Nagaland Cabinet and we have acted on that.

Shastriji answered in 1965. "We have already said that we have accepted that it should be transferred to the Home Ministry". After that, we consulted the Nagaland Cabinet and as recently as April, 66 the advice they gave us was, don't transfer it at present.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Did they give any reasons for it?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Yes; they had given reasons. I will tell you what reasons they gave. The first reason that they gave was that the change in the present juncture may have political repercussions within Nagaland. The second reason was that a State Government like Nagaland was not under a particular ministry, it dealt with different ministries for different subjects the only exception being matters of political situation and law and order which were being dealt with by the Ministry of External Affairs. They also felt that placing Nagaland under the Ministry of Home Affairs would give an impression that Nagaland had been relegated to the position of one of the Union Territories which were being controlled by that Ministry.

Shri Hem Barua: How can that be? Are you satisfied with this statement? How could this mean that it had been relegated to the position of a Union Territory?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Yes, the Home Ministry deals with all States. The Nagaland State Government said that they dealt with various ministries for various subjects, the Home Ministry also had some control over them as other States, but as Nagaland had peculiar problem of its own it should

be dealt with by the Ministry of External Affairs. I assure you that as soon as we get the advice of the Nagaland Cabinet we will transfer this subject to the Ministry of Home Affairs and I hope my hon. colleague the Minister of Home Affairs will be able to deal with it better than I am.

Shri Hem Barua: It is not for that that we want it to be transferred. It is only your politeness that makes you say so.

Shri M. C. Chagla: My hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta, said that we should try to win the hearts of the Naga people. I entirely agree with him and we are trying to do what we can by means of cultural exchanges, by means of getting Naga boys to come to our schools, colleges and universities, to make them feel not only that they are politically an integral part of India but emotionally also they are an integral part of India. After all, we have to make a distinction. I can see the difference. It is not enough to make a State feel that politically it is an integral part of India, it should emotionally also feel that it is a part of this great country. That is what we are trying to do.

Shri Hem Barua: Have you given these boys and girls stipends?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I think there are some scholarships.

Shri Hem Barua: Very few, very negligible.

Shri M. C. Chagla: As I am not in the Education Ministry I do not remember now. But I agree that there should be more of them. I shall certainly convey to my colleague the Minister of Education the feelings of the hon. Member and tell him that this should be done.

A question was raised about Pakistan and China. My hon. friend suggested that there was no infiltration. That is not true. Even today—this

is also partly in answer to the point raised by my hon. friend, Shri Ranjit Singh—people are infiltrating into Pakistan, and from there into China, and after being armed and trained they come back into our country and indulge in acts of sabotage. Here I must pay a compliment to the Government of our neighbouring State, our friendly State, Burma, that they are giving us every possible help to prevent this infiltration. But as Major Ranjit Singh would know—I take it he has been to that part of India—the terrain is such that it is impossible to prevent this. Therefore, this danger and threat remains, this infiltration into Pakistan, this training of these hostiles in Pakistan and their coming back and indulging in acts of sabotage remains.

Shri Hem Barua: Why don't you close down the vulnerable points?

Shri Dhireswar Kalita (Gauhati): Is there no border security police?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Yes. It is impossible. We have discussed it with the Burmese Government. They are prepared to co-operate, but the terrain is such—as Major Ranjit Singh says it is the most impenetrable jungle in any part of the world—that it is impossible to prevent five or ten people from getting into Burma and going to Pakistan. My hon. friend, Shri Hem Barua asked, why don't you seal the border. How? You will require tens of thousands of people. You will have to post a soldier or policeman every few yards to prevent it. This is what is happening in Kashmir. There it is much easier to stop it than to stop it in Nagaland. The terrain there is not so bad as it is in Nagaland. Even there we found it difficult to prevent infiltration from the Pakistan occupied part of Kashmir.

Shri Hem Barua: What is the remedy?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I will come to the remedy. As some hon. Member

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

has said—I think it was Shri Ranjeet Singh Pakistan is actively encouraging them. We know what Pakistan is doing. She is trying to give trouble to us. We have objected and protested. We are not so gullible as to accept any explanation given by Pakistan. We know exactly what mischief Pakistan and China are up to, as far as our border States are concerned.

Shri Hem Barua: Has Pakistan given any explanation whatsoever?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Yes, an explanation of denial. But we did not accept the denial because we have got facts. After all, we have got our own agencies for observation.

Shri Dhireswar Kalita: There is a border security force. If it cannot prevent any infiltration what is it for?

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is physically impossible.

Shri Dhireswar Kalita: Then why do you run the government?

Shri M. C. Chagla: There are one or two statements of facts made by Shri Ranjit Singh in his maiden speech which are not correct. The first is about missionaries in Nagaland. There are no American missionaries in Nagaland today. There are three catholic Italian nuns and one British lady as teacher. Barring this there are no foreign missionaries in Nagaland. Therefore, the argument that Shri Ranjit Singh built on the foundation of foreign missionaries trying to set up the Naga people against us is not correct.

The other statement of fact I want to correct is about Rani Guidallo. On this, again, the facts are not correct. She has never been put in jail by us. On the contrary, she was given a pension of Rs. 200 after independence. She remained underground from 1960 onwards and came

out only last year. She was given full protection and her followers were rehabilitated by providing them with jobs and cash grants. Therefore, far from persecuting her, far from not recognising her work as a nationalist, we have given her pension and we have rehabilitated her followers.

Shri Ranjeet Singh: Sir, permit me to make only one point on this subject.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At this stage only questions can be asked.

Shri Ranjeet Singh: About Rani Guidallo, it is true you recognised her role by giving her pension and rehabilitating her followers. But, then, it appeared in the papers that her movement has been restricted, that she was kept under surveillance and that is why I referred to the restriction of her movements.

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: Let the Minister deny it or confirm it.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am not aware of this. I know that she was given a pension of Rs. 200 even though she was underground.

Shri Ranjeet Singh: That you are giving even to Sheikh Abdulla.

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have tried to rehabilitate her followers. As to whether she is under restrictive orders, I will try to find out.

Shri Hem Barua: She is.

Shri M. C. Chagla: One suggestion was made that the Naga problem should be resolved in the same way as we are trying to solve the Mizo problem. That is a very interesting suggestion and, certainly, we will look into it.

Again, we come back to the question as to what is the necessity for this Bill. There was the final round

of talks with the Prime Minister. The situation is peaceful, much more peaceful than it has ever been. There is every hope of a settlement.

Shri Hem Barua: Not so. It is peaceful inside Nagaland but outside Nagaland, on the outskirts of Nagaland boundary adjoining Assam area, it has not been peaceful. They have been exploding bombs on railway tracks.

Shri M. C. Chagla: But my hon. friend will agree with me that it is better than what it used to be.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour): You have stopped night trains through that area.

Shri M. C. Chagla: We are aware of it. That is precisely why we have come to this House for this legislation.

My hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta, does not realise that this is merely an enabling legislation. If you look at the original Act, it gave the discretionary power to the Governor. It adds:—

"If the Governor of Nagaland is of opinion that the whole or any part of the State of Nagaland is in such disturbed or dangerous condition that the use of armed forces to the aid of the civil power is necessary, he may, by notification in the official Gazette, declare the whole or, as the case may be, such parts of the State of Nagaland to be a disturbed area."

It is only when the Governor exercises his discretion and declares either the whole or part of Nagaland to be a disturbed area that the provisions of this Act will come into force.

Can any Member of this House say that the Governor should not be armed with these powers? Are we going to allow those Nagas, who are loyal to us to be shot down? As my

hon. friend, Shri Baura, says, are we going to allow bombs to be exploded or agents of Pakistan to use nefarious means against us? We must trust the discretion of the Governor. It is only when that discretion is exercised and he declares either the whole or part of Nagaland to be a disturbed area that the substantive provisions of the Act will come into force. Therefore, my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta's apprehensions are entirely unfounded.

We are not coming to this House and saying, "Arm us with the authority to put down people in Nagaland". All that we are asking this House is, "Give us the power, in case of need, to declare Nagaland or part of it as a disturbed area." I hope, the Governor will never use his discretion. I hope and pray that peace will prevail in the whole of Nagaland, in which case this Act would be a dead letter; but, suppose, there is trouble. Suppose, as I said, loyal Nagas are attacked and the ordinary police is not in a position to deal with the situation. Are we then going to sit in Delhi with folded arms and let that situation deteriorate and a most explosive situation to develop? That is the reason why I submit that this Bill should be considered by this House as absolutely non-controversial.

I am all for peace; I am all for reconciliation. We will go on trying to get a peaceful solution. I agree that the Naga problem cannot be solved militarily. In this world no problem can be solved militarily. Ultimately, you have to have a peaceful solution. After all, as I said, they are our kith and kin. It hurts us to take measures against them which are strong measures. But when it comes to the security of our country and when it comes to the safety of our country—see where Nagaland is—we have to take strong action. All that I am asking the House is to permit the Governor to use his discretion and declare Nagaland or a part

[Shri M. C. Chagla].

of it to be a disturbed area and then the provisions will come into force.

I submit that the House pass this Bill. Sir, I move:

Shri Ranjeet Singh: A question arises out of all that the hon. Minister has said. Firstly, you have said how you are trying to introduce Indian culture among the Nagas by cultural exchanges. I do not know how you regard Naga culture as a culture separate from that of the rest of India. India is a conglomeration of different types of culture.

Shri M. C. Chagla: That is exactly what I said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he has a question to ask, he can do so; but he is arguing.

Shri Ranjeet Singh: I am not arguing; I am asking him whether by weaning the Nagas away from their basic culture, by bringing them to Delhi schools and colleges and university, by teaching them here nothing but twist and rock'n roll and an anglicised life, you are inducing Indian culture in them.

Another thing that I ask you is this. You have said that there are only four foreign missionaries left in the area. Do you consider that four are too few, when a single man, Michael Scott, was enough to create all this Naga trouble? Are they being kept under surveillance or not? You have just said that Rani Guidallo is drawing pension. We know she is under surveillance. She is rightly being given pension and wrongly being kept under surveillance just as Sheikh Abdullah is wrongly being given pension but rightly being kept under surveillance. Would you consider this fact?

Shri M. C. Chagla: We are taking every precaution to see that no foreign influence, in any way, jeopardises our national interest. Our policy

is not to permit any more foreign missionaries, as far as possible, to come into Nagaland. Those who are there, if they are carrying on their legitimate avocations like teaching or nursing, they will be permitted to do so. But we will not, certainly, permit any foreign missionary to carry on any political activity in Nagaland.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I want to put one question.

Although Mr. Phizo is a British citizen, the Naga hostiles are maintaining communication with Mr. Phizo and receiving advice from him on the political negotiations with the Prime Minister. In that context, may I know what steps Government propose to take to snap this communication between a section of the Indian people and a man who is a British national already?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Fortunately or unfortunately, some of these hostiles look upon Mr. Phizo as their leader. That is the situation. I wish, they would not.... (Interruption) I quite agree Mr. Phizo holds a British passport; he is not an Indian citizen and he has no connection with Nagaland. But if some misguided people choose to rely on his advice or want his advice, it is very difficult for us....

Shri Hem Barua: But you encourage them.

Shri M. C. Chagla: We do not encourage them.

Shri Hem Barua: You encouraged them. During the last round of talks with the Prime Minister, the underground Nagas had suggested to the Prime Minister that a delegation of underground Nagas would like to go to London to meet Mr. Phizo and the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government, gave an assurance that everything will be done to help them to go to London. That shows you are encouraging them.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I would like to answer that. I want to clear misunderstanding which has existed in the minds of some people. I have seen it in the press also. The Prime Minister said, "If you want to consult Mr. Phizo for the purpose of carrying on these talks or coming to a settlement, we will not come in your way." But—this is an important "but"—"if you want to go to London, you must apply for an Indian passport and go with an Indian passport".

Shri Hem Barua: That is but natural.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is not natural; they have not done so.

Shri Hem Barua: It is but natural for Indians to have Indian passport.

Shri M. C. Chagla: But they have not done so. So it was not at our instance. Mr. Hem Barua will realise that if the people want to consult somebody it is not right that we should stop them from doing so if that helps ultimately and it is easier to carry on talks with them in the next round.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रश्न नहीं पूछना अगर माननीय मंत्री जी इस का उत्तर दे दें क्योंकि यह प्रश्न उठाया गया कि क्या नागा भूमि में बाहर के लोगों पर या जो विदेशी मिशनरी हैं उन के जाने पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा हुआ है या लगावेगे। लेकिन इतना ही बेलवासियों के बहो जाने पर प्रतिबन्ध है। यह प्रश्न उठाया गया था, लेकिन मंत्री महोदय ने बड़ी आसानी से उस का उत्तर नहीं दिया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो भारतीय लोग हैं उन के बहो जाने पर से जब प्रतिबन्ध उठाया गया है तो क्या हर हिन्दुस्तानी को यह अधिकार मिलेगा कि वह वहाँ जा सकेगा और उस को किसी प्रकार की परमिशन या आदेश देने की आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ेगी ?

श्री मु० क० बागला: हर एक भारतीय को भी नागालैंड जाने की छूट है।

श्री हेम बरुआ: परमिशन ले कर।

श्री रामसेवक यादव: डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया को वहाँ जाने की परमिशन नहीं मिली थी, सायब मंत्री महोदय को यह नहीं मालूम है।

श्री मु० क० बागला: परमिशन होयी तो सब के लिये होगी।

श्री श्री लक्ष्मण: यह गलत है। इस को हटा दीजिये। वह अपने देश का ही एक हिस्सा है। उरवसीयम्, नेफा भयवा नागालैंड में यहाँ के लोगों को न जाने देने की बात नहीं होनी चाहिये।

15 hrs.

श्री श्री मु० क० बागला: यह सच है कि हमारे देश में ऐसी भी जगहें हैं जहाँ की सिचुएशन ऐसी है कि उरा सिक्कोरिटी ज्यादा करनी पड़ती है और इस सिक्कोरिटी के सबब से ही वहाँ . . .

श्री लक्ष्मण: विदेशी पादरी जा सकते हैं, रह सकते हैं और हमारे अपने जो नागरिक हैं वे नहीं जा सकते हैं।

श्री मु० क० बागला: हमारे अपने जो आदमी हैं उनके सामने भी यह सिक्कोरिटी का मामला रहना चाहिये और इसका भी खयाल उनको करना चाहिये।

Shri Tulshidas Jadhav: I want to ask one question. Why are these padhris allowed to remain there for so many years and we are not allowed. What are the reasons?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Who?

Shri Tulshidas Jadhav: The Christian missionaries.

Shri M. C. Chagla: They are there all the time. We are not allowing any others.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to continue the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Regulation, 1958, for a further period, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We take up clause-by-clause consideration.

There are no amendments. So, I shall put all the Clauses together.

The question is:

"That Clauses 1 to 3, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 to 3, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

15.03 hrs.

MOTION RE: FOOD SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now we go on to the motion about food situation in the country.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): I rise on a point of order under rule 56. (Interruption). Let them hear what it is and then let me see what they have to say about it.

Under rule 56, I am raising this point of order. This question refers to the food situation in the country which was the subject-matter of what I raised on the floor of this House

along with 17 Members from Kerala as a motion for adjournment a week ago. At that time I did not get any reply. Later on, the question was raised on the floor of this House as a call attention notice. Then about 40 Members were signatories to that motion. According to rules, when a motion for adjournment is sent to the Speaker, the Speaker has recourse to only one of the two alternatives: one is to accept the motion or the other is to say that the motion is not acceptable and then rule it out.

Rule 60 says:

"The Speaker, if he gives consent under rule 56 and holds that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order, shall, after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon, call the member concerned who shall rise in his place and ask for leave to move the adjournment of the House:

Provided that where the Speaker has refused his consent under rule 56 or is of opinion that the matter proposed to be discussed is not in order, he may, if he thinks it necessary, read the notice of motion and state the reasons for refusing consent or holding the motion as being not in order."

Neither the one nor the other action was taken by the Speaker.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Please hear me, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has forgotten. Yesterday the Speaker has not given his consent.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: No, it was not. Yesterday I raised the question. You may look into the proceedings. I pointed out to him that the names of nearly 40 members were included. I asked a specific question whether all the 40 members will get a chance to speak on the