

sengers by the ship during the currency of the agreement.

- (v) Miscellaneous charges on account of chartering the vessel, e.g. fuel oil, Suez Canal dues, hiring of tugs etc.

(d) The ship chartered to bring back the Indian contingent was SS 'MOHAMMED'.

Air-Lifting of Indian Contingent from Gaza

5146. Shri George Fernandes:

Shri J. H. Patel:

Shri S. M. Banerjee:

Shri Madhu Limaye:

Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government had made a written request to the U.N. Secretary-General to airlift the Indian troops in the Gaza strip after the U.N.E.F. was officially withdrawn at the instance of U.A.R.;

(b) if so, when the request was made and what was the reply from the U.N. Secretary-General;

(c) whether Government had offered to airlift the Indian troops at its own cost;

(d) if not, the reasons therefor; and

(e) who paid for the final airlifting of the Indian troops to India; and the cost thereof?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) to (e). The Secretary-General was asked on May 30th if airlift could be provided for Indian troops in Gaza area. The Secretary-General, however, expressed his inability to agree to evacuation by air. He referred to the schedule of evacuation submitted by the United Nations Emergency Force Commander which could not be changed by unilateral arrangements and without prior approval of the Secretary-General. As the Indian Contingent to the U.N.E.F. was entirely 1282 (a1) 1-5.

under the command of the United Nations, Government of India was not in a position to do more than make suggestions for urgent evacuation which was done.

Financial responsibility for airlifting Indian troops was that of the United Nations and hence cost of operation is not available. Information is, however, being obtained.

12.17 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED STATEMENT BY SHRI PHIZO IN LONDON REGARDING TALKS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ON NAGA PROBLEMS

Shri K. P. Singh Deo (Dhenkanal): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may kindly make a statement thereon:

"Reported statement made by Shri Phizo in London about his intention to participate in talks with the Government of India on the Naga problems on certain conditions."

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr. Speaker, Sir, attention of the Government of India has been drawn to press reports emanating from London that Mr Phizo, in an interview with a Press correspondent, has indicated his desire to return to India for negotiations with the Government of India provided his presence is required by the Underground Nagas and a 'safe conduct' is assured by the Government of India.

The Government of India has not been approached for 'safe conduct' for Phizo either by him or by the Underground Nagas.

As the House is aware the Government's stand has always been to seek a peaceful solution within the

[Shri M. C. Chagla.]

framework of the Indian Union. It is for this reason that we accepted on 6th September, 1964, an agreement on the suspension of operations and have been continuing talks with the Underground leaders. It is in pursuance of this policy that, on a request by the Underground leaders, we had allowed the Underground representatives to visit London for consultations with Mr. Phizo.

The views expressed by Mr. Phizo to the Underground representatives have not been communicated to the Government of India either by the Underground or by their representatives who visited London. Recent statements made by Mr. Phizo which have appeared in the press cannot be treated as authoritative and Government have no intention of proceeding to act on them.

Mr. Phizo who is now a British Citizen and therefore able to visit India without a visa, would nevertheless need to be granted a 'safe conduct' by Government if he did not wish to be subjected to the due process of law under a warrant of arrest pending against him since 1956. Government of India would consider any such request, if made, in consultation with the Government of Nagaland State and others concerned. I should like to take this opportunity of expressing our deep appreciation of the efforts made by the Nagaland Government in maintaining law and order in the State in very difficult circumstances and further progress achieved by them in developing Nagaland economically. The people of Nagaland want peace and security, progress and development and Government of India are giving every support to the State Government for achieving these objects.

Shri K. P. Singh Deo: In view of the fact that the Chief Minister of Nagaland has said that since Phizo was a foreign citizen he should not be brought in the context of the Naga

problem, is the Government going to hold any talks with Phizo clandestinely behind the back of the Government of Nagaland?

Shri M. C. Chagla: We do not propose to do anything behind the back of the constituted Government of Nagaland. If Mr. Phizo wants to come here we will first consult the State Government before we take any decision.

Shri K. P. Singh Deo: In view of the fact that the House is aware that the Government stand has always been to seek a peaceful solution within the framework of the Indian Union, may I know....

An hon. Member: Sir, only one question is allowed on a Calling Attention Notice

Mr. Speaker: I shall not repeat it. It is only a mistake. I have called him today. But it cannot be a precedent. If he does not insist on his asking the second question, I will be happy.

Shri K. P. Singh Deo: All right, I will not insist on it.

श्री कंधर लाल गपल (दिल्ली सदर) :
इस बात का खयाल करते हुए कि क्रिजो एक ब्रिटिश नागरिक है और इस बात का भी खयाल करते हुए कि क्रिजो दुनिया के देशों में भारत के खिलाफ प्रचार करता रहा है अगर उसको यहाँ बुला कर उसके साथ बातचीत की गई तो उसका मतलब यह होगा कि सरकार इस देश के साथ गहरी को प्रीमियम देती है और इसके साथ ही किसी बिदेसी नागरिक को हमारे अन्दरूनी मामलों में दखल देने की इजाजत देती है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सही है कि श्री क्रीमिन्स्टर्न को कोर्रोरस में नागालैंड के श्री क्रीमिन्स्टर्न ने भारत सरकार को स्पष्ट तौर पर यह बता दिया है कि क्रिजो को किसी

बुरत में भी इस बातचीत में शामिल नहीं करना चाहिए और यह भी कि भारत सरकार को विद्रोही नागाओं के साथ इनडैफिनिटली बातचीत नहीं करते रहना चाहिए। उस बातचीत को जल्दी खत्म करना चाहिए और अब यह तमाशा बन्द होना चाहिए।

Shri M. C. Chagla: The first part of the question is based on the assumption that we are going to permit Shri Phizo to come here. As I said, no decision has been taken on it and no decision will be taken without consulting the Nagaland Government.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : क्या चीफ़ मिनिस्टर ने भारत सरकार को यह कहा है या नहीं ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I cannot disclose any correspondence of any talks that take place between the Central Government and the Chief Minister. But I want to assure the House that we will not go contrary to the advice of the State Government of Nagaland.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मेरे दूसरे सवाल का जवाब नहीं दिया गया है। क्या नागालैंड के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर ने यह भी कहा है कि विद्रोही नागाओं के साथ इनडैफिनिटली बातचीत नहीं की जानी चाहिए ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Well, the same answer applies.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): It was in the press and people talk about it. Still, you do not know about it.

12.23 hrs.

**RE: QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE
MISREPORTING OF LOK SABHA PROCEED-
INGS BY UNI AND INDIAN EXPRESS**

Mr. Speaker: On the 6th July, 1967 Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya raised a question of privilege against the UNI

and the *Indian Express* for misreporting of his speech in the House on the 4th July, 1967 and I had then said that the UNI and the *Indian Express* would be asked in the first instance to state what they had to say in the matter. I have since received replies from both the parties.

The General Manager and Editor of the UNI in his letter dated the 7th July, 1967 has stated "that there was no error in reporting nor any reference to gherao attributed to Mr. Bhat'acharyya in the news agency report circulated by UNI.

The Editor of the *Indian Express*, in his letter dated the 7th July, 1967, has stated as follows:

"I have gone through the original copy of the UNI Parliamentary report and of the report published by us in our issue of July 5, 1967. Let me say at once that the mistake is ours. I find that one of our Sub-Editors, while trying to compress the copy for reasons of space, cut out a paragraph and in doing so created the erroneous impression that what Mr. Dange said had been said by Mr. Bhattacharyya. We are genuinely sorry about this mistake. The Sub-Editor concerned has been taken to task."

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): No, Sir. He ought not to have been taken to task.

Mr. Speaker: I am reading that letter. It says:

"The Sub-Editor concerned had been taken to task. Moreover, we made it a point to publish in our issue of July 7 the PTI report of Mr. Bhattacharyya's complaint which makes it clear that he had not said what had been attributed to him mistakenly in the *Indian Express*."

Shri Nath Pal: The mistake could have been rectified without taking him to task.