

the Leader of the House, politely request the Leader of the House, to tell us when the Leader of the House can persuade his Minister and the Government to come out with a statement on this. We want them to make this statement, if possible, today itself, because fire is not a new thing; it has been happening for the last four or five days...

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: महोदया, यह भवनों में आग लगने के साथ-साथ ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभापति: लीडर आफ दि हाउस ने कहा है कि वह इन्फार्मेशन लेकर स्टेटमेंट हाउस के सामने रखेंगे तो इसलिए अब इस मसले को खत्म करके... (Interruptions)

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: महोदया, दिल्ली में जो बम ब्लास्ट हो रहे हैं और अखबारों के माध्यम से पता लगता है कि ... (व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. We have taken half-an-hour on this. I have got a List of Business here. Please take your seat now.

श्री राम नरेश यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदया, मैं आपके माध्यम से... (व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You ask the Chairman, Don't ask me now.

श्री राम नरेश यादव: महोदया, जम्मू-कश्मीर, जो राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न बना हुआ है, इसलिए आपके माध्यम से मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस पर ध्यान दे। कश्मीर भारत का अविभक्त अंग है और वह भारत के नक्सों से विश्व बैंक की रिपोर्ट से गायब हो गया, इसलिए मैं आपके माध्यम से चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस पर ध्यान दे।

... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: महोदया, दिल्ली में जो बम ब्लास्ट हो रहे हैं, उसके बारे में अभी तक सरकार ने कोई जवाब नहीं दिया। (व्यवधान)...

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Talks between Foreign Ministers of India and Pakistan at New York—Contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI P. SHIV

SHANKER): Madam, before the hon. Minister gives the clarifications, there is the latest development on which I would like to see a clarification. This is connected with Ammanullah Khan. I may be permitted to say just a few words and seek clarifications from the hon. Minister.

Madam, the JKLF chief, Mr. Ammanullah Khan (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your leader is speaking. Please have courtesy for your own leader. He is making an important point.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Madam, Mr. Ammanullah Khan, the JKLF chief, has been calling the shots in Kashmir, sitting from the USA. At the time when the hon. Minister was having bilateral talks with his counterpart in Pakistan, this gentleman was there, and before these bilateral talks the Government had issued an FIR against Ammanullah Khan and sought extradition of this gentleman from New York to India. The result of diplomatic approach with the USA and the result of our diplomacy and the consequent bilateral discussions with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan had been that this gentleman has been allowed to slip to Pakistan. This is the news which we got this morning which has already come out. It is possible that as a result of the bilateral discussions and the later discussions that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan had with the US Secretary of State, Mr. Baker, this man has been allowed to move to Pakistan. I do not know whether this is our successful diplomacy based on which we were holding discussions with the American government, which has resulted into this catastrophe. I would not like to say that this is a failure of our diplomacy. But indeed this is a slip, and I would say that the USA seems to have scant respect for the request that we had made for the extradition of Ammanullah Khan.

Now, therefore, having regard to this development, and if this is the

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

development which has taken place as a result of the bilateral discussions between the two Foreign Ministers, what is it that our Foreign Minister proposes now? Does he want to enter into another bilateral discussion with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to see that Ammanullah Khan is brought over to India? What exactly is going to be his approach? The House would certainly be interested to know this because this gentleman had been creating havoc from the USA.

It is this clarification that I thought I should have from the hon. Minister.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I will like to ask...

उपसभापति: कल आप का हो गया...
I cannot open a Pandora's box.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: I will take only half-a-minute.

There is a news item published in the *Hindustan Times* today: "Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto announced today after mediation by Japan that she was ready to meet her Indian counterpart, V.P. Singh, to resolve the Kashmir issue".

"I am prepared to meet Indian Prime Minister any time to resolve the Kashmir issue through a dialogue", she told a joint Press conference..."

My only question is what is the reaction of the government to the latest offer made by the Pakistan Prime Minister, Mrs. Bhutto?

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maharashtra): Very politely, I would like to (*Interruptions*) very politely, very politely...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All of you are becoming polite. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I crave your indulgence. (*Interruptions*) The Japanese Prime Minister has made an offer of mediation between Pakistan and

India on this dispute. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, what is the attitude of the Government of India towards this offer of the Japanese Prime Minister, because it is obvious that when he has made this offer he must have discussed when he was here in India recently.

He has met the hon. Minister for External Affairs. He has met hon. Prime Minister and then he has gone to Pakistan. So, I would like to know what is their reaction. Did he make this offer when he was in India and what was your reaction to what he said? I am sure he must have brought this up during the talks here.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): Madam, may I first of all thank my hon. friends from both sides of the House for their very major contributions made in the debate. I am heartened by the tremendous interest shown by the Members in the conduct of our foreign policy. This was amply clear from the large number of speakers and the informed questions and clarifications that they had asked me.

Before I go to answering these clarifications point by point, I would like to refer once again to what I had said while replying to the Demands for Grants of my Ministry in the other House. I had stated *inter alia* that there is a national consensus on the basic postulates of our foreign policy spelt out by our freedom struggle and initially enunciated by no less a person than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself. This was also quite clear from the various points that were made by the hon. Members yesterday. I had also stated then in the other House that there is a tremendous global change taking place and our policies must respond to this. We must look globally, react globally and harmonise relations in South Asia and of South Asia with other regions in the perspective of this global change. As I had indicated at that time, the thrust of this global change is against

Pakistan's belligerence. The passing of the cold war has deprived Pakistan of some subtleties of certain opportunities in the international alignments. By pursuing its present policy, Pakistan is missing a great opportunity of peace and friendship with India. However, as I have stated time and again, if Pakistan wishes to proceed ahead towards friendship and normalisation of our relations we will not be found wanting. India is willing to restore a dialogue with Pakistan and establish constructive and cooperative relationship.

We believe in the letter and spirit of Shimla Agreement and are committed to settle all differences peacefully through bilateral negotiations. I also wish to thank all my colleagues particularly Shri Vajpayee, Shri Yashwant Sinha and Shri Roy Chowdhury who accompanied me to New York and whose support and advice at all times was very valuable.

Having said this, let me take up some of the points that my friends referred to here. Shri Kapil Verma asked me who took initiative for the talks. As I have said, we are committed to the Shimla Agreement under which all differences between India and Pakistan are to be resolved bilaterally through negotiations.

Therefore, when Pakistan suggested talks, I accepted. I wished in particular to impress up the government of Pakistan the dangers inherent in their policy of brinkmanship that they were following.

Several countries in the world have made appeals for present tensions in India-Pakistan relations to be reduced and confrontation avoided through talks. But to interpret their appeals as pressure is completely incorrect and out of context. We do not accept pressures from any side whatsoever. This is a legacy of India's foreign policy. We ourselves believe that tensions and confrontations are not in the interest of the people of our two countries and of peace and stability in the region. While on this

question, I must refer to press reports of this morning. As my friend, Mr. Malaviya, said, it appeared in the press this morning quoting Mohatrama Benazir Bhutto, Prime Minister of Pakistan, as having said that she was ready to meet our Prime Minister for a dialogue to resolve differences over Kashmir.

At its face value, such an offer conforms with what I have just stated, that is, that we always welcome bilateral discussions at all levels to sort out outstanding issues between our two countries. The difficulty arises due to the conditions which Pakistan's Prime Minister has once again applied to such a dialogue, and to Pakistan's continued support for subversion and terrorism in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir. She calls for observance of outdated UN Resolutions. She has also referred to "troop deployment and neutral mechanism" to verify allegations and counter-allegations from both sides. These references are identical to what Sahabzada Yakub Khan has mentioned to me in New York.

Hon. Members will recall that in my statement I have said that third party involvement is irrelevant and redundant in the context of our bilateral relations. But in this situation, the only way in which progress can be made is by Pakistan taking credible measures to create confidence, and demonstrate seriousness about improving relations with India.

I also notice that the Japanese Prime Minister who is a very valued friend of India has given attention to the current tensions in our region. I appreciate his well-meaning concern. Hon. Members would recall that while addressing the Parliament during his recent visit to India, the Japanese Prime Minister had appreciated India's position when he called for settling the differences peacefully through talks in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Simla Agreement.

[Shri I.K. Gujral]

My friend, Mr. Kapil Verma, had also proceeded to ask me whether Pakistan's Foreign Minister changes stand after the talks. Our official spokesman in his statement on 28th April, 1990, and I myself during my discussions with the media people in London had expressed our surprise at this change in his position compared to the approach he had indicated during the meeting. I would rather not speculate on what his motivations could have been, but it would not be an unsafe guess to say that he had his own hawkish lobby at home in mind. Several Members also referred to Pakistan Foreign Minister's political leanings within Pakistan. As far as we are concerned, he is the Foreign Minister of the Government of Pakistan, and we talk to him in that capacity.

My friend, Mr. Subramanian Swamy...

SHRI KAPIL VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): What about the attitude of the super powers?

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: If I sit down without replying to any of the questions that you have raised, then please raise your question. I will reply to every question that was raised by every hon. Member here. And if I missed anything, then you kindly tell me.

I was referring to my hon. friend, Mr. Subramanian Swamy who has said that there is no reference to the statement of Kashmir being an integral part of India. The Government has time and again made clear that there can be no compromise on our stand that Kashmir is an integral part of India. The Prime Minister has said it, I have said it, and the official spokesmen have clarified our position. My reference in the statement to the fact that we would not tolerate infringement on our sovereignty and territorial integrity was obviously related to our principled stand on Jammu and Kashmir. I should also recall here the clear communication of our policy in the reply given by us recently at New York when Pakistan Delegation had made a

reference to Jammu and Kashmir in the Non-aligned Meeting. And in New York when the Pakistan Delegation had made a reference to Jammu and Kashmir, on this occasion, we categorically stated that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral, inseparable part of India.

Mr. Kapil Verma has also asked me about the attitude of the super powers, and you are also wanting to know. There is a general appreciation of India's stand. The super powers and other Governments have all endorsed Simla Agreement. The US Government has also expressed itself against plebiscite in Kashmir. It also does not favour internationalisation of the issue.

The Soviet Union has indicated clearly that there is no change in their stand regarding Kashmir. China expressed the hope that India and Pakistan will remove differences and settle disputes through friendly consultations. All these countries have expressed support to resolving differences between India and Pakistan through dialogue as indicated in the Simla Agreement.

Shri Malaviyaji had asked me, is Pakistan disowning the Simla Agreement? While various Pakistani leaders have said time and again that they support the Simla Agreement, in actuality Pakistan has been violating several of its provisions. These include stipulations relating to prevention of the organisational assistance or encouragement to any acts detrimental to maintenance of peaceful and harmonious relations, two, prevention of hostile propaganda directed against each other; three, respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Pakistan's attempts to internationalise the Kashmir issue are also in violation of the provisions, although the two countries are resolved to settle their differences by peaceful means or bilateral negotiations or any other peaceful means mutually agreed to between them.

Vishwanathji had asked me. ...*(Interruptions)*...

. SHRI SITARAM KESARI (Bihar): You have mixed up the two, Vishwanath and Vishvjit. The difference is...

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: ...only in size.

It appears to us, Madam, that Pakistan hopes to make certain gains through overt and covert support to terrorism and by encouraging insurgency. Such ambitions are clearly based on wrong assumptions. Pakistan should be aware that we have the capacity to defend our sovereignty and integrity. We are keeping our communication channels open with Pakistan in the belief that they will realise that it is in their own larger interest that they should abandon the misguided policies before they are overtaken by events. Our agreeing to talks is an indication of our confidence in ourselves.

Shri Gurudas Das Gupta had asked me about the people whom I met in New York and what they said. I met a large number of Foreign Ministers from various parts of the world and I would be summing up by saying that virtually all of them appreciated India's position and expressed support for the Simla Agreement.

Shri Kulkarniji, who is still in the House, although he had threatened to go out—well I am glad that he is here—had asked me what is the Government doing about the BBC reports. The reports, Madam, only reinforce what we have been saying. We have sufficient evidence regarding Pakistan's involvement and support to terrorism directed against India. The evidence had also been provided to the Government of Pakistan on the 12th of February. Confirmation from independent sources is also now becoming available. Apart from the BBC other reliable commentators have also highlighted the support. In addition there is an article in *Washington Post* of the 23rd

April, 1990, by Mr. S. Harrison where it is said:

"Evidence obtained in Pakistan as well as through Indian and American intelligence sources indicate that 63 Pakistan operated camps have been functioning at various times during the past two years".

The *Time Magazine* of May 7, 1990, issue has called on Pakistan not to encourage secessionists. As far as BBC report is concerned, we have already asked our High Commissioner to send a copy of the programme and we shall analyse it and study it. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): What about Ammanullah?

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Have I finished? At your age you must have patience. *(Interruptions)*.

Madam, Shri Hari Singh asked about the links between the Kashmir extremists and the Afghan Mujahideens. There have been several reports indicating that the Kashmiri extremist groups have been in touch with the Afghan Mujahideens, obtaining weapons and training. There are also reports suggesting that some of these Kashmir groups have been participating in the fighting in Afghanistan against the Government there. We are carefully monitoring all such possibilities and linkages and will take appropriate countermeasures to safeguard our national interests.

Another hon. Member whose name missed recording, asked me 'Will India attack the terrorist camps?'. I would not like to use the language of belligerence and bellicosity.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDEI (Uttar Pradesh): Your Prime Minister does it.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: I can assure hon. Members that there will be no compromise on our integrity and

[Shri I.K. Gujral]

sovereignty. Appropriate measures will be taken in this regard.

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR: The Prime Minister also should have spoken in the same light.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Shri Shiv Shankar, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who has also been the Minister of External Affairs, understands diplomacy better than I do. He understands the parameters of diplomacy also.

In my statement, I had referred to my bringing to the notice of Mr. Yakub Khan, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, the activities of this gentleman who goes by the name of Amanullah Khan. I also produced before him the evidence that was with me about his doings. I would also like to take this opportunity to inform hon. Members regarding the status and processing of provisional detention and extradition of Amanullah Khan. After completing the legal processes in India, we transmitted the warrant of arrest and other legal documents to the U.S. Government and sought provisional detention of Amanullah Khan, pending completion of the legal formalities for extradition proceedings. On the morning of 1st May, we received information that Amanullah Khan had been located in New York. The Justice Department appealed to the Magistrate having jurisdiction over the area for a warrant of arrest. But the plea was denied on the ground of insufficient evidence directly linking Amanullah Khan to the crimes for which he was charged. We have since then provided more and additional material to the U.S. Government and requested that another attempt be made to put Amanullah Khan in detention. This is where the matter stands at the moment. We are awaiting further information and we are in touch with the U.S. Government in processing the matter further. We are aware of the news-stories emanating from the U.S. that Amanullah Khan

might have fled from the U.S.A. We are trying to verify the facts.

Before I sit down—I think I have met all the points—I would only like to say that we support the democratic process in Pakistan and would be happy to see its consolidation. However, the present policy of the Pakistan Government and various other elements in the Pakistani polity pose a danger to the political and democratic process in Pakistan itself. We have nothing but immense goodwill for the people of Pakistan. We believe in a meaningful co-operative relationship, to our mutual economic, cultural and political benefit.

Hon. Members will agree that this is a crucial moment in our national life when our will, determination and valued institutions are being tested. Our pluralistic democracy discusses and occasionally differs on various issues, but, when challenged, it has always risen to the occasion and responded unitedly. Today, Pakistan is not only trying to cause disturbances in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir, but it is primarily wanting to disrupt our secular polity, the bedrock of our national unity. We may be diverse in several ways, but our zeal of patriotism unites us. This is a moment when nothing should be said or done that may give a wrong impression or go to weaken the cherished institutions of secularism and democracy.

1.00 p.m.

We will have time and leisure to differ and criticise each other, but today unitedly we must defend our fort, the secular democratic polity.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: The BBC also mentioned about Iranians and Saudi Arabians and their involvement with the terrorists. The terrorists have said so in their interview with the BBC. What is your information and reaction to this?

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): I asked about the attitude of the Islamic countries, particularly in the background that the Islamic Conference has always

been supporting Pakistan. Will the Minister explain whether he contacted any other Islamic country? Also, has he or any of his companion talked about Fiji? I would like the hon. Minister to explain this.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): As far as Kashmir is concerned, Kashmir is an integral part of our country and there cannot be any kind of dispute over that. Just now, he said that the Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto had expressed the desire to talk with the Government of India on the issue of Kashmir and that our Government has welcomed this. Madam, my point is that Kashmir is an integral part of our country and there cannot be any difference of opinion on that aspect. As late V.K. Krishna Menon said, as far as Kashmir was concerned there was no dispute but it was a situation created by Pakistani aggression. Once you accept this, then your whole stand is demolished. Therefore, you can talk with the Prime Minister of Pakistan on other aspects, other issues, but as far as the differences on the Kashmir issue are concerned, I think this government should not accept the offer of the Pakistan Prime Minister. So, I would like to know the reaction of this Government on this aspect.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is another statement also. I cannot allow a discussion on this. Yes, Mr. Kesri, you wanted to say something.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Partiality.

श्री सीताराम केसरी: उपसभापति महोदया, कश्मीर भारतवर्ष का एक हिस्सा ही नहीं है, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सीमा के अन्तर्गत भी आता है। आपकी सरकार भारतीय जनता पार्टी द्वारा समर्थित सरकार है।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर: बड़ी तकलीफ है आपको।

श्री सीताराम केसरी: नहीं। मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि

आप अपने चेहरे का नकाब उतारिये और साफ-साफ बात कीजिये। आपके समर्थन के बारे में मेरी राय क्या है, क्या नहीं है, दोपेन घोष जी जवाब देंगे। इसलिये कश्मीर के संबंध में भारतीय जनता पार्टी की जो नीति है उस नीति के अन्तर्गत कश्मीर की समस्या का समाधान आप खोज रहे हैं या उनकी नीतियों से प्रभावित हो कर आप फौलादी कदम उठाने में असमर्थ हैं, अगर नहीं हैं तो आपका केटेगरीकली इस हाउस में स्टेटमेंट होना चाहिये कि आपकी नीतियां निष्पक्ष हैं और इस देश की जो विदेश नीति रही है उसी पर आधारित है। आप किसी भी हालत में अपने समर्थकों की नीतियों से प्रभावित नहीं होंगे।

श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजराल: मेडम, मेरा ख्याल था कि सीताराम जी मेरे बयान को गौर से सुन रहे होंगे मेरी बदकिस्मती है कि उन्होंने यह नहीं सुना जब मैंने यह कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान की फौरेन पालिसी हमारी फ्रीडम स्ट्रगल ने बनाई थी और उसको पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने निर्धारित किया था। और यह पालिसी हिन्दुस्तान की कन्सेप्स कांस्टीट्यूट करती है और इस सरकार की वही पालिसी है। यह मैंने आज भी कहा है, इससे पहले वहां भी कहा है और आखिरी बात जो मैंने कही थी वह आज फिर मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। आजकल महाभारत देखने की बहुत चर्चा है। महाभारत में एक बात कही गयी है। इस हाउस में हो या बाहर, हम आपस में सौ हों या पांच, जब दूसरा है तो हम 105 हैं।

श्री सीताराम केसरी: एक दूसरा प्रश्न उठता है जब आप 105 की बात करते हैं ... (व्यवधान) वैदेशिक मंत्री महोदय, मैं नहीं चाहता हूँ डिबेट हो मगर जब आपने 105 का प्रश्न किया है तो आपके प्रधान मंत्री ने सुरक्षा के संबंध में जो यह आरोप लगाया है कि हमारी सरकार ने इतनी तैयारी नहीं की और कमजोर रखा है युद्ध के लिये। लेकिन बजाये कि पाकिस्तान से इस मसले पर युद्ध की बात करते वे हमसे लड़ने के लिए प्रस्तुत हैं। सबसे बड़ी शर्म की बात यह है। इसलिए आप ... (व्यवधान) एक सौ या एक सौ पांच की बात नहीं करते हैं। यह शर्म की बात है। पहले आप कहिए कि जिस समय आप वित्त मंत्री थे उस समय क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि सुरक्षा के संबंध में ... (व्यवधान) देखिए मैं बताता हूँ जब आप एक सौ से एक सौ पांच की बात करते हैं तो हम तैयार हैं और आपसे आगे बढ़कर तैयार हैं और इस राष्ट्र को आज राजनैतिक ... (व्यवधान) रूप से चलाने में आज कांग्रेस ही जिम्मेदार रही है, कोई दूसरा दल नहीं है और आप भी उसी के पार्ट एण्ड पार्सल रहे हैं। मगर आप याद रखिए

[श्री सीताराम केसरी]

जब आप सुरक्षा की बात करते हैं कि एक सौ से एक सौ पांच हैं तो हम स्वागत करते हैं मगर अपनी जबान पर ताला लगाइये और ठीक से बात करिये।

उपसभापति: स्टेटमेंट बंद रहा है इस बीच में I have an appointment and so I have to leave the Chair for our new Vice-Chairman.... The Vice-Chairman is hiding behind. He is shy. Now we have a new Vice Chairman and I have to request the hon. Members, he has been a Professor and been presiding over turbulent students and youth. Now I put the Elders into his hands. Please be kind to him.

[The Vice-Chairman (Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur) in the Chair]

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): We extend a hearty welcome to him.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): You are a teacher. You can rule the unruly students on that side.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): I will try, whatever I can, on both sides.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Incident at Palej Railway Station in Bharuch District of Gujarat

गृह मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सुबोधकांत सहाय): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस सम्माननीय सदन को 30 अप्रैल को गुजरात में भड़ौच जिले में पालेज रेलवे स्टेशन पर 23 डाउन बाम्बे-फिरोजपुर जनता एक्सप्रेस में यात्रा कर रहे भारतीय जनता पार्टी एवं राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ के स्वयं सेवकों और स्थानीय व्यक्तियों को भीड़ के मध्य हुई घटना के बारे में सूचित करता हूँ। पता चला है कि श्री प्रकाश मेहता भारतीय जनता पार्टी के विधायक (महाराष्ट्र) के नेतृत्व में एक ग्रुप 2.5.90 को आयोजित होने वाली 'कश्मीर बचाओ' रैली में भाग लेने के लिए दिल्ली आ रहा था। 14 बज कर 35 मिनट पर गाड़ी पालेज रेलवे स्टेशन पर रुकी, जहाँ पर इसका रुकने का समय चार मिनट का है। भारतीय जनता पार्टी एवं राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ के स्वयं सेवक गाड़ी में नारे लगा रहे थे। जिसका रेलवे स्टेशन के नजदीक रहने वाले कुछ स्थानीय मुसलमानों द्वारा विरोध किया गया। जैसे ही

गाड़ी पालेज रेलवे स्टेशन से चलनी प्रारंभ हुई कुछ व्यक्तियों ने जंजीर खींच दी, जिससे गाड़ी रुक गई। लगभग 200 व्यक्तियों को एक अवैध भीड़ ने, जो प्लेट फार्म पर एकत्र हो गई थी, गाड़ी पर पथराव करना शुरू कर दिया।

गाड़ी में यात्रा कर रहे भा० ज० पा० एवं रा० स्व० से संघ के स्वयं सेवकों और भीड़ के बीच झड़प हो गई। दिल्ली आ रहे ग्रुप में से एक व्यक्ति पर तेज हथियार से हमला किया गया और वह घटना स्थल पर ही मारा गया। गाड़ी में यात्रा कर रहे ग्रुप के अन्य 8 व्यक्ति झड़प में घायल हो गए। घटना का समाचार सुनकर भड़ौच से पुलिस तुरंत पालेज पहुंची और स्थिति को नियंत्रण में किया।

घायलों में से दो व्यक्तियों को भड़ौच सिविल अस्पताल में भर्ती कराया गया और शेष छह को बड़ौदा सिविल अस्पताल में भेजा गया। शव परीक्षा के बाद शव को पुलिस संरक्षण में बम्बई भेजा गया।

भारतीय दण्ड संहिता की धारा 143, 147, 148, 149, 302, 323, 394, 395 और भारतीय रेल अधिनियम की धारा 108 के अन्तर्गत एक मामला दर्ज किया गया है। अब तक 21 व्यक्तियों को गिरफ्तार किया जा चुका है।

राज्य सरकार ने घटना की उच्च स्तरीय जांच के आदेश दिए हैं। पुलिस महानिदेशक द्वारा जांच की जा रही है। राज्य सरकार ने मारे गए व्यक्ति के निकटतम संबंधी को 50,000/- रुपये की अनुग्रह राशि दिए जाने के भी आदेश दिए हैं।

पालेज तथा उसके आस-पास स्थिति शान्तिपूर्ण है।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश): यह मेरे उल्लेख पर वक्तव्य दिया गया है, इसलिए मैं कुछ पूछना चाहूंगा। जैसा मैंने कल संदेह प्रकट किया था... (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR): Just one minute. We already have a list of names.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: This was in response to my