

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri Bhagwat Dayal, Shri M. R. Shervani, Shri M. C. Setalvad and Shri K. Sundaram for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

(No honourable Member dissented)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

MOTION RE STATEMENT MADE BY THE HOME MINISTER IN THE RAJYA SABHA ON APRIL 27, 1970 ON THE SSP DEMONSTRATION NEAR PATEL CHOWK ON APRIL 6, 1970.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to move—

“That the statement made by the Home Minister in the Rajya Sabha on April 27, 1970, be taken into consideration.”

Sir, it is with great pain and sorrow that I have to refer to the happenings on the 6th April relating to the massive SSP demonstration that was organised on the first day of the National Week. We in this country since the Jallianwala Bagh days celebrate the National Week commencing on the 6th April. It is indeed ironical that the incidents that took place in and around the Patel Chowk coincided with the 6th April. That naturally recalls to our mind the atrocities that were perpetrated in Jallianwala Bagh during the days of the British imperialism. This happening had stunned the entire country. Nothing more shocking, nothing more inexpressibly sad or outrageous had happened as I shall seek to establish a moment later, in the course of our history after independence than this incident. Although its dimensions may not be very large, the implications of it would indicate that never even during the days of the British imperialism could such a thing have happened or have been allowed to happen within the ken of Parliament. This is remarkable and therefore, it becomes very sinister that this thing happened within the ken of Parliament within a stone's throw from Parliament. And there was absolutely no fear or no sense of restraint on the agencies which dealt with the situation there spite of Parliament being in session—in

spite of at least one of the Houses of Parliament being in session only at a few yards' distance. Parliament is the sentinel of our nation; it is the symbol of vigilance of our nation. Parliament is the watch-tower of the nation. And if this thing could happen within the ken of Parliament you can imagine what would be happening outside the ken of Parliament. And that is the sinister implication of it. Not that when we mention about an honourable Member of Parliament being involved in this we claim any superiority for him in relation to other citizens. Many a time it has been heard that Members of Parliament claim a kind of superior citizenship. That is not a fact. Members of Parliament are servants of the nation. And if those who are in charge of making the law and also seeing to the extent possible the administration of the law, can be made victims of the most brutal attack, you can imagine what would be happening on the poor masses of India.

The sinister implication of this, again, is that this has been done by an agency of the Government and this indicates a kind of an organised attack on a procession. And what was the procession about? The procession was for ventilating some of the most legitimate grievances of the people. The procession, the demonstration, related to the economic demands, and they wanted to present a charter, an economic charter, to the Presiding Officers of the two Houses and, may be, also to the head of the Government or the head of the State. But they were not allowed to do that and so they assembled in that area where many times we have heard there has been a prohibitory order in force, which I must say, has been observed with consideration for the convenience of the Government. This point I can never fail to emphasise that although this prohibitory order has been in force or is said to have been in force since the anti-cowslaughter agitation, it has not been enforced by this Government with the impartiality with which it ought to have been done. The Government never squarely faced this question. We know the kind of reply that has been given by the Government and the way in which the Government has been able to get away with it. But after November 1966, though it has been supposed to be in operation, there have been cases where the Government has been instrumental in aiding and abetting demonstrations and processions organised within the area in which the prohibitory order is supposed to

be in force. And therefore, you found that only about six or seven months back there was a demonstration here during the course of which there was some kind of an assault on some Members of Parliament. But the Government never took notice of that. We also recall to our mind that when the Working Committee was meeting in 7, Jantar Mantar Road in November last, some important leaders of the country were assaulted and pushed about and the police was standing by. This happened within the ken of the Parliament and therefore it is a most serious thing and this demonstration, as will be pointed out in detail by some friends a little later, wanted to ventilate the grievances of the people with regard to their economic problems and so on. These were the problems of prices. What was there to fear about, I really do not know. The grievances related to the problem of unemployment which is becoming so explosive that now it is becoming difficult for member of the Government to address meetings. The other day some hon. Members of this Government wanted to address a meeting at Patna and they simply could not do so because Bihar is afflicted with the problem of educated unemployment in a very large measure and 2200 engineers seem to be unemployed at the present moment. They wanted to highlight all these problems. Might be there would have been certain political problems too and these related to the danger to democracy, the way in which democracy was sought to be throttled yet it is this procession on which attacks were made by an agency of the Government. I must make it clear that I am not one of those who would like to roundly criticise the police and yet I must say because the police is also an important wing of the administration I would not like to find fault with them everywhere. May be on many occasions they have to function under most trying circumstances and under great strain but here is an instance where we have not come across a single thing which has been pointed out from the side of the agency which might have justified the action they took on that occasion. We do not find even prosecutions having been launched against the persons on whom the severe assaults were made. If they had committed certain crimes then there should have been prosecutions launched. But we do not find any prosecutions having been launched. On the face of it, that indicates that there were no tenable charges against hon. Members who had to be victims of the Police assault. I would like to have information from the Government

as to what are the reasons why prosecutions have not been launched and yet they were subjected to such serious assaults which many of us have seen with our own eyes in the hospital where they were laying and even now a standing symbol of it is there in the person of the hon. Member Shri Rajnarain in this House. So I submit that there does not seem to be, on the face of it, any kind of crime which could be imputed by the Government to these persons who were supposed to be the leaders of any kind of demonstration which, it was feared, might have done some harm to the Government or to any property of the government. I do not really know. Therefore everyone of us feel very much concerned about the implication of this incident. You would remember that after the Jallianwala Bagh case, Dr. Rabindranath Tagore had said that that was the monstrous progeny of a monstrous war. I do not want to use any such strong words but there is a similarity that I shall point out.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : क्या आजादी की लड़ाई देखी है ?

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : लेकिन वह पालियामेंट के नजदीक नहीं चली ।

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : I hope you are representing the views of the Party . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Rabindra Nath Tagore had characterised that Jallianwala Bagh as the monstrous progeny.

श्री नेकीराम (हरियाणा) : कभी उधर से बोलते हैं और कभी उधर से बोलते हैं ।

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश) : पहले जरा उनको कंट्रोल में रखिये ।

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I really do not know. We have a remedy to any other person but not to Mr. Neki Ram. I was saying that I would not like to use such a strong word and yet I must say that it is the most monstrous act that could have been perpetrated by any agency of the Government and particularly the Government which calls itself to be a democratic civilised Government. I may again say that I am not brought up in a tradition in which I would blame an agency of the Government. I should rather blame the political element which runs that agency and that is the most honourable code for us to follow. It is not the police

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

with which we have to find fault so much because after all when I was mentioning that it happened within a stone's throw of Parliament House I also wanted to add that it happened within a few yards from the Central Secretariat which is supposed to be in charge of the police administration here. Parliamentary tradition demands that we should demand the head of the steward of the Government or administration and we should not demand the head of an individual officer particularly. This should be because so of the fact that the whole matter has been remitted to the care of a judicial enquiry.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Why do you demand the head when you have lost a foot only ?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I am speaking figuratively. I am not demanding actually the physical head of Mr. Chavan, the Home Minister, but it is in the parliamentary tradition that we should demand the head of the Minister. We should not demand the head of an individual officer and there are special reasons here for doing so. That is what I wanted to establish. We remember that in this very city of Delhi atrocities were perpetrated in Indraprastha Estate only about 1½ years back. After that one thought that things would be corrected and there would be a better crowd management by the police, better management of demonstration and other kinds of rallies organised here by the various political parties almost on the basis of one per day but what happened after the Indraprastha incident? There was a non-official committee appointed on that occasion and it consisted of Shri Purshottamdas Tricumdas and Shri Justice Sarjoo Prasad. What did the hon. Home Minister say on that occasion? I would draw the attention of the hon. Home Minister to the observation he had made on that occasion. He had said :

"I have read it particularly . . ."—
(That is the Purshottamdas Tricumdas Committee report—)

and find that the basic conclusions of the Enquiry Committee of the non-officials and of the Deputy Commissioner are the same—that the police entered the Indraprastha building unjustifiably and that without discrimination they used force."

These are the words used by the hon. Minister with regard to the report of the non-official committee which was appointed

to go into the Indraprastha Estate incidents. May I repeat so that he might reply to it later :

"The police entered the Indraprastha building unjustifiably and that without discrimination they used force".

That was the conclusion of both the Deputy Commissioner and also the non-official committee that had gone into this matter. What has the Home Ministry done after this incident? That is the real point to be considered and therefore I say that the responsibility rests squarely upon the Home Ministry although its agency might be blamed and is bound to come in for criticism and blame on this occasion.

Now, after having said this, the approach was also indicated by the hon. Home Minister on that occasion. And what was this approach ? The approach was that "the question of Indraprastha and what the police did there cannot be considered in isolation, because the police acted in a certain developing situation that very day, and that certain developing situation in Delhi was also part of what was, happening in the entire country." Now if that is the justification which is provided, then there would be endless justifications for this kind of incident that has taken place in Delhi. The conclusions of the hon. Home Minister were the same as those of the non-official committee or of the Deputy Commissioner, but he came with a kind of justification for this that this has to be explained in terms of a developing situation inside the country as well as in Delhi. Now the situation in the country, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is developing in such a way that there is violence in the air everywhere. But what does it lead us to? Does it lead us to this that in Delhi itself we should be a witness to such scenes of atrocities and excesses as we have seen here ? Now, after that incident, it was also made known to us that the police would be given training in better crowd management. What has happened to that ? In fact, we learn that a good deal of money was spent on that.

Now here we have come to know from those persons, who were involved in this, that the assault was made when the meeting was dispersing. I would not like to go into the details of that just now. Otherwise, it may be said that it would prejudice the course of the inquiry. And yet, Sir, certain facts, only plain and hard facts, have to be mentioned for the information of the House and also for those who might be concerned with this a little

latter. Now, what we came to know was that when the meeting was dispersing the assault was made. If they were supposed to have come in a procession in a prohibited area then, probably the much better course was to arrest them than to subject them to such inhuman treatment, as was done on that occasion. That is what baffles us completely and really it is just beyond us why it was not thought necessary to arrest these persons instead of beating them so mercilessly. That point has never been explained to us. And we have also come to learn that when only five or six persons were there that the police entered the area and some of these persons were heavily belaboured. It was not any crowd at the time; only five or six persons were on the dais. So, what I want to say is that we do not know what was the occasion about which it could be said that some such action had been taken with any amount of justification. However, the whole matter would be gone into by the Commission of Inquiry.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, many hon. Members might shake in their shoes that we might tread upon the delicate ground to be covered by the Commission of Inquiry. But the House would be quite competent in going into the adequacy or inadequacy of the terms of reference. May I suggest that the terms of reference of this inquiry are not adequate for the purpose? Now the first thing that they mention in these terms of reference is "the course of events arising out of the procession taken out by the Samyukta Socialist Party and particularly the incidents in and around the Patel Chowk". Now, may I submit that it is not only arising out of the procession taken out by the S. S. P. and the incidents in and around the Patel Chowk? The procession had started much earlier. To which procession does it refer? And then there was also the meeting at Patel Chowk. Now, probably the contention from the other side is that the whole thing started when the meeting was being held there, it did not start with the procession. So why has it been strictly confined to the procession and why has it not been mentioned—the meeting? Although it may be submitted by the Government that it relates to all the incidents in and around Patel Chowk, yet, if it has been thought fit to mention specifically the procession, we should have thought that, from the judicial point of view, it would have been much better if the meeting was also included in this first

term of reference. That is the point which is being mentioned by some of the hon. Members who were involved in this incident. Now the second thing which I would like to mention is that in the terms of reference it is said that the death of Mr. Behari of Barabanki could have been caused as a result of the use of such force. I really do not understand the justification for the word 'alleged' here. I would come to that. If the word 'alleged' is justified there, then the word 'alleged' should have been justified in the context of the injuries also caused to Members of Parliament among others. Now it may be that even the point of injuries caused may be inquired into by the Commission of Inquiry. And yet, it has been as clear as noon-day that the injuries were inflicted on the members of the demonstration by some agency, may be the police. And that has been indicated here. Now therefore, if you have not found any justification for using the word 'alleged' in their case, I really do not know why the word 'alleged' has been used in the context of the death of Shri Behari of Barabanki. I really do not quite understand it. And it is quite plain to us, because his death followed just a few hours after the incident and it was the result of the beating. So I really do not understand why the formulation is like this. And then, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the third thing which has been mentioned in the terms of reference is "the justification for the use of force by the police." Now, to my mind, it should have also included the words 'or otherwise'; it should have read: "the justification or otherwise". You are putting it in a positive way like this "the justification for the use of force by the police", and that includes a positive indication. If it should have meant that you wanted to take a neutral stand with regard to that, it should have been "the justification or otherwise for the use of force by the police". But that is not what is mentioned in the terms of reference.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say a few words with regard to the actions that have been taken by the Government. I must thank the hon. Home Minister that some action, as he had promised in the other House, has been taken against some officers, who had been directly involved in this matter. He mentioned yesterday that actions have been taken against two officers. But may I say that the officers selected happen to be so humble that it does not satisfy us at all? Again, as I have been saying, this is the

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

most honourable course for us to adopt that we demand the head of the hon. the Home Minister. I would not demand the head of the Superintendent of Police on duty there. It would have been more honourable for him to take action against some of the big ones. But he has taken action against the small ones, and that is what happens everywhere and that is our experience every day. Whenever there is any corruption case, it is against a clerk or a peon, and the hon. the Home Minister is true to the form of the Government. (Interruptions) I am enamoured of his face, may be, but as regards the action taken, I must say that it has only provided a kind of sop to us; that is the impression carried to us. And these two persons, it may be that they have not been responsible to that extent. After all, they must have acted under the orders of some persons. Now, a poor Additional Superintendent of Police and a poor Sub-Divisional Magistrate—I really do not know how far they have been responsible—these people have been selected for action. However, that is merciful enough, and to the extent the action has been taken, he has probably thought that he has fulfilled the promise that he had made to the other House—but not in the spirit of what the country wanted. That has not been done, that is, the main officers responsible have not even been made to know that they have *prima facie* erred in this matter and there would be no delay in taking action against them. And that was also necessary, Mr. Deputy Chairman, from the point of view of the administration of justice. What is feared is that the course of the administration of justice would be tampered with by some of the important officers. And if those officers remain entrenched in power, this fear cannot be removed. And that is what is happening in West Bengal at the present moment. It is the complaint made by some persons that in Burdwan and other places Courts of Inquiry cannot be impartially conducted because there are officers who are constantly trying to interfere with the administration of justice. Here we thought that the Home Minister would have taken the action as the other House had demanded.

Again in the terms of reference, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I forgot to mention one important aspect and that is this. Allegations have been made by important and responsible persons that it was the political element in the Administration which was responsible for this atrocity. That has been

made in the other House also; no less a person than Acharya Kirpalani said that the police had only been a tool in the hands of the Government and it is the Government which has been responsible for all this. Now there are indirect evidence—not very direct and I would not like to be unfair to them—and there are certain circumstances which might lead one to the conclusion that the Government here was responsible in some way for this kind of atrocity being perpetrated on them. I would not lightly make any complaint with regard to that but yet I think it is my duty to place before the House certain circumstances in which one is driven to that conclusion. Now, what are the circumstances? Here is a party, Mr. Deputy Chairman, which is supposed to be the most militant opposition to the Government. Here is a party, the Samyukta Socialist Party, which is supposed to be most critical of the head of the Government. I am not suggesting anything but I am only placing these facts and may be that some persons would draw some conclusion from these facts. This is being talked about; not that I am saying here; it is being talked about by the people. It has been stated in the other House that this party happens to be the strongest critic of the Government and more particularly of the Prime Minister and probably so the police had the courage to do it because they thought that they could get away with it with impunity. May be their active aid and abetment were not provided on this occasion.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: They want their police also must be committed.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: They want probably not only the police but everyone else to be committed, including the Opposition. Perhaps that might also come in slow degrees. However, what I am telling now is that there are certain circumstances which go to indicate that there might be involvement of the Government in the whole show. One thing that I have mentioned is about the character of the organisation which organised this demonstration and that organisation has been recognised by everybody as a very very militant opposition and sometimes even in a personal way—although we have not liked it—they have criticised the Prime Minister. I must say that it has been a great distress to me but yet I cannot forget to mention that this has been done by this party on many occasions in this House and in the other House also. Now this is the party which is involved. And only the rank and file, Mr. Deputy Chairman,

which has been subjected to this brutal assault but all the hand-picked leaders have been involved without any exception. A person like me can claim to know all the leaders and even some important workers of the SSP because we had worked together for decades, for two to three decades; we had worked in the field and we had worked side by side earlier during the independence movement and we know many of them. None of the important leaders has been spared. The Chairman of the Samyukta Socialist Party was subjected to this assault; I came to see him in the dispensary of Parliament. I saw that the Chairman was assaulted; the General Secretary was assaulted. I had an occasion to visit him soon after this incident in the Willingdon Nursing Home and I must tell you that I cannot describe adequately the kind of injuries he had received all over the body. Mr. George Fernandes is the General Secretary of the party. Mr. Deputy Chairman, the persons involved were all top Members of Parliament whose photos appear every morning in one newspaper or the other, whose utterances appear every day in the newspapers. Not that they are non-entities and one cannot say that the police did not know them. They happen to be important Members of Parliament and I am emphasizing their importance not from the point of view of claiming any superiority for them in the eyes of the law, I am only emphasizing so that the police could not say that they were not important leaders of the party and therefore they could not try to be circumspect or careful in this matter. So what I am suggesting is this if you find a constellation of circumstances like this that the party involved is of a particular character and that all the leaders of the party have been subjected to this assault, what is the conclusion which you would be driven to? The conclusion would be that there has been some invisible hand behind this and it is not the police by themselves. After all the assurances that have been given in the wake of the Indraprastha incident one would have thought that the Government here would be more careful in seeing to it that such incidents did not occur again in future. So my humble submission would be that the terms of reference should have included to what extent the political element in the Administration has been responsible for this. When I stress the inadequacy of the terms of reference I particularly want that this should also be included. Many a time some hon. Members advise us to be extra careful and in fact it is necessary that in judicial matters

one should be extra careful but I must say that there are certain things which ought to be pointed out. If I differ with regard to a person appointed, if I had a different opinion about the objectivity or impartiality of a person who is supposed to constitute a Commission of Inquiry I am perfectly competent to come before the House and say that I differ with this kind of appointment and there would be nothing wrong in it although the Commission of Inquiry had been constituted. These are aspects which have to be brought to the notice of the House. However, I do not have anything to say about the person appointed; he does command the respect and confidence of all of us. Let there be no doubt about that. But the terms of reference with which he is going to be confronted might hamstring him and he would not be able to go into the political aspect of the matter. I am not referring to the lower level of politicking or the lower level of politics but I am only speaking about the political element in the Administration which to my mind is ultimately responsible for this. If that is not done I think that the whole purpose of the enquiry is going to be frustrated. We are not interested in having in the net of the judicial inquiry an ASI or a policeman or a constable. Because this happens to be the responsibility of the Central Government and this has happened within a stone's throw of the Central Secretariat we have to place the responsibility on them although I must say that the hon. Home Minister has been working to under very difficult circumstances, unenviably difficult circumstances from which he could have extricated himself but of which he has chosen to be a captive. Therefore what do we find? Within a few hours a judicial inquiry was announced but not by the hon. Home Minister. Although he has got a very pleasing voice and he could have made the announcement to the entire satisfaction of the other House, the announcement was chosen to be made by the Prime Minister herself. Now I really do not know why it is so. If I have an occasion Mr. Deputy Chairman, I will deal with the "presidentialisation" of the office of the Prime Minister. This is a trend which is in evidence. This happened in some other countries also. During the Macmillan regime in the United Kingdom this happened and this is happening in this country also. When any important announcement is to be made—and here Shri Y. B. Chavan is important enough to have made this announcement—it is the Prime Minister who makes it. It was the same story with regard to the location

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

of the steel plants also. That also highlighted this phenomenon which I am referring to, the presidentialisation of the office of the Prime Minister.

It is indeed a dangerous trend which is in evidence in this country—the location of a steel plant has to be announced by the Prime Minister and not by the Minister concerned and the location of the petro-chemical complex and refinery just on the eve of the PCC meeting in Assam in Gauhati has to be announced by the Prime Minister. Now, this is what is happening and that has taken place here. My fear is that the hon. Home Minister would not be allowed to create conditions in which the enquiry would be made with the utmost amount of impartiality and objectivity. There would be interference from some persons. Therefore, I have tried to stress this aspect that the announcement has been made by some other person. I submit that this motion should receive the attention of the House.

SHRI S. D. MISRA: All credit to her and discredit to the Home Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Let him complete his speech.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): They want to eliminate everybody opposed to them.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: If he is a willing victim, what can you do?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: We cannot do anything more.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Now, I would not like to carry on further; only a word more and I will have done. I would like to submit to you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that it does seem to me that this incident is going to be of a far-reaching character in the history of democracy of this country. In some of the States we have seen that when some such incidents have taken place, there has been a definite catastrophe in that State, the fall of the Government itself. I have seen that myself in my State, although at that time I happened to be associated with the party which constituted the Government then. At that time also some of the important leaders of the Opposition parties were belaboured in the lawns of Patna, and after that what happened was there for all of us to see. Now, this incident, which has

taken place here in the city of Delhi, is going to prove to be of a very far-reaching consequence and I have no doubt that after this incident we will have to give much more thought to the problem of saving democracy in this country. This is organised violence committed by the Government, but it may not be so in the judgment of the Commission of Inquiry—I may be wrong I do not know—and this has been done. This is an example of organised violence committed by an agency of the Government and, therefore, it portends ill for democracy. That is what we have seen in some of the States. In fact, the Calling Attention Motion which we were going to discuss this morning was also going to highlight some of the problems which had been created by some people there. So, I would like the Government to consider the serious implications or repercussions that such incidents are going to have on democracy itself. It is not a question of a party that is involved in this. The entire nation has been shaken because of this incident and every body has begun to fear that democracy in this country is escaping the final collapse by a hair's breadth. So the feeling is that this Government should not be allowed to remain in the saddle.

Thank you very much.

The question was proposed.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

“That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

‘and having considered the same, this House views with grave concern the happenings of April 6, 1970, in connection with the S. S. P. demonstration in and around Patel Chowk in Delhi.’”

The question was proposed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion and the amendment are before the House. There is a large number of speakers who would like to speak. I think the hon. Home Minister would like to speak at about 5.15. So, we have got very short time at our disposal. If the House wants that a large number of Members should be accommodated and they should be given a chance to speak, in that case every hon. Member will have to restrict his speech to ten or twelve minutes. Mr. Rajnarain will be an exception because the demonstration was in connection with his party and he is a victim of the

incident. Therefore, it will be quite natural to show him a little more latitude. Therefore, I would appeal to hon. Members to restrict their observations or remarks to ten or twelve minutes. Mr. Rajnarain.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Sir, we are all signatories to this demand and we all want to associate ourselves with the amendment that has already been moved by Mr. Niren Ghosh.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are a number of names added to the amendment of Mr. Niren Ghosh.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Shall I speak now ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have formally moved your amendment. Mr. Rajnarain will speak now and then others.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, एक निवेदन है कि आज पांच के बाद भी समय बढ़ा दिया जाय ता कोई हर्ज नहीं है ।

मैं सर्वप्रथम सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को 6 अप्रैल की तिथि क्यों कैसे आई उसकी पृष्ठभूमि बताना चाहूँगा ।

श्रीमन्, 10 जनवरी, 1970, संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी सोनपुर अधिवेशन । राष्ट्रीय अधिवेशन में 10 जनवरी, 1970, को रात्रि में जब यह प्रस्ताव पस हुआ, उसमें यह 6 तारीख का फैसला लिया गया । इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि लोग जरा समझ लें कि यकायक यह तिथि नहीं आई और एकरा इससे भी नहीं भाग सकती कि उसको जानकारी नहीं है ।

“संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी एक बार फिर ठोस नीतियों को ध्वजारोपण बना कर समता के द्वारा एकता और सम्पन्नता प्राप्त करने के लक्ष्य के प्रति समर्पित होने के अपने अटूट संकल्प को दुहराती है ।

देश की राजनीति के इस निर्णायक क्षण में यह सम्मेलन अपने तमाम साथियों का आवाहन करता है कि भूमि वितरण, निजी खर्च पर सीमा, 18 साल की उम्र वालों को बालिग मताधिकार, बेकारों को काम या बेकारी का भत्ता, नया संविधान बनाने के लिये संविधान

परिषद् के निर्माण आदि आदि मांगों को लेकर लोहिया जयन्ती के अवसर पर 23 मार्च, 1970 को देश भर में प्रभात फेरी, प्रदर्शन, सभा आदि करें और 6 अप्रैल, 1970 को दिल्ली में जनवाणी दिवस मनायें । ”

यह राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन का निर्णय है, श्रीमन्, 10 जनवरी, 1970 का ।

मैं श्री मिश्रा जी का और सभी विरोधी दल के नेताओं और उन साथियों का आभारी हूँ, जिन्होंने इस सदन में आज वह परिस्थिति पैदा की कि सदन इस विषय पर विचार कर रहा है । मैं भविष्य का जो खतरा है उसको भी बता देना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि हमारा एक निर्णय और है ।

“यह सम्मेलन राष्ट्रीय समिति को आदेश देता है कि जनवाणी दिवस की मांगें अगर निश्चित अवधि के भीतर पूरी न हों, तो तीव्र, व्यापक और सशक्त सिविल नाफरमानी की एक समयबद्ध योजना तैयार करें और मई, सन् 1970 के आसपास राष्ट्रीय समिति द्वारा निश्चित तिथि से सारे देश में सत्याग्रह आरम्भ करें । ”

यह 6 अप्रैल एक आगे का संदेश भी देता है, कि मई के आसपास राष्ट्रीय समिति बैठे जो यहां बैठने जा रही है और सम्पूर्ण देश में एक तेजस्वी सत्याग्रह करे । यदि ये मांगें समय के अंदर पूरी नहीं होती हैं तो । जरा इस पर भी सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य ध्यान देंगे कि जनवाणी दिवस प्रदर्शन के समय यदि सम्पूर्ण देश में जब हमारा तेजस्वी सत्याग्रह शुरू होगा तो क्या होगा ? यह गम्भीर प्रश्न है । विरोधी पक्ष का जो कर्तव्य है, उसका विरोध पक्ष के लोग यहां निर्वाह करेंगे । मैं सरकारी पक्ष की बात सम्मानित सदस्य मित्रों से, मोहन धारिया और दूसरे लोग हैं उनसे पूछना चाहूँगा—समाजवाद और जनतंत्र के लिये उनके मन में हमसे कम टीस नहीं है, ऐसा इस सदन में अक्सर प्रदर्शित होता है—कि हमारी इन मांगों में ऐसी कौनसी मांग है, जो जनतंत्र और समाजवाद के मार्ग को खोजती

[श्री राजनारायण]

नहीं है। क्या इन मांगों के पूरे हुए बिना इस देश में जनतंत्र या समाजवाद का मार्ग खुल सकता है। मेरा कहना है नहीं। जनतंत्र और समाजवाद पर्यायवाची शब्द हैं, एकांगी नहीं हैं। जनतंत्र से समाजवाद, समाजवाद से जनतंत्र। अगर देश आमदनी और खर्च की सीमा का निर्धारण नहीं करता, अगर देश नये ढंग से भूमि का वितरण नहीं करता, अगर देश बेकारों को काम दिलाने की योजना नहीं बनाता, अगर देश नयी संविधान निर्मात्री परिषद् के द्वारा वर्तमान संविधान में जो असंगतियाँ हैं, समाजवादी जनतंत्र के मार्ग में उनको दूर नहीं करते तो निश्चित रूप में जनतंत्र और समाजवाद का नाम लेना धोखा है। श्रीमन्, इसको मैं यही छोड़ देता हूँ, इतना बता कर कि हमने 10 जनवरी को बता दिया था कि हम 6 अप्रैल को दिल्ली आयेंगे। श्री नेता विरोधी दल, श्री डा. ह्याभाई पटेल, मित्र भूपेश गुप्त लोकनाथ जी मिश्र जो इस समय यहां नहीं हैं, इसी सदन की उस कार्यवाही को स्मरण करें, जब कि हमने कहा था कि समाचारपत्रों में निकला है कि 6 अप्रैल को संसोपा के प्रदर्शन को मद्देनजर रखते हुए दिल्ली के पार्लियामेंट स्ट्रीट और कनाट प्लेस में भी इस सरकार ने दफा 144 लगा दी है। हमारे सब मित्रों ने कहा कि अगर संसोपा के इस प्रदर्शन को लेकर यह अपवादस्वरूप किया गया है, तो बड़ा गलत है। मुझे संदेह है, मुझे डर है, मैं समझता हूँ यह सरकार एक षडयंत्र कर रही है, इसलिये इस सदन में दो या तीन बार हमने कहा कि 6 अप्रैल के प्रदर्शन को लेकर यहां उत्तेजना पैदा की जा रही है। ऐसा क्यों? 6 अप्रैल के प्रदर्शन को लेकर पार्लियामेंट स्ट्रीट और कनाट प्लेस में दफा 144 लगायी जा रही है, ऐसा क्यों? उस पर भी श्रीमन्, ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। हमने अपनी आगे आने वाली मुसीबत की चर्चा इस सदन में कर दी थी।

अब मैं आता हूँ 5 अप्रैल की तारीख में, करीब साढ़े 7 बजे रात की बात है, चव्वाण साहब सुन लें। ए० डी० एम० जिसको कि

ए० डी० सी० भी यहां कहा जाता है, मैं आगे उसको अतिरिक्त जिलाधीश और जिलाधीश कहूंगा, तो अतिरिक्त जिलाधीश का मेरे पास टेलीफोन आता है कि राजनारायण जी, आपके कार्यालय ने जो मार्ग मांगा था, उस मांग को अस्वीकार कर दिया गया है। प्रदर्शन का वह मार्ग नहीं आपको दिया जायेगा। अगर आप चाहते हैं कोई दूसरा मार्ग तो फौरन लिख कर हमें भेज दें। 8 बजे हमने एक आल्टर्नेटिव, एक विकल्प मार्ग, लिख कर उनको भेज दिया। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं जिलाधीश से आपकी इस मांग को जो मार्ग के बारे में है कहूंगा। करीब 7 या साढ़े 7 बजे, जिलाधीश श्री अरोड़ा का टेलीफोन मेरे पास आता है: राजनारायण जी, आपने जो प्रदर्शन का मार्ग मांगा है, हम उसका लिखित उत्तर भेज देंगे, हम आपसे जानना चाहते हैं, क्या आप दफा 144 तोड़ेंगे या नहीं। हमने कहा आपने यह सवाल मुझसे क्यों किया, तो उन्होंने कहा कि जार्ज फर्नान्डेज ने तो मुझे कह दिया है कि दफा 144 नहीं तोड़ी जायेगी। हमने कहा, जार्ज फर्नान्डेज हमारे जनरल सेक्रेटरी है, जब जार्ज फर्नान्डेज ने आपको यह बात बता दी, तो 144 दफा नहीं तोड़ी जायेगी, जनरल सेक्रेटरी के निर्देशानुसार सभी काम होगा। यह बात सात साढ़े सात बजे प्रातः 6 अप्रैल की है। श्रीमन्, 9 बजे से हमारी जो सब कमेटी थी, उसकी बैठक श्री मधु लिमये के निवास स्थान पर हुई। हम लोगों ने विचार करके फैसला ले लिया कि दफा 144 नहीं तोड़ी जायेगी। बाकायदा जिलाधीश को, अफसरों को बता दिया गया कि दफा 144 हम नहीं तोड़ेंगे। अब इसके बाद जरा ध्यान दिया जाये, मैं चला गया रेवाड़ी। रेवाड़ी की सभा से करीब 5 साढ़े 5 बजे शाम को लौटा हूँ, उसके बाद गया हूँ महरौली, महरौली में जो दिल्ली में है जन सभा थी, जहां इन्द्रप्रस्थ है, पृथ्वीराज का किला है। महरौली से 10 बजे रात आता हूँ, सभा करके पंडाल जाता हूँ, उस पंडाल में अतिरिक्त जिलाधीश, जिलाधीश, डी० आई० जी०, एस० पी० सभी आते हैं। जार्ज फर्नान्डेज के पास आए, मैं भी आ रहा हूँ जिससे

उन लोगों से पूरी हो जाय । जार्ज फर्नान्डेज से सारी बातें हुई और उनको बता दिया गया कि दफा 14 हम नहीं तोड़ेंगे । अब मैं आपको और सम्मानित सदस्यों से अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ, जिलाधीश के सुझाव पर हम बोट क्लब आये जहाँ से पटेल चौक पर सभा करेंगे । जिलाधीश का कहना है कि वह हमको मन्च बनाने की इजाजत देंगे । सभा में लाऊडस्पीकर लगाने की भी इजाजत देंगे, हम लोग पटेल चौक पर अपनी सभा कर लेंगे । हम लोगों ने जिलाधीश की बात को मान लिया । अंत में जिलाधीश ने जार्ज फर्नान्डेज से एक लिखित भी ले लिया कि आप हमको लिख कर भी दे दीजिए कि हम यहाँ सभा करेंगे । तो जार्ज फर्नान्डेज ने लिख कर भी दे दिया । मैं वास्तव में कुछ चिंता के साथ इस भाव को प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ भदन के सम्मानित सदस्य उसको अतिरिक्त मानें । हमने 1930 का आंदोलन देखा है, 1932 का देखा है । 1940 और 1942 में तो खूब जम कर कूदे हैं । इसके अतिरिक्त कांग्रेस राज में तीस, चौतीस बार जेल काटी है, लाठियाँ खाई हैं । हम उस परिवार के हैं, जो गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में 1920 की लड़ाई में लगतार शामिल हुए हैं । इतना ही नहीं वारेन हेस्टिंग्स से लड़ने वाले हैं और अगर चेत सिंह भाग न होता, तो वारेन हेस्टिंग्स मारा जाता और भारत का इतिहास दूसरा होता, मगर वह चेत सिंह भागा था हम लोगों की राय के विरुद्ध, इसलिए वारेन हेस्टिंग्स छुप कर बच गया । मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ किस पर चोट लगाई है तुमने । राजनारायण एक व्यक्ति हैं, रहे या न रहे, अगर हम मर जाते तो कोई बात नहीं थी, हमारे लिये तो कोई चिंता न रही, मगर अफसोस कि टूटे पांव को लेकर जदा हैं । यही हमको अफसोस है । मर जाना हम पसन्द करते हैं और आज भी मैं आपके द्वारा यशवन्तराव चव्हाण से कहना चाहता हूँ, हमारा पैर तोड़ने से ज्यादा अच्छा था हमको गोली मार देते । हमको जीने का कोई लालच नहीं, हमको कुछ पाना नहीं है । जीने का लालच है तो इसलिये है

कि समाज का नवनिर्माण हो । हमें जीने का लालच है तो इसलिए है कि आज जो शोषित, पीड़ित, मजलूम और महलूम लोग हैं, उनके हाथ में ताकत और सत्ता आये । शायद इन लोगों के लिए हम कुछ कर सकें, इसलिए ही हम जिन्दा रहना चाहते हैं । अगर हम इन लोगों के लिए कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं, तो हम यहाँ पर फौरन खत्म कर दिये जायें और हमें इस बात में कोई हिचक नहीं होगी । हमें इस बात की तनिक भी परवाह नहीं है और हमें एक मिनट के लिए भी हिचक नहीं होगी, क्योंकि हम मरने के लिए हमेशा तैयार रहते हैं । जो मौत का चुम्बन करता है, वह जिन्दा रहता है और जो मौत से डरता है वह मरता है । इसलिए जिन्दगी के वास्ते मौत होगी और हम जिन्दा रहना चाहते हैं, इसलिए मौत का चुम्बन करते हैं ।

श्रीमन्, हमारा जलूस बोट क्लब आने वाला था । पटेल चौक क्यों रखा गया, इसके बारे में सारी बात अधिकारियों से तय हो गई थी । एक बात है । एक अधिकारी ने यह कहा कि महिलाओं के पास तीर और धनुष हैं । हमारे जलूस में मिदनापुर से करीब 1,200 महिलाएँ जो आदिवासी हैं, आई हुई थीं । हम लोगों ने अधिकारियों को स्पष्ट कर दिया था कि ये तीर धनुष उसी तरह से रखते हैं, जिस तरह से सिख लोग अपने पास कृपाण रखते हैं ।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : क्या महिलाओं को भी पीटा गया था ?

श्री राजनारायण : 300 के करीब महिलाओं को पीटा गया । अगर आप इस चीज को देखना चाहते हैं, तो गाजियाबाद चले जाइये, जो श्री गुरुदयाल सिंह जी एडवोकेट हैं, वे आपको सब बातें बतला देंगे । वे दो दिन हमारे पास अस्पताल में आये थे और उन्होंने सब बातें हमको बतलाई ।

तो मैं आपसे यह कह रहा था कि हमने अधिकारियों को आश्वस्त कर दिया था कि तीर और धनुष रखने का इनका रिवाज है । वह

[श्री राजनारायण]

इन चीजों को रखने के अभ्यस्त हैं और यह उनकी आदत है और जब आदिवासी लोग चलते हैं, तो तीर और धनुष साथ लेकर चलते हैं। इसलिए कोई अशान्ति होने का खतरा न समझिये। वे पोटली लेकर साथ चलते हैं, क्योंकि उनके पास और कोई चीज है ही नहीं। जो खाना होता है वह औरतें पोटली में बांध लेती हैं। जब हमने इस तरह की बात बतलाई तो अधिकारी मान गये। 10 बजे जलूस चलता है। अगर अधिकारियों की पूर्व सहमति इस बारे में नहीं होती तो हम यह चीज भी नहीं रखते। 10 बज जलूस चलता है और जलूस के आगे चूंकि "अ" से आदिवासी लोग आते हैं, इसलिए पहले जलूस में उन्हें ही रखा गया। औरते आगे थीं और फिर आदिवासी लोग थे। जब आधे घंटे में पटेल चौक के पास जलूस पहुंचने को आता है, तो हमने एक ट्रक को ही मंच बनाने की बात रखी; क्योंकि हमारी एक गरीब पार्टी है। हमने सोचा कि मंच क्यों बनाया जाय, उसी ट्रक के पल्ले को उलटा दिया जायेगा और खोल दिया जायेगा। आधे घंटे के बाद ट्रक भी पटेल चौक के पास पहुंच गया। माइक वहां पर था। हम लोग वहां पर सब तख्त पर बैठ गये और कार्यक्रम शुरू हुआ। आदिवासी औरतें और लड़कियां गाना गाने लगीं और नृत्य करने लगीं। हमारे मित्र श्री मधु लिमये, श्री रबी राय और श्री पटेल, ये सब लोग पहुंचते हैं। ये लोग चाहते थे कि एक और दो बजे के बीच में जो लोक सभा में खाने का रिसेस होता है, इस बीच में लोक सभा के अध्यक्ष को बुला लिया जाय और उन्हें मांग-पत्र दिया जाय।

लोक सभा के अध्यक्ष को लाने के लिए जब लोग जाते हैं, तो फिर वहां का नक्शा देखा जाय। पटेल चौक के सब मार्गों पर कांटेदार तार लगा दिये गये थे। दो दिन पहले से इस तरह के कांटेदार तार लगा दिये गये, मगर हमने इस चीज को पहले से नहीं देखा था। कांटेदार तारों से चारों तरफ के मार्ग घिरे हुए थे। श्री मधु लिमये तथा कुछ लोग लोक सभा के

अध्यक्ष को लेने के लिये चलने लगे तो पार्लियामेंट की तरफ से जो सड़क आती है वह रस्सियों से घिरी हुई थी। पुलिस उनसे कहती है कि इस रस्सी को पार करके मत जाना। ये लोग कहते हैं कि हम पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं और हम लोग लोक सभा के अध्यक्ष को लेने के लिए जा रहे हैं। इस पर उन लोगों के ऊपर मार पड़ती है। जब उन लोगों के ऊपर मार पड़ी, तो यह बात सही है कि उस समय कुछ नौजवान जो यह देख रहे थे कि मधु के ऊपर मार पड़ रही है, वे थोड़े से गरम हो गये। इस बीच हम वहां पर ट्रक के पास पहुंच गये। जार्ज ने हमसे कहा कि तुम जरा नीचे आओ और अभी मंच पर मत चढ़ो; क्योंकि राष्ट्रपति जी ने यह कह दिया है कि हमारे पास चार पांच आदमी आ जायें। हमारी योजना यह थी कि केन्द्रीय पार्टी के अध्यक्ष और सदस्य तथा राज्यों के अध्यक्ष और सेक्रेटरी राष्ट्रपति के पास जाकर मिलें; अगर वे यहां पर नहीं आते हैं। हमने राष्ट्रपति के सेक्रेटरी से नागेन्द्र सिंह जी को लिख कर भेजा था कि राष्ट्रपति जी हमारे प्रदर्शन को देखने के लिए आयें, उन्हें सम्बोधन करें और फिर हम उनको मान पत्र देंगे। श्री नागेन्द्र सिंह जी ने पूछा कि क्या कभी राष्ट्रपति महोदय इस तरह के प्रदर्शनों में आये हैं। हमने कहा कि जहां तक हमें याद है 3 जून, 1951 को जब पहला जनवादी दिवस मनाया गया था, जब आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव जीवित थे, श्री जय-प्रकाश नारायण जी हमारी पार्टी में थे, तो उस समय हमारे प्रदर्शन के सामने राष्ट्रपति राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी आये थे और उन्होंने मांग पत्र के संबंध में और तमाम प्रदर्शनकारियों के सामने अपनी बात कही थी। उस समय हम लोगों ने फैसला किया था कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू के पास नहीं जायेंगे और प्रधान मंत्री को अपना मांग-पत्र नहीं देंगे। हम अपना मांग-पत्र राष्ट्रपति को ही देंगे; क्योंकि राष्ट्रपति अम्बव पार्टी है। इस तरह से 3 जून, 1951 को राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी हमारे प्रदर्शन के सामने आये थे।

श्री गिरी जो कि राष्ट्रपति हैं, जो अपने को स्वयं जनतंत्री और समाजवादी कहते हैं, उन्होंने

प्रदर्शनकारियों के सामने आने से इन्कार कर दिया। हम लोगों ने फैसला किया था कि केन्द्रीय बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष श्री कर्पूरी ठाकुर, महामंत्री श्री जार्ज और हर राज्य के अध्यक्ष तथा सेक्रेटरी राष्ट्रपति का नाम जायेंगे। इस तरह से करीब 50 आदमी हो जाते थे। लेकिन सेक्रेटरी साहब ने कहा था कि केवल तीन चार आदमी ही राष्ट्रपति से मिल सकते हैं, इसलिए हमने तय किया कि पार्टी के चेयरमैन श्री कर्पूरी ठाकुर, सेक्रेटरी, लोक सभा के सदस्य श्री रवी राय, राज्य सभा के सदस्य श्री गौड़ मुराहरि, श्री मणी राम जी जो संचालक थे, श्री राम सेवक यादव और श्री कौशिक जो मध्य प्रदेश के सेक्रेटरी थे, ये लोग राष्ट्रपति जी से मिलने जायें। जब हम इन लोगों के दस्तखत कराने के लिए गये तो एक आदमी ने कहा कि श्री मधु लिमये के ऊपर डण्डे पड़े रहे हैं तथा वहाँ पर उत्तेजना बढ़ रही है। जार्ज दौड़ कर वहाँ पर चले गये और पुलिस से कह रहे थे कि इधर रहो और विद्यार्थियों से कह रहे थे कि तुम उधर रहो। जार्ज ने कहा कि हम लोगों ने फैसला किया है कि हम शान्त रहेंगे, इसलिए सब को शान्ति बनाई रखनी चाहिये। पुलिस और प्रदर्शनकारियों के बीच में करीब 12 और 15 गज का फास ला होगा। जार्ज दोनों के बीच में खड़े हो गए। जब वे बीच में खड़े थे, तो किसी ने कहा कि यही जार्ज है और इसको मारो। इस तरह से जार्ज को पहिचान कर मार पड़ी और जार्ज का कर मारने की कोशिश की गई। इस बीच में महाराष्ट्र पार्टी के सेक्रेटरी श्री सोलानी साहब दौड़ पड़े और उन्होंने कहा कि यह हमारे जार्ज हैं। वे उनके ऊपर गिर पड़े और उन्हें और मार पड़ने से बचाया। अगर वे बीच में या उनके ऊपर न पड़े होते तो आज जार्ज हमारे बीच में न होता और वह आज इस दुनिया से चला गया होता। उन पर जो मार पड़ी वह जन्मकर मार पड़ी कि यह संसोपा का सेक्रेटरी है और यह जानकर मार पड़ी कि यह संसद सदस्य हैं, यह जानकर मार पड़ी कि यह शोषित, पीड़ित और मुजलिम तथा मेहनतकश लोगों का नेता है। वह मजदूरों

का नेता है, यह जानकर श्री जार्ज के ऊपर मार पड़ी। मैं मंच पर चढ़ जाता हूँ।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : आपकी आंखों का देखा हुआ है ?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं बता रहा हूँ, मुन लीजिये। हम मंच पर चढ़ गए, माइक हमारे हाथ में है, एक आदमी आता है, वह कमलेश है, ज्वाइन्ट सेक्रेटरी है, कहता है नेता जी पुलिस जार्ज को बुरी तरह पीट रही है। हमने कहा कि पुलिस मार रही है तो तुम हमें खबर देने आये हो, जाओ उनको पकड़ो और मैं कहता हूँ पुलिस के लोगों को कि काहे मार रहे हो। हमारा यह कहना था कि भयंकर आंसू गस, भयंकर लाठी चली कि प्रदर्शनकारी भागने लगे, उन तमाम कांटों में फंस कर उनका बदन फटने लगा, सब एकदम तितर-बितर हो गए। मैंने माइक से कहा कि आप लोग भागो मत, शांति के साथ बैठ जाओ, आपको क्या चिन्ता है, क्या डर है, सत्याग्रही हो तो सत्य पर आरुढ़ रहो, भागो मत। हमारे कहने से लोग बैठ गए, लेकिन बैठते ही फिर आंसू गैस, फिर लाठी फिर भगदड़ मच गई। इसके बाद फिर हमने जोर से कहा तुम भागना क्यों पसन्द करते हो डटो, खाओ लात; क्योंकि लात नहीं खाओगे तो तुम्हारा काम भी नहीं होगा, क्या गांधी जी दक्षिण अफ्रीका में नहीं मारे गए थे, कोई चिन्ता नहीं लात खाओ। हमारे कहने से 400-500, जो लगता है हमको छोड़ कर नहीं जाना चाहते थे, नीचे बैठ गए। उनके बैठते ही फिर वार हुआ। हमारा रमाशंकर कौशिक पड़ा सकता है यहां बहुत से लोगों को, दो विषयों में एम० ए० फर्स्ट क्लास, हमारा सेक्रेटरी है, रहने वाला मुरादाबाद का है, पुलिस उसको बुरी तरह से से मारती है। मैं कहता हूँ पुलिस के लोगों को काहे मार रहे हो, क्या हम अपराधी हैं, क्या हम चीनी हैं, क्या हम पाकिस्तानी हमलावर हैं, क्या हम देशद्रोही हैं, काहे वार कर रह हो, लेकिन कौन सुनता है। हमारी पार्टी के उत्तर प्रदेश के मंत्री राम शरण दास को, जो सहारनपुर के रहने वाले हैं, बुरी तरह से पीट

[श्री राजनारायण]

जाता है, दूसरे दिन वे हमको अस्पताल में देखने आते हैं, तो दूसरे लोग हमको कहते हैं कि राम शरण दास की धोती उठवा कर देखो, वह लजा रहे थे, उनकी धोती उठवाई तो उनका चूतड़ सारा लाल और इतना सूजा। हमने शंकरन जी को बुलाया, जिन्होंने हमारी हड्डी की सेटिंग की और उनसे कहा कि आप इनको देखिए और अस्पताल से जाने मत दीजिए। मैं आपसे क्या कहूँ। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि स्वतंत्रता संग्राम के वीर सेनानियों और कार्यकर्ताओं से कि वे सोचें कि क्या अंग्रेजी राज की हिम्मत थी कि इस तरह से लाठी चलाए, कभी अंग्रेजी राज ने इन्हीं लाठी चलाई है, कोई गवाह कि ऐसी लाठी चली हो? अगर हमने कुछ किया हो तो ठीक है, थोड़ा सा एक्सेसिव हो जाय, वह बात दूसरी है, हमने कहा हम 144 तोड़ेंगे ठीक है, 144 तोड़ने के लिए पुलिस मना करती है, कुछ अतिरिक्त शक्ति का प्रयोग हो जाय, वह अलग चीज कही जा सकती है, मगर हमने पुलिस को बताया कि हम 144 नहीं तोड़ेंगे, पहली बार संसोपा के इतिहास में संसोपा के नेताओं ने तार्किक दृष्टि से बहस करके फैसला किया कि 144 नहीं तोड़ेंगे और डिजीजन कम्युनिकेट कर दिया गया, फैसला डी० एम० को बता दिया गया, अधिकारियों को बता दिया गया। जब हम कहते हैं कि हम शांत रहेंगे, तो सरकार कहती है कि शांत रहोगे तो हम मारेंगे, डंडे बरसाएंगे, आंसू गैस छोड़ेंगे। फिर सोचिए आप...

श्री महावीर त्यागी : फर्स्ट एंड का इन्तजाम था ?

श्री राजनारायण : बहुत से लोग गए हैं, मगर जो उत्तर प्रदेश और हरियाणा के लोग थे, जो अपनी बसों में आए थे, उन्होंने लौट कर अपनी अपनी जगहों में मरहमपट्टी कराई।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : डाक्टर नहीं था ?

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं था। आप ज्यादा जानना चाहते हैं, तो बालकृष्ण जी गुप्त से पूछिए, क्योंकि इनका बंगला पटेल चौक के निकट है

और पुलिस लोगों को मारती हुई इनके बंगले तक गई है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : इनका बंगला कहाँ है ?

श्री बालकृष्ण गुप्त (बिहार) : 30 नम्बर अशोक रोड।

श्री राजनारायण : जहाँ तक मेरी दृष्टि गई, वहाँ तक मैंने देखा कि दौड़ दौड़ कर पुलिस ने मारा है, हमारे सत्याग्रहियों को दौड़ कर पीटा है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : बालकृष्ण जी को भी पीटा ?

श्री बालकृष्ण गुप्त : हमको भी पीटने आए, लेकिन हमने कहा हम बीमार हैं, इसलिए नहीं पीटा।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : डाक्टर का इन्तजाम नहीं था ?

श्री राजनारायण : हमारी बात सुन लो, त्यागी जी, अपने सवाल लिखते जाओ, इस तरह हमारा क्रम टूट जायेगा।

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, आप बैठ जाइए, आप ज्यादा कष्ट मत कीजिए, आप 30 मिनट बोल चुके हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, अब मंच पर अन्त में 5-6 आदमी रह गए और कोई नहीं रहा, 5 मिनट तक सारा वातावरण शान्त। मैं माइक लिए हुए सोचता रहा क्या कहूँ। इसी बीच में कोने से 25-30 पुलिस वाले आंसू गैस का शोला लिए हुए जैसे कोई जम्प करता हुआ, हू-हू करता हुआ दौड़े वैसे हमारे ऊपर दौड़ते हैं और 8-10 गज की दूरी से मंच के ऊपर आंसू गैस का प्रहार होता है। एक आंसू गैस का शैल हमारे दाहिने पैर के पास फूटता है और दूसरा आंसू गैस का शैल बाएँ पैर के पास गिरता है। हम इतना तो कहेंगे कि बड़ी पावरफुल आंसू गैस थी। इसके पहले भी हम पर 5-6 बार आंसू गैस चल चुकी है,

लेकिन इतनी सशक्त आंसू गैस पहले नहीं थी। इसके लिए मैं सरकार की तारीफ करूंगा कि सरकार के पास आंसू गैस बहुत शक्तिशाली हो गई है।

श्री बालकृष्ण गुप्ता : यह नई आंसू गैस शायद रूस से आई है।

श्री राजनारायण : अब एक लम्बा लोहे का छड़ लेकर सिपाही प्रहार करता है। एक दम हम करते भी क्या करीब 8-10 मिनट मुझे होश नहीं था, आंखें हमारी खुल नहीं सकीं, सांस भी हम ले नहीं सके थे, बिल्कुल एक दम से अचेतावस्था में हो गए। 8-10 मिनट के बाद सचेत होने पर उठने लगे तो देखते हैं कि हमारा पैर टूटा हुआ है। फिर हम देखते हैं कि हमारे पास बिहार पार्टी के हमारे सेक्रेटरी श्री विनायक यादव पड़े हुए हैं, उनकी पीठ पर भी डंडा पड़ा और उनका हाथ भी फटा हुआ है। अस्पताल में उनकी मरहम पट्टी हुई। अब आधे घंटे के करीब मैं अकेला सड़क पर हूँ, पुलिस वाले दौड़ते हैं, मैं कहता हूँ कि पानी दे दो, कोई पानी नहीं देता, हमको टैक्सी मंगा दो तो कोई टैक्सी नहीं मंगाता। हमारे बंगला के एक मित्र एक श्रीनाथ शर्मा, जो काशी विश्वपीठ के सेक्रेटरी विश्वनाथ शर्मा के लड़के हैं, जा रहे थे, हमने उनसे कहा श्रीनाथ टैक्सी ला दो, पुलिस ने उनको रोक दिया। आधे घंटे के बाद ए० डी० एम० आनन्द, जो मुझे कई बार गिरफ्तार कर चुके हैं, मुझको जेल भेज चुके हैं, जाते हैं, वे भी हमको नेताजी कह कर पुकारते हैं, आपको बड़ी चोट लगी, मुझे मालूम नहीं था। मैं उनको कहता हूँ कि आनन्द मेरे पास यह साधन नहीं कि मैं तुमको खबर कर सकता हूँ कि आनन्द आओ, वहस मत करो, जो तुम्हें काना था कर दिया, अब टैक्सी मंगा दो, उन्होंने कहा कि मैं गाड़ी का इन्तजाम करता हूँ। करीब 10-15 मिनट के बाद पुलिस की गाड़ी आई, लेकिन मैंने कहा कि मैं विलिंगडन नहीं जाऊंगा, जहाँ डा० लोहिया की हत्या कराई गई हो, उस अस्पताल में मैं नहीं जाता। उन्होंने पूछा कहाँ ले चलें। मैंने कहा या तो बलरामपुर, खनऊ भेजो या बनारस भेजो, हमको अभी

ले चलो 95 तक। सामने कमरे पर आए तो पता चला कि जार्ज और मधु लिमये संसद की डिस्पेंसरी में हैं, हमने कहा कि टैक्सी में हमको भी वहाँ पहुंचा दो; क्योंकि चोट खाई तो मरते समय तीनों एक साथ बैठे रहें। हमारे आने के थोड़ी देर बाद वहाँ चव्हाण पहुंचते हैं। चव्हाण साहब पर मुझे दया है। मैं छिपाना नहीं चाहता। चव्हाण साहब की शक्ल बहुत ही गमगीन थी। उनका चेहरा गिल्टी प्लीड कर रहा था। इसलिए मुझे उन पर दया आती है। और मुझको तो इतनी पीड़ा अपने जीवन में कभी नहीं हुई थी, जितनी पीड़ा उस समय हो रही थी। हमको याद है कि हमने इतना जरूर कहा था कि चव्हाण साहब, आपने यह कायरतापूर्ण हमला किया है। यह उचित नहीं था। इसके बाद उनको जो बात करनी थी वह उन्होंने की। वह हमको सफदरजंग अस्पताल ले गये। वहाँ हमारी हड्डी की सेटिंग हुई और उसके दो दिन के बाद मुझे मालूम हुआ, किसी ने कहा कि आपकी पेशाब में कुछ दोष आ रहा है, तो इसलिए फिजीशियन डाक्टर चुग आ कर देखेंगे। मैंने कहा कि क्या यह वही चुग है कि जिसके कारण लालबहादुर जी ने अपनी जान गंवाई थी? लोगों ने बताया कि हां, यह वही चुग है, तो मैंने कहा कि यहाँ से हमको हटाओ। मैं श्री के० के० शाह का अनुग्रहीत हूँ। क्योंकि मैंने उनसे कहा था कि मुझे और कहीं न ले जाकर इंडियन मेडिकल इंस्टीट्यूट में ले जाया जाय और उन्होंने उसकी सारी व्यवस्था करायी। मैं इस सारी बात को अब छोड़ दे रहा हूँ। अब मैं कुछ तथ्य आपके सामने रखना पसंद करूंगा। यह जो हुआ सो हुआ, आप देखिये कि अब क्या हो रहा है जिससे कि सरकार की इच्छा प्रदर्शित होती है...

श्री उपसभापति : आपने 35 मिनट ले लिए हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : अगर इस समय भी आप रोकेंगे तो यह दुर्भाग्य है देश का। अगर दस-पांच मिनट बढ़ भी जायेंगे, तो कोई नुकसान नहीं होगा। कल रूलिंग में जितना समय आप ने ले लिया था, उतने में तो बहस हो जाती।

[श्री राजनारायण]

तो मैं सीधी बात कहना चाहता हूँ। क्या सरकार के पास कोई सबूत है कि कहीं एक बल्ब टूटा, कहीं एक खम्भा गिरा, कहीं एक शीशा टूटा ? इतना शान्तिपूर्ण हमारा प्रदर्शन था कि कहीं भी एक बल्ब नहीं टूटा, कहीं पर एक खम्भा नहीं गिरा और कहीं भी एक भी शीशा नहीं टूटा और कहीं पर पुलिस को चोट नहीं आयी। अगर कोई पुलिस को चोट आने की बात कहता है, तो झूठ बात कहता है, बनाता है। फिर भी उस में दो हजार के करीब लोग चोटिल हुए हैं और हमारे प्यारे शहीद बिहारी लाल यादव ने अपने प्राणों को गंवाया है। मिश्रा जी, त्यागी जी, भूपेश गुप्त जी और मोहन धारिया जी, आप लोग इसके आगे की घटना को सुनिये। बिहारी लाल की लाश हमें नहीं दी जा रही थी। अस्पताल में मुझे कहा गया कि अरे, यह बिहारी लाल दूसरा है। मुझे कहा गया कि एक बिहारी लाल, जो पागल था कोई, लाल किले के मैदान में रोज आकर सोता था, वही मर गया है। मैं इस घटना को इसलिए बता देना चाहता हूँ कि पता लग जाय कि सरकार के अधिकारियों की इच्छा क्या है। वह क्या षडयंत्र कर रहे हैं और उन के रहते क्या जूडिशियल इन्क्वायरी होगी ?

श्री महावीर त्यागी : यह किसने कहा था ?

श्री राजनारायण : अस्पताल में कई लोग थे और कुछ पुलिस के लोग भी जाते थे हमको देखने, उनमें से कई लोगों ने कहा कि शायद यह बिहारी लाल तो दूसरा है। आप देखिये, कि करीब और 2 बजे के बीज उस की मृत्यु हुई है 6 तारीख की रात को। 7 तारीख को 3½ बजे तक पोस्ट मार्टम के लिए डाक्टर नहीं आये। 3 और 4 के बीच में पोस्ट मार्टम हुआ और 7 बजे हमको लाश दी गयी कब ? जब कि हमारे लोगों से उसकी शिनाख्त करा ली गयी। जो लोग उसके गांव के थे, उसके रिश्तेदार थे, जब उन्होंने पहचाना और यहां से कलेक्टर बाराबंकी को टेलीफोन किया गया, एस० पी०, बाराबंकी को टेलीफोन किया गया कि क्या

यही बिहारी लाल है, पता लगाया जाय, लेकिन जो बात सत्य है वह तो खुल कर रहेगी। यानी उसके मरने के बाद भी सरकार की इच्छा थी कि इस घटना को दबा दिया जाय और कोई दूसरा बिहारी लाल बना दिया जाय ताकि यह सिद्ध न हो पाये कि प्रदर्शनकारी बिहारी लाल की हत्या इस सरकार ने की। यह सरकार हत्यारी है यह सिद्ध न हो, इसलिए यह सब काम हुआ। इस के पहले 5 तारीख को महरौली में हमारा प्रदर्शन हुआ था। लेकिन इस घटना के बाद दिल्ली की पुलिस तमाम आस पास के इलाकों में जा रही है और हमारी पार्टी की यूनिटों को और सेक्रेटरीज को धमका रही है, लोगों से जबरदस्ती बयान ले रही है, गलत बयान लिखवा रही है कि तुम यह लिखो कि पुलिस ने कुछ नहीं किया, तुम यह लिखो कि लाठी चार्ज नहीं हुआ, तुम यह लिखो कि वहां अश्रु गैस नहीं चलायी गयी। यह क्यों किया जा रहा है ? क्या चव्हाण साहब को घटना की जानकारी नहीं है। यह इसलिए हो रहा है कि सरकार के इरादे कुछ दूसरे हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ और कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस घटना का सही पता लगाना है तो पता लगाया जाय कि किन-किन राज्यों की पुलिस और पी० ए० सी० यहां आयी थी। उत्तर प्रदेश की कितनी पी० ए० सी० यहां आयी थी, हरियाणा की कितनी पी० ए० सी० यहां आयी थी और राजस्थान की कितनी पी० ए० सी० यहां आयी थी और उस समय हमारे प्रदर्शन के मुकाबले में जो पी० ए० सी० खड़ी थी, वह कहां की थी। जहां तक मैं समझ सका हूँ, इन्दिरा सरकार की समर्थक जो राज्य सरकारें हैं, उनकी पी० ए० सी० यहां आयी थी और उन्होंने अपना यह पराक्रम यहां पर दिखाया। इसमें केन्द्र और राज्य का दूरस्तर का षडयंत्र है। इसलिए श्री यशवंतराव जी चव्हाण को सफाई के साथ यहां बताना चाहिए कि किन-किन राज्यों की कितनी-कितनी पी० ए० सी० यहां आयी थी और उन लोगों का कहां-कहां इस्तेमाल हुआ और कैसे-कैसे उनका प्रयोग किया गया।

मैं एक बात यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमने श्रीमन्, 7 अल को राष्ट्रपति जी के पास चिट्ठी भेजी है। मुझ प्रसन्नता है कि राष्ट्रपति जी का जो पत्र मेरे पास आया है वह इस समय मेरे पास है। मैं उसको आपकी आज्ञा से थोड़ा सा पढ़ूँ। उनका पत्र है :

“प्रिय श्री राज नारायण,

7 अप्रैल, 1970 का आपका पत्र प्राप्त हुआ और मामले की जानकारी पायी। आपके अभ्यावेदन को मैं प्रधान मंत्री तथा गृह-मंत्री को अग्रसारित कर दिया है। आशा है आप स्वस्थ होंगे।

सम्मान सहित

आपका,

वी० वी० गिरि”

मैंने पूरा विवरण देते हुए उन से कुछ मांगें की हैं। उन मांगों को मैं आज फिर दोहराना चाहता हूँ। आपसे यानी राष्ट्रपति जी से विनम्रता से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ऐसा बर्बर कुकृत करने वाली सरकार कभी भी जनतंत्रीय, समाजवादी हो सकती है? हमारी मान्यता कि नहीं हो सकती। हमने राज्य सभा में दो, तीन बार इस प्रदर्शन की ओर सरकार का ध्यान खींचा था और आपसे निम्नांकित मांग कर रहा हूँ और वह मांग मैं श्रीमन्, इस मौके पर सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों के द्वारा भी करना चाहता हूँ। पहली हमारी मांग है राजनैति : कि सरकार प्रायश्चितस्वरूप तत्काल इस्तीफा दे। मैं साफ कह दूँ श्री यश-वन्तराव चव्हाण से व्यक्तिगत मेरा कोई आक्रोश नहीं, प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के साथ मेरा कोई आक्रोश नहीं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों के कार्यों के लिए यह सरकार अपने को जिम्मेदार मानती है या नहीं, जनतंत्रीय प्रथा में यह सरकार उन के लिए अपने को जिम्मेदार समझती है या नहीं? अगर जनतंत्र में उनके कामों के लिए यह सरकार जिम्मेदार है, तो दिन दहाड़े, सूरज की रोशनी में, सार्वजनिक ढंग पर खुले

आम लाठी प्रहार हो, अश्रु गैस का प्रयोग हो, बिहारी लाल की जान ली जाय, दो हजार के करीब लोग चोटें खायें, इससे बड़ी घटना और क्या हो सकती है? सरकार कब इस्तीफा देगी? सरकार के कर्मचारियों के कुकर्मों के लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है? अगर जनतंत्र है, संसदीय प्रथा है, तो सरकार जिम्मेदार है और ऐसी स्थिति में सभ्य सरकारें इस्तीफा देती हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि प्रधान मंत्री का इस्तीफा हो। प्रधान मंत्री के इस्तीफे के साथ सभी का इस्तीफा होगा और घर मंत्री के इस्तीफे के साथ प्रधान मंत्री का इस्तीफा नहीं होगा। यह मांग मैं इसलिए कर रहा हूँ, क्योंकि इस षडयंत्र के मूल में प्रधान मंत्री हैं। हमने उनको यह लिखा है। यह हमारी राजनीतिक मांग है।

दूसरे, न्यायिक, स्वतंत्र, निष्पक्ष, खुली जांच हो, कोई जाने-माने व्यक्ति, जिसकी निष्पक्षता पर लोगों को संदेह न हो, उसके द्वारा जांच करायी जाय। श्रीमन्, नेता विरोधी दल ने जो टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस पढ़े हैं, उनको सुनने के बाद और उसके पहले भी हमारी मान्यता हो चुकी थी कि जिस ढंग से न्यायिक जांच बिठायी जा रही है, उससे कहीं भी सत्य तक पहुंचा नहीं जा सकता। इसलिए सही न्यायिक जांच कराना इस सरकार का काम है। मैं आपसे अपील करना चाहता हूँ जनाबे सदर, कि आप इस सदन के हर दल के लोगों को लेकर एक पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी बनायें और उस पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी के द्वारा इस घटना की जांच करायें, ताकि भविष्य में इस की पुनरावृत्ति न हो। अगर सभी दलों के सम्मानित सदस्य सीधे-सीधे एक कमिशन में बैठें, तो वह हर दृष्टि से विचार करेंगे, राजनैतिक दृष्टि से विचार करेंगे, न्यायिक दृष्टि से विचार करेंगे और यह बतायेंगे कि कैसे भविष्य इस तरह की घटनाओं पर रोक लग सके, इसलिये मैं यह मांग कर रहा हूँ।

तीसरी मांग यह थी। पश्चिमी बंगाल, मिदनापुर, के आदिवासियों के किराये का

[श्री राजनारायण]

रुपया छीन लिया गया है, उनको फ्री पास या किराय की व्यवस्था करा के उन्हें घर भेजा जाये ।

चौथा यह है कि जिनकी पोटली छीन ली गयी, उनके खाने की और कपड़ा की तत्काल व्यवस्था करायी जाय ।

आगे यह है कि जिलाधीश श्री अरोड़ा को फौरन मुअत्तल किया जाय । आज भी मैं यह मांग करूंगा कि अगर कोई न्यायिक जांच या पार्लियामेंटरी कमिशन की जांच हो, तो जिलाधीश जिम्मेदार हैं, उनको पहले हटना चाहिये । हमारी बात हुई है जिलाधीश से । जिलाधीश ने 6 तारीख को सात बजे या साढ़े सात बजे के करीब मुझको फोन किया है और मुझको कहा कि जार्ज साहब ने कहा है कि 144 को हम नहीं तोड़ेंगे, तो हमने कहा कि जार्ज साहब ने जो कहा है वही होगा, वह जेनरल सेक्रेटरी हैं । तो वह अरोड़ा साहब रह जायें और छोटे-मोटे को पकड़ कर इधर उधर हटा कर कुछ दिखाना चाहें तो वह ठीक नहीं । कोई भी न्याय बुद्धि से काम करने वाला हमारी इस मांग को मानेगा । कुछ लोगों को मुअत्तल कर दिया, कुछ लोगों को जबरदस्ती छुट्टी दिलवा दी, इसलिए हम न्याय-पथ पर चल रहे हैं, श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण साहब, यह काफी नहीं है । जिलाधीश श्री अरोड़ा की तत्काल मुअत्तली हमारी सबकी मांग है । और उन पुलिस अफसरों को दंडित किया जाय, जिनकी कर्तव्यहीनता से लाठी का प्रयोग किया गया ।

छठा मृतक व्यक्ति श्री बिहारी के परिवार को मुआवजा और मृत्यु के कारणों की अलग जांच हो । श्रीमन्, मैं चाहता हूँ कि श्री बिहारी लाल की हत्या की एक अलग जांच हो । सब को एक में ही मिला कर सभी को ढापने की बात न की जाय ।

सातवां यह है कि दफा 144 रोक बन्दी को तत्काल हटाया जाय ।

श्रीमन्, 7 तारीख को राष्ट्रपति को हमने जो खत लिखा उसी में हमने ये मांगें कर दी थीं । इसका आगे का जो अंत है, वह भी मैं पढ़ रहा हूँ ।

“मैं यहां आपको स्पष्ट करना चाहता हूँ कि जिलाधीश का यह कहना पूर्णतया असत्य है कि प्रदर्शनकारियों ने घेरा तोड़ने का प्रयत्न किया । जो यह कांड हुआ, वह एक षडयन्त्र का परिणाम है । यहां वर्तमान मंत्रिपरिषद् में कुछ मंत्रियों का आपस में तनाव है और उस तनाव के फलस्वरूप संसोध प्रदर्शनकारियों पर उपर्युक्त चोट है । संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी द्वारा वर्तमान केन्द्रीय सरकार की उसकी दकियानूसी नीति के कारण उसे हटाने के अभियान से इंदिरा जी रुष्ट हैं । यही सब कारण है, उपर्युक्त ढंग के अमर्यादित आंसू गैस और लाठी-चार्ज का । यही कारण है अमर्यादित, बर्बर, जंगली, निरंकुश रूप से इस आंसू गैस और लाठी-चार्ज का ।”

श्रीमन्, इन्हीं तथ्यों को लेते हुये हमने अपने चेयरमैन साहब, सभापति जी, श्री गोपाल स्वरूप पाठक को भी अस्पताल से चिट्ठी लिखी । कल उन्होंने बताया कि उन्होंने वह घर मंत्री, प्रधान मंत्री को भेज दी है । मुझे मालूम नहीं कि उन पत्रों पर क्या कार्यवाही हुई ।

श्रीमन्, अब मैं एक और बात निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ । मिश्रा जी जरा मुनिये, श्री एस० एन० मिश्रा साहब, नेता विरोधी दल, आप जरा गुजराल साहब के माया जाल से मुक्त होइये । आप बाकी घटनाओं को भी देखिए । हमारे गुजराल साहब बड़े माहिर हैं, रोज़ लेटर टु दि एडिटर निकलवाया जा रहा है । राष्ट्रपति जी को हमारी यह चिट्ठी 19 अप्रैल की है । जरा मुनिये :

“माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी,

18 अप्रैल, सन् 1970 को लेटर्स कालम में मधु लिमये शीर्षक से श्री पी० आर० टम्पुल जोम्स का एक पत्र हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स अंग्रेजी

के दैनिक में छपा । इस पत्र में संसोपा के 6 अप्रैल के प्रदर्शन के बारे में लिखा गया है कि इस प्रदर्शन के द्वारा संसोपा ने 23 वर्ष पूर्व अंग्रेजों ने जो आजादी दी और अच्छा संसदीय ढांचा भारत ने दिया, उसको नष्ट कर दिया । अंग्रेज लेखक ने यहां तक लिखने की घृष्टता की है कि मधु लिमये को सार्वजनिक ढंग पर कोड़ा लगाया चाहिए था । मेरी समझ में इस उच्छृंखल अंग्रेज ने भारत के घरेलू प्रश्न पर बोल कर अपनी कमजबानी का इजहार किया है । श्री मधु लिमये संसद् के सम्मानित सदस्य हैं, उन ने सार्वजनिक ढंग पर कोड़ा लगाने की बात कह कर अंग्रेज लेखक ने संपूर्ण संसद और भारतीय स्वतंत्रता का अपमान किया है । उस सूकर मस्तिष्क अंग्रेज ने—सूकर मस्तिष्क के माने पिग-हेडेड—यहां तक लिखने की हिम्मत की है कि आज के 23 साल पूर्व उसने भारत को आजादी दी । मैं चाहता हूं कि आप ब्रिटिश हाई कमिशनर को और उसके द्वारा इस लेखक सरीखे अंग्रेजों को प्रह स्पष्ट कर दें कि भारत ने अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद को ध्वस्त कर अपनी स्वतंत्रता हासिल की थी । श्री मधु लिमये और उनके अन्य साथी अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद विध्वंसकों में हैं । हमने अपनी स्वतंत्रता और अपनी संसदीय प्रणाली, अपने त्याग और बलिदान से हासिल की है । कि अंग्रेजों की कृपा से । मुझे आश्चर्य है कि अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद को ध्वस्त हुए 23 वर्ष व्यतीत हो गए, फिर भी श्री जोम्स ऐसे दक्कियानूसी आज बचे हैं, जो साम्राज्यवादी मनोवृत्ति की सड़की दुर्गन्ध से सराबोर हैं ।

मुझे विश्वास कि भारत का प्रत्येक नागरिक एक विदेशी नागरिक द्वारा अपने संसद् सदस्यों के प्रति वक्ता की गयी भावना का जम कर विरोध करेगा और ऐसी जन-शक्ति संगठित करेगा, जिसने कि भविष्य में विदेशियों को ऊल जलूल हरे ढंग की बात कहने की हिम्मत नहीं पड़ेगी ।”

श्रीमन्, यह पत्र हमने अस्पताल से माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी को भेजा है और इसकी प्रतिलिपि उपराष्ट्रपति, अध्यक्ष लोक सभा और प्रधान

मंत्री को भी भेज दी है । मुझे मालूम नहीं कि इस पर क्या कार्यवाही हुई । मैं चाहता हूं कि जब 6 तारीख की घटनाओं पर यहां विचार हो, तो नेता सदन और नेता विरोधी दल इस घटना को भी मद्देनजर रखें । 6 तारीख को इस सरकार की पुलिस ने जो कुकर्म किया, उससे ही हिम्मत पड़ती है एक नालायक अंग्रेज की कि वह इस ढंग से चिट्ठी लिखे । मधु लिमये कोई मामूली आदमी हैं, वह एक राष्ट्र-व्यापी दल का अध्यक्ष रह चुका है, लोक सभा में संसोपा का नेता रह चुका है, आज भी संसद् का एक सदस्य है और उसके बारे में कहता है कि पुलिस ने रेस्ट्रेंट किया, पुलिस के रेस्ट्रेंट की वह तारीफ करता है और वह अंग्रेज कहता है कि मधु लिमये को सार्वजनिक ढंग से कोड़ा क्यों नहीं लगाया ।

श्री ए० जी० कुलकर्णी (महाराष्ट्र) : वह अंग्रेज नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : वह अंग्रेज हो या अंग्रेज का बच्चा, इससे हमको कोई मतलब नहीं है । बहुत से अंग्रेज के बच्चे न होते हुये भी अंग्रेज यहां बैठ हुये हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, बहुत समय हो गया, आपके पैर को दर्द होता होगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : अच्छा बैठ कर बोलता हूं ।

श्री उपसभापति : भाषण भी समाप्त कीजिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : समाप्त करता हूं । अब मैं आपकी बात को मान कर के इसको समाप्त करने की ओर बढ़ रहा हूं । श्रीमान चव्हाण साहब जनाब सदर के द्वारा हमें बतायें ईमानदारी से, छिपायें नहीं कि क्या सरकार चाहती है, सरकार के इरादे क्या हैं ? बाबू त्रिलोकी सिंह यहां बैठे हैं, मैं चाहूंगा कि उनको भी आप बोलने का मौका दें, हम उनको भी सुनना चाहते हैं, वह भी बैठे हैं, कल उन्होंने कहा था कि मौका आयेगा, तो वह इस सदन में अपने भावों को व्यक्त करेंगे, मैं उनसे भी

[श्री राजनारायण]

पूछना चाहता हूँ । हमारे पास 19 तारीख को माननीय जयप्रकाश नारायण जी भी गये थे, हमने उनको एक चिट्ठी लिखी थी, उनको मिली नहीं । हमने उनसे पूछा कि श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण जी, आप और आचार्य विनोबा भावे जो अपने को आज गांधी जी का सर्वोपरि अनुयायी कहते हैं, बतायें कि हम किस मार्ग का अवलम्बन करें । मैं आज उन लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किस मार्ग का अवलम्बन करें । आज सरकार हमको किस मार्ग का अवलम्बन करना सिखाती है । यह प्रश्न है । उठ रहा है यह सवाल, है कोई कि दे जवाब । आज इस सवाल का मैं उत्तर चाहता हूँ घर मंत्री से । हे घर मंत्री, एक जनतंत्री समाजवादी पार्टी है, वह कोई नई समाजवाद की सखी-सहेली नहीं है, वह पार्टी है जो कि 1934 से कांग्रेस के अन्दर समाजवादी दल को बना कर के, समाजवादी मांगों को ले कर के अग्रसर हो रही है, उस पार्टी पर इस तरह चोट पहुंचाई जाय, तो यह चोट केवल पार्टी पर नहीं है, यह चोट जनतंत्र पर है, समाज पर है । अपने विरोधी को जो शासक बर्दाश्त नहीं करता, वह शासक जनतंत्री हो ही नहीं सकता । जनतंत्र तो विरोध को बर्दाश्त करता है, जनतंत्र तो विरोधी को अवसर प्रदान करता है कि अगर विरोधी अल्पमत में हो तो वह विरोधी अपने को बहुमत में परिणत करे । वह इसका एक मौका देना चाहता है । जयप्रकाश नारायण के उत्तर की इंतजारी में विनोबा भावे से कहना चाहता हूँ, इस सदन की मार्फत से और जो इस देश की जनतंत्रीय प्रथा में यकीन करने वाले लोग हैं, उनसे कर वद्ध प्रार्थी हो कर पूछ रहा हूँ, हमें मार्ग बतायें, कहां जायें । श्रीमन्, यशवन्तराव जी के सेक्रेटेरिएट में कितना अंधेर है, जो हमारे पास पत्र आ रहे हैं, उनको पढ़ लें । हमारे नौजवान कहते हैं : राजनारायण, तुम लात खाते-खाते अभ्यस्त हो गये, तुम्हारी मति मारी गई है । कहते हैं हम इन्दिरा गांधी को सबक सिखा दें, कहते यशवन्तराव चव्हाण को वयों न पीट लें ।

हम कहते हैं धीरज रखो, खामोश रहो, लात खायेंगे, मारेंगे नहीं मानेंगे नहीं, इस सिद्धांत पर चलिये । मगर आज हमको डर है कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि हमारी बात कुछ लोग अनसुनी करें । अभी हमें यकीन है कि नहीं करेंगे । मगर कब तक । आज धीरज का धीरत टूट रहा है । चव्हाण साहब से हमारी प्रार्थना है कि चव्हाण साहब केवल एक रस्मी तौर से आज के विवाद को न चलायें, आप एक कुशल प्रशासन, जनतंत्रीय प्रशासन की हैसियत से चलाएं । जब शान्तिपूर्ण निहत्थे प्रदर्शनकारियों पर इस तरह से बर्बर, निरंकुश लाठी चार्ज हो, तो सरकार उनको क्या सबक दे रही है, क्या सिखा रही है । श्रीमन्, नक्सलाइट्स के विषय में कालिंग अटेंशन पर चर्चा शुरू होगी । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, क्या नक्सलाइट्स को पैदा करने के लिये...

श्री उपसभापति : यह कल आयेगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : हां, तो श्रीमन्, हमारा नाम भी उसमें जोड़ दीजिएगा ।

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप खतम तो कीजिए ।

श्री राजनारायण : खतम कर रहा हूँ । मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ, आप भी जवाब दें; क्योंकि आप एक योग्य पद पर जिम्मेदार होकर बैठे हैं, आप खुद इसकी खोज और छानबीन करें । गरीब पूछता है, हम वाराणसी अस्पताल में थे और हमको लोग देखने आते थे कि जब आप लोगों को मार पड़ती है तो हम कैसे बचेंगे, हमारे ऊपर क्या बीतेगी ? कभी कल्पना कर सकते हैं इसकी चव्हाण साहब । इसका उत्तर दे सकते हैं । इसका आज क्या उत्तर है, जो दिल्ली में पालियामेन्ट की आंख के सामने, नाक के नीचे, सार्वजनिक ढंग पर पुलिस का प्रहार हो रहा है, जालिमाना हरकत हो रही है, निरंकुश प्रहार हो रहा है, बर्बर प्रहार हो रहा है, अमानवीय प्रहार हो रहा है । तो जो गरीब हैं, जो मरहूम और मजरूम हैं, जिनकी आवाज कहीं नहीं पहुंच सकती है, उसका क्या

गेगा । यह हमारा सवाल है आपसे । आप चेयरमैन तो हैं ही मगर हम जानते हैं आप वकील भी हैं । सरकार दो तरह से जान लेती है...

श्री उपसभापति : आप तो ख़त्म कर रहे थे ।

श्री राजनारायण : तभी तो बोल रहा हूँ : जान लेने पर आ गया तो ख़त्म कर रहा हूँ । एक तो आई० पी० सी० की दफा 302 है । जिस पर जान लेने का आरोप सिद्ध हो जाता है, उसको सरकार अपनी अदालत से फांसी देकर जान ले लेती है । जान लेने का आरोप सिद्ध होने पर ही सरकार जान लेती है । यह अंग्रेजों का बनाया हुआ है । और दूसरी तरह से सरकार जान लेती है अनी लाठी और गोली के द्वारा । तो क्या यह निर्णय वहीं नहीं होगा । यह कानून वहाँ लागू नहीं होगा । मैं चाहूँगा, यह कानून वहाँ भी लागू हो और बिलकुल सख्ती से आज यह तदन कहे कि लाठी और गोली का प्रहार ऐसे प्रदर्शन पर नहीं हो सकता, जो प्रदर्शन कि हथियार से बलवा नहीं करता है, जिसने सरकारी गाँवों की जान न ले रखी हो और आगे भी जान लेने का ख़तरा नहीं हो । बिहारी लाल के जान क्या चव्हाण देंगे ? खम्भा गिर जाये, खम्भा लग सकता है, बिल्डिंग टूट जाये, बिल्डिंग बन सकती है, मगर यशवंतराव चव्हाण के जान नहीं दे सकते हैं । क्या बिहारी लाल ने किसी की जान ली थी । क्या संसोध के प्रदर्शन ने किसी की जान ली और हमको अखबार में पढ़ने को मिला था कि एक पुलिस वाले ने तीर लग गया...

श्री उपसभापति : अब ख़त्म कीजिए ।

श्री राजनारायण : बहुत जल्दी ख़त्म कर रहा हूँ ।

श्री उपसभापति : एक घंटा आपको बोलते हुए हो गया ।

श्री राजनारायण : एक पुलिस वाले को तीर लग गया, मगर बाद में तुरन्त ही हमारा संतोष हो गया कि उसके बदन में कहीं ख़रोंच

बनाई गई, मगर जो कुत्ता था वह अपनी जगह पर ज्यों का त्यों बना रहा, उस पर कोई ख़रोंच नहीं बनी । यह सरकार है, जो इस तरह की घटनाएँ बना-बना कर जुडीशियल प्रोसिडिंज बनाए । चव्हाण जी, 1919 में आस्ट्रिया में 3 पुलिस के जवानों की जांच चली थी । सोशलिस्ट सरकार ने कहा, कैबिनेट का डिसीजन था कि गोली नहीं चलेगी । फौज और पलटन और पुलिस जनता से पैसा लेती है, तनखाह पाती है, उनकी जिदगी जोखिम में रहेगी, इसके लिये गोली नहीं चलायें । जनता की सरकार जनता पर गोली नहीं चलायेगी । जनता की सरकार निहत्थी जनता पर गोली नहीं चलायेगी । वह जनता की दुश्मन सरकार है, पूंजीपतियों की सरकार है, साम्यवादियों की सरकार है, जो जनता पर गोली चलाती है, वह जनता की सरकार नहीं । इस सवाल पर बड़ी चर्चा हुई है । भारत का राज-नैतिक इतिहास भरा पड़ा है । मुझे अफसोस है, आज डाक्टर लोहिया जीवित नहीं हैं, आज डा० लोहिया के अभाव में हम लोग कही कहीं अंधेरे में पड़े हैं । डा० लोहिया ने इस सिद्धांत को प्रतिपादित किया कि जनतंत्र में गोली नहीं चल सकती, जनतंत्र में लाठी नहीं चल सकती । जब तक लाठी और गोली का प्रयोग नहीं हुआ है और जान न गई हो, तब तक जान नहीं ली जा सकती । मुझे अफसोस है कि...

श्री उपसभापति : अब समाप्त कीजिए ।

श्री राजनारायण : ... डा० लोहिया हमारे बीच नहीं रहे । आचार्य विनोबा भावे ने उस समय जब कि उन्होंने बिहार का दौरा किया था, यह बयान दिया कि गांधी जी के मरने के बाद डाक्टर लोहिया एक आदमी हैं, जिसने कि अहिंसात्मक सिद्धांत को साकार स्वरूप देने में अगुवाई की । मैं चाहता हूँ यशवंतराव चव्हाण आज जब इस चर्चा में भाग लें, तो यह कहें कि मैं इस्तीफा देकर प्रायश्चित करूँगा, इस्तीफा देकर सरकार प्रायश्चित करेगी । तब जाकर कर्मचारियों को पता लगेगा कि उन्होंने कितना गम्भीर अपराध किया, कितना गम्भीर जुल्म किया । तब जाकर उनको इस बात का अहसास

[श्री राजनारायण]

होगा। तभी प्रफुल्लित होगा जनतंत्र, क्योंकि सरकार अपने कर्मचारियों के कर्मों के लिये अपने को जिम्मेदार मानती है। जवाब तो कुछ न कुछ वह दे ही देंगे। जवाब तो एक खूनी भी सफाई में पेश कर देता है। एक कातिल भी अपनी सफाई पेश करता है। मैं इस सरकार से कातिल की सफाई नहीं चाहता। मैं आज यशवंतराव जी से चाहूंगा, वह एक जनतंत्री दार्शनिक बन कर इस सदन में बोलें ताकि देश का विश्वास जगें और हमारे पास जो चिट्ठियां लोगों की आती हैं, उनको भी इसमें संतोष हो कि चव्हाण पर जोर पड़ा है और इस प्रकार की घटनाओं की पुनरावृत्ति न हो।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : फ्लोर क्रास कर लो और मिनिस्टर हो जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं फिर अंत में अपने सहयोगियों को मुबारकबाद करता हूं और खास कर विरोधी पक्ष जिसने आज अपने अधिकार की मान्यता के लिये इस सरकार को मजबूर किया और इस ढंग का प्रस्ताव, इस ढंग का संशोधन यहां पर लाया। इसके लिये हम अपने सब मित्रों को मुबारकबाद देते हैं। मैं किसी भी समय और हर समय अपनी जान जोखिम में डालने के लिये तैयार रहता हूं। मगर हम चाहते हैं कि जो गरीब लोग हैं, उनको अच्छी तरह से रोटी मिल जाये। हमारी जान श्री चव्हाण साहब ले लें, मगर हम चाहते हैं कि वे समाजवादी प्रतिष्ठा को अगर बनाये रखना चाहते हैं, तो गरीबों को रोटी दें, उनका पेट भरें, चाहे इसमें हमारी जान भी क्यों न चली जाये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं फिर एक बार आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं।

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं फिर एक बार आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं; क्योंकि आपने बिगड़ते हुए मामले को बनाया है और इसलिये भी आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं।

श्री अकबर علی خان (अंधेर प्रदीप) :

جناب دہشتی چیرومین صاحب - میں آپکی اجازت سے ہندوستانی میں بولنا چاہتا ہوں - میں یہاں پر یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں اور ہمارے ورودھی بھائی جناب راج نرائن بھائی کو اس بات کا یقین دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جو دکھ درد ان کے دل میں ہے اس میں ہم سب شریک ہیں - جو زحمت، جر پریشانی انہیں ہوئی ہے اس کو ہم دل و جان سے تسلیم کرتے ہیں - مجھے کیا یہ کہنے کی ضرورت ہے کہ جو قربانیاں ایس - ایس - پی - کے لیڈر شری راج نرائن نے کی ہیں وہ سب ہمارے دل میں ہیں اور ہم دل سے ان کی عزت کرتے ہیں - کیا مجھے کہنے کی ضرورت ہے کہ ہم لوگوں نے جنہوں نے گاندھی جی کے قدموں کے پاس تربیت پائی ہے ان سے سبق لیا ہے، ان سے اپنی زندگی کو مرتب کیا ہے ان کے ساتھ عقیدت میں آپ حضرات آئے ہیں تو یہ سمجھنا کہ ایسی کوئی گھٹنا ہو، ایسی کوئی مصیبت ہو جہاں پر رعایا کے اوپر سختی کی جائے، لائق چلائی جائے تو یقین مانتے کہ ہم کسی سے پیچھے نہیں ہیں - اگر ضرورت ہو تو ہم تن، من، دھن سے قربانی کریں گے اور ان اصولوں کو جنہیں گاندھی جی نے سکھایا ہے جس کی بلحاظ حکومت قائم ہے ہم چاہیں گے کہ اس کا سر ہمیشہ کے لئے بلند رہے -

شری راج نرائن جی اور جتنے ہمارے بھائی اس طرف بیٹھے ہیں اور جتنے ادھر بیٹھے ہیں ان میں آپ کوئی فرق نہیں پائیں گے اگر ہم محسوس کریں کہ جتنا آپ بچاؤ کے لئے، تحفظ کے لئے جتنی ضرورت تھی اس سے زیادہ پولیس نے کارروائی کی ہے تو یقین مانتے کہ ہم آپ سے زیادہ ان کو کٹدم کریں گے - میں نے اس بارے میں

اخبار میں پڑھا اور اس لئے میں چشم دید واقعات کے متعلق کچھ عرض نہیں کر سکتا ہوں لیکن مجھے اس میں اطمینان ہے کہ بلا کسی تاخیر کے حکومت نے جس کمیشن کی تقرری کا اعلان کیا ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں وہ ٹھیک کیا ہے۔ ہوم منسٹر اور حکومت اس چیز کے لئے قابل مبارک باد ہے کہ انہوں نے اس معاملہ میں فوراً تحقیقات کا حکم دے دیا۔ میں چاہتا ہوں کہ سچے واقعات سامنے آئیں۔ آج ہم اس بورڈ میں نہیں اور میرے بھائی شری مسرا جو ڈپٹی وھپ آف دی ایجوکیشن ہیں وہ کہہ سکتے ہیں۔ (انقریشن...) انہوں نے اس موقع پر جو چاہتے تھے، ہم پر جو الزام لگائے ہیں، ہمارے بیچ جو تفریق پیدا کرنے کی کوشش کی ہے، جو ہمارا مزاق اڑانے کی کوشش کی ہے، ان کو حق ہے لیکن جس پر وہ بیٹھے ہیں کیا وہ اس کی شان کے مطابق ہے؟ وہ اس کو موزوں نہیں ہے۔ میں ان سے زیادہ توقع رکھتا تھا اور لیڈر آف دی ایجوکیشن کے لئے میرے دل میں بڑی عزت ہے کیوں کہ وہ نکست ٹو دی پرائم منسٹر ہوتا ہے تو میں یہ آپ سے توقع کروں گا کہ آپ کا عمل آپ کی زبان آپ نے قول اور فعل سے ایک بات بھی ایسی نہ ہو جس کے لئے ہم لوگوں کی نکتہ چینی کرنے کا موقع ملے۔ آپ کو اس بات کا حق ہے کہ جس طرح سے چاہیں پ نکتہ چینی کریں، ہماری کھلیاں انہیں، ہماری باتوں کی تردید کریں لیکن یہ نہ کریں کہ جہاں ایسا بڑا مسئلہ ہو، جہاں انسانیت کا مسئلہ ہو۔ میرا تو یقین ہے کہ دونوں اہل کے واسطے ہی انسان پیدا ہوا ہے۔ انسان کی زندگی کا اگر کوئی مقصد ہے تو ایسی چیز ہے تو صرف یہی ہے کہ جو دلہی ہے، جو

مظلوم ہے، جو پریشان حال ہے ان کی مصیبت میں شریک ہو ورنہ کوئی مقصد انسان کی زندگی کا نہیں ہے۔

سیاست کی حیثیت سے بھی میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ وائلنس کا استعمال سیاست میں ایک بہت بڑی چیز ہے اور اگر اس طرح کا کوئی وائلنس کا استعمال کرتا ہے اور اگر وہ گورنمنٹ ہے تو وہ زیادہ تربیت کے قابل ہے، زیادہ اظہار غم کے قابل ہے لیکن ساتھ ہی ساتھ میں یہ بھی عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس امر کو بھی دیکھا جائے جہاں ایسی صورت ہو تو آپ اس طرح کے پرنسپل لے راون کر دیجئے کہ جو ڈیمانسٹریٹر آتے ہیں ان کے ساتھ اس طرح کا سلوک کیا جانا چاہئے۔ اس طرح کی ڈیمانسٹریشن میں جتنے بھی لوگ آتے ہیں۔ ان میں ہمارے بھائی۔ بچے اور بہنوں ہوتی ہیں۔ اگر ان بہنوں کو کچھ ہوا ہے تو یقین مانئے راج نرائن جی میری بھتی اور بہن کو ہوا ہے۔ اگر کسی کو دکھ ہوا ہے تو ہم کو بھی دکھ ہوا ہے۔ اگر بھائی پہاری لال شہید ہوئے ہیں تو میرے گھر میں بھی ایک شہادت ہوئی ہے اس میں کوئی شبہ نہیں ہے لیکن ہم کو بیلنس قائم رکھنا ہے۔ ہمیں امن کو قائم رکھنا ہے، ہمیں ملک چلانا ہے۔ حکومت کو چلانا ہے اور اس کے لئے کچھ چیزیں ہوتی ہیں۔ اگر پارلیمنٹ اس بات کا اقرار دیتا ہے کہ آئینہ جتنے بھی ڈیمانسٹریشن ہوں گے وہ سب اندر چلے آئیں تو آپ اس کے بارے میں طے کیجئے۔ میں کہتا ہوں کہ اگر آپ اس طرح کی بات طے کرتے ہیں تو نہ حکومت اور نہ ہی پولیس اس بات کی خلاف ورزی کر سکتی۔ اگر آپ چاہتے ہیں کہ ایسی بات نہ ہو جس سے پارلیمنٹ

[شری اکبر علی خان]

کی شان دنیا میں کم ہو۔ اگر آپ یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ پارلیمنٹ کا وقار ہو۔ جمہوریت کا وقار قائم رہے تو پھر آپ کو ایسے اصول بنانے چاہئیں، ایسی تدابیر بنانی چاہئیں جس کی وجہ سے ڈیموکریسی چلے اور ساتھ ہی ساتھ کسی کو مضرت نہ پہنچے۔

میں کہتا ہوں کہ آج پولیس کے لوگوں کو اس نقطہ نظر سے، اس درستی سے نہیں دیکھنا چاہئے جس طرح سے ہم انگریزوں کے زمانے میں دیکھتے تھے۔ آج ہمارے بھائی، ہمارے بچے، ہیں آپ انہیں ہدایت کیجئے لیکن اگر کوئی ذیوقی انہیں سپرد کرینگے اور وہ اس ذیوقی کو اچھی طرح سے بجا لاتے ہیں تو پھر اگر ملا مت کرنا، ان کی نکتہ چینی کرنا آپ کی اور ہماری شان کے مطابق نہیں۔

اس لئے میری گزارش صرف یہی ہے کہ آج اتنا کمبھیر، اتنا سپریس اور دل دکھانے والا موقعہ ہے یہاں پر آج تقریر بازی کرنے کا مسئلہ نہیں ہے، کوئی پوائنٹ کٹیں کرنے کا مسئلہ نہیں ہے۔ آرگومنٹ کے ذریعہ ایک دوسرے سے بازی لے جانے کی ضرورت نہیں۔ کیوں کہ آج ہم ایک دکھ درد میں شریک ہیں۔ کیوں کہ کمیشن قائم ہو گیا ہے میں یہ نہیں چاہتا ہوں کہ اس میں واقعات میں جایا جائے۔ یہ واقعات اٹھنگے اور پوری ایمان داری کے ساتھ یقیناً حکومت بھی اس امر کو دیکھے گی اور نہایت آزادی کے ساتھ، سچائی کے ساتھ واقعات کو سامنے لائے گی۔ جب کمیشن کی رپورٹ ہمارے سامنے آئے گی تو یقین مانتے کہ اگر اس بات کا پتہ چل جائے چاہے وہ گورنمنٹ ہو یا پولیس ہو جو بھی خطاوار ہو یقین مانتے ہم آپ کے ساتھ

ہوں گے ملامت کرنے میں اور انسوس کرنے میں لیکن میں اس وقت نہایت ادب کے ساتھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس روایت کے پیش نظر جو جمہوریت کی اعلیٰ خصوصیت ہے۔ اس میں نہ لیجر آف دی اپوزیشن کو، نہ ہی کسی بھائی کو واقعات میں جانا مناسب ہے۔

آخر میں میں نہایت ادب کے ساتھ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ یہ نہ سمجھا جائے کہ اس مسئلہ کی حقیقت کی کیا صورت ہے لیکن جو بھی اس مسئلہ میں خطاوار ہو اس کو سزا ہو اور ہم اس بارے میں خلاف نہیں ہیں لیکن یہ کوشش کرنا اور یہ کہنا کہ ہوم منسٹر اور پرائم منسٹر کے بیچ تنازعہ ہو گیا ہے یہ شایان شان نہیں ہے۔ میں اس بات کا یقین دلاتا ہوں کہ چاہے ہوم منسٹر ہو یا پرائم منسٹر ہو یا کوئی بھی ہو ہم ایک اصول کو لے کر چل رہے ہیں ہم ڈیموکریسی، سوشلزم اور سیکولرزم کے ماننے والے ہیں اس مقصد کے لئے ہم جان دینگے، اس مقصد کے لئے کدھے سے کدھا ملا کر کھڑے رہینگے۔ یقین مانتے آپ ہمارے دل میں اس طرح کا اختلاف پیدا نہیں کر سکیں گے۔ ہمارے پیس نظر ذاتیات نہیں ہے، ہمارے پیس نظر ملک کی خدمت کرنا ہے، جو مظلوم ہیں، جو بڑے ہیں۔ جو غریب ہیں جو لاچار ہیں۔ . . . (انگریزیشن)

†[श्री अकबर अली खान (आंध्र प्रदेश) :

जनाब डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, मैं आपकी इजाजत से हिन्दुस्तानी में बोलना चाहता हूँ। मैं यहां पर यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ और हमारे विरोधी भाई जनाब राजनारायण भाई को इस बात का यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो दुःख दर्द उनके दिल में है, उसमें हम सब

†[]Hindi Translation.

शरीक हैं। जो जमान, जो परेशानी उन्हें हुई है, उसको हम इलाजान से तस्लीम करते हैं। मुझे क्या यह कहने की जरूरत है कि जो कुरबानियां एस० एस० पी० के लीडर श्री राजनारायण ने की हैं, वे सब हमारे इल्म में हैं और हम दिल से उनकी इज्जत करते हैं। क्या मुझे यह कहने की जरूरत है कि हम लोगों ने जिन्होंने गांधी जी के कदमों के पास तरबियत पाई है, उनसे सबक लिया है, उनसे अपनी जिन्दगी को मुरतल किया है, जिनके साथ अकीदत में आप हजरत आये हैं, तो यह समझना कि ऐसी कोई घटना हो, ऐसी कोई मुसीबत हो, जहां पर रियायत के ऊपर सख्ती की जाय, लाठी चलाई जाय, नो, यकीन मानिये कि हम किसी से पीछे नहीं हैं। अगर जरूरत हो तो हम तन, मन, धन का कुरबानी करेंगे और उन उसूलों को जिन्हें गांधी जी ने सिखाया है, जिसकी बिना पर हुकूमत कायम है और हम चाहेंगे कि उसका सिर हमेशा के लिए बुलन्द रहे।

श्री राजनारायण जी और जितने हमारे भाई उस तरफ बैठे हैं और जितने इधर बैठे हैं, उनमें आप कोई पार्क नहीं पायेंगे। अगर हम यह महसूस करे कि जितना अपने बचाव के लिए, तहफफुज के लिए जितनी जरूरत थी, उससे ज्यादा पुलिस बार्बरवाई की है, तो यकीन मानिये कि हम अगले ज्यादा उनको कंडेम करेंगे। मैंने इस बारे में अखबार में पढ़ा और इसीलिए मैं अगदीद वाक्यात के मुताल्लिक कुछ अर्ज नहीं कर सकता हूं। लेकिन मुझे इसमें एतमिना है कि बिना किसी ताखीर के हुकूमत ने जिस कमिशन की तकरीरी का ऐलान किया है, मैं समझता हूं बहुत ठीक किया है। होम मिनिस्टर और हुकूमत इस चीज के लिए काबिले मुताकबाद हैं कि उन्होंने इस मामले में फौरन तहकीकात का हुकम दे दिया। मैं चाहता हूं कि सच्चे वाक्यात सामने आयें। आज हम इस पर्जेशा में नहीं और मेरे भाई श्री मिश्रा जी जो डेप्टी लीडर आफ दी अपोजीशन हैं, वह कह रहे हैं। (Interruption) उन्होंने इस मीके पर हम लोगों पर जो छीटा कंसा है, हम पर जो इल्जाम लगाये हैं, हमारे बीच

जो तफरीक पैदा करने की कोशिश की है, जो हमारा मजाक उड़ाने की कोशिश की है, उनको हक है, लेकिन जिस पद पर वे बैठे हैं, क्या वह उसके शान के मुताबिक है। वह उसके मौजू नहीं हैं। मैं उनसे ज्यादा तवक्को रखता था और लीडर आफ दी अपोजीशन के लिए मेरे दिल में बड़ी इज्जत है; क्योंकि वे नैक्स्ट टु दी प्राइम मिनिस्टर होता है। तो मैं आपसे यह तवक्को करूंगा कि आपका अमल, आपकी जवान, आपका कौल और आपके फैल से एक बात भी ऐसी न हो, जिसके लिए हम लोगों को नुक्ताचीनी करने का मौका मिले। आपको इस बात का हक है कि जिस तरह से चाहें आप नुक्ताचीनी करें, हमारी खिल्लियां उड़ायें, हमारी बातों की तरदीद की है, लेकिन यह न करें जहां ऐसा बड़ा मसला हो, जहां इन्सानियत का मसला हो। मेरा तो यकीन है कि दर्द दिल के वास्ते ही इन्सान पैदा हुआ है। इन्सान की जिन्दगी का अगर कोई मकसद है, कोई परपज है तो सिर्फ यही है कि जो दुःखी है, जो मजलूम है, जो परेशान हाल है, उनकी मुसीबत में शरीक हो, वरना कोई मकसद इन्सान की जिन्दगी का नहीं है।

सियासत की हैसियत से भी मैं समझता हूं कि वायलेंस का इस्तेमाल सियासत में एक बहुत बुरी चीज है और अगर इस तरह का कोई वायलेंस का इस्तेमाल करता है और अगर वह गवर्नमेंट है तो वह ज्यादा तरबियत के काबिल है, ज्यादा इजहारे गम के काबिल है। लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि इस अमर को भी देखा जाय कि जहां ऐसी सूरत हो, तो आप इस तरह के प्रिंसिपल्स लें डाउन कर दीजियें कि जो डिमोन्स्ट्रेंट आते हैं, उनके साथ इस तरह का सलूक किया जाना चाहिये। इस तरह के डिमोन्स्ट्रेशन में जितने भी लोग आते हैं, उनमें हमारे भाई, बच्चे और बहिन होती हैं, अगर इन बहनों को कुछ हुआ है, तो यकीन मानिये राजनारायण जी मेरी बेटी और बहिन को हुआ है। अगर किसी को दुःख हुआ है, तो हमको भी दुःख हुआ है। अगर भाई बिहारी लाल शहीद

[श्री अकबर अली खान]

हुए हैं, तो मेरे घर में भी एक शहादत हुई है। इसमें कोई शुबहा नहीं है, लेकिन हमको एक बैलेंस कायम रखना है, हमें अमन को कायम रखना है, हम को मुल्क को चलाना है, हुकूमत को चलाना है और उसके लिए कुछ चीजें होती हैं। अगर पार्लियामेंट इस बात का करार देता है कि आइन्दा जितने भी डिमोन्स्ट्रेशन होंगे, वे सब अन्दर चले आयें, तो आप इसके बारे में तय कीजिये। मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर आप इस तरह की बात तय करते हैं, तो न हुकूमत और न ही पुलिस इस बात की खिलाफ-वर्जी कर सकती है। अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि ऐसी बात न हो जिससे पार्लियामेंट की शान दुनिया में कम हो, अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि पार्लियामेंट का वकार और जम्हूरियत का वकार कायम रहे, तो फिर आपको ऐसे उसूल बनाने चाहियें, ऐसे तदावीर बनाने चाहियें, जिसकी वजह से डेमोक्रेसी चले और साथ ही साथ किसी मजूरत न पहुंचे।

मैं कहता हूँ कि आज पुलिस के लोगों को उस नुक्ते नज़र से, उस दृष्टि से नहीं देखना चाहिये, जिस तरह से हम अंग्रेजों के जमाने में देखते थे। आज वे हमारे भाई और हमारे बच्चे हैं, आप उन्हें हिदायत कीजिये, लेकिन अगर कोई ड्यूटी उन्हें सिपुर्द करेंगे और वे उस ड्यूटी को अच्छी तरह से बजा करते हैं, तो फिर आकर मलामत करना, उनकी नुक्ता-चीनी करना आपके और हमारी शान के मुताबिक नहीं है।

इसलिए मेरी गुजारिश सिर्फ यही है कि आज यह इतना गम्भीर, इतना सीरियस और दिल दुखाने वाला मौका है। यहां पर आज तकरीरबाजी करने का मसला नहीं है, कोई प्वाइन्ट गेन करने का मसला नहीं है, आरग्यूमेंट के जरिये एक दूसरे से बाजी ले जाने की जरूरत नहीं है; क्योंकि आज हम एक दुःख दर्द में शरीक हैं। चूँकि कमिशन कायम हो गया है, मैं यह नहीं चाहता हूँ कि इस समय वाकयात में

जाया जाय। वे वाकयात आयेंगे और पूरी ईमानदारी के साथ यकीनन हुकूमत भी इस अमर को देखेगी और निहायत आज़ादी के साथ, सच्चाई के साथ वाकयात को सामने लायेगी। जब कमिशन की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने आयेंगी, तो यकीन मानिये कि अगर इस बात का पता चल जाय, चाहे वह गवर्नमेंट हो या पुलिस हो, जो भी खतावार हो, यकीन मानिये हम आपके साथ होंगे मलामत करने में और अफसोस करने में। लेकिन मैं इस वक़्त निहायत अदब के साथ अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि उस रबायत के पेशे नज़र जो जम्हूरियत की आला रबायत है, इस समय न लीडर आफ दी अपोजीशन को और न ही किसी भाई को वाकयात पर जाना मुनासिब है।

आखिर में मैं निहायत अदब के साथ अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह न समझा जाय कि इस मसले की हकीकत की क्या सूरत है, लेकिन जो भी इस मामले में खतावार हो, उसको सजा हो और हम इस बारे में खिलाफ नहीं हैं। लेकिन यह कोशिश करना और यह कहना कि होम मिनिस्टर और प्राइम मिनिस्टर की बीच तनाजा हो गया है, यह शयाने शान नहीं है। मैं इस बात का यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि चाहे होम मिनिस्टर हो, चाहे प्राइम मिनिस्टर हो या चाहे कोई भी हो, हम एक उसूल को लेकर चल रहे हैं। हम डेमोक्रेसी, सोशलिज्म और सेक्युलरिज्म के मानने वाले हैं, इस मकसद के लिए हम जान देंगे, इस मकसद के लिए कन्धे से कन्धा मिला कर खड़े रहेंगे। यकीन मानिए आप हमारे दिल में इस तरह का इख़्तिलाफ पैदा नहीं कर सकेंगे। हमारे पेशेनज़र जाति-यात नहीं हैं; हमारे पेशेनज़र मुल्क की खिदमत करना है, जो मजलूम हैं, जो भूखे हैं, जो गरीब हैं, जो लाचार हैं...]

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY :
On a point of clarification. I am very grateful to my senior Member, but two things he said. He said, we do not want to find fault with the police officers. I do not want to say anything about the police officers. Please find out the

other aspect. He was very careful to say that he did not want to condemn the police officer.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is all right.

SHRIMATI NASHODA REDDY : Secondly, it is not a matter for the Opposition only. It is a matter for the whole House. It is not a matter of the Opposition or the Opposition group. It is a matter for the whole House. It is very wrong to say that it is a matter for the Opposition. It is a matter for the House and not only of the Opposition.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : I know you are an hon. Member and I treat you as my daughter. You know it very well.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please listen now. You continue your speech.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : I simply want to say this. It is true that it is a matter for the whole House, but you have forgotten it but yesterday you made the charge that nobody from this side spoke . . .

SHRIMATI NASHODA REDDY : Exactly . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order please. Do not interrupt. Let there be no interruption. It is not proper to interrupt him now.

SHRIMATI NASHODA REDDY : I was ashamed that the ruling group did not get up. I am ashamed of it.

I do not : شری اکبر علی خان

want to say anything. ختم کروں گا اور ختم کرے کے پہلے آپ کے ذریعہ پورے ملک کو یہ یقین دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جو نچوڑ ہوا ہے اس پر ہاؤس کے سر ممبر کو انتہائی دکھ ہے، انتہائی ملال ہے اور دم بڑی بے چینی کے ساتھ اس عدالتی تحقیقات کا انتظار کرینگے جس کی رپورٹ آنے پر، رانعات کی چھان بین ہونے پر، ان ساری چیزوں کے سامنے آئے ہر ہم ایسی رائے کا اظہار کرینگے . . . (انتزیشن) . . .

7-22 R.S./76

†[SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : I do not want to say anything. अब मैं खत्म करूंगा और खत्म करने के पहले आपके जरिए पूरे मुल्क को यह यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ हुआ है उस पर इस हाउस के हर मेम्बर को इन्तहाई दुःख है, इन्तहाई मलाल है और हम बड़ी बेचैनी के साथ उस अदालती तहकीकात का इन्तजार करेंगे, जिसकी रिपोर्ट आने पर, वाक्यात की छानबीन होने पर, इन सारी चीजों के सामने आने पर हम अपनी राय का इजहार करेंगे।]

श्री राजनारायण : अकबर अली साहब, हम नाम नहीं लेंगे, लेकिन बहुत से मंत्रियों ने खुद कबूल किया है कि षडयंत्र था, साजिश थी, मगर साजिश का प्रकार वे भिन्न बताते हैं। इस बात का आप जवाब दीजिए।

شری اکبر علی خان : میں اس

میں نہیں جاؤں گا - اگر کسی نے کہا ہے نو اس کو بھی کمیشن کے سامنے آ کر بیان دینا چاہئے وہاں تصفیہ ہوگا۔

ان چند الفاظ کے ساتھ میں اس تحریک کی تائید کرتا ہوں اور میں چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ تحریک منظور کی جائے۔

†[श्री अकबर अली खान : मैं इसमें नहीं जाऊंगा। अगर किसी ने कहा है तो उसको भी कमीशन के सामने आकर बयान देना चाहिये, वहां तस्फिया होगा।]

इन चंद अल्फाज के साथ मैं इस तहरीक की ताईद करता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह तहरीक मंजूर की जाय।]

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, हमारे भाई किवला अकबर अली खान साहब ने हमें बड़ा साहस दिया। जब हम श्री राजनारायण जी का वक्तव्य सुन रहे थे, तो उस समय हमें ऐसा मालूम हो रहा था कि सारी

†[]Hindi transliteration.

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

घटना हमारी आंखों के सामने हो रही है और हम इस बात के लिए विचार कर रहे थे कि इस घटनाक्रम में, हम अपने आपको कैसे जोड़ें। लेकिन हमारे भाई साहब ने कभी दर्द-दिल की बात कह कर और कभी दूसरे शेर सुना कर हमें इस बात के लिए उत्साहित किया कि हम भी उनको बताएं कि—“जब रंज दिया बुतों ने तो खुदा याद आया”।

यह निश्चित रूप से किसी पार्टी का प्रश्न नहीं है। यदि किसी माननीय संसद् सदस्य के साथ इस प्रकार को कोई व्यवहार हो, जैसा कि गत 6 अप्रैल को हुआ था, तो कम से कम ऐसे सभ्य में पूरे सदन को एक मत होना चाहिए। यदि हम इसे गम्भीरता से न लेकर केवल दलगत राजनीति से सोचते हैं, तो हम समझते हैं कि हमारे प्रजातंत्र में कहीं कोई खामी है या प्रजातंत्र का भविष्य अच्छा नहीं है। श्रीमन्, राजतंत्र के युग में भी प्रजातंत्र के चाहने वालों के साथ इस तरह के अत्याचार होते रहते थे। जो राजनीति के जानने वाले हैं, उनके सामने हम कुछ तथ्य रखते हैं। इंग्लैंड में जब राजतंत्र था, तब प्रजातंत्र को चाहने वाले पार्लियामेंट के लोगों ने चार्ल्स फर्स्ट के सामने प्रदर्शन किया, फ्रांस के प्रजातंत्र के चाहने वालों ने लुई 14 के सामने इस प्रकार के प्रदर्शन किए और रूस में जार के सामने प्रजातंत्र चाहने वालों ने प्रदर्शन किया, लेकिन हमें ऐसा ज्ञात होता है कि वे तीनों काल इस तथ्याकथित कांग्रेस के राज में इकट्ठा होकर आ गए हैं, उन तीनों काल में जो घटनाएं हुई थीं, उनको दोहरा दिया गया।

श्रीमन्, पिछले समय में 6 अप्रैल को जो कुछ घटना हुई, उसके सम्बन्ध में एकमत से, मुक्त रूप से एक बात स्वीकार की जानी चाहिये और वह यह है कि शासक दल इस बात को स्वीकार करे कि प्रदर्शनकारियों ने क्या कोई ऐसा कार्य किया था, जिसके कारण पुलिस और पार्लियामेंट को घेरने के लिए जो सिपाहीगण बाहर से बुलाए गए थे, वे अपने आपसे बाहर हो गए और अपने पर से नियंत्रण खो बैठे।

अगर यह बात है कि प्रदर्शनकारियों ने कोई ऐसा कार्य किया था, तो कि 7 अंश तक इस बात को स्वीकार किया जा सकता है कि उनका इस प्रकार का कार्य करना उचित था। लेकिन अगर वे शान्त थे और अपने जन्मसिद्ध अधिकार का प्रदर्शन करने के लिए, जैसा बहुधा प्रजातंत्री देशों में होता है, आए थे और जैसा बाबू राजनारायण जी ने अभी कहा कि उन्होंने एक दिन पहले यह सर्वसम्मत हल निकाल लिया था कि प्रदर्शनकारी पूर्ण रूप से शान्त रहें, 144 धारा को न तोड़ें और यदि इसके अनुसार वे पूर्ण शान्त रहे तब इस सदन के सामने, माननीय सदस्यों के सामने एक गम्भीर प्रश्न उपस्थित है और वह गम्भीर प्रश्न यह है कि अगर एक ओर प्रदर्शनकारी पूर्ण शान्ति के साथ अपना प्रदर्शन करें और दूसरी ओर उन पर बर्बर लाठी चले और उस दशा में जबकि लाठी चलाने वालों को यह इंगित किया जाय, उनकी जान-पहचान में यह बात लाई जाय कि फलां व्यक्ति फलां हैं और उनके ऊपर लाठी बरसाओ तो यह पूरा का पूरा कांड और भी विभत्स और भयानक हो जाता है। हमारा ख्याल है कि पुलिस को हमारे शासक दल वाले इस समय अपने को बचाने के लिए वदनाम करने पर तुले हुए हैं। पिछले समय में दो वर्ष पहले यह पुलिस दल वह दल था, जिसने अर्थी वगैरह निकाल कर गृह मंत्रालय के खिलाफ प्रदर्शन किए थे; उस समय हमारे बहुत से मित्रों और श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण ने यह आरोप लगाया था कि इन पुलिस वालों को संसोपा के लोगों ने बहका दिया है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.]

और जब उनमें से बहुत से व्यक्तियों को, 800 आदमियों को बरखास्त कर दिया गया तो उनके लिए सबसे अधिक अगर किसी ने लड़ाई लड़ी, तो वह संसोपा के लोगों ने लड़ी कि उन लोगों को फिर से नौकरी में ले लिया जाय। हम समझते हैं कि संसोपा वालों ने जब पुलिस वालों के लिए इतनी लड़ाई लड़ी, तो पुलिस वालों को एक दम से ऐसा कौन सा जनून आ

गया, ऐसा कौनसा उनका मस्तिष्क विकृत हो गया कि एक दम से अपने हितैषियों को वह इस तरह से मारने लगे। तुलसीदास जी ने एक स्थान पर लिखा है : “हित अनहित पशु पक्षिउ जाना।” पशु और पक्षी भी जानते हैं कि कौन उनका हितैषी है और कौन उनको हानि पहुंचाने वाला है। तो क्या पुलिस वाले यह पहचान नहीं कर सकते थे कि यह संसोपा वाले कौन हैं? हम समझते हैं कि शासन जब कभी किसी आयोग को बिठाता है, तो उसके सामने दो उद्देश्य होते हैं। उसका एक उद्देश्य तो यह होता है कि जो मामला बहुत तेजी के साथ जनता के सामने आ रहा है और जनता का मस्तिष्क उसमें उलझता जा रहा है, उस मामले को ढिलाई के साथ जनता की आंखों के सामने से हटा दिया जाय और दूसरा उद्देश्य यह होता है कि आयोग के आने के बाद हम सब जानते हैं और विशेष रूप से जो एडवोकेट्स हैं, वकील हैं, वे जानते हैं कि अदालती कार्यवाहियों में क्या क्या नहीं किया जा सकता और क्या क्या किया जा सकता है। गवाहियां किस प्रकार प्रस्तुत होती हैं, कौसी गवाहियां हम चाहते हैं कि प्रस्तुत हों और वही गवाहियां फिर किस प्रकार की हो जाती हैं, उन तमाम चीजों में हम यहां जाना नहीं चाहते। तो शासक दल का कभी कभी मंतव्य ऐसा होता है कि इस प्रकार के आयोग और कमीशन स्थापित करने के बाद जो सही बात है, चाहे वह सामने आवे या न आवे, लेकिन उसके लिये थोड़ा बहुत समय जरूर मिल जाय। हम नहीं कह सकते कि शासक दल का इसमें कौनसा विचार था। हमारे मित्र श्री अकबर अली खान साहब ने अभी कहा कि जैसे ही शासन को यह मालूम हुआ, तो उसने अपनी बड़ी दरियादिली से एक नए आयोग को नियुक्त कर दिया। मैं माननीय सदस्यों से इस बारे में एक प्रश्न करूंगा। इस प्रकार की जब कोई गंभीर घटना हुई है, तो कहां आयोग स्थापित नहीं किये गये और जितने आयोग स्थापित किये गये, उनका परिणाम क्या जनता जैसा समझती थी और जैसा चाहती थी, उसके अनु-

रूप हुआ? नहीं हुआ। कभी कभी हुआ हो भले ही, लेकिन अधिकांश में ऐसा नहीं हुआ। तो इस प्रकार केवल कमीशनों के भरोंसे पर हम बैठे नहीं रह सकते। इस कमीशन के सामने लोग गवाहियां देंगे और उसके बाद जिस पर हम आश्रय कर के बैठे हैं, उसका परिणाम शून्य निकले, हमारे सामने यह प्रश्न नहीं है। हमारे सामने यह प्रश्न है कि अब प्रजातंत्र धीरे-धीरे आ रहा है। आज से 15 साल पहले एक असेम्बली में हम जब विरोधी दल के नेता थे, तो उस समय कांग्रेस पक्ष के जितने गिनितर थे, वह गर्व के साथ असेम्बली के धरातल पर कहा करते थे कि इस पक्ष में बैठने का अधिकार हमारे सिवाय और किसी को नहीं है अर्थात् इस देश में प्रजातंत्र की बातें वह उपहास के रूप में समझते थे। आज प्रजातंत्र धीरे-धीरे आ रहा है और हम समझते हैं कि आज जो श्री यशवन्तराव जी चव्हाण देश के गृह मंत्री की कुर्सी पर बैठे हैं, कल यह भी संभव है कि उधर के बहुत से सदस्य इधर आकर बैठ जायें और इधर के बहुत से सदस्य उधर जा कर बैठ जायें और जब कभी ऐसा समय आयेगा, तो उस समय यह बात मस्तिष्क में नहीं आयेगी और इस बात के मस्तिष्क में आने के बाद इस बात पर लोग जरूर विचार करेंगे। हमको उन माननीय सदस्यों से कुछ नहीं कहना है कि जिनके मस्तिष्क इतने विकृत हो गये हैं कि जो प्रजातंत्र की परिपाटी को ही समझना नहीं चाहते या जो सत्ता के इतने भूखे हैं कि प्रजातंत्र में सारे अधिकार वे केवल अपने लिए ही रखना चाहते हैं और प्रजातंत्र में दूसरों को कोई अधिकार देना ही नहीं चाहते। ऐसे माननीय सदस्यों से हम कुछ निवेदन करना नहीं चाहते, लेकिन प्रजातंत्र में जो संसद् के सदस्यों के कुछ अधिकार हैं, ऐसा समझते हैं उनसे मैं कुछ निवेदन कर सकता हूं। श्रीमन्, अगर ऐसे शान्तिपूर्ण प्रदर्शनों के बीच में हो कर माननीय संसद् सदस्यों को संसद् में आने का अधिकार प्राप्त है, ऐसे सदस्यों को जो कि राष्ट्रपति तक जा सकते हैं, प्रधान मंत्री तक जा सकते हैं और उनको वहां जाने से रोका

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

गया और उन पर लाठियां और अश्रु गैस बरसायी गयी, तो हम समझते हैं कि यह प्रजातंत्र का खून है, यह प्रजातंत्र की हत्या है। इस केस में इसी प्रकार की बातें हुई और हम समझते हैं कि बहुत से मित्रों ने यह कहा कि गृह मंत्रालय के परस्पर प्रतिद्वन्दी दावेदार हैं। हम इस केस में जाना नहीं चाहते कि कौनसा प्रतिद्वन्दी श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण को गिराना चाहता है या श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण किसी दूसरे प्रतिद्वन्दी का गला घोटना चाहते हैं। हम समझते हैं कि सत्ता के लिए युद्ध में यह सब संभव है। हमारे देश में भी ऐसा हुआ है। हम लोग तो आपस में प्रतिद्वन्दी कहे जा सकते हैं, लेकिन सत्ता के युद्ध में तो पिता अपने पुत्र का गला घोट देता है और पुत्र अपने पिता का वध कर देता है। तो इस प्रकार अगर उनकी कैबिनेट के मंत्री एक दूसरे से आपस में लड़ें और सत्ता के लिए इस युद्ध में एक दूसरे पर दोषारोपण करें, तो हमें इसमें किसी प्रकार की अप्रसन्नता नहीं है। हम तो इसको आश्चर्य की बात भी नहीं समझते। हम तो इतना ही कहना चाहते हैं कि श्रीमन्, आप कृपा कर के अपने घरेलू युद्ध का भार अपने घर वालों पर ही डालें, तो अच्छा होगा, लेकिन अगर उस युद्ध का भार संसद् पर, संसद् के माननीय सदस्यों के अधिकारों पर और उन दूसरे निर्दोष व्यक्तियों पर डालेंगे, जिनका आपके षडयंत्रों में कोई हाथ नहीं है, ऐसे लोगों पर अश्रु गैस चला कर, उन निरीह और शान्त व्यक्तियों पर दोष थोप दें, तो ऐसा करने से यह प्रजातंत्र चलने वाला नहीं है। आप खयाल कीजिये श्रीमन्, कि संसोपा के इस प्रदर्शन में कितनी दूर दूर से लोग आये और उसमें एक व्यक्ति बिहारी लाल नाम का भारा गया। हमारे मित्र श्री राजनारायण जी ने कहा कि कुछ लोगों ने वहां जा कर यह कहा कि यह बिहारी लाल वह नहीं है, जो प्रदर्शन में आया था, यह बिहारी लाल दूसरा है। तब मैं समझता हूं कि प्रारम्भ से ही जब इस प्रकार का रंग इसे दिया जाने लगा है, तो आगे जा कर तो न जाने

क्या हाल होगा। कुछ हमारे शासक मित्रों के अखबारों में भी हमें ऐसी बातें पढ़ने को मिलीं और ऐसी भावनायें फैलाने का यत्न किया गया। हम समझते हैं कि यह उनका आश्रय-स्थल नहीं है और न ऐसी भावनायें फैलाने वालों का किसी भी बुद्धिमान माननीय सदस्य को साथ देना चाहिए कि संसोपा में आपसी झगड़े थे और संसोपा का एक दल दूसरे संसोपा के दल को बदनाम करना चाहता था, इसलिए यह सब हुआ। हम समझते हैं कि इस प्रकार की कोई निन्दनीय बात नहीं है। चूंकि प्रदर्शन का प्रश्न है, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि प्रदर्शन हर देश में हुआ करते हैं। श्रीमन्, मैं अपने कांग्रेसी मित्रों से पूछना चाहता हूं कि जो बात-बात में रूस की और समाजवाद की बात करते हैं, यद्यपि मैं इस बात को दृढ़ता के साथ कहता हूं कि हमारे देश में समाजवाद किसी बाहरी देश की देन नहीं है। हमारे देश में तो समाजवाद था, लेकिन इसके बाद भी मैं उनका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि पिछले वर्ष चेको-स्लोवाकिया में जब रूस के विरुद्ध वगावत हुई और रूस के टैंक प्रेग की सड़कों पर जाने लगे, तो एक टैंक चलाने वाले चालक और सिपाही को दुबचेक की पार्टी की एक लड़की ने चांट मार दिया। अगर वह टैंक चलाने वाला और उसका साथी चाहता, तो उसका बदला एक हजार आदमियों को कत्ल कर के ले सकता था, लेकिन उसके बाद भी उसने ऐसा कुछ नहीं किया और वह हंस कर आगे बढ़ता चला गया। किसी राष्ट्र की यही उपलब्धि होती है। जिस राष्ट्र में इस प्रकार की सहनशीलता और शालीनता होती है, उसी में प्रजातंत्र चलता है और जिस राष्ट्र में इतने नीचे स्तर पर अधिकारी उतर आये कि कुर्सियों को बचाने के लिए और दूसरों को बदनाम करने के लिए खुले आम चारों तरफ से आक्रमण करें, तो उस प्रजातंत्र की रक्षा श्रीमन्, कैसे हो सकती है। यहां पर संसद् में सबके समान अधिकार हैं और उसके कारण हम समझते हैं कि किसी एक माननीय सदस्य पर जो आघात हुआ, तो केवल उस माननीय सदस्य पर ही वह आघात

नहीं है या केवल उमाननीय सदस्य के दल के ऊपर ही वह आघात नहीं है, अपितु सारे संसद के सदस्यों के अधिकारों का उससे हनन हुआ ऐसा हम समझते हैं और इसी दृष्टि से इस प्रकार की चीजों को देखा जाना चाहिये।

श्रीमन्, संसोपा के प्रदर्शन के पहले भी और बहुत से यहां पर प्रदर्शन हुये, बड़े-बड़े प्रदर्शन हुये। एक बात तो हो सकती है कि जो शान्तिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन होते हैं, उन्हें कभी-कभी ऐसी कठिनाइयां उत्पन्न हो जाती हैं कि वह शान्तिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन भी अशांति का रूप धारण कर लेते हैं। पिछले समय में यहां पर 7 नवम्बर को एक बड़ा भारी प्रदर्शन हुआ था और उस प्रदर्शन में जिस व्यक्ति का किसी प्रकार से दोष नहीं था उसको बर्बाद का बकरा बना दिया गया और गृह मंत्रालय उससे छुड़ा लिया गया। हम इन गुण-दोषों पर नहीं जाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन हम समझते हैं कि इसमें भी कहीं बलि का बकरा निश्चित रूप से कोई न कोई बनने वाले हैं, चाहे एक पक्ष का हो या दूसरे पक्ष का हो; क्योंकि जिस सत्ता को दूसरे को बलि का बकरा बना कर दृष्टि किया है, तो उस सत्ता के कारण उनमें आस में भी लड़ाई होने वाली है, उनमें आपस में सह हो नहीं सकता, स्नेह केवल उस स्थिति में हो सकता था कि जिनकी हम बार-बार दुहाई देते हैं, गांधी जी महाराज की उनके सिद्धांतों के अनुसार ही वह त्याग और बलिदान के आधार पर सत्ता पर बैठे होते, तब हम उनका, सबका अभिनन्दन करते, लेकिन इस वर्ष भी जब कि गांधी शताब्दि वर्ष चल रहा है, गांधी जी के आदर्शों को भुला कर यदि शान्तिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन पर, जो कि जनता के मौलिक अधिकारों तो आगे ले जाने वाला हो, उनके ऊपर इस प्रकार का प्रहार किया जाता है, तो हम समझते हैं श्रीमान कि भाई कृपा कर के गांधी जी का नाम न लो; क्योंकि गांधी जी की जो कुछ भी जीवन भर की कमाई थी, उसे आपकी सत्ता की भूतान और आत्मा की, आवाज ने समाप्त कर दिया टांकरी के सारे आम आपने बेच दिये और अब उसमें कुछ भी नहीं रहा

और उसका घोर परिणाम यही हुआ। अगर इस प्रकार के प्रदर्शनों में इस प्रकार की कार्यवाही चलती रही, तो वह दिन बहुत दूर नहीं है जब कि यह कुर्सी जिसके लिये आप घनघोर प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, जिसको बचाने के लिये आप औरंगजेबी चाल भी चल रहे हैं वह कुर्सी अंततोगत्वा आपके पास बची नहीं रहेगी और न आपसे चिपकी रहेगी। ये सत्तायें चलती हैं, बदलती हैं और चलती जाती हैं।

(Time bell rings.)

जैसा कि शासक दल के बहुत से लोगों ने और स्वयं गृह मंत्रालय के प्रधान श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण ने कहा कि उनको इस बात का खेद है, हम समझते हैं कि हमको, सबको खेद है, लेकिन खेद का प्रदर्शन उनकी आत्मा से होना चाहिये, मकराश्रु की भांति नहीं होना चाहिये, मगर के आंसू नहीं होना चाहिये, यह उनके हृदय से है तो हम समझते हैं कि वह प्रजातंत्र की परम्परा को अपनायेंगे और पूरा सदन उनके साथ सहमत होगा, किन्तु इतना हम अवश्य चाहते हैं कि इस प्रकार की घटनाओं की पुनरावृत्ति न हो। इस आज की बहस का, श्रीमन्, अगर कोई नतीजा निकल सकता है, तो वह केवल यह निकल सकता है कि हम आत्म-विश्लेषण करें, आत्म निरीक्षण करें कि भविष्य में हमारी किसी गलती के कारण किसी माननीय संसद सदस्य के अधिकारों पर कोई चोट, कोई आघात न हो या किसी प्रकार से उनके हृदय को कष्ट न हो। यही हमारी धारणा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The Home Minister will intervene at five. He has work later on in the Lok Sabha. Mr. Dharia.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : While participating in this discussion I cannot hide my feelings of distress and concern at the plight of my colleagues like Mr. Rajnarain, Mr. Madhu Limaye and Mr. George Fernandez with whom I have had the privilege to work for several years; when I see my own colleagues beaten by the police mercilessly, I do feel that there is something wrong

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

somewhere, and this is indeed a challenge to the democratic functioning of this country.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the outset I would say that even though my signature is not there on that amendment moved by Mr. Niren Ghosh I am a party to that amendment. Because I was called outside by some people waiting for me. I had to go out. So even though it is not signed by me I do stand by that amendment and I do feel that whatever happened on the 6th April is indeed a matter of grave concern.

The political situation in this country has been changing very fast and while we are discussing this matter, I feel that instead of trying to exploit such a situation for political purposes, it would be better if we tried to understand the problems that are being faced and that are likely to be faced by all the parties or at least by some parties who will be in power either in the State or at the Centre, whatever it is. It is a new confrontation that has to be faced. We cannot avoid demonstrations in any democratic set-up. And whenever a political party feels that public opinion must be mobilised over certain issues, that political party has every right to carry on peaceful demonstrations, and all possible care shall have to be taken to see that while they can exhibit their feelings or they can demonstrate, such merciless beatings or such sort of atrocities are not repeated. And here I believe that it becomes a matter of concern not only for the Government but for all political parties. It is the responsibility of the Government to take care that the police behaves in a proper way. And it is also the responsibility of the demonstrating parties to see that no provocative attitude is generated.

Sir, in this case I do not know the whole details. But I have heard Mr. Rajnarain very patiently. When it was agreed that Section 144 shall not be broken and that they shall have their meeting in the Patel Chowk, I do not know what was the occasion for beating Mr. Madhu Limaye or Mr. George Fernandez at the very outset when they wanted to go and see the President or the Speaker whoever it is. Of course, as the whole matter is now before a Commission of Inquiry, I would not like to

go into those details. But I do feel that it was the duty of the police officers or of the magistrate to see that as far as possible no provocative atmosphere was generated. And particularly, in the case of Members of Parliament I do not want any special privilege. But is it not possible for the Government to see that some inspectors or some responsible officers are asked to look after these leaders, who are not only leaders but who are the very representatives of the people?

Sir, in a democracy or in a parliamentary form of institution, it is not the building like Parliament, but it is the Members of Parliament, it is the Members of the State Legislatures who are important. And if their dignity, if their honour is not maintained properly, how can we maintain the honour of the parliamentary institutions? It is not only the building; it is the spirit which is more material, and it is from that point of view that I have to say that it is. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Are you referring to the Rules of Procedure?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I am coming to it later on.

It was possible Sir, to take care of these Members. And instead of beating them was it not possible for the officers to straightway arrest these leaders and take them into custody? Was it not possible for them to detain Mr. Rajnarain, Mr. George Fernandes and Mr. Limaye? And here we agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If not, every day, on several occasions they have courted arrest. We can train our police so that they should know that it is not the British Empire that is ruling the country; in a free country it must be the duty of the police officer to know who are the leaders and who are the social workers and to see that they are properly taken care of. But here it was beating the leaders. It was certainly a challenge to the workers for having their faith and allegiance in those leaders. It is from this point of view I feel a time has come for all of us to behave in the right way. It is time for us to create a code of conduct for this Government and also for political parties. There should not be an occasion for any sort of provocation whereby there could be teargassing or lathi charge and what not.

Here Sir, again, before lathi charge I have not been able to understand why it is not possible in this modern age, in this modern world, with all possible scientific knowledge at our command to disperse the mob without a lathi charge. Could they not disperse the unruly mob through powerful hose-pipes? Should we not try that way? Particularly in the case of the Parliament House which represents the whole country and where ultimately people come for justice, when demonstrators come and try to go beyond a particular limit is it not possible for us to have water supply with all possible pressure in order to disperse a mob if it is at all unruly?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Then the lathis will be unemployed.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : It is true that lathis will be unemployed. But anyway that is not the problem today.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : That is a welcome unemployment.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is from this angle that I would like to appeal to this House today not to exploit this situation for political purposes. Today my party may be in power at the Centre. But some of the other parties are in power in some other States. While they have to face my party here and demonstrate my party, who knows, may have to face them in the States. That fact we cannot forget.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN (Tamil Nadu) : You want to remain in power always.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : It is my desire and it shall be my desire that my party should be in power also in all the States. At the same time I cannot forget realities. I am a politician. I cannot forget realities.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I think you can demonstrate in Gujarat. Ahmedabad is a good place.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, in that case my party shall have also to take care that while breaking the law we do not disturb the peace and tranquillity. If at all we have to remember Gandhiji—we should or we should not may be a point of dispute—let us not forget that the method of satyagraha which was adopted by Gandhiji was

quite a clear method. The moment Gandhiji wanted to break the law he used to give notice to the Government that this would be his method of breaking the law. Naturally, Gandhiji could mobilise the people in this country for that very great national struggle at the same time. And there was the least possible atrocity from the other side. So if at all we want to emulate Gandhiji why should we not think of those methods or new methods? Is it not possible to apply new principles while they have these demonstrations? So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to appeal to all the parties to think in this direction.

Now the last point which this House cannot forget is this. What was the demonstration meant for? It was meant for five basic demands. It was unemployment. It was giving the right of voting to those who have crossed 18 years of age. It was for land reforms. It was for a Constituent Assembly, and also it was for bringing down the level of existence to Rs. 1,500. These were the five basic demands. Now in this country which has a parliamentary institution if we fail in achieving these social objectives there is no power on earth which can save our democratic institution...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Tell your Raja Bhanu Prakash Singh.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : He is too small a man for me to go into controversy. So I am not prepared to recognise Mr. Bhanu Prakash Singh.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You control him.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : We shall control him. So, Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, in a democratic form of institution if we cannot achieve this social objective, if we cannot do away with this sort of injustice, whether social or economic we cannot save democracy not can we maintain the decorum, the dignity and the honour of democracy. I do differ with the S. S. P. people when they make a demand for inviting the Constituent Assembly. I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever that article 368 empowers both the Houses to have any sort of amendment excepting those relating to the States where we are supposed to have ratification from more than 50 per cent. of the States. Therefore, there is no

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

need of having a new Constituent Assembly. Even though I differ from that view that does not mean I get an authority to have this sort of brutal repression against our own colleagues, against our own processes. And it is from this point of view that I would like to appeal to this House that we shall have to concentrate all our energies so that we can give this social justice as early as possible. I would like to remind and warn this Government that if the Government does not implement the programmes that are dear to the people, this Government shall not be able to maintain peace in this country, this Government shall not be able to save democracy in this country. We are trying to haggle for all the issues including the abolition of privy purses. The Government cannot give to any sort of protection to democracy or the people if people do not behave. It is from that point of view that if people go astray the responsibility lies squarely on the shoulders of the Government; the Government cannot function. Let us look at this problem from a constructive point of view. Let us not try to politically exploit the situation. It is in this context that I have offered my suggestions.

Sir, I am indeed sorry when I look at Mr. Rajnarain and other colleagues and I hope such a sort of situation will not be repeated in this country. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have all been deeply concerned about what happened near Parliament House on this 6th of April. Some of our colleagues were severely and brutally assaulted by the police, many others have been injured and one was done to death. Now what we are considering is whether this situation created by the police was at all warranted. It is obvious from the apologies tendered by the Government and the regrets expressed by the Prime Minister and the Home Minister that something was basically, fundamentally wrong on the part of the authorities and the police in dealing with this situation. Had it not been so, the leaders of the Government would not have been obliged to stand up in the House and tender public apology. Now this is not a subject matter of debate or discussion. We have to examine as to how this could happen. I have been here for 18 years now. We have seen

many demonstrations. We have earlier seen many demonstrations but never did we witness the kind of police orgy that was let loose on the 6th of April near the Parliament House in which a number of Members of Parliament were injured and assaulted. It appears that the leader of the S.S.P., Mr. Fernandes, narrowly escaped death. Therefore, we should all ponder over the incidents that took place.

Sir, the demonstration was brought in order to voice certain demands of the working people. The point is not whether you agree with them or not. The point is whether we have a right to make such demands or to voice demands which some people may or may not like. Now, the police must have made preparations. The police has an Intelligence department also and they must have got information as to how the demonstration would conduct itself. Moreover, we have been told by Mr. Rajnarain in this House that there was an agreement between the leaders of the demonstrators, namely, the S.S.P. leaders on the one hand and the magistrates on the other that there was no intention to defy section 144 or any other law and the demonstrators intended to conduct the demonstration peacefully and within certain limits. What remains to be explained is why in such a situation the Government and the authorities launched the kind of brutal attack that has been spoken about here by the previous speakers. It does appear that it was a pre-meditated attack. I say this thing because nothing happened on the spot in order to invite the kind of attack they launched. Surely murders were not being committed. The Parliament House was not being raided. Vehicles were not being burnt. The window-panes of the various offices within the vicinity of Parliament were not being broken. How is it that this force was applied in the name of dealing with what they called the law and order situation? That also we cannot understand.

The only explanation can be that the Delhi Police had planned this attack for whatever the reasons, and I think the Commission should go into the Delhi Police, its ramifications, its activities and the antecedents of those who are in charge of the police administration in Delhi. This attack could not have taken place on the spur of the moment and Mr. Chavan should realise this thing that an attack of this kind against so many

people including some Members of Parliament and almost right at the gates of Parliament when Parliament was in session, could not have come about all of a sudden unless some people had given some thought to an attack of this kind and had prepared it. I see a deep conspiracy in the police administration. I do not know what exactly it is. It is for the Government and the Inquiry Commission to unravel it. Well, Sir, a suspicion comes to one's mind because there should be some people in the police high-up linked up with certain other shady elements in public life under very wrong and retrograde influence, who are interested in creating this situation in order even to discredit the Government. Well, I would not rule it out. It is quite possible, and it is also possible that other reasons were there. But from the look of it, it seems that some people might have contrived this as a means of pushing some of their political acts at the cost of the SSP, at the cost of Parliament, at the cost of the dignity of Parliament. It was the kind of a thing which provocateurs sometimes do. These provocateurs, if at all, must be very highly placed in the police administration. Mr. Chavan should not be so sure about his men. I do maintain that a section of the Delhi Police is under a very wrong, retrograde, reactionary, influence in the sense that these reactionary elements do not like anything which is remotely progressive, which is remotely in the correct direction to happen. And it is these people who might have engineered a situation of this kind by attacking the SSP to find an *alibi* for something else or to provide for an *alibi* for something else to happen in this country. Well this political aspect of the matter should not be ignored.

Now, I should like to know from Mr. Chavan if there was any consultation between him as the Home Minister and the heads of the police administration in Delhi or, for that matter, the head of the Delhi Administration, and I should also like to know whether that conversation, if any, took place before the incident. This is a very material information I require. I should also like to know whether any police officials and the Home Secretary, Mr. L. P. Singh, and others contacted Mr. Chavan as the situation according to them, not according to us, was getting out of hand. Was there any attempt to find out Mr. Chavan's reactions by the Home Secretary or the head of the police administration,

the DIG and other officials, as to what Mr. Chavan would think? In the first instance the demonstration took place very near the Parliament House. Secondly, it took place in the Capital of India. Thirdly the leaders of one of the major opposition parties in the country were leading this demonstration. In such a situation, was it not expected of the Home Secretary, Mr. L. P. Singh, who is supposed to have very considerable influence on the Delhi Police, that he should find out from Mr. Chavan as to how Mr. Chavan would like to deal with this situation? Was any political advice sought? These are questions which may be partly gone into by the Inquiry Commission, but certainly Parliament cannot defer discussion of these questions simply because a Commission has been appointed. I suspect that there were elements in the Home Ministry and in the police administration in Delhi who wanted these things to happen and so these incidents took place. Mr. Chavan should get correct details as to how his Ministry dealt with this situation before it took place. We are entitled to be clear about that aspect of the matter. I am saying this because it is very very important...

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN : Sir, on a point of order. I find a thorough change in the attitude of the honourable Member who always used to attack the Government. Today he is not attacking it but...

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : We are very happy about it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : It is a point of disorder.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Will you kindly tell my friend that Mr. L. P. Singh does not belong to a relief society not does he belong to a dancing class but that he belongs to the Government? I am attacking the Home Ministry and my attack is more concrete. Your attack is like jet planes which fly leaving behind some smoke. My attack is entirely different. I am making a very concrete attack and I am right because it is difficult for me to believe that Mr. Chavan ordered this attack. My dear friend, sometimes I do attack Mr. Chavan the Home Minister. But it is difficult for me to believe that Mr. Chavan ordered this attack on Messrs. Madhu Limaye, Fernandes and others. Anyhow, if you believe that Mr. Chavan did it, say so.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

But I have a different feeling because Mr. Chavan can do a lot of other things. He is capable of mischief, mischief actual and mischief potential. Very few people can beat him. But in this matter I am not prepared easily to accept, in the absence of information, that Mr. Chavan would be so senseless or would be without common-sense as to order such a thing. Therefore, I am not saying anything personal. But constructively he is certainly responsible for what his police has done or what his Secretary has done and he is answerable to Parliament. But do not try to confuse the issues. Therefore, I would not like to say anything personal. The trouble is sometimes we go out of the head of the Minister and the policemen go after our heads. But we do not like to lose our heads. We want to save our heads...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Is the Delhi Police reactionary or progressive?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That you ask Mr. Ranadive and he will explain it...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : You are saying so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is for you to ask Mr. Ranadive to explain to you. I am not concerned with that and I do not know. I thought the interruption would be slightly more intelligent than it was. Here whether Mr. Chavan is progressive or reactionary is not the issue at all. The issue is whether Mr. Chavan had ordered this thing...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : You are saying so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not saying that. I am going just a little more beyond that. It is not the issue at all. The issue is whether Mr. Chavan had ordered such a thing. And if he had not ordered it, the other thing is whether he was consulted in such matters when the situation was developing. This is for him to explain. After that I shall come to my judgment. Anyhow we have tabled the same amendment. I do not know whether the amendment is revisionary or revolutionary because we share the same amendment.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : According to him you are finding progressiveness

in the Government. That is a development for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Let us note the development.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My friend knows that the test of the pudding is in the eating.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Exactly, your words you are eating. That is the test.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Do not provoke me to say things. Anyway it enlivens the debate. Now I find from Mr. Chavan's clarification that action has been taken only against two policemen. I am not at all satisfied with that. It is only against one Police Officer and another magistrate. Surely there must be some log book, some document to show who were the officers who were detailed for this work and who were in command of the Police Force. All of them, without exception, unless one can prove that he was not responsible, even constructively, should be suspended. If there were 10 officers, all the ten should be put under immediate suspension, because we do not know which one was responsible and to what extent, but collectively they all were responsible. All of them should be put under suspension. Surely he knows the policemen who assaulted. The names must be there with the Police authorities as to who were the bosses there. Action should be taken against them because it should be made known to the police officers and men that for such action they are liable to immediate action and preemptory action is called for and the Government has been in default in not taking preemptory action. What about the I.G. or the Head of the Police? Was he called upon to explain his behaviour or conduct? What explanation has he given, Mr. Chavan should explain. *Prima facie* the gentlemen needs to be suspended to say the least. Nothing of the kind has been done. There is an attempt to cover up the police and that attempt sometimes is made not only by the reactionaries like Mr. Chavan but also in progressive circles. That we have seen not only by the reformists but also by the revolutionaries. The protection of the police has become an art and profession in the current politics of to-day.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : That we have seen.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not mentioning you. My friend has not become a Police Minister but

I have no doubt that if he becomes ever one, it will be a horror.

SHRI NIRIN GHOSH : You make me one and find out the horrors.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : This is not the occasion for Party quarrels.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I would like to say my friend, Niren Ghosh, as a Minister but Minister in charge of Prospecting.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NIRIN GHOSH : Everybody says that Mr. Gupta is a Minister for Proxies in the Parliament. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : According to him. Do not digress. That is his trouble because after all in such a situation perhaps is it necessary for him but forget about him. What was the need for interruption whether Mr. Chavan is a progressive or reactionary?

SHRI NIRIN GHOSH : You said certain reactionary Police officers. You were giving a thesis to us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I need not learn my political lessons from my friend. These are childish questions but parliamentary democracy provides for childish questions.

SHRI NIRIN GHOSH : These are childish interruptions? Only a servitor of bourgeois would say so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : When we are discussing a practical question, we are not discussing about the bourgeois philosophy. We can do that but later on. Now I say that these are matters for Mr. Chavan to enquire and tell us. I charge that it was a premediated attack by the Police, with or without the knowledge of Mr. Chavan but I have no information that they planned it along with Mr. Chavan. I want to know the role of the Home Ministry and as I said, some officials, according to my information, are very closely connected directly, despite the Delhi Administration, with the Home Ministry and everybody in the Police knows that the Home Secretary has very great influence over the Delhi Police. I am not talking of his influence in other spheres but he is a very relevant factor in the Home Ministry.

Before I sit down, I would only say one or two things. Something should be done about it because demonstrations before the Parliament will take place and if demonstration do not take place before the Parliament, there is little point in having this, show here. People are entitled to come here, demonstrate and submit their petitions and raised their demands because these are the people who returned us to Parliament and naturally it is our duty to see that they are not hindered in this respect. Now therefore the Government should consider this question of demonstration before Parliament and the restrictions should be removed and conditions should be created so that peaceful demonstrations, naturally in a proper manner, can take place and the Police does not behave in the manner in which it has behaved.

I should also like the Home Minister to give standing directions to the police officers that the leaders of the various political parties and others also but more especially the leaders, because they are a present force in the society, have to be respected in such matters. It would be useless to say that the policemen did not know Shri Rajnarain. Who does not know Mr. Rajnarain? Surely they know Mr. Rajnarain. His photographs appear. He moves about in Delhi. Who does not know Mr. Madhu Limaye whose picture has appeared in the front pages for good or bad many occasions? Who does not know Mr. George Fernandes? Every police officer present knew each one of them and they did it because they knew. They fixed their target, they found the men, they wanted to assault and then they took special care to assault. It was all done knowingly. Let us not think that they did not know such men. Now it is not a question of our having extra privileges or extra right but the fact remains that M. Ps. have to be respected by the administration. Our order of precedence should not merely mean that we go to the parties of the Government and our chair is put before that of the Secretary. It should not be merely that. The M.Ps. as representatives of the people are certainly entitled from the officials, from the Police in particular, due respect. This respect is shown not to an individual but to an institution. This respect is shown not to personal ideas, or other things, but to the mandate of the people. This respect is an indispensable aspect of the working of Parliamentary democracy.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Therefore, let us not be apologetic all the time when we want certain things should not be done in regard to Members of the Legislative Assemblies, Members of Parliament and so on. When we mention this, we say this in the context of the working of democratic institutions. So everybody knows it. When a big leader goes, certain arrangements are made even by the Government on its own sometimes. Here the Government is not showing any concern. Now the Delhi Administration and this Government will have to explain how is it that under their nose the policemen behaved in this manner instead of showing even the minimum respect towards 3 or 4 prominent leaders of a political party which is an all-India Party. They assaulted and attacked them and brutally beat them up and one of them might have died even. This demands to be explained.

Therefore I would ask of the Government to discuss this matter in the appropriate quarters and issue mandatory directions to the police and other administrations that respect towards Members of Parliament and of Assemblies should not only mean that Secretaries should get up, or that the chairs, in a dinner party or a lunch party, for the Secretaries concerned, should be placed next to those of Members of Parliament. Now, this hypocrisy must end. They have no respect—the Indian police. Well the Indian police under the Congress has cultivated no respect for popular representatives, for democratic movements, for leaders of democratic movements and, most of all, when it comes to the case of the leaders of the Left movement. I think therefore, Mr. Vice Chairman, that this matter should be gone into very seriously, instructions should be worked out, and those police officials, who show disrespect to the leaders and other representatives of democratic movements, they should be summarily dismissed from the service. Once again I repeat; much more drastic action, is called for in the case of Delhi police administration. It is the cesspool of corruption. It is manned by people who are soleless, anti-democratic, treacherous. It is headed by men who have no sense of values, and are connected with some people in the Home Department—I do not know in pursuit of what kind of conspiracy and other things. This Delhi police administration, which has shown its utter incompetence in dealing with the crimes

in the city of Delhi, Old and New this administration should be completely overhauled. And with regard to other demands my friend, Mr. Rajnarain, has made, I extend my support that the whole thing should be gone into by the Government and the demands should be met. Mr. Vice-Chairman, let it not be said that the police can come and launch such an offensive in front of Parliament and attack Members of Parliament and others when they came for a demonstration, and Parliament did not safeguard its dignity and interests and provide for, what is more important, the most effective and drastic action. Mr. Chavan's *bona fides* and the *bona fides* of this Government will be tested not by a profusion of sentiments and regret, but by the concrete actions that are taken in order to bridle the police force, in order to orientate it, if possible, to some extent and in order to teach it that the days are gone when they could with impunity commit such barbarous crimes before Parliament and elsewhere against mass movements and the leaders of mass movements. That is what they are called upon to do. Unless that is done and done to the satisfaction of this House and the other House in concrete terms and concrete actions, in necessary policy changes, in necessary disciplinary and other penal actions against the police men and the magistracy responsible, we shall not accept the *bona fides* of this Government, and the Government shall stand condemned in the eyes of the nation and before the bar of public opinion and its police force as an inert, incompetent, cruel and politically an absolutely unacceptable force in the country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The Home Minister.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very glad indeed that you have given me this opportunity.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : It means, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the other Members, who have submitted their names to participate in this debate, are not going to be allowed. Is it so?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : After hearing the Home Minister, if the House wants to continue . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : No, I think it is better that the Home Minister replies after other Members of the other groups have participated in the debate.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala) : At least the parties that have not yet participated in the debate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Yes, but the Home Minister has got an assignment in Lok Sabha after three quarters of an hour from now. That is why . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I will explain. Sir, I have asked for your permission and I would like to ask for the permission of the House to allow me to speak now because there is going to be taken up in the other House a Constitution (Amendment) Bill for a debate and a decision thereon immediately after 6 o'clock, and I think you will permit me, because I will have to go and participate in that debate and voting. Therefore I am seeking this adjustment. After that, immediately I will come back here and, if necessary, I will reply, or my colleague, Mr. Shukla, who will be here during my absence from here, will reply. (*Interruptions*) The right of reply this times goes to the Leader of the Opposition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But you have the right of interruption always and you can make your interruption.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Not the right of interruption, but of intervention. I do not exercise the right of interruption.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : It is the privilege of the Opposition.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Now, Sir, I do not want to participate in this debate in a spirit of replying to each and every point that is raised. That is not my attitude in this debate, and I do not want to take any particular position about the facts, about what happened during that particular period when there was a clash between the demonstrators and the police. I will give certain facts where I was personally concerned, because these are facts which I know and which, I think, I will have to stand by. But before that I would like to give certain background. The whole thing arose out of the promulgation of the order under Section 144. This one fact is there. And, Sir, there is a long history of this order under 144.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Very long history.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Very long history. I may be taking a little time over this matter, but I think it is much better that one knows the whole background of the practice of promulgation of this order. The history goes back to 1960, when there was a demonstration round about Parliament House. In 1960 demonstration round about Lok Sabha. There were some six demonstrations near the gurudwara at Rakabganj, or some such thing. And there the police were required to use gas. It was so near Parliament House that the tear gas ultimately infiltrated into the house itself. And the Members of Parliament felt very angry about it. There was a Calling Attention Notice about this matter, and the House wanted certain conditions created so that the House could work in a peaceful condition. At that time, Sir, this is what the Speaker observed which I am quoting. Of course I am quoting from a note that I have got; I have not got the book self but these are the words. He says "I am interested in seeing that the Parliament House is safeguarded. Therefore, what I may say is that, hereafter, whatever may be the nature of the demonstrations, they ought not to be allowed to come within a furlong round about Parliament House." And this observation was communicated to the Home Ministry with the instruction that they should give further instructions to the Delhi authorities to implement this instruction of the Speaker. And, Sir, from thereon, from 1960 onwards, when the Session of the House is about to start, the Lok Sabha Secretariat—and I think the Rajya Sabha Secretariat also—communicate the date of commencement of their parliamentary work to the local authorities so that they can promulgate this order under Section 144. And this whole thing continued up to 1965 or 1966. But at that time the practice was that the local authorities were permitted to use their discretion and they used to allow certain demonstrations to come up to a certain point. Though the order was there, they used to use their discretion to allow some processions to come up to a certain point. Then there was the infamous incident or notorious incident of 1966 on the 7th of November.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) : And it took the toll of the then home minister.

श्री वाई० बी० चव्हाण : हां । ठीक बात है । What happened on the 7th November is now history; I do not to go into it. Later on after 7th November it was my duty to take another view about this matter of 144 and the only thing that I added to the practice that was already going on was not to use discretion in allowing demonstrations to come near Parliament. The practice of section 144 was already there.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

The practice was to promulgate 144 a couple of days before Parliament activity started. The only thing I modified or I added was the decision that under no circumstances any demonstration should be allowed to come near Parliament which normally was allowed in the discretion of the local authorities.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Was it there throughout the year or only a few days before the commencement of Parliament?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : A couple of days before; normally, that is the practice. That was the practice. I am just saying that the necessity of having section 144 arose out of the . . .

श्री जगदम्बीप्रसाद यादव (बिहार) : प्रधान मंत्री की तारीफ में जलूस आये तो उसको आप एलाऊ कर देते हैं ।

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : नवम्बर में किया उसका जरा जवाब दीजिये । नवम्बर में सेशन के दो दिन पहले यहां पर आने की इजाजत दी थी, उसका आप जवाब दीजिये ।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I will come to that; I know you have mentioned that. I am giving the facts; I am not trying to convince anybody. I am merely giving the facts from my side. You are free to draw your own conclusions; you can pass your own judgement on this matter. I am giving merely the facts. So my point is that the need and the practice of promulgating section 144 arose not out of the sweet will of the Home Minister or out of the sweet will of the district authorities but it arose from the need to allow an efficient and peaceful functioning of the greatest fount of the country, namely Parliament. That is one thing

Now up to 1966 there were occasions when demonstrations before the Parliament House were organised by political parties but I must say that after the experience of 1966 many political parties gave me co-operation in adjusting in this matter. Whenever there were such occasions they came to me and I brought about some sort of talks between them and the district authorities. I personally used to take interest in this matter to see that the right of political parties to have peaceful demonstrations is allowed within reasonable limits and at the same time to see that this notification of section 144 is also enforced very carefully. This was going on.

Now one incident to which reference was made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mishraji, was that some demonstration came near Parliament House to which we went. At that time Parliament was not in session.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : It was two days before.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : He is referring to which demonstration?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Please listen to me. Why do you want to ask questions now? It was a fact that some demonstration came near Parliament and we went to meet that demonstration. We went to meet them and talk to them. We went to that place and the police had allowed the demonstrators to come there because there was no 144 on that day; it was to start from the next morning. These are the facts; I am not just saying something.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : That was within two days of commencement of the session.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am telling you it started the next day. It was announced before; it was not announced afterwards. These are all on record. I am not just saying anything.

श्री राजनारायण : घर मंत्री जी, जब आप इतना बता रहे हैं तो कृपा कर के यह भी बताइय कि इसके पूर्व जो धारा 144 लगी थी वह उठी कब थी । 144 की दफा उठाई कब गई थी ? श्रीमान्, वह कह रहे हैं कि दफा 144 उन दिनों नहीं थी तो इसके पूर्व वह उठी कब थी ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Immediately after the Parliament session ends the order under section 144 is revoked. It is only meant for the session of Parliament. These are the facts and this is the practice all along. It is not only for this one session or that session. Now, Sir, I know at that time certain incidents took place in which one of my colleagues, an hon. Member of the other House, Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha, was involved in some unfortunate incident for which we all were very sorry. I immediately telephoned to her and expressed regrets because it happened...

श्री राजनारायण : यह बात कह रहे हैं तो आप यह भी कहे कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा गई हैं, वह उस मीटिंग में गई हैं और यह घर मंत्री जा है उन्होंने वहाँ जा कर के क्षमा याचना की ।

श्री वाई० बी० ब्रह्मण : वह मैंने कहा । यह बात ठीक नहीं है । प्राइम मिनिस्टर भी उस मीटिंग में थी और मैं भी था ।

श्री राजनारायण : प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने उस घटना के बारे में कुछ भी नहीं कहा है ।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I do not think so. If the suggestion is that the Prime Minister approved of it I say nothing can be farther from the reality in this matter because I know she also felt very sad about that particular matter.

Now whenever Parliament has been in session it has been my constant worry as to what happens to these demonstrations and I would like to tell hon. Members in this case it was not the first demonstration that took place. Only the day before a very big demonstration and a procession by one of the leading political parties whose members are sitting here took place and I do not think that party is very friendly to Government or the Government is friendly to any particular party. It went off peacefully. Wherever it is peaceful there is no difficulty. About this particular demonstration will tell the hon. House how my personal conduct came in this matter. Mr. Fernandes, a very leading member of the party and a member of the other House is also a friend of mine. Though we do not belong to the same party and we do not subscribe to the same ideologies now, we had participated in the struggle for many years and we are close friends. I respect him; I respect

all the Members. Possibly they may not respect me but I do respect them. That is a different matter. He wrote to me. I do not remember exactly the date but I think maybe a week before the demonstration asking me to ask the authorities to give him permission to bring a demonstration to the Parliament House. He also said that people were coming from outside Delhi and so the authorities may be asked to give certain facilities for them. I wrote back to him saying that I understood his point but this permission could not be given. But about facilities for people who are coming from outside Delhi I said I will ask the Delhi authorities to get in touch with him, and I did talk to the Delhi authorities. Beyond that what could you do about it? And I thought that things must be going on quite all right. Then a night before the demonstration—I do not remember the exact time of the night, but it must be between 9 and 10 P.M. Mr. Fernandes telephoned to me. I was at my residence. And he said : Look here, we met this afternoon and we have decided to hold a peaceful demonstration. That was also what he had originally said. He said : we have decided not to break 144 and we would like to hold a peaceful demonstration but I have got one request to make. We want to cross that road which is under 144. You see, this Patel Chowk is in that part which is under 144 notification. He said they wanted to cross it. I had told the authorities that if they were peaceful we need not take a technical view. He told me that night : "We have decided not to break 144 but it is our intention not merely to cross that road but to have a meeting there in the Patel Chowk." I argued with him in a friendly manner and I told him : "For God's sake do not insist on holding this meeting because even though your intentions are good, these are matters which ultimately move from one thing to another and create complications. So please don't do it; I would not like you to have a meeting there because something unprecedented or unwanted might start happening" and unfortunately that seems to have happened. I said; "I cannot agree to this but if there is anything else which is to be done you get in touch with the Deputy Commissioner because he is the person who is dealing with the local situation." I also told Mr. Fernandes that I will ask the Deputy Commissioner to get in touch with him if there are any other points. I did telephone the Deputy Commissioner "This is what Mr. Fernandes is saying that he wants to have a meeting there. Better

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

meet and persuade him not to have it." This is what I had told him and that is all. That night I could not do anything more. The next morning I was very worried. I do not know why. I was really worried. I wanted to know what was the next development, but I had some other seminar to attend in the morning. I wanted to know what transpired between Mr. Fernandes and the Deputy Commissioner that night. So, I wanted to meet him immediately. I got back from the seminar, which was starting at some time about ten o'clock. I remember I came back at 11.30 or so to my Parliament office and there the Deputy Commissioner had come to tell me what was happening and what was arranged. He told me that he went that night to Mr. Fernandes after I telephoned him, he had discussed with him and he had tried to convince him that it was not right to have a meeting there. He said "I cannot permit you to have a meeting." Then, again, the next morning when he met me at about 11.30 hours, he told me that he had telephoned Mr. Fernandes again not to have any meeting. The Deputy Commissioner told him : "I cannot give permission for the public meeting." Then I asked him : "You have told them that, but suppose they hold the meeting, what are you going to do?" He said : "As long as they are holding their meeting peacefully we will not disturb it. We do not want to create conditions whereby things might be provoked into something undesirable, unprecedented." I said, it is all right. At the same time, his main intention was not to allow this procession to come through Parliament Street and to Parliament House. This was the one thing that he had to do under any circumstances, because that was the intention of section 144. Even though his permission was not there for holding a meeting in Patel Chowk, he had decided not to disturb that meeting but his main intention was to see that the procession and the participants in the demonstration did not follow Parliament Street and ultimately come to Parliament House. Sir, this is what had happened. I do not want to go into the details as to what happened next, what went wrong where one went wrong, which officer did what.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : You okayed it. You instructed them when they held a meeting peacefully in Patel Chowk. . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I had not instructed. That is what he told me.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : You did not leave any instructions for him?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : No. There was no question of giving any instruction. I wanted to keep in touch with what was happening. Ultimately he was the person to decide the matter, but as it was a political matter I was trying to keep myself informed about it.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : As the Home Minister in such matters having the jurisdiction did you not try to tackle the matter? That is the point.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The point is, Mr. Niren Ghosh, if you will not get angry, your concept of the working of the Home Ministry is different from my concept of the working of the Home Ministry.

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये चव्हाण साहब, आप टेकनिकेलिटि के करीब मत जायें । आपने जैसा पहले कहा आप को डिटेल् मे नहीं जाना चाहिये ।

श्री वाई० बी० चव्हाण : मैंने उतना ही कहा जहां तक मेरा संबंध है ।

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, प्रोसेशन पहुंचने के आध घंटा पहले वहां पर ट्रक पहुंची । वहां सभा शुरू हो गई, लाउड स्पोकर पहुंच गया है. . .

श्री वाई० बी० चव्हाण : मैं उन बातों का जिक्र नहीं कर रहा हूं जिसके बारे में मुझे निजी तौर पर पता नहीं है । जहां तक मेरा निजी संबंध आता है उन्हीं बातों का मैंने जिक्र किया, दूसरी बातों का जिक्र नहीं किया है । मैं करना नहीं चाहता हूं । So, Sir, unfortunately I had some work in Parliament. From twelve onwards I was in the House. At lunch hour I went home for lunch. There I heard that something had gone completely wrong and lathi-charge or cane-charge, whatever it was, had taken place and the use of tear gas had been made. Some people had been injured. Sir, I left my home immediately and rushed to Parliament House. When I reached here. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Who informed you?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Well, Sir, I do not remember exactly who telephoned me, but my office here must have informed me, because I have my people sitting here in Parliament House. They informed me about what had happened. So, I came back straight way. When I came here I was told that some Members of Parliament were very badly injured and they have been brought to Parliament House. I rushed there. I must say I was very sad. I did not know what to do or what to say and that occasion was described by Mr. Rajnarain. I came and I saw him. I went and saw my friend, Mr. Madhu Limaye. I must say I felt very ashamed. I do not want to hide anything. I have nothing to say in justification of what happened. Well, Sir, this is all that I have to say about this particular matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : According to you, Mr. Chavan, you were informed at lunch time, but by whom you do not remember. Obviously . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : By my office.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : . . . he is not such a person as the DIG or a very big shot of the police administration. Some of your people . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Naturally. They must be in touch with my office and the office told me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now it is very clear that they acted, according to your statement. . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I said about what had happened. About who made the mistake, I am not saying one thing or the other.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Is it not a serious thing that they never even contacted him when he was not there?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : There is no question of contacting, because they contacted me through my office. My point is when actually they are on the scene, they are not supposed to contact me and take instructions from me. I am not supposed to give instructions to him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Did the Home Secretary go to the spot?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am coming to that. It is your pet aversion. Mr. L. P. Singh, the Home Secretary, is your pet

aversion. Unfortunately for you and fortunately for him, on these two days he was on leave, not only on leave but he was in hospital for some operation. What can I do?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not suggesting . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar) : I saw him in the nursing home.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : In these matters it is the officer concerned who is mainly responsible, that is, the Deputy Commissioner of Delhi. He is not supposed to take instructions from the Home Minister or from the Home Secretary. This is the way the Home Minister functions in a parliamentary democracy, Mr. Niren Ghosh.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : They did not instruct or say any thing?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : This is about as far as the facts are concerned. Naturally I also consider this matter to be of grave concern because whatever be the reason, Members of Parliament were injured and there is nothing that I can justify. I personally consider it a matter of grave concern and this must be objectively mercilessly examined. I do not want any other consideration to be taken into account. When I returned after seeing the Members, the House was sitting. Naturally there was excitement. Naturally the House was very angry and there was nothing wrong about the House getting angry. On our way we thought of a judicial enquiry. On our way the Prime Minister mentioned that we would have to hold a judicial enquiry. I said certainly we must have a judicial enquiry. Some Members asked why did not the Home Minister announced it and why did the Prime Minister announce it.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Yes. Were you consulted?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Yes, I was consulted, and I would like to say at my cost. When I found that the House was very angry I wanted to get up and say something about it, but the House was so angry and justifiably angry that they did not want me to speak and when the House did not want me to speak, I thought it wise for me not to speak. So, I sat down. When the opportunity came and when the Prime Minister got an opportunity

[SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN]

to speak, she announced it. So, there is no question of the Prime Minister ignoring me. It was a time when the House was angry and it was my duty to respect the wishes of Parliament. I did not intervene then, but I intervened later on when the House was a little calm, because like any person, the House has also certain moods of anger and affection. Both are there. So, naturally as a child of the House I respect the moods of the House. I said, this is not the time for me to intervene. I sat down, but the Prime Minister got an opportunity and she announced the enquiry. Now, let us all wait for the enquiry. I am very sad that one worker of the SSP, Shri Bharilal, died in this whole thing. I share the feelings of Shri Rajnarain, I share the feelings of the hon. House. It is much better that . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : It is said "alleged to have succumbed".

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I know you have raised this point.

श्री जगन्मो प्रसाद यादव : जो बिहारी मारा गया है उसके परिवार वालों को सरकार की तरफ से कुछ दिया जायेगा ?

श्री वई० बी० चहाण : जो कुछ इसमें करना होगा उसको सोच विचार करके किया जायेगा । इसके बारे में फैकट्स संग्रहित और जो कुछ करना होगा किया जायेगा ।

About the terms of reference, the hon. Members has said why the word "alleged" is mentioned. The point is fortunately or unfortunately the man was not found on the spot. He was admitted in hospital at 11 o'clock at night. It is true that the Members have said that he was a participant in the demonstration. When it has to be put in the terms of reference, it has to be said "alleged". Whether it is alleged or true or not the commission can see. The hon. Member has raised other points. I would like to tell him if he reads it from the point of view from which I am reading it—I know he must have read it carefully—but if I request him to see the whole terms of reference, they are much more comprehensive. He said why is it that the meeting was not mentioned in the terms of reference or incidents that ultimately led to this procession and other things. The meeting

is a part of the procession. So it is included therein. If we merely mention the meeting, other facts could not be included. He said, why did you merely say "justification" and not "or otherwise". When a matter of "justification" is before the court, "or otherwise" is included in it. It is a matter of understanding. It is included. A certain thing is justified or is not justified. Then again, if you see part (c) of the terms of reference, it says "any other matter having relevance to the above". If anything is left out of this it is a very comprehensive term "any other matter having relevance to the above". So, I do not think there can be more comprehensive terms of reference than these.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I hope you will appear before the Commission.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : If the Commissioner wants me, yes, certainly. Do you think I will shirk appearing before the Commission? I can tell Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that I believe in the rights of the opposition, I believe in democratic functioning. Even before I came here, as Chief Minister it was my misfortune to resort to firing in a certain place in Ahmedabad, and I offered to go before the Enquiry Commission. I took the responsibility. Unfortunately for Shri Bhupesh Gupta, the Judicial Enquiry Commission decided in my favour. I would like to tell him that I will not shirk. If the Commission wants me to go, I will go, whatever the part that I have played in this matter, and face the Consequence. Somebody wanted my head. If at all I have to offer my head, at that time you will see a smile on my face.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : What?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : You wanted my head.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You say if somebody wanted your head, you will have a smile on your face. That smile of yours is sometimes more dangerous.

(Interruptions)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am a born democrat. Whether I remain here or whether I do not remain here, I will continue to be a democrat in practice. This is what I wanted to say. I share the feelings of this hon. House, I share the anger of this hon. House. Now, Sir, with all the objectivity, with all the impartiality, with all the sense of democracy, be-

cause the judiciary is a part of democracy. let us await the verdict of the judicial enquiry.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं चाहता हूँ कि पुलिस की तरफ से दिल्ली के आसपास के जो गांव से लोग हमारे प्रदर्शन में आये थे उनकी तलाश की जा रही है और उन्हें दंडित किया जा रहा है। इसके लिए सरकार क्या करने जा रही है ? हम इस बारे में सदन में चर्चा कर रहे हैं और इस बारे में सरकार हमें सब कुछ बतलाये।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Niren Ghosh.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Mr. Deputy Chairman, after a protracted fight we have succeeded in having the matter discussed in the form of a motion and also in an amendment being submitted to the motion. Certainly we had some purpose in it. I do say that the amendment that I have moved, though it does not go the whole way as I would have liked it, still it implicitly condemns the Government and the police action. It is not explicit but it is implicit in the amendment that has been moved. Let it be understood clearly. We would have liked if we had made the thing explicit.

Now I would like to tell you and the House that Mr. Chavan has just said that he differs from me on the question of the manner of the Home Minister functioning. I do not know where the difference exists because it is a revelation to me. Because this demonstration was planned, and Shri Rajnarain raised it on the floor of the House, naturally the Minister would be seized of the matter. The Ministry must leave some instruction to the Deputy Commissioner or the police authorities as to how to tackle it. Mr. Chavan says he gets himself informed but he did not leave any instructions. That is the gap. That is the position which is inexplicable to me. Any person holding this portfolio, knowing that the police might do something untoward—he said that he was seized with a premonition that something untoward might happen, and such thing worried him in his mind—a Minister holding this portfolio should leave certain instructions as to how to tackle the demonstration and in what way. I think if he had not done so, it is a failure on his part. I do not know whether Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will agree with me, but I do hold that this police is an oppressive machine.

This police machine either at the Centre or in the States is an oppressor of the people and protector of the vested interests. That is its general character. It has been built up by the British and its character has not changed under the Congress regime. It is an instrument, an engine of oppression. That being so, whether Mr. Bhupesh Gupta agrees with me or not I do not know, but since a comparison has been asked for I will say that during the 13 months of the United Front regime we did not ask the police to side with the oppressed or the oppressor. The police used to side always with the oppressor. What we did was we asked them to remain neutral and let the oppressed people have their say with the oppressors in a legitimate, peaceful and democratic manner.

AN HON. MEMBER : Why don't you abolish the police?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : If we had our way, we would have scrapped this police and installed a new police, dedicated to the people, each and every one of them. We would have done that. But the Constitution does not allow that. So we restrained the police so that it does not suppress the people. I take this debate to be a warning to the police, a warning to the Central Government, a warning to the State Governments and the State Police also that Parliament condemns their behaviour that they go to the extent of suppressing the legitimate rights of the people and the legitimate rights and dignity and privileges of the Members of Parliament and the Legislature. It is precisely that thing which is intended to be done by this amendment. In my State also I should say just now what the police is doing. They have killed a person and hanged that person from a tree and oppressed the entire village so that nobody would dare come forward to give evidence that they have murdered him. Now, the police is aiding and abetting certain goondas to set fire in the colliery area; they raid them, they arrest thousands without any provocation. All those things are going on. Generally, normally, that is the function of that department. That is why Parliament wants to be seized of this amendment; at least our House wants to pass strictures, pass its words of condemnation that the police is appearing in the role of an oppressor. Now, why the Home Minister did not leave any word of instruction, I do not know. I do feel that any Home Minister

[Shri Niren Ghosh]

would tackle such things. For the enlightenment of Mr. Chavan, I might say that when the Congress regime was there in West Bengal, the police or the Home Minister used to give specific instructions to the police how to beat us, how to suppress us, how to lathi-charge us. They would go even to the control room and, issue instructions how to suppress processions, continuously for twenty years. For one year we have said, do not oppress the people. There is no Section 144 around the West Bengal Legislative Assembly during the UF regime. Hundreds and thousands of processions and demonstrations have come up to the gate. Ministers have come out and addressed them. Such untowards incidents have not happened there. Not one demonstration, I can say hundreds and hundreds and bigger demonstrations than the SSP demonstration staged here demonstrations by 20,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 people were there. They went up to the gates of the Assembly. They were allowed. Section 144 was withdrawn. So, I do say that there was no necessity to impose Section 144 here around the precincts of Parliament. Any demonstration can come to the precincts of Parliament. That should be the practice. That is the normal democratic right. But the Congress regime prohibited it. In the UF regime we allowed peaceful demonstrations. I do not know whether under the President's rule there is no Legislative Assembly—we will be able to hold demonstrations in the Dalhousie Square. Before the Writer's Building itself, demonstrations by one lakh and fifty thousand people have been there, and these things have not happened. Heavens have not fallen.

So, generally that is the character of the police. The character of the police has not changed. It has been nurtured by the Congress regime. And Mr. Chavan to be honest to himself since he belongs to that party—ought to own up that the police never acted for the people, but they oppressed and suppressed and exploited them. For the 80 per cent of the people they have never acted during the twenty years. They have acted against the opposition; they have acted against the workers; they have acted against the kisans, have shot them, arrested them manhandled them, ill-treated them. That has been the general character. That is why I was interrupting Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who was giving a new thesis that the police is O. K., there is something progressive and something reactionary.

Generally, it is reactionary. One fellow might be good. Generally, the officer corps are reactionary. It has been trained and nurtured for the purpose of suppressing the people. Such being the fact, these things cannot go by default. Now, it happened in such a manner that the entire attention of Parliament has been focussed on it. And I do say that this amendment does condemn indirectly the Government as well as the police. The officers of the police are responsible. It is not explicit, but it is implicitly saying that and that should take it in that spirit.

Now, Sir, what has happened to Mr. Rajnarain cannot be undone. I only want to say that such things might happen to us in future also...

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY :
That will be a solution.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : ... if this landlord-bourgeois Government continued. If this ruling class, these oppressors and their representatives in the Government continue and if this machinery is kept intact—it is an anti-people machinery such things will go on. It has gone on uninterrupted for 22 years. It will go on. We know. We have taken lathis from the police. And certainly, even as MPs they can arrest us under the PD Act. Within six years, I did spend three years in jail under that Act during my last term. No Parliamentary immunity, nothing of that sort. So, I take it for granted that unless Parliament and the people assert themselves, no halt would be cried to such things in future also. The entire purpose of the debate is to focus the attention of the entire country and the entire people to this and to condemn the Government, to condemn the police force, and that Parliament—at least the majority here—does not wish to allow this thing under whatever circumstances. The majority in Parliament feels that way that the police should not be allowed to do so, to run riot among the people, to go against all privileges of MPs. It is only in that spirit that we agreed to this compromise amendment. And we did succeed in compelling and persuading the Chairman to allow this and in compelling the Treasury Benches to withdraw their objection so that the entire thing can be debated in the form of a motion, so that the House can record its verdict in whatever form it wishes to. In the Lok Sabha, somehow or the other, it was defeated. It was an adjournment motion and had it been carried

out, it would have been a censure of the Government. In the Rajya Sabha we cannot do that; we cannot say that even if we pass a motion of censure the Government will fall. But morally it comes to that. But in the Rajya Sabha we have succeeded. This amendment is there. It is an implicit condemnation of the Government and the violence...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Do not interpret it now.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : I want to make this point once and for all, and if Parliament stands on guard like this in future, certain restraints would be there certain obstacles would be put in the way of the police who think that the people should be whipped, should be shot down. What have you done ? It is a warning to the Andhra Government and the Andhra Police who have exterminated the Naxalites without giving them any trial. In the name of police encounter, they have apprehended them and shot them without trial. It is a condemnation against that practice also. Is the amendment that we have moved. Let it be understood clearly. Let this voice go out and at least some check, some restriction, some control be put on them, and more should be done. But personally, I do not expect that.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, today we are discussing about the incident that occurred on the 6th April, 1970 in connection with the SGP demonstration before Parliament. At the outset, I express our deep sorrow over the incident. Much has been said about the judicial inquiry. The matter is under judicial inquiry. Therefore, there is no scope for discussion. Some of our friends said so. But now we are discussing about the matter.

I want to analyse this matter in two parts. I want to take two proved facts in connection with this incident. The first and the foremost proved fact is this—that is, violence, brutality, ruthlessness and mercilessness have been unleashed on that day against the demonstration before Parliament. This is a proved fact. Nobody can deny that fact. My submission would be we are against violence whether it is organised or unorganised. Whether it is by the Government or by any political party we are against violence, whether it is in the form of police force or in the form of demonstrations or in the form of spears or sword or bow and arrow in the hands of the demonstrators. We are against

violence as a whole whether it is by the Government or by any political force in this country. Sir, on this point the Government has announced a judicial enquiry. We are satisfied with the announcement and we are anxiously awaiting the result of this judicial enquiry regarding the incident before the Parliament House, regarding police excesses on that day.

I want to comment on the next proved fact. The next proved fact is this, Sir. On that day Members of Parliament were attacked and were assaulted. They received injuries. They received head injuries also.

SHRI B. T. KEMPARAJ (Mysore) : Grievous injuries.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : The injured Members of Parliament are not only Members of this House but also the representatives of the people. They come to Parliament to execute their duties as a Member of Parliament and also as the representatives of the people. As per the rights conferred by parliamentary democracy on a Member of Parliament, he must exercise his duty in this House as a representative of the people. If a Member is prevented from discharging his duty, as a Member it involves privilege, Sir.

So far as the second part of the question is concerned, a judicial enquiry would not be enough. We must go further. This matter should go to the Committee on Privileges also because four Members of Parliament were prevented from discharging their duty as Members of Parliament. They were assaulted at the gate of the Parliament House itself. I will be very brief in my remarks. Regarding the first proved fact, a judicial enquiry is enough. Regarding the second proved fact this matter should go to the Committee on Privileges. With these words I conclude.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : माननीय डिप्टी चैयरमैन महोदय, 6 अप्रैल को जो दुखद घटना हुई उस से सदन को और सदन के जो सदस्य हैं उन को और जो हमारे देश के दूसरे राजनैतिक कार्यकर्ता लोग हैं उन को गहरा दुख है और इस के साथ गहरी चिन्ता भी है। मैं जानता हूँ कि उस के लिए एक जुडिशियल कमीशन बन गया है। मैं उस की गहराई में जाना

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

नहीं चाहता और क्या क्या बातें जो हम ने सुनी हैं उन में म यहां जाना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन अपनी सरकार से एक बात जरूर कहना चाहता हूं कि आगे से कोई भी जलूस या डिमांस्ट्रेशन आये और वह कहीं भी निकले सारे देश में, यदि वह शान्तिमय हो और उम में हथियार न हों, हिंसा की प्रवृत्ति न हो तो उस पर लाठी या गोली कभी नहीं चलाई जानी चाहिए। किसी हालत में भी उस पर लाठी चार्ज नहीं होना चाहिए और न कभी उस पर गोली ही चलाई जानी चाहिए। यदि उस के द्वारा कानून की अवज्ञा होती है और उस में ऐसे लोग पाये जायें कि जो कानून की अवज्ञा करते हों तो उन को डीला करने के लिए उन को गिरफ्तार किया जाय, उन के जलूस पर पानी के फौवारे छोड़े जायें और इतने पर भी यदि बस न चले तो राजनारायण जी को तो टियर गैस अच्छी नहीं लगी, लेकिन ऐसे जलूस पर टियर गैस भी इस्तेमाल हो सकती है।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : कभी पानी की मार नहीं खायी ऐसा लगता है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : लेकिन इस के साथ साथ हमारी सरकार से एक शिकायत और है। जिस तरह की परिपाटी चली है उस में यह तो कुछ मांगों को ले कर आये हैं, लेकिन हमारी पुलिस और सेना को जहां मजबूती दिखलानी चाहिये वहां वह उतनी मजबूती नहीं दिखलाती। हमारे देश में ऐसे क्षेत्र हैं कि जहां विद्रोही हैं और वे अपनी सेना बना कर चलते हैं, वे सरकार के पुल तोड़ते हैं, लेकिन हमारी फौज और पुलिस देखती रहती है इसलिए कि उन के दमन के लिए दिल्ली से फतवा नहीं गया है और इस के विपरीत जहां कोई ऐसा जलूस निकलता है वहां लाठी ही नहीं गोली भी चला देते हैं। हमारे सब से बड़े जो लीडर आफ अपोजीशन हैं, जो चार रोज से ही इधर के बजाय उधर बैठ रहे हैं उन्होंने न इस की तुलना की है जलियां-वाला बाग से। राजनारायण जी तो पीड़ित

हैं, भुक्तभोगी हैं, लेकिन आप सोचें, कहां जलियां-वाला बाग और कहां यह जलूस। एक लीडर के नाते श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र जी को इसे इतना बड़ा चढ़ा कर कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी।

(Interruptions)

इस लिए सरकार को इस जगह मजबूती दिखलानी चाहिए। जहां देश की सुरक्षा और आजादी को खतरा हो वहां उसे डील नहीं देनी चाहिए। मैं माननीय सदस्यों से और भाई राजनारायण जी से भी एक बात कहना चाहता हूं। यह जो लेफ्ट सी० पी० आई० वाले हैं उन की तो नीती है कि तोड़ फोड़ करो और गड़बड़ करो और जब खुद पुलिस मिनिस्टर हो जायें तो जितना जुल्म हो सके करें। ज्योति बसु जो मिनिस्टर हुआ है उस ने कमाया भी है और देखा जाय कि कलकत्ता में उस ने किस प्रकार पुलिस का इस्तेमाल किया। वहां नक्सल-पथियों ने जो कुछ किया उस के लिए वहां की पुलिस ने कुछ नहीं किया, तो अगर दिल्ली में भी ऐसा ही हो जाय तो उन के खिलाफ पुलिस फिर कोई ऐक्शन नहीं लेगी। यह ठीक है कि पुलिस जहां दोषी है उस को वहां सज मिलनी चाहिए, लेकिन उस के पहले देखना चाहिए कि जो कुछ हुआ उस के लिए कहां तक उस की जिम्मेदारी है। सिपाही और कांस्टेबल को गाली देने से ही काम नहीं चलेगा। अगर नक्सलपंथी गड़बड़ करेंगे और पुलिस ऐक्शन नहीं लेगी तो देश की सुरक्षा और आजादी खतरे में पड़ जायेगी। इस लिए जरूरत है कि इस बात को ध्यान से देखा जाय। जो पुलिस के अफसरों की कार्यवाही है वह तो सामने आयेगी ही, लेकिन इस बात को भी ध्यान में रखना चाहिए कि पश्चिमी बंगाल की हालत यहां न पैदा हो जाय जहां दिन दहाड़े लोगों की घड़ी छीन ली जाती है, पर्स निकाल लिये जाते हैं। इस तरह की परिस्थिति दिल्ली में न आये इस बात का ध्यान रखने की आवश्यकता है। इन शब्दों के साथ इस घटना के लिए दुख प्रकट करते हुए मैं सरकार से फिर कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर कोई भी जलूस शान्तिमय तरीके से आये अपनी मांगों को ले कर तो

उस पर लाठी चार्ज नहीं होना चाहिए, उस पर गोली बर्षा नहीं होना चाहिए। उस पर सिर्फ पानी का प्रयोग होना चाहिए, टियर गैस का प्रयोग होना चाहिए...

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : उस को पालिया-मेन्ट तक आने देना चाहिए।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : नहीं, उस के लिए तो स्पीकर साहब के आर्डर्स हैं। टियर गैस स्पीकर साहब और मेम्बर्स की नाक में चली गयी थी और उस के कारण काम करने में असुविधा हुई थी। तो चेयरमैन और स्पीकर का आर्डर तो मानना ही पड़ेगा। इस पर हम अपनी कोई राय नहीं दे सकते इस लिए कि उन के सामने हम सब को नतमस्तक होना पड़ता है। इस चीज में गहराई के साथ यह जुडिशियल कमीशन जायेगा और राजनारायण जी कमीशन के सामने इस बात को रखें कि इस के लिए कौन दोषी है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं फिर इस घटना के लिए अपनी गहरी चिन्ता प्रकट करता हूँ।

6 P. M.

SHRI N. C. GORAY (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would have liked to speak on an occasion which was happier than this. But unfortunately, the first time that I am rising to speak in this House I have to speak about an incident which was atrocious in its nature. I have been listening to the debate in this House since yesterday and I am really sorry to find that instead of the Government Benches accepting the position that the House should express its regret and its anger, a great deal of evasive tactics were resorted to and that it was only after a lot of pressure brought by the Opposition that the Treasury Benches agreed to a motion of this kind. I would have been happy if the Chairman also had on his own as the guardian of the dignity of the House, expressed himself in unequivocal terms and had condemned the police atrocities. But that also did not take place. I think we are caught in a dilemma or a contradiction which is inherent in the Rules of procedure of this House. It seems that the Rules do not provide for an adjournment motion or a censure motion. But in view of what has happened, I think, if it is necessary, the Rules of Procedure ought to be amended so that this House

will get an opportunity to express it self even if it wanted to condemn the Government and to ensure the Government because such occasions are likely to arise.

Having said that, I would like to say something on the subject under discussion. The story as was narrated by Mr. Rajnarain has many lessons for all of us. I would have liked the Home Minister to be present on this occasion. I would have liked him to speak, he had listened to the points that were made by all the speakers. But unfortunately he has some business in the other House. And I do not know how far it will be really conducive to arriving at any conclusion when he has already spoken. But having listened to him, I must say that he did not go to the basic problem at all. As is usual with him, he was frank and very considerate. He was very spot. But I wanted the Home Minister to take up the real issue. What is the real issue? The real issue is that the police in this country behaves as it likes. It does so not only where the Congress is in power, but in other places also. I think that the behaviour of the Delhi Police and what it has done should serve as a warning to all the parties, not only to the Congress Party which is in power, but to the Congress Party which is in opposition and the other left parties and also to parties like the Jan Sangh, the Swatantra, etc. because you will find nowadays that it is not only the Congress Party which is in power. In Orissa, for instance, it is the Swatantra Party which is in power; in Gujarat it is the Congress (Organisation) Party which is in power; in West Bengal there was a United Front Government in which fourteen parties participated. But what is their record? I am really worried about the police in India because whenever it finds that it has to deal with the Opposition, it does not behave according to any norms. If the police has indulged in one type of excesses in Delhi, you will find the other type of excesses in West Bengal where in spite of the fact that the people asked for police protection, they did not give it. The police in West Bengal refused to give protection to the people. Here Mr. Rajnarain was beaten, Mr. George Fernandes was beaten, Mr. Madhu Limaye was beaten. In spite of the fact that Mr. Rajnarain appealed to the police that there was no occasion for such atrocities, the police went ahead beating the people right and left. I do not see any difference between the action of the police here and the action of the police in West Bengal in spite of the fact that some people of a family were being murdered, some

[Shri N. G. Goray]

people were being assaulted, in spite of the fact that they appealed to the police to come to their rescue and protect them, the police did not go there.

So you will find that in India we have not been successful in imparting in the police any sense of duty. What is the duty of the police towards the citizens? How should the police behave towards the citizens? In this connection I would like to cite the instance of France two years ago. There was a colossal upsurge against the Gaullist Government. Students participated in it, workers participated in it, middle class people participated in it. And they destroyed so many things, attacked buildings, and it appeared as if the whole of France was on the brink of a revolution. But please look at their record and you will find that hardly anybody lost his life. The police tried to be as non-violent as possible because they knew that they were dealing with the free citizens of a free country. But here in India in spite of twentyfive years of independence the police behaves as if it were an enemy of the people and the people were its enemy. This is irrespective of the fact whether it is the Congress Party which is ruling or the other parties which are in power.

Here some Members ask for the resignation of Mr. Chavan. I have no special affection for Mr. Chavan. But I would like to remind the House that when there was a communal holocaust in Gujarat, did all of us ask for the resignation of Mr. Hitendra Desai? No, we did not. It was a hundred times more terrible than what happened on the streets of Delhi. There in Gujarat people were butchered, massacred. Hundreds of houses were gutted. But we did not ask for the resignation of Mr. Hitendra Desai. Only some parties asked for it, but the others did not. So it depends to which party you belong. If the party in power happens to be your opponent, immediately you ask for its resignation. But if it happens to be on your side, you say, "It is all right". That encourages the police. I would like to draw the attention of the House to this fact that if we are really so anxious about the preservation of the democratic values, then, all of us, whether we belong to the Swatantra Party or to the Congress or to the CP(M) or to the CP(I), we must be genuine in our faith in democracy. If we want to use democracy only as an instrument of seizing total power in our own hands, than the police are not foolish

as not to understand the game and they know that one Party could be played against the other. The Police will behave only if they knew that so far as the democratic traditions of our country are concerned, so far as the honour and prestige of the average citizen is concerned, every Party, right from the Rightist to the Leftist Party, is united on this one issue that whatever happens, the Police cannot degrade the citizen. Unless we create that sort of atmosphere and that sort of atmosphere and that sort of assurance, all this type of talk of condemning will surely assume its political overtones. Just now my friend here, Niren Babu, told us that so long the police were on the side of the oppressors and after they came to power in West Bengal, they told the police not to take sides, to remain neutral. What has happened? Has he the courage to say that everywhere it is those who were oppressed before, who are now the masters of the situation? I put it to him that in West Bengal it is not the people who were oppressed and dispossessed who are on the top but it is the goonda element which is on the top. Now he may have fallen foul with Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee but he was their Chief Minister and Ajoy Babu is on record as having said : "I am ruling over the destinies of the most barbarous State in the country".

Here is then, a lesson for all of us. I want that the dignity of the Houses of Parliament should be maintained. I want that people like Shri Rajnarain, Mr. Madhu Limaye and Mr. George Fernandes who are the accepted leaders of the people, of the down-trodden freedom fighters should be able to move about in this country with full dignity but the police does not spare even them. I am not saying that M. Ps. should have special privileges but I want special privileges for them in a sense because when the common people see that even M. Ps. could be assaulted, what sort of morale would they have? The Police will think that they can do anything and nobody can question them and the common man will think that nobody can protect them from the wrath of the police. Both ways the morale will be lost and therefore, I would say that if the Home Minister had gone deeper into this question and had not only stopped with expression of regrets and sympathy, if he had said: "I am going to tackle this question as to why in India the police is behaving like that" and if he had asked for the cooperation of the Left or Right Parties and the entire House to tackle this question, I think it would

have been much better, because this is the most important question in India to-day. The charges were levelled by no less a person than Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that a particular man at the top—he named him, Mr. L. P. Singh—must have been at the bottom of this. It is, Sir, a grave charge. I hope it is not true but if it is true, it means that the entire democratic edifice is about to crumble not because the different political parties have wished it to crumble but because of the machinations of the police. They can bring about the downfall of the entire parliamentary system. Here the danger lies and therefore before concluding my speech, I will only make an appeal to the Home Minister and also to the other Members that we are passing through very dangerous times. There will be tensions, there are tensions, there will be conflicts. The question is while we are resolving these tensions, while we are resolving these conflicts, are we going to adhere to the democratic principles, whether we belong to the Party in power or to the Opposition or whether we are going to do whatever we like, only criticise the Party in power and claim all the privileges because we happen to be in the Opposition. I think this sort of outlook or policy will not help us and only an all-India picture, a democratic way of life and an explicit and unshakeable faith in the parliamentary institution, that alone can save the situation. That alone will be able to bring our influence to bear on the police and also on the military. A few days back you may be remembering, an ex-General spoke in terms of having a military rule in India. He was criticised in the Parliament but do you know that is not the only man who is speaking in these terms? There are hundreds of people outside who say that in India democracy will not succeed because there is no safety of life, there is no guarantee of our freedom and therefore they say in their own way that instead of having this sort of democracy, which is not good at all, which is not in a position to deliver the goods, let us have a military rule. We must try to understand what is agitating the minds of the people. Therefore on this occasion I will say if the Home Minister comes back in the House and if he really takes up this issue that the police in India, whether they belong to the Central Government or the State Government, are not behaving as the police should in a democratic country and we have to solve it, all of us have to solve this problem and that is the central problem that has been highlighted by the atrocious incidents that happened on the 6th of April.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) :

At the outset allow me to associate myself with the expression of resentment and condemnation against the manner in which the peaceful demonstration organised by the SSP on 6th April last was sought to be suppressed. I have listened to the description of the events vividly given by our hon. colleague Shri Rajnarain. I have also listened patiently to the bunch of facts given by the Home Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan. You would easily understand that the facts which the Home Minister chose to give to the House, have not certainly met certain charges levelled against the Government in this House itself. You might remember that charges have been levelled in the House that the whole action of the police was all pre-meditated. It was not merely a certain action of a certain Police Constable because the course of events would unerringly prove that there was no reason for which the police on the spot should get provoked. This suspicion has been raised in my mind as to what necessitated or warranted such a violent attack upon the demonstrators. It has become a normal practice with the police officials on the spot as far as I know because I had the opportunity and privilege to lead many a demonstration of this nature. I had the opportunity and privilege sometimes of being beaten up by the police. I had the opportunity and privilege also of being jailed by the police but all the while I have seen one thing even under the Congress regime in West Bengal. Now, when the police want to take certain action against a crowd, they come out and tell us that the crowd or the assembly is illegal. And if the crowd does not disperse within a certain period of time, then the police go into action. They swing their lathis or operate in any way they like. But here nothing has been said by way of facts, which Mr. Y. B. Chavan claims to have said, whether there was any warning given by the police officials on duty on the spot for them to disperse. You have also noticed that there was a meeting for which permission was given in a way, because it has been said by Mr. Y. B. Chavan that he did say to the police official, to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police in Delhi; that there should not be any disturbance in the meeting caused by police officials. But it has been said all the time by the S.S.P. organisers and S.S.P. leaders that they were holding a peaceful meeting and there was no reason for the police to pounce

[Shri N. G. Goray]

upon them. You might have noticed that their identity, as Members of Parliament, was disclosed not by themselves but by the crowd also. I read in the newspaper that, when Mr. George Fernandes was being beaten up, people were crying that it was Mr. George Fernandes who was being beaten up but yet the police did not restrain themselves. It means that the police ran amuck and wanted to do the thing for which they had a premeditated plan. I have also culled a piece of information published in the 'Statesman' of the 8th of April wherein mention has been made of the report of the post-mortem examination of Shri Behari Lal, who has become a martyr. Sir, in the course of the statement made by the hon. the Home Minister, it has been merely said that Shri Behari died because of blunt force. But I think he has very conveniently sought to conceal one thing, namely, that he had received head injuries and out of those head injuries caused by blunt force he had to meet his tragic death. Sir, normally, the duty of the police would have been to scare away the crowd. But here it has not been the objective of the police to scare away the crowd. Had the objective been to scare away the crowd, there was no necessity to injure a man on his head. There was no necessity of dealing with the crowd in that violent manner. They could have taken to other methods also which we have witnessed many a time before in Delhi with a crowd of that nature. Therefore, Sir, even after listening to the facts given by the hon. the Home Minister, the very important charge levelled in this House by the Leader of the Opposition, and levelled by many other hon. Members, stands, namely, that this was a premeditated plan, that the entire thing was well thought of and that the object was to emasculate the opposition, emasculate the parties who want to demonstrate people's demands. Sir, although we are in this Parliament, we do not believe that a change in the policy of the Government can be brought about merely by making intelligent speeches or by moving certain amendments here or by taking to any methods by which wisdom may dawn on those who adorn the Treasury Benches. Sir even in the democratic set-up under which we are working the necessity is there for democratic mass action. Although we speak here, although we raise our voice of protest here, there is the necessity of launching a democratic mass movement outside

this Chamber. And if that is not allowed, then the very fundamentals of democracy are being attacked. Sir, permit me to say that it is not Mr. Behari Lal who has been sought to be murdered; it has been the democracy which has been sought to be murdered because, by murdering Shri Behari Lal, this Delhi police administration, with the connivance of the Government here at the Centre, wanted to murder our democratic set-up, wanted to strike a very deadly blow against our democracy itself. It is not a question that Mr. Madhu Limaye or Mr. George Fernandes, or my honourable colleague, Mr. Rajnarain here, has been attacked and injured. It is the entire parliamentary democratic system which has been attacked and trampled upon. It is not an individual Member, Mr. Rajnarain, who has been attacked and injured and who is here in this injured state; we all here are injured because democracy has been injured. It is not Mr. Behari Lal who has been murdered; they have sought to murder democracy itself. Not only that. It is also a very bad example, because people would shudder to think that, if honourable Members of Parliament are treated in this shabby manner, worse may befall the ordinary men living in the villages and organising and launching movements, and sometimes organising and launching movements against the very ruthless police officials. Now here the movement was launched against the policies of the Government, for a reversal of the policies of the Government on the basis of a character of demands placed or sought to be placed by the Samyukta Socialist Party. So many instances are there, examples are there, in different parts of the country, where people are required to build up movements, against the oppressive police officials also. Now what will happen to them? If the people have got some legitimate or genuine grievances against some local oppressive police officials and they lead a demonstration to the police station and want to meet the officer-in-charge

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

of the police station for redress, then it seems that the police officials there will also take to the method of violence and deal with that peaceful demonstration as violently as police have done here just near Parliament House. So where is the security for those people? By that the entire democratic movement is being sought to be emasculated and

mutilated. Sir, if you are really interested, if this Parliament, if this House is really interested not to treat this House as merely a talking shop and if you also really want to bring about a radical change in the social and political life of the country, there is the vital role to be played by the democratic mass movement. And if that democratic movement is to be emasculated, mutilated and annihilated in the manner it has been done here, there is no future for the democratic mass movement in the country. Therefore it is not the particular persons alone who have been attacked but, as I have sought to say, this is an attack on democracy itself. Now coming back again to the charge levelled against the Government, since there has been a premeditated plan, as has been alleged by the Leader of the Opposition and certain other hon. Members, that point has not yet been met. And unless that point is met, and met to the satisfaction of the House, unless that is met to the satisfaction of the hon. Members of the House, I think Government stands guilty and it cannot extricate itself from that charge levelled against it. In this connection it is also to be borne in mind that, unless the Government takes certain positive measures in the matter of changing the very bureaucratic attitude of the police personnel, particularly of those who are high up, this kind of thing is likely to occur in the near future also. Sir, if you leave this law and order question only to the wooden-headed bureaucrats, or only in the hands of the trigger-happy police officials, democracy's survival is doomed. Therefore there should be a new approach to this problem, a new approach to the democratic mass movement and a new approach to the police administration itself. But nothing in that direction was referred to while the hon. the Home Minister was speaking. Therefore, Sir, it is also the duty of the Government to see that it is not the expression of platitudinous sentiments that is going to mollify our feeling but the Government should take action in concrete terms so that the attitude of the bureaucrats and the attitude of the erstwhile, or of even today, trigger-happy police personnel is changed. And for that Government should be squarely held responsible, particularly in this matter. I think Government should bear these things in mind.

SHRI VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Thank you.

श्री श्याम लाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन में 6 अप्रैल की घटना के सम्बन्ध में राजनारायण जी का एक विवरण आया है जिसमें उन्होंने अपना पक्ष बहुत ही विस्तार के साथ रखा। हम उम्मीद करते थे कि गृह मंत्री जो सरकारी पक्ष है, डिपुटी कमिश्नर का जो वर्णन है वाक्य का वह सामने रखेंगे, लेकिन उन्होंने केवल उसी हद तक घटना का विवरण दिया जिस हद तक उन्हें व्यक्तिगत जानकारी थी या उनसे विचार-विमर्श हुआ था। एक पक्ष की बात को सही मान कर हम किसी निर्णय पर नहीं पहुँच सकते। शायद इसीलिए दूसरा पक्ष सामने नहीं आया क्योंकि इन्क्वायरी कमीशन बैठा हुआ है और उसके सामने सारी बातें आएंगी।

मान्यवर, अगर जनतंत्र के माने यही है कि जो सरकार की मशीनरी हो, जो पुलिस हो, उसको जो वैधानिक अधिकार हों उनका परिपालन करने में रुकावट पैदा की जाय तो जनतंत्र नहीं चल सकता। इस देश में सौभाग्य से ऐसी स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है कि प्रत्येक राजनीतिक दल को कहीं न कहीं सरकार में रहने का मौका मिला है। इसी पुलिस की मशीनरी का वेस्ट बंगाल में किस प्रकार से लेफ्ट कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने अपने हित में उपयोग किया उसका वर्णन वहाँ से आए हुए माननीय सदस्यों ने सदन के सामने रखा। लिहाजा यह आक्षेप लगाना कि यह मशीनरी पुलिस की वह नहीं है जो जनतांत्रिक पद्धति में चल सकती है, जो समाजवाद ला सकती है, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बात इस सदन में केवल इसलिए कही जा रही है कि जो सज्जन कह रहे हैं उनके पक्ष में यह बात पड़ती है और जो शामनारूढ़ दल हैं उनके विरोध में यह बात जानी है। जनतंत्र के माने, मान्यवर, यह नहीं है कि कोई राजनीतिक दल, कोई विधान सभा, विधान परिषद या समद का सदस्य कानून अपने हाथ में ले ले। जनतंत्र तभी इस देश में चल सकता है जब हम सब दल, इस देश के निवासी, इस देश के नेता जनतंत्र को मानने को तैयार हों। जनतंत्र के माने, मान्यवर, क्या है? केवल प्रदर्शन

[श्री श्याम लाल यादव]

निकालना, किसी मांग के लिए, वह कितनी ही अच्छी क्यों न हो, जोरदार आन्दोलन करना मात्र जनतंत्र का तरीका नहीं है। जनतंत्र संविधान के मातहत रूल आफ ला है। नियम का कानून इस देश में चलता है, किसी दल का किसी नेता का नहीं, चाहे जितना ऊंचा नेता वह हो। नियम का राज इस देश में नहीं चल सकता तो, मान्यवर, जनतंत्र इस देश में नहीं चल सकता।

माननीय राजनारायण जी ने कहा कि पांच मौलिक बातों को लेकर उनका दल प्रदर्शन कर रहा है। यही नहीं, और प्रदेशों में भी उन्होंने प्रदर्शन किए और उन प्रदर्शनों में किस तरह उन्होंने कार्य किया उसे मुझे भी देखने और सुनने का मौका मिला। उन्होंने इस सदन में कहा कि उनके दल के सदस्य उनको चिट्ठी लिख रहे हैं कि हमें इजाजत दीजिए कि हम प्रधान मंत्री के ऊपर आक्रमण करें, हम गृह मंत्री के ऊपर आक्रमण करें। उनके दल के सदस्य यह चिट्ठी लिख रहे हैं। तो, मान्यवर, इस देश में प्रजातंत्र कैसे चल सकता है जहां प्रधान मंत्री के ऊपर आक्रमण करने की बात एक राजनीतिक दल के साधारण कार्यकर्ता अपने नेता से कह रहे हों।

श्री राजनारायण : हम ही जनतंत्र बचा सकते हैं।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : आप जनतंत्र को नहीं बचा सकते। अगर दुर्भाग्य से आपको शासन मिल जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश में तानाशाही ही कायम हो जायगी। उत्तर प्रदेश का मुझे अनुभव है। आपकी पार्टी सरकार में थी और दिल्ली में आपके दो-दो मंत्री कानून का उल्लंघन कर रहे थे, कानून को तोड़ रहे थे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ दुनिया के किस देश में ऐसा जनतंत्र चलता है, किस समाजवादी देश में ऐसे जनतंत्र की व्यवस्था है कि सरकार में भी रहें और कानून को भी तोड़ें। (Interruptions) अगर आपमें हिम्मत हो तो जनता के नामने जाइए, संविधान में अधिकार प्राप्त

हैं, आप जनता से अनुरोध करिए कि वह इस सरकार को पलट दे। (Interruptions) आप में हिम्मत नहीं है, आप चाहते हैं कि ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा की जाय, ऐसी अराजकता फलाई जाय जैसी वेस्ट बंगाल में फैली, जैसी केरल में फैली थी। (Interruptions) आप आवाज के बल पर जनतंत्र को नहीं दबा सकते। जनतंत्र हमेशा इस देश में चलेगा तो कानून के मातहत चलेगा। अगर कानून के लिए आपके दिल में श्रद्धा नहीं है, आप नियम और कानून को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आपको कोई वैधानिक अधिकार नहीं है। आज रूल आफ ला को मानने के लिए आपकी पार्टी और बहुत सी पार्टियां तैयार हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ...

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर। हम लोग 6 तारीख की घटना पर विचार कर रहे हैं। 6 तारीख की घटना पर विचार होगा या जनतंत्र की शिक्षा - दीक्षा होगी? हमारा सारा जीवन... (Interruptions) यह आदमी एक बार जेल नहीं गया, केवल चापलूसी से मंत्री बन गया।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : चापलूसी आप करते होंगे, मैं नहीं करता, आपका सारा खानदान चापलूसी करता होगा। ऐसे अभद्र शब्दों को मैं बर्दाश्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि मैं आपका आदर करूँ तो आप अच्छे शब्दों का प्रयोग करें। इतिहास साक्षी है, मैं इसे बर्दाश्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं आपकी बात से डरता नहीं हूँ।

गोरे जी ने बहुत अच्छे शब्दों में कुछ बातों को रखा। मैं उनसे महमत हूँ कि पुलिस के रवैये पर विचार होना चाहिए, उसमें सुधार होना चाहिए। (Interruptions) फिर भी जो पुलिस आफीसर आन ड्यूटी होगा उसे निर्णय लेना पड़ेगा। अगर वह निर्णय गलत हो तो उसके खिलाफ कार्यवाही हो... (Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन, मैं पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर रज कर रहा हूँ। आप कृपा करके हर सम्मानित सदस्य की मर्यादा सिखाइए। यह जो आवाज बोल रही है इस आवाज का गुंजायमान उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा में हुआ है क्योंकि 13 तारीख को उत्तर प्रदेश में, लखनऊ में इन्दिरा का पुतला जलाया गया और उसमें स्पेशल पावर्स एक्ट... (Interruptions) महात्मा गांधी ने कहा कि स्पेशल पावर्स एक्ट बैड ला है, इसका तोड़ो। उत्तर प्रदेश में... (Interruptions)

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : अगर राजनारायण जी में हिम्मत थी तो मेरी बातों को सुनें और फिर उनका जवाब दें। उन्हें ही बोलने का अधिकार नहीं है। हमें पांच मिनट बोलने का मौका नहीं मिलता। यह कोई तरीका नहीं है। मैं उम्मीद करता था कि राज्यसभा बहुत ऊंची संस्थ है...

श्री श्यामनन्द मिश्र : है भी।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : है। लेकिन मुझे यह उम्मीद नहीं थी कि एक सदस्य अपनी बात को तो कहे और जिसे चाहे उसको रोक दे। मान्यवर, अगर इनमें हिम्मत है तो आप इनको मौका दें और फिर मेरी बात को काटें, मैं शान्तिपूर्वक सन्तुष्ट रहूंगा। यह कहां का कानून है। जो व्यक्ति संविधान के अंतर्गत नियम से बंध कर सदन में नहीं रह सकता उससे हम कैसे उम्मीद करें कि वह चौक में पुलिस के सामने नियंत्रण रख सकता है। जो व्यक्ति मेरी बात सुनने को तैयार नहीं है...

एक माननीय सदस्य : चौधरी चरण सिंह से पूछिए।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : मान्यवर, चौधरी चरण सिंह का नाम लिया गया। मैं निहायत अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि चौधरी चरणसिंह वह व्यक्ति है जिसने एक छोटी सी पार्टी बनाई जिसमें अध्यावधि चुनाव में दुनिया के सामने एक नयी जा पेश किया और उसने या लिखा अपने मनीफेस्टो में, क्या स्पीच दी

सारे प्रदेश को घूम कर श्री राजनारायण के मुकाबले, उनकी पार्टी के मुकाबले (Interruptions) उन्होंने कहा कि हमारी पार्टी रूल आफ ला में विश्वास करती है... उत्तर प्रदेश में जो मिश्र जी का दल है उसके साथ गठबंधन में आप लगे हुए थे, जो पूंजीपतियों की सरकार थी उसके इशारे पर आप दौड़ रहे थे, मिनिस्टर नहीं थे लेकिन हेलीकोप्टर से जाते थे। मान्यवर, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्री राजनारायण जी इस तरह के आक्षेप लगा कर अपनी मर्यादा को नहीं बढ़ा सकते, वे हमें दबा भी नहीं सकते, हम उनसे दबने वाले नहीं हैं और न ही कुछ सीखने वाले हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : हम इनको दबाना नहीं चाहते, ये अपने आप दबे हुए हैं।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : आप दबे होंगे, मैं आपसे नहीं दबता। मान्यवर, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ...

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : तुमको दबाया उमाशंकर निवारी ने।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : आपको हराया (Interruptions) शास्त्री ने। आपमें हिम्मत नहीं है नहीं तो आप इलेक्शन लड़ कर देख लें, हम चैलेंज करते हैं अमेम्बली का या लोक-सभा का इलेक्शन लड़ने। आपकी पार्टी का सिद्धान्त बता कि वे चोर दरवाजे से नहीं आएंगे, लेकिन आप आए चोर दरवाजे से। तो मान्यवर, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को दृढ़ता के साथ कार्यवाही करनी चाहिए। यह मैं नहीं पसंद करूंगा कि सरकार केवल इस लिए ढीला कदम उठाये कि उसे बहुमत का डर है। अगर इस तरह की टेंडेसीज, इस तरह की अराजक स्थिति देश में उत्पन्न होगी और उस का कड़ाई के साथ दमन नहीं किया जायगा तो देश में जनतंत्र नहीं चल सकता। रूल आफ लाँ देश में चलनाही चाहिए। आज देश में क्या हो रहा है। महाराष्ट्र में शिव सेना बनी है, तेलंगाना में फौज खड़ी हुई है, हमारे

[श्री श्याम लाल यादव]

प्रदेश में उन के आक्रमण हुए हैं, पंजाब में हुए, बंगाल में हुए । क्या इस तरह की स्थिति का सामना करने के लिए हम सक्षम नहीं हैं ? क्या हम चाहते हैं कि देश में अराजकता फैले ? इस देश में सौ, दो सौ, हजार, दो हजार आदिमियों के दिल में अगर कोई भावना पैदा हो जाय और उसे ले कर सरकार पर दबाव डालने के लिए अवैधानिक तरीके अपनाये जाय और उन के द्वारा अगर कानून तोड़ा जाय तो ऐसे लोगों के साथ हमारी हमदर्दी नहीं हो सकती । वह हमदर्दी इस लिए नहीं हो सकती क्योंकि हम जनतंत्र के हामी हैं । इस लिए सारे मामले की जांच होनी चाहिए । किसी भाववेष में नहीं आना चाहिए । किसी को लाठी लग गयी या कोई मर गया तो उस के लिए हमारे दिल में कोई हमदर्दी नहीं होनी चाहिए क्योंकि ऐसे लोग जनतंत्र के दुश्मन हैं, क्योंकि वह देश की जमहूरियत को मिटा देना चाहते हैं, क्योंकि यह संविधान को तोड़ना चाहते हैं और दूसरी संविधान सभा बनाना चाहते हैं । यहां फ्रांस की और दूसरी क्रान्तियों का उदाहरण दिया गया । जब फ्रांस में चार्ल्स के खिलाफ आन्दोलन हुआ तो क्या हुआ । वहां विधान सभा और राज्य सभा नहीं चल सकी और इसलिए वहां खूनी क्रान्ति हुई । वहां शान्ति के साथ गवर्नमेंट नहीं चल सकी । अगर वही स्थिति आप देश में पैदा करना चाहते हैं तो हमें क्या एतराज है । हम तो आगे बढ़ जायेंगे । तो मान्यवर, इन शब्दों के साथ मैं गृह मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि ऐसे मसलों पर यह ठीक है कि लोगों की भावनाएं जग जाती हैं और जिस को चोट लगती है उसके साथ स्वाभाविक तौर पर हमदर्दी हो जाती है लेकिन देखना यह चाहिए कि वहां वास्तविक स्थिति क्या थी, क्या वाकई में लोग कायदे कानून को भंग कर रहे थे या नहीं और इन सारी बातों की जांच कर के तब सदन को कोई राय बनानी चाहिए ।

श्री राजनारायण : जो संपैथी प्रकट की है उस को उन्हें वापस ले लेना चाहिए ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

यह पुलिस के पेड़ वकील मालूम होते हैं और उन से फीस ले कर यहां आये हैं ।

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are coming to the end of the debate and I must say that I am very much satisfied with the debate that has taken place in this House on this important subject, but I am sorry that I am not in a position to say the same thing so far as the reply of the Government is concerned. When I say that I do not say that by way of any petty-minded reaction to the reply given by the Government. I do it on a certain concrete basis on which we have set out to discuss this important subject. At the same time, I would say that this House is not as ineffective or helpless as some hon. Members on the other side had imagined it to be and more particularly my hon. friend, Mr. Triloki Singh, who had so imagined it to be yesterday. This House is not a sleeping animal. This animal snarls on occasions and that it has established it after one and a half day's battle on this House, which was really a battle of democracy. By that battle this House has added a few centiments to its stature of which we are really proud. I must thank all sections of the House, with a few exceptions. No doubt exceptions only prove the rule. All sections of the House ultimately came to the decision that this House had the right to discuss any subject that it wanted to discuss. It has come to certain conclusions on this.

Now, I would like to say in the very beginning that I agree with the amendment which has been proposed by my hon. friend, Mr. Niren Ghosh, and I think that represents the national consensus. It was not only represents the consensus of this House. It represents the national consensus. What does this consensus mean? It means that the issues involved in this were not of a partisan character. They went far beyond the narrow confines of parties or their self-interests. They affect the future of democracy itself and, therefore, there has been such a remarkable, a most, near unanimity except for one discordant voice.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition will agree that I suggested that we should go inside and meet the Chairman.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : I would ask Mr. Mishra to give the devil its due.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : He would not always invite us to go with him inside the corridors which he would like to visit.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : It was by mutual agreement.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : But only after one and a half days' hard battle in this House. That we will always remember. In spite of that I think the result has been extremely satisfactory and for that I am prepared to give credit to the other section of the House as well.

Now, Sir, since you happen to be in the Chair, it would not be proper for me to refer to some of the observations that you had made while you were speaking from your seat. That would not be proper. I must assure you that I would do nothing that would compromise the dignity—if there is any office—of the office of the leader of the Opposition. I have not done that and I am not going to do it in future. Whatever I have sought to point out here is in the national interest. In fact, I completely differ from some of my hon. friends when they want to lay the blame on the police, a humble agency of the Government. In fact, there was a long and very interesting dissertation by one of our most respected Members of this House, a new entrant, the hon. Member, Shri Goray, on the functions of the police. I must say in all humility that I differ from him on this subject. I would not consider an agency of the Government to be responsible for this. In the best parliamentary tradition I would lay the blame on the head of the Government, not on the head of the police. That is the tradition in which I have been brought up. I would not do that. It depends upon the horseman whether the horse should go trotting or galloping. It depends on the player of the harmonium whether it should play in the voice of a cuckoo or in the voice of an ass. Much would depend on the player of the harmonium. Much would depend on the horseman. I would not like any person to lay the blame on the agency. If we have the courage to do that, we should lay the blame on the political head of the administration. That is what we want to do. May I say that I did say, during the course of

my speech, that I did not want to roundly criticise the police? On many occasions the police act under the most trying circumstances and under the greatest strain. Some of the policemen are the finest specimens and they are the very embodiment of dedication and service. About that I have no doubt, but here what has been done does no credit to the police administration. Again, I would not mention only the police administration. Here whatever has happened has happened under the shadow of the great institution of Parliament and under the shadow of the Central Secretariat. Here when we wanted to raise some points, it was not meant to deepen the crisis in the country. The crisis is indeed deepening and widening in the country. I would not say anything which would add to the depth of the crisis. What we want to highlight is if these issues are not tackled in time, then the crisis is bound to be grave. Therefore, we had raised certain points to be answered by the hon. Home Minister and I must say, to my great disappointment, that he indulged, if I may say so in all humility, in some irrelevancies. Those irrelevancies sometimes seemed to please some hon. Members, but they cannot swerve us from the objective to which we have set ourselves. Therefore, I would say that when the hon. Home Minister was saying that there was necessity for enforcing section 144 or for promulgating section 144, within the vicinity of Parliament, was there any question raised about that? Never was the question raised. This is indeed a necessity. So it was not necessary for him to dilate on that point for so long as he did. But the issues we had raised have been completely evaded by the hon. Home Minister. We wanted to raise these issues to be answered so that the tongue of calumny might be silenced and the democracy might be strengthened. The tongue of calumny cannot be silenced if the hon. Home Minister takes such an evasive attitude as he did. You will remember, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that we had asked; when no prosecutions have been launched, there does not seem to be any basis for beating the hon. Gentlemen as has been seen by all of us. Not only these hon. gentlemen but a vast crowd was subjected to this kind of thing, hundreds of persons, men, women and children, ultimately resulting in the death of one member of the demonstration. So we wanted to know; if prosecutions had not been launched, there was absolutely no charge against them and even then these people were heavily belaboured and one death

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

had been caused; we have to be answerable to the people and Government has to be answerable to the people of this country. But there is no answer coming from the Government side. Then we had also asked why these persons were not arrested instead of being so mercilessly beaten. They could have been easily arrested and taken to any place so that the crowd could have been controlled. Why were these persons not arrested? There has been no answer from the other side. That is the question which is being widely asked by the public in general. Thirdly, we had also wanted to know what this Government had done after the sad Indraprastha affair. The Home Minister is on record as having said that during the Indraprastha affair the police had used force indiscriminately and there was no justification for it. That is what he said. It was the conclusion both of the official Committee and of the non-official Committee which consisted of two important persons, Shri Purushottam Das Tricum Das and Shri Sarju Prasad. But what did the Government do after that? The other day I had accused the Government of feudal lassitude. After all we pay them we maintain them we give them respect as they have to function even after such sad experiences as we had in the Indraprastha affair. What are we going to tell the people in regard to how this Government has been trying to control situations which are arising?

Then Mr. Vice-Chairman, the hon. Home Minister has made the position worse by saying that he did not leave any instruction with the police when the police told him "we are going to take this step". The hon. Home Minister maintained a sphinx-like silence. Probably he thought that that was the cleverest thing that he had done on that occasion. My hon. friend, Mr. Niren Ghosh, asked him this pointed question: "Did you react to that? Did you give any instructions to them"? If he did not give any instructions, he was guilty of grave dereliction of duty. He should have been in personal control of the situation sitting in the operation room as it were, but he did not do that. We also had the temerity to ask this question: Don't you know that people are talking about the involvement of the political element in the whole episode? I said I would not make that charge very lightly and it would be rather cruel of me to me to make that charge very lightly.

But we pointed out certain circumstances in which it became somewhat natural, I would not say irresistible but somewhat natural, to raise certain doubt, and the doubt was caused particularly because of the fact that the entire leadership of a party which happens to be the severest critic of the Government and also unfortunately of the Prime Minister—I said that it is distasteful to me that personal criticism should be made against any person and more so against one with whom we had worked. I would like to submit to you that although we have separated, the bonds of fraternity have not snapped, and that I must say.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): That we are seeing everyday in the House. Every word that the Leader of the Opposition utters displays that.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : These bounds of friendship have not snapped. He would not find us indulging in any criticism which might be called heartless criticism or cruel or irresponsible criticism. I have not done that. But at the same time I must make it clear that so far as badgering is concerned in the interests of democracy and the objectives we have set before ourselves in the Indian National Congress, we are not going to be sparing in our criticism. About that let there be no doubt. I was telling you of the political involvement. We are as much interested in the reputation of the Government being clean and spotless, as clean and spotless as possible, as anybody. We will resist if there are undue attacks on the Government on its reputation. After all the Government happens to be the Government of the country. At the same time we shall see to it that the Government also takes care to safeguard its own honour and reputation. Here was an ideal opportunity afforded. The Government put itself in the dock. That is what the great Prime Minister who happened to be at that time the Railway Minister did; he gave that example before the country only to be lost to the members of the Treasury Benches. After all the Railway Minister was not responsible for the construction of the bridge which led to the railway accident. Wonderful arguments are being heard from many hon. Members who want to be soft and sweet to the Home Minister. At that time he was not a construction engineer who had the responsibility for that bridge and yet when there was a railway accident, he resigned. Here was that great

Railway Minister who ultimately came to be the Prime Minister very naturally and justifiably on the basis of his merit and sacrifice. He showed that example, and yet we are sycophantic enough today to say that this is something else which is responsible and that too even after the Indraprastha affair.

The Home Minister said that he was prepared to give his head. When I was demanding his head, it was in the figurative sense of the term. In fact, Sir, your face is more pleasing. I can demand your head for being preserved. When I was demanding his head, that is the parliamentary language that one demands the head of the Government. One does not mean it literally, but the Home Minister said that he would have given his head with a smile.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : The difficulty is you wanted the head of the Government, the Prime Minister is the Head of the Government and not the Home Minister.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : My head is my cap, and if he takes my cap, I will be very happy.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I do not want him to say that his cap adorns his head.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : The hon. Home Minister said—I would keep the House so long as it is interested in this; let it be quite clear; I have got the sense of the House also—only one point. The hon. Home Minister said that he was prepared to give his head with a smile. We want him to give some sacrifice with a smile. Even that would satisfy us, only some sacrifice. Otherwise words which are merely verbal and only rhetorical have no practical purpose.

Only one word. I must say that ultimately this matter has been remitted to the care of a distinguished Judge of a High Court, and as I said in the beginning we have all faith and confidence in him. I must say that whatever his findings, so far as I am concerned they are absolute because after all we are bound to err, but here are certain things which we wanted by way of duty to point out so that you would find even now that we have done or said nothing which is prejudicial to the administration of justice in this matter. And then

7 P. M.

it has been revealed during the course of the discussion—which again, Mr. Vice-Chairman, cannot be lost sight of and that point has not been met by the hon. Home Minister—that although the main organisers of the demonstration had given a clear understanding to the police authorities and even probably to the Home Minister, that they did not intend breaking Section 144 which was in operation, even then, something had happened. And there was an apprehension that there might be troubles. This point also which has been very much highlighted by some of the hon. Members has not been answered properly or adequately by the hon. Home Minister.

And then when we expressed yesterday our condolence and our sense of sorrow for Shri Bihari Lal, we did not have enough opportunity to do that. But I must say that we also expressed our sorrow for—proper attention and care not having been paid to most of the injured persons and we are still assailed by doubts as to their whereabouts, where these persons happen to be, some of them who are still untraced. On that point also, our apprehensions and fears have remained where they were, and I hope that the Government will try its best to find out these persons who still seem to be missing.

With these words, I would like the House to support the amendment moved by my hon. friend, Shri Niren Ghosh, unanimously although I do see that many would have liked it to be in a different form. But even then I should consider it as a great progress registered by the House. In spite of the ideas and conceptions of certain hon. Members about the nature and function of the House, the authority of this House had been established through the motion which, Sir, you were pleased to ask me to move, notice of which I had given yesterday and to which an amendment has been moved by my hon. friend, Shri Niren Ghosh.

Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The question is.

“That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely—

“and having considered the same, this House views with grave concern the happenings of April 6, 1970,

[The Vice Chairman]

in connection with the S.S.P. demonstration in and around Patel Chowk in New Delhi."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The question is :

"That the statement made by the Home Minister in the Rajya Sabha on April 27, 1970, be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House views with grave concern the happenings of April 6, 1970, in connection with the S.S.P. demonstration in and around Patel Chowk in New Delhi."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I think the motion, as amended, has been unanimously adopted. I must congratulate the House for its unanimous decision because that shows that in difficult circumstances also we could work together.

The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 29th April, 1970.