

[श्री राजनारायण]

मक्षिका स्थाने मक्षिका, जो सी० आर० पी० सी० में लिखा हुआ है वही सेन्टेन्स उठा कर माननीय मंत्री जी के लीगल एडवाइजर ने कह दिया कि इस बिल में डाल दो। 59 सी० आर० पी० सी० का पढ़ रहा हूँ। एक सेन्टेन्स भी भिन्न है ?

श्री महेश्वर नाथ शील : यह तो ड्राफ्टिंग में होता ही है।

श्री महावीर प्रसाद शुक्ल : वह तो पहले से लागू है।

श्री राजनारायण : शुक्ल जी यह तहसील नहीं है।

श्री महावीर प्रसाद शुक्ल : यह राज्य सभा है।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं जानता हूँ आप वकील हैं, वकालत करते होंगे तो तहसील में करते होंगे, हम हाई कोर्ट में, सुप्रीम कोर्ट में वकालत करने वाले हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ...

श्री टी० पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : लाइसेन्स कहाँ है वकालत का ?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : लाइसेन्स मांगते हैं प्रावर्ती का नष्ट करने के लिए ; वह नहीं देना चाहते।

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हमारे सविधान ने निश्चित रूप से हमको बता दिया नागरिक सुरक्षा का अधिकार देने हुए कि हमारी गिरफ्तारी कैसे हो और हमको गिरफ्तार होने के बाद जो गिरफ्तार करने वाला अधिकारी है वह कहाँ ले जायेगा। अब चह्वाण साहब यह तर्क दे तो हमको उनकी वृद्धि पर तरस आयेगा...

5 P.M.

तरस है कि चह्वाण साहब ने जो संविधान में जो सी० आर० पी० सी० में 59 और

54 पर है उसको काट दिया है, उसको बिल्कुल अलग कर दिया है। अब यहाँ पर वहन्ता नहीं लिया जा सकता कि चूँकि सी० आर० पी० सी० में किसी को अधिकार दे रखा था कि किसी पुलिस आफिसर वा पुलिस स्टेशन पर ले जा कर हाजिर करे, यह बिल्कुल गलत है। हमारी गिरफ्तारी के बाद किसी को कोई राइट नहीं कि नोयरेस्ट मजिस्ट्रेट के पास न ले जाये।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: May I move that we take up the Half-an-hour Discussion after we finish this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is finishing it.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, देखिए अभी हमको 17, 18 प्वाइंट पढ़ने हैं और हमारे ये जो प्वाइंट हैं ये किसी तरह से इररेलेवंट नहीं हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जितने लीगल एडवाइजर्स सरकार के हैं, जो इनको पढ़ने की क्षमता रखने वाले हैं, वे इसको देखें। अब जो सेड्यूल्ड बिजनेस है पाँच बजे के बाद आधे घंटे के डिसकशन का वह ले लिया जाय, पुलिस के बारे में जो है उसको ले लिया जाये।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We arranged accordingly the Half-an-hour Discussion. We will put questions and go home. This is according to the business. I think this will be convenient for the Treasury Benches.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Half-an-hour Discussion should be within its limit. Just half an hour.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION RE. POINTS ARISING OUT OF ANSWERS TO STARRED QUESTIONS NOS. 96 AND 105 RELATING TO DEMANDS OF DELHI POLICEMEN

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश)  
माननीया, 1958 में...

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह भी श्रावका है ?

श्री राजनारायण : हमारा है और किसका हो सकता है ।

माननीया, 1958 में—माफ़ कीजियेगा 1958 नहीं 1858 में—लार्ड एडिनबरा ने भारतवर्ष में पुलिस का संगठन किस तरह से बनाया जाये ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope you know the meaning of Half-an-hour Discussion. You will get ten minutes.

श्री राजनारायण : हाँ, बिल्कुल जानता हूँ। यह समय काट दिया जायगा। हम 15 मिनट में खतम कर देंगे। हम जानते हैं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must conform to the Rules of Procedure.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीय 1958 ई० में जब पहले सामन्तवदी कानून, सन् 1857 ई० को नाकामयाब हुई तो एक अग्रज लार्ड एडिनबरा ने लिखा है कि पुलिस फोर्स कैसी होनी चाहिये। उस सेंटेंस को मैं चाहूँगा कि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य सुन लें :—

"The sepoy must be made to fear officers even more than the enemy."

भारत की पुलिस कितना ढंग से संगठित हो उसके बारे में लिखा है कि सिपाही लोग अपने अफसरों को डराने और मजबूर किये जाय जितना कि शत्रु नहीं डरते। यह लिखा हुआ है और मैं देखता हूँ कि उसी एडिनबरा के पदचिह्नों पर आज केन्द्र

को बरेलू सरकार चल रही है। क्यों ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसके बैकग्राउंड को जान लें। 1915 ई० में गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया एक्ट में पुलिस शक्ति का सिविल सर्विस के रूप में माना, 1915 ई० का कानून कोई पड़े, पुलिस को बराबर सिविल सर्विस माना गया है। हाँ, मैं यह कबूल करता हूँ कि 1935 ई० के एक्ट में यह स्थिति बदल गई और 1935 ई० का जब कानून आया तो गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया ने पुलिस सेवा के स्वरूप का बदल दिया था। यह चतुर्दश साहस के पक्ष में कुछ बात जानी है मगर 26 जनवरी, 1950 ई० का संविधान में पुलिस सर्विस को सिविल सर्विस के रूप में मान्यता दी गई। आज पुलिस को सिविल सर्विस के रूप में यह सरकार नहीं मान रही है संविधान की हत्या कर के। क्यों। संविधान के अनुच्छेद 311 (2) को पढ़ा जाय। माननीया, 311 (2) यह है :—

"311 (1) जो व्यक्ति मंत्र को अर्सेनिक सेवा का या अखिल भारतीय सेवा का या राज्य को अर्सेनिक सेवा का सदस्य है, अथवा, मंत्र के या राज्य के अग्रोत सैनिक पद को धारण करता है, वह अपनी नियुक्ति करने वाले प्राधिकारी से निचले किसी प्राधिकारी द्वारा पदच्युत नहीं किया जायगा अथवा पद से हटाया नहीं जायेगा।

(2) उपर्युक्त प्रकार का कोई व्यक्ति तब तक पदच्युत नहीं किया जायेगा, अथवा पद से नहीं हटाया जायेगा, अथवा पदच्युत नहीं किया जायेगा, जब तक कि उस के बारे में प्रस्थापित की जाने वाला कारणोंवादी के खिलाफ कारण दिखाने का यकिनपुक्त अवसर उसे न दे दिया गया हो।"

यह हमारा संविधान, अनुच्छेद 311 (2) कहता है। मगर यहाँ पर क्या है !

[श्री राजनारायण]

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

14 तारीख को एक डिक्टेटरशिप का, डिक्टेटरी, तुशतकी फर्मान निकल जाता है और 5 बड़े-बड़े अधिकारी जिसमें कि पुलिस एसोसियेशन के प्रेसिडेंट हैं, वाइस प्रेसिडेंट हैं, ट्रज्जरर हैं, सब को एकदम से निकाल दिया जाता है और इसके बाद शाम को और 11 को निकाल दिया जाता है, क्यों निकाल दिया जाता है यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता। तो मैं थोड़ा सा समय आपकी कृपा से, श्रीमन्, चाहता हूँ ताकि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इस पुलिस आन्दोलन के पीछे सरकार का क्या षड्यंत्र था, उसको समझ लें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : 12 मिनट से ज्यादा नहीं।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, अब आप जैसा सोचें। हम क्या करें।

1966 ई० को जून में पुलिस यूनियन यहाँ बनाई गई। 15 हजार में से 12 हजार सदस्य पुलिस यूनियन के बने। पहले इस यूनियन में बाहरी पदाधिकारी रहते थे। यूनियन की मांग थी कि हमारा वेतन 75 रु० से 110 रु० कर दिया जाये, आठ घंटे से ज्यादा काम हम से न लिया जाय, बड़े बड़े आफसरों के यहाँ जो चार से दस सिपाही रखे जाते हैं उनके निजी कारोबार के लिए, लड़का लड़की खिलाने को, साग तरकारी लाने के लिए, जूता साफ करने के लिए, पालिश करने के लिए, वह न रहें, कानून के अतिरिक्त, जन-सेवा के अतिरिक्त और कोई काम उनसे न लिया जाये। सभी कर्मचारियों की वर्दी एक हो चिह्न भिन्न भिन्न हों। अभी सिपाही व मुख्य सिपाही को एक है, सबइंस्पेक्टर और इंस्पेक्टर को दूसरी और डी० एस० पी० से लेकर

आई० जी० तक की तीसरी, इस तरह से उनके ड्रेसेज हैं। परन्तु पुलिस की मांग थी कि सब के ड्रेस एक से कर दिये जायें, चिह्न जुदा हों, पद के मुताबिक उनके चिह्न उस पर लगा दिये जायें। और उन्होंने कुछ अपनी मुर्तबतें भी बताई थीं। इस समय पुलिस के जवानों के रहने के लिए क्वार्टर नहीं हैं, पुलिस के जितने आफसरान हैं सब के पास क्वार्टर्स हैं, सिपाही में केवल 11 फीसदी के पास क्वार्टर हैं, मुख्य सिपाही में केवल 13 फीसदी के पास क्वार्टर हैं, बाकी के लिए क्वार्टर नहीं थे, उन्होंने मांग की थी कि हम लोगों के लिए यहाँ पर क्वार्टर की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए।

श्रीमन्, यह देखा जाय कि इस पर एक श्री खोसला साहब की कमेटी बैठी सितम्बर, 1966 ई० में। रपट इसकी अभी तक नहीं आई मगर उनकी अंतरिम रपट कब आ गई जब कि आन्दोलन शुरू हुआ, आन्दोलन शुरू होने के बाद खोसला साहब की अंतरिम रपट आई, इसके पहले नहीं आई।

12-12-66 को, मैं सरकार को आगाह करना चाहता हूँ, 12-12-66 को सरकार ने स्वयं एक ड्राफ्ट दिया पुलिस कर्मचारी संघ के नाम से और उसी ड्राफ्ट के मुताबिक संगठन बना, सरकार ने उसको मान्यता भी दी और उसमें साफ है कि पुलिस अपने हितों के लिए अपने संगठन के जरिये काम करेगी। तो मैं जानना चाहूँगा कि पुलिस की जो मांग थी, जो उन्होंने डिमांड किया, क्या वह उनके हित में नहीं था। अपने हित के लिए क्या उन्होंने मांग नहीं की? क्या सरकार ने ड्राफ्ट नहीं भेजा और क्या उस ड्राफ्ट के मुताबिक पुलिस कर्मचारी संघ नहीं बना और उसको सरकार ने मान्यता नहीं दी। उसके बाद उनका आन्दोलन होता है, सभा होती है, तीन सभायें हुई, 14, 21 और 28 मार्च को,

तो 28 मार्च को जब सभा हुई तो 29 मार्च को इनके ए० आई० जी० बेहनोट साहब ने उनको लिखा कि आप लोग सभा नहीं कर सकते हो तो पुलिस के जवानों ने—मैं आपको बताऊंगा कि कितना अनुशासित यहां का पुलिस कर्मचारियों का संघ रहा है क्योंकि उन्होंने—उसको लिख कर दे दिया कि ठीक है, आप कहते हो कि सभा न करें तो सभा नहीं करेंगे। यह पुलिस कर्मचारी संघ के अनुशासन का द्योतक है कि वहां के ए० आई० जी० ने जब लिख कर कहा कि पुलिस संगठित रूप से, सामूहिक रूप से सभा नहीं कर सकती है तो पुलिस ने भी उसको मान लिया कि हां, हम सभा नहीं करेंगे। अब इसी बीच में सरकार के मन में एक तूफान पैदा होता है। सरकार सोचने ली कि कहीं अगर यह पुलिस संगठन इस ढंग से चलता है तो बड़ी गड़बड़ हो जायगी और शायद सरकार के तुंगलकी फर्मान को, तूफाने बदतमीजी से भरे आदेशों को मानने से कहीं पुलिस इनकार न कर दे और अगर कर दे तो क्या होगा? अब यहीं से पड़यंत्र शुरू होता है। अब संघ को खत्म करने के लिये, पुलिस संगठन का दमन करने के लिये यह सरकार आरुढ़ होती है। इसके हमारे पास सबूत हैं, बिलकुल लिखित, देखिये :

अप्रैल के प्रथम सप्ताह के लगभग, 8 अप्रैल तक, लोक सभा चलती है और 11 अप्रैल तक राज्य सभा चलती है, दो तीन दिन उसको बैठक बढ़ गई थी। सरकार के दिमाग में यह उठा कि जब तक लोक सभा चलती है, तब तक पुलिस संगठन के संरक्षण पर कोई हमला होगा तो लोक सभा और राज्य सभा में सरकार के ऊपर बड़ा हमला होगा। मगर उसके लिये सरकार ने बराबर तैयारी कर ली। कैसे? 8 अप्रैल के प्रथम सप्ताह में, सरकार ने केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस को दस, पन्द्रह हजार की संख्या में दिल्ली में बुला लिया। अगर सरकार के

दिमाग में इस पुलिस कर्मचारी संघ का दमन करने का इरादा नहीं था तो पुलिस ने अप्रैल के प्रथम सप्ताह में केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस को क्यों बुलाया? 8 अप्रैल को जब लोक सभा की बैठक खत्म हुई, तो 9 अप्रैल से सामान्य पुलिस संतरियों को हटाया गया और केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस के आदमियों को लाया गया। चव्हाण साहब के बंगले पर पार्लियामेंट के गेट पर, सभी थानों से संतरियों की राइफलें ले ली गईं। यह दमन शुरू होने से पहले उनके हाथ से राइफलें ले ली गईं, उनको डंडे दे दिये। दुनिया के किसी मुल्क में इस तरह की बात कहीं देखने में नहीं आई कि जहां पुलिस के हाथ से राइफल छीन कर डंडे दे दिये गये हों। उनका आंदोलन हुआ है 14-15 तारीख को मगर सरकार ने पहले से ही उन से हथियार छीनने की साजिश शुरू कर दी और उनको डंडे दिये जाने लगे। संघ की तरफ से पूछताछ की गई कि ऐसा आंदोलन क्यों हो रहा है तो सरकार की ओर से जवाब दिया गया कि ऐसा सामान्यतया हो रहा है।

14 अप्रैल को दो काम सरकार की ओर से हुए। पहले 8 पुलिस कर्मचारियों को बरखास्त किया गया, जिनमें 5 संघ के पदाधिकारी थे। उसी शाम को 11 और आदमी बरखास्त किये गये। संविधान के 211 (सी) के तहत उनको बरखास्त किया गया। क्या संविधान का 211 अनुच्छेद पुलिस के लिये है, इसको अगर सरकार अच्छी तरह से देखेगी तो इस सरकार की समझ में आयेगा, तो आगे यह देखा जाय कि दिल्ली में सभी जगह सामान्य पुलिस से हथियार ले लिये गये और रिजर्व पुलिस लगा दी गई। डा० लोहिया ने चव्हाण साहब से 14 ता० को बातचीत की, टेलीफोन किया। डा० लोहिया ने कहा कि ऐसी ऐसी हमको रफ्त लगी है, ऐसी बात क्यों हो रही है? इसके बाद चव्हाण साहब ने—वे यहां बैठे हैं बताएंगे क्या-

[श्री राजनारायण]

कहा—लेकिन हमारी जानकारी है कि उन्होंने कहा तार्मल चेंज आफ ड्यूटी हो रही है।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** राजनारायण जी, दस मिनट हो गये हैं, अब हो मिनट में खत्म करना है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** अच्छा जैसा सचे दो मिनट को लम्बा कर दीजिए। पांच मिनट और चाहिये।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** वह समय लम्बा नहीं हो सकता है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** कहीं लिखा नहीं है, कूल हमने देखा है। पढ़ लीजिए। उसके बाद 14 अप्रैल को 2000 को तत्वाद में पुलिस कर्मचारी चव्हाण साहब के मकान जाते हैं, आगू गैस का प्रयोग होता है। 12 अप्रैल को धारा 144 लगा दी जाती है। चव्हाण साहब के मकान में 24 घंटे तक घरना पड़ा था, बराबर शांति थी, कहीं पुलिस वालों को तरफ से उद्दड़ता या शान्ति भंग करने की कार्यवाही नहीं हुई। 15 तारीख को पलटन आई क्योंकि 14 की शाम को केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस के बारे में सरकार को लगता था कि कहीं कोई भी कार्यवाही करने से इन्कार न कर दें, उन्होंने समझ लिया इस पुलिस कर्मचारी संगठन को दवाने के लिये हमें भेजा गया है और केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस ने भी अब सरकार के आदेशों का उल्लंघन शुरू किया, तो 15 तारीख को पलटन बुलाई गई, पंजाब की सशस्त्र पुलिस बुलाई गई तथा सीमा सुरक्षा पुलिस आयी। पंजाब वालों को शराब पिलाई गई। घेरा में जो लोग थे गिरफ्तार किये गये। 700 सिपाही जेल में डाल दिये गये। विजय चौक पर एक ट्रक उलट गई। दो मरे सत्रह घायल हुए। ड्राइवर साहब

शराब के नशे में चूर थे। सारा काम निड करता है कि पुलिस के बड़े बड़े लोग जो बाहर से आए, इस पुलिस कर्मचारी संघ का दमन करने के लिये उनको शराब पिलाई गई थी ताकि शराब के नशे में पुलिस उनके साथ न हो जाय। इस पुलिस कर्मचारी संघ का दमन करने के लिये उनको शराब पिलाई गई और वे आगे बढ़े। कर्नाल, गुडगांव, गाजियाबाद, ऊधमपुर में उनको छोड़ा, केवल जाधिया और गंजी में। संगीत और रायफल के कुन्दे मारे गये। ट्रक गिरने से मुकुन्दी लाल सिपाही मरा। एक आदमी और मरा है जिसको चव्हाण साहब कहते हैं यह गले में कांटा लगने से मरा है। ये बतायेंगे गले में कांटा कैसे लगा? वस्तुतः गले में संगीत लगी थी। सीमा सुरक्षा फॉर्स को लेकर सामान्य सिपाहियों को अफसरों ने मारा और गिरफ्तार किया। 1007 जेल में है जिस दिन हमने मोशन मव्ह किया था। नय्यर नामक डी० एस० पा० ने पेट में ठोकर मारो उम्मेद सिंह के, वह मर गया इरविन अस्पताल में उसको भर्ती किया गया। बाद में उसका पता नहीं चला। सरकार की तरफ से कहा गया कि वह निश्चित रूप से...

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** अब खत्म कीजिए। हाफ एन आवर डिबेट है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** हमने तो देखा है हाफ एन आवर के डिसकशन में समय बढ़ा देते हैं। इतना समय तो हमारा कम मत कीजिए। तो इसके बाद उसका पता नहीं लगा। 18 तारीख को प्राइम मिनिस्टर से बात हुई। बहुत से लोग गये थे। प्राइम मिनिस्टर से इतनी बातें तय हुईं: 1. प्रधान मंत्री या घर मंत्री संघ के प्रतिनिधियों से बातचीत करें 10 अप्रैल से बराबर संघ के प्रतिनिधियों ने प्रधान मंत्री और घर मंत्री को भी लिखा। 2. बरखास्तशुदा लोग काम पर लिये जायें। 3. बदले की कार्यवाही

न हों। 4. कमिशन पुलिस को रपट पर जल्दी ही सरकार अमल करे। इसी के साथ मैं आप से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि एक तरफ तो प्रधान मंत्री जो से जो बातें हुई उनको पूर्ति होनी थी उधर जेलों में जो लोग रखे गये उसमें से 998 इस समय भी जेल में हैं सब के सब "सी" क्लास में रखे गये, उनकी जमानत नहीं ली गई, उनकी शिनाख्त के लिये तरह तरह की दिक्कतें सरकार की ओर से पैदा की जाती हैं, उनके दस्तखत बेरोफाई नहीं होने देते हैं। भगवान दास शास्त्री ने अनशन करने की सूचना दी है।

इन बातों की तरफ सरकार द्वारा अमल होना चाहिये :

1. संघ की मान्यता सुरक्षित हो।
2. जेल से सम्भो रिहा हों।
3. सभी प्रकार के मुकदमों वापस हों।
4. मुअ्तली, बरखास्तगी वापस ही।
5. 9 अप्रैल के पूर्व जो जिस ड्यूटी पर था वह वहां रखा जाय।
6. मरे तथा घायल लोगों को या परिवार को उचित मुआवजा मिले।
7. सारी घटनाओं की जांच के लिये जुडिशल इन्क्वायरी हो जिसमें पांच जज हों, एक सुप्रीम कोर्ट का तथा बार लगे राज्यों के हाईकोर्ट से।

पुलिस मंत्री, श्री चव्हाण, चूंकि पुलिस प्रजामन को संभाल सकने में अयोग्य सिद्ध हुए हैं इसलिए मालविका के नाम पर, जनतंत्र और संवैधानिक प्रथा के नाम पर, चव्हाण साहब को यह एक पोलिटिकल ड्यूटी होती है कि वे इस्तीफा दें। इसलिये हमारी मांग है कि चव्हाण साहब इस्तीफा दें और यदि वे इस्तीफा न दें तो उनका हटाया जाय।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Chavan.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to ask . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You will have your questions later after his statement is made. I refer you to rule 60(5). That was raised and I have given a ruling the other day, that there will be a statement by the Minister and then you will have a right to ask questions.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं एक बात और मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा कि बिहार के होम मिनिस्टर श्री रामानन्द तिवारी यहां आयें थे और वे पुलिस के लोगों से जेल में मिलना चाहते थे मगर उन्हें मिलने की इजाजत नहीं दी गई, तो क्यों नहीं दी गई ?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): Sir, it is rather difficult for me to mention about all the things because he practically ran through some of the points during the last few minutes of his speech. He has not made much of a case for asking for my resignation; certainly, he ended his speech demanding my resignation.

Sir, the facts also he gave rather in his own way, twisting his points, trying to interpret facts to his own advantage. But the point is that the Delhi Police Force has its own problems. That is a fact which we have never tried to conceal; on the contrary, we have always accepted the fact. The other fact is that we are not indifferent to the problems of the Delhi Police. That is another point. And it is clear from the number of times that we have given out those facts. We know the difficult housing conditions of the Delhi Police. I agree that the housing candidate are difficult. The reasons for that also we will

[Shri Y. B. Chavan.] have to go into, as to how the Police Force in Delhi grew. It grew in the same way as Delhi City has grown in the last 20 years or more, in a haphazard and unorganised way. Delhi City was about half a million 20 years ago, now it is more than three million.

The city's problems became very complicated. The economic problem grew, and with that, naturally, the police force also grew in that manner. Sir, I have made all these points in the other House. But I am repeating them with a view to meeting the points that have been made here. The success or failure of any force, depends upon its officers and men. Unfortunately, Sir, there was not a regular well-articulated officers' cadre of Delhi Police Force. It had to take officers on deputation from other States. Naturally, they were not looking forward for their future career to what happened in Delhi. They used to look forward to their parent States and there was that indifferent relationship between the officers and the Police Force.

Then, Sir, in addition to that, the general economic conditions of the country also contributed and we found—at least, Sir, when I took over in last November—that this question had come to quite the forefront which had to be taken note of and taken note of very seriously because as these other conditions were worsening, some political parties had helped in worsening the morale and the discipline of the Police Force also.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Question.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Well, I put a big question on the speech of Mr. Rajnarain if he has not understood the whole question. The situation, as it existed in November last, was that there were elements which were instigating the Police Force to act in a most unorganised manner, in a most

indisciplined manner. A number of them, when they were going on duty, were raising very unfortunate, political slogans in which there was no sense. On one occasion when the I.G.P. went to take a parade, I got the report from the I.G.P. that the parade was broken as if it was a sort of election meeting. Anyway, it was broken. Sir, you cannot expect a police force to behave that way. Naturally, the Government had to take certain actions. And these actions were both ways. Government had to pass a legislation. This legislation was initiated in this very House to see that they were not allowed to have their own trade unions. But at the same time they should have some forum, some association, through which they can air their grievances, they can represent their grievances and get them redressed.

Sir, there were problems of the Police, I agree. But the Government was not indifferent to them. The Government was prepared to give them a sort of forum, an association where they could air their grievances and get them redressed. That was also ultimately conceded. Along with this, or even before this we decided to attend to their immediate problem. The first was the housing problem. It is a problem which had accumulated as a result of the last nearly 15-20 years' deficiencies. So it had to be worked out as a sort of long-term programme.

As a first step of the programme we approved a scheme of housing estimated to cost about Rs. 50 lakhs, and it was decided that this should be pushed through as speedily as one can do. You know, Sir, getting land in Delhi is a very difficult problem. Even for the Government it is a very difficult thing. But we saw that they got lands quickly, and, Sir, the housing programme is being pushed through as speedily as one can do.

Then, there are many other problems, problem of their transport, **pro-**

blem of their winter uniform, problem of having some sort of allowance for them when they work beyond certain hours of duty at one stretch. All these problems were attended to. Then we decided that there were other aspects of the matter which were also long-term and for which it is necessary to have some sort of proper enquiry made. And, therefore, the Khosla Commission was appointed and the whole matter is under the examination of the Khosla Commission.

I thought, Sir, that the whole thing was going in a proper way. The police were given opportunity to place their grievances before the Commission. Some of them went and represented their grievance. But other elements to which I made a reference were not allowing the police to function in a disciplined manner. Some elements in the police force were working in such a way and behaving in such a way that it could not any longer be called a force of discipline.

Sir, things again started happening. In the last week of March some hunger strike was observed. Some corner meetings were held. Strange speeches were made. This old habit of giving wrong slogans when going on duty was started. And, naturally the Government had to take certain actions. And, therefore, the Government decided to take action and dismiss some persons; they were dismissed.

It is a fact that on the 14th morning Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia telephoned to me. Of all the persons he knows what is happening in the police force on duty in the Rashtrapati Bhavan. He told me that while duty was to be changed from one group of policemen to the other group of policemen they were refusing to hand over. They were always making allegations that they were being disarmed. Sir, anybody when he is not on duty is always naturally unarmed. It is not necessary to disarm him. Even in the normal course of work when they go on duty they are armed. But when

they go out of duty, naturally they go by rotation, they are disarmed because they go and keep their arms there. When the period of duty was over naturally they had to be changed.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): By whom?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Who are you to decide it? It is for the officer there to decide. It is not a question of my doing it or your doing it.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: There lies the whole point. It is the policemen who disarmed them.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: It is not my concern or your concern. It is the concern of the Duty Officer to decide whom he should put on duty. The police force cannot learn democracy like this taking orders as to who should go on duty and when . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI: It is dictatorship.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: You have got wrong ideas of democracy and wrong ideas of dictatorship, perhaps. That is all I can say. It is none of our concern. If the police are being changed on the normal duty the police must obey the orders. If they are asked to vacate the duty they must vacate the duty. Sir, they did not. Naturally, in the course of the day the big *morcha* started and came and gave *dharana* or whatever they say call it. And the hon. Members say that they were very peaceful. If that is the idea of their peace, I would say that it would be my duty to save the people and the country from such a peace, and I shall do my duty. Sir, if this displeases some hon. Members it is my misfortune that I had to displease, but my intention was not that.

Sir, for nearly 24 hours, roughly 24 hours, the types of slogans that they raised and the way they were shouting you cannot say they were peaceful. You see, the life of the people living there, peaceful citizens living in that part of the city, I was very sorry myself that I became their neighbour and became a sort of nuisance for them. Across the road there was a marriage ceremony to be held



[Shri Y. B. Cixavan.] near my house that evening. You can understand what most of the people who had come to that marriage ceremony would have thought of the police, of the Government, of the country and of independence and everybody else, if that is the idea of peace. Sir, this was done by those people who are expected to protect us from disturbances, who are supposed to be the representatives of peace. They are supposed to guard the peace. And this was the guarding of the peace.

Sir, we showed all restraint because I thought it was my duty to have all restraint. They were making very provocative slogans and speeches all along. For a few minutes I had the privilege of the visit from Shri Bhupesh Gupta and another Member of Parliament. And they can very well know. At one stage even they went and advised them. They asked me whether they could go and advise them. I said, "Certainly, you can go and advise them to vacate and go away". But they were in such a position. I do not know what had happened to them. They were not prepared to listen to any sensible advice given by any sensible Member. Naturally, Shri Bhupesh Gupta and other friends had come to advise me to have a deputation received of the policemen. I refused to do that because the way they had come—they had broken section 144—the way they had behaved because their assembly was completely illegal. By the way they had behaved, if they had not been stopped from entering my house, I do not know what they would have done that afternoon. But that does not matter. If anything would have happened, it would have happened to me personally or to the members of my family. I do not care about that. When one takes responsibility of such a high office, one must take all the consequences of holding such an office. For that matter I am not worried about it. But, Sir, the next morning, when I found that they were still sitting here—normally I go to office at 9-30 and I said I must go to my office and I was on my way to

office at that time—even though I did not receive their deputation the previous night, as I was going away from there, I thought it was my duty to stop by them and talk to them. I stopped there and talked to them. And I told them "We all belonged to the same family, to the same team. From a small constable up to the Home Minister, we are a team and we are supposed to protect the people, their rights, their lives and their families and you have been misled. You have done very wrong things since yesterday. But still I would make an appeal to you—go back to your duty, join duty and we will all forget all about it." But nothing happened. Then naturally they had to be arrested that evening and, Sir, this operation of arresting was very peaceful. The entire press corps was present that day and I think what they reported the next day in the papers showed that this operation was complete within 20 minutes and was very peaceful. But, Sir, things happen. Unfortunately, that very evening, immediately after, these people were arrested, on their way to jail, one of the trucks overturned and a few persons were injured and two persons died. This is all that happened that evening. Sir, I now leave it to your judgment and to the judgment of the hon. House, as to how we should treat our police force and what sort of discipline we expect out of them. I quite agree that we have to be sympathetic to their problems. Sir, here and now, I would like to say that we will do everything that is possible and everything that this House sanctions to remove their difficulties and grievances and meet their problems. But, at the same time, I must make it clear that we will be failing in our duty if we tolerate any indiscipline in a very important and essential force of security service like the police.

Now an hon. Member asked me to resign.

Those who hold offices do not hold offices permanently. They hold offices during the pleasure of the President . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal)  
That is about the only truth we are beginning to realise.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: ... and during the pleasure of the people and the pleasure of this hon. House. I would not resign if a single Member like Mr. Rajnarain shouts asking me to resign. I would not resign. I would not resign even if he should shout a hundred times. The only forces that can ask me to resign are this hon. House the people and the President.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Shri Chitta Basu.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May we stop for two minutes so that hon. Members can applaud to their hearts' content? They are applauding him.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): I suppose the Khosla Commission has considered the short-term as well as the long-term grievances of the Delhi Police personnel, and they might have recommended certain wages to remove the long-standing grievances of the Delhi Police Force. Now will the hon. Minister be pleased to state whether he would place on the Table of this House the report of the Khosla Commission and also whether the Government proposes to give some interim relief for the police personnel before the recommendations of the Khosla Commission are fully or partially implemented? This is number one. Secondly, there is a general feeling among the people that a certain amount of excesses had been perpetrated upon the peaceful demonstrators of the Delhi Police personnel. I do not want to dilate the thing. Now about 700 persons have been arrested and some 50 officials have been dismissed from the service; and it is also reported that about two police personnel were killed and they were tear-gassed and lathi-charged when they were being whisked away from the place to the jail. While on the truck they were also silenced at the point of the bayonet. All this information published in the press has created a feeling among the people that a certain

amount of excesses had been committed upon the demonstrators. In view of that, will the hon. Minister be pleased to state whether he is ready to institute a judicial probe into the matter.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: First the interim report of the Khosla Commission is under examination by Government and it is not our intention to lay it on the Table now till the decisions of the Government are taken. But after the decisions are taken, along with the decisions or after the decisions, we shall certainly place the report of the Commission before the House.

श्री राजनारायण : जुड़िशियल इन-क्वायरी के बारे में क्या हुआ ?

श्री बाई० बा० चव्हाण : इनक्वायरी नहीं होगी।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to ask for some clarifications. He has made a reference to the fact that I was in his House; till midnight that day, I was in there. But when I entered his House, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I thought I was in Gallipoli in the midst of war because so many armed forces were there, coming in from all sides. Well, I do not know why that show was necessary there. We requested him to accept the deputation, but he would not accept it. He was very firm that he would not accept the deputation. We pleaded with him because we felt that if he would accept a deputation from those people, the problem might be brought completely under control to the satisfaction of all. I do not know why on that night—he will explain it—Mr. Chavan did not listen to us. The next morning, as he himself admitted, on his way to his office, he talked to them<sup>1</sup>. Now, is it not standing on prestige in a very infantile manner giving rise to the aggravation of the situation, I would like to know. He said they were shouting slogans. I would not also like people at mid-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

night to shout slogans in that manner, but I found that they were not at all shouting indecent slogans, *i* was listening and I followed the slogans, because Mr. Chavan is an honourable man, that too the mighty Home Minister of the country and I felt that if he was angry, I might enquire into it since I was on the spot. I found out that the slogans were very normal, useful slogans from their point of view and nothing was insulting. I asked the people to translate the slogan<sub>s</sub> for me I think Mr. Chavan was obsessed with the idea and he felt somewhat like that; he had conditioned himself in such a way that any slogan shouted, even a love slogan, would have seemed to him a war slogan. He must have felt like that. Then the same day, a number of dismissal orders were issued suddenly. Seven or eight were issued under Article 311. No reason was given. They were not given a<sup>y</sup> charge-sheet. They were not even asked to explain their conduct. It was just peremptory, summary dismissal. Well, I know how hon. Members feel if someone wants to be a State Minister, if he is not made a Deputy Minister, he goes on strike; we have seen that in this very House. It is in that situation that I found those police officers. From my talk with them I felt that they were not only patriotic, but they were highly intelligent people.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): May I request you to put your question?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The question is coming. Now I found they were amenable to discipline. They wanted a settlement. They wanted to ta<sup>k</sup> to the Home Minister and that is why they came there. But the Home Minister, for whatever reasons or may be advised by his officers, decided not to meet them<sup>l</sup>. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I ask: How i<sub>s</sub> it that the police were violent and very aggressive but when the arrest ■took place were very peaceful and

nothing happened? Do I understand that they mounted cannons just to frighten the policemen out of their life so that they would surrender or that they were peaceful and when they arrested them, even at that time they were peaceful so that no incidents, no disturbances took place? The fact that arrests took place in a peaceful manner shows that the policemen came there with no intention except to present and formally press their demands. Then I should like to know this. w<sup>"e</sup> met the Prime Minister. We als<sub>o</sub> looked into their grievances. Is it not a fact that the Government itself came to the conclusion that the officers coricerned of the Police Force had neglected the policemen, rank and file especially, had not looked into their demands and in fact had treated some of the policemern—rank and file—in a very harsh and unsympathetic manner as a result of which the grievances accumulated and it sought an outlet in such peaceful presentation of how they felt, before the Home Minister's house. Thi<sub>s</sub> is about all.

Finally I would like to know this. Is it not the concern °f the Home Minister to think as to how is it that the Police Force—we know at our cost what it means and what kind of Force you have trained—even that Police Fprce, trained by them conditioner by them, had to go into such action, some thousands of them? Does it not show that there must be something rotten in the Police administration at the top, something very inhuman or unsympathetic? If that is so, was it not proper for the Home Minister to take a larger view of this matter and gone into the question and tackled the problem of the rank and file of the police officers in a manner, not in the way in which he did but in a different way? Why is that so? The only thing I can say is that the Home Minister forgot that he was the Home Minister in a parliamentary system. He thought ne was a super-D.I.G. or LG. That is the trouble.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Gupta, is all this a question? You referred me to the rules the other day. Is this all a question? If you say it is a question, I will say that it is \_\_\_\_\_

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can I say?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): No. If you want enforcement of the Rules, please be within the Rules also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Question is question. Is it not a fact that the trouble arose that at the political level the Home Minister for the time being under some evil influence, it seems, became a super-I.G. rather than the Home Minister of a parliamentary system?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then he accepts it. (Interruptions) You do not accept?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Murahari.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : जहाँ तक कि पुलिस की उकसाने की बात है, मेरे ख्याल में जो दो घटनाएँ हुई पुलिस के साथ कई महीनों से उनकी डिमान्डों पर विचार न होना, या सरकार के कानून के मुताबिक उनका जो एंटीसिमेंशन बना उसके जो पदाधिकारी थे उनके खिलाफ जो कार्यवाही की गई सरकार की ओर से वह जिम्मेदार है। उसके बाद जैसा उन्होंने बताया, कुछ राइफल्स लेकर उनको डिस्आर्म किया गया। ये तीन चीजें हैं उनकी उकसाने के लिए जिम्मेदार। यह कहना कि किसी राजनीतिक पार्टी ने उनको उकसाया है, यह सरकार झूठ है, गलत होगा। जहाँ तक मैं जानता हूँ, पुलिस का जो मामला चल रहा है—क्योंकि डा० लोहिया के पास कई पुलिस वाले आते जाते हैं क्योंकि उनकी सुनवाई कहीं नहीं होती...

787 R.S.D.—9.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : अपने प्रश्न पर आइए।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : सरकार के पास जाते हैं कोई सुनवाई नहीं होती, होम मिनिस्टर के पास जाते हैं कोई सुनवाई नहीं होती। जैसा भूपेश गुप्ता ने कहा, होम मिनिस्टर खुद आई० जी० जैसा बर्ताव करने लगेंगे तो सुनवाई कहाँ होगी। इसलिए वे तंग आकर कई महीनों के बाद डा० लोहिया के पास या किसी और के पास आए हैं। कई महीनों से यह मामला चलता आ रहा है, इस चीज को मैं उनका तरफ से कह सकता हूँ। कोई राजनीतिक उकसाव हुआ है, यह मैं मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। जहाँ तक उकसाव का बात है, डा० लोहिया ने बारबार कहा कि तुम लोग ऐसा रास्ता न अख्तियार करो जिससे किसी बात में तेजी आए।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी (मध्यप्रदेश) : आप डा० लोहिया की इतनी सफाई क्यों दे रहे हैं?

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : अगर हम उकसाना चाहेंगे तो उकसायेंगे और जब उकसायेंगे तो आप लोग यहाँ नहीं रहेंगे।

(Interruptions)

लेकिन जब आपके पास कोई चीज नहीं है और आपके पास कोई सफाई नहीं है तो खाली कह दिया कि राजनीतिक दलों ने उकसाया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : गोडे मुराहरि जो, अपने प्रश्न पर आइए।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : मैं प्रश्न पर आ रहा हूँ। मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो आजकल परिस्थिति है उसमें क्या सरकार आजकल जो जेल में बन्द हैं उन पुलिस कर्मचारियों को रिहा करके, उनके जो भागों पर निवार करने, उनके जो क्लेश वगैरह हैं, उनमें बाधा न पड़वा कर उनके

[श्री गोडे मुराहरी]

साथ इनसानियत का व्यवहार करने के लिए तैयार है या नहीं? यह मेरा प्रश्न है।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The cases are in the court and the Government will go according to the process of law.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can withdraw that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Thengari

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Sir . . .

{Interruptions}

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): I have called Mr. Thengari.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh): The Prime Minister has laid great stress upon discipline. That is one aspect of it. I would like to know whether he has enquired into another aspect, namely, whether tactlessness and high-handedness of some particular officials were also responsible for provoking the police, whether that aspect has been enquired into? That I should like to know specifically.

Secondly, now that the agitation has been called off and the Minister has rightly said that right from the smallest constable up to the hon. Minister, all belong to one family—he is preserving the family Of India—may I know what measures have been adopted after the calling off of the agitation up to this day, by the Home Minister for the redressal of their grievances? At least has any move been initiated in that direction? That is number two.

Thirdly when this Police Forces Bill was under discussion it was clearly stated that if the police are to be deprived of the trade union

rights, some appropriate machinery must be devised for redressal of their grievances and also for mutual consultations. In the absence of such a machinery, aggravation of the discontent was but natural. Will the Government consider setting up of such a machinery in the near future?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I thought I had explained these points. I will answer his last point first, that the association of the policemen was recognised, its constitution approved and its office-bearers properly elected and it had started functioning quite all right. So there was no question of any lack of any organisation which can look after their problem. It was there. It was a representative body.

The second point that he mentioned was whether any steps have been taken or not. As I said, this Khosla Commission and its report is one of the most important steps, because allowances and pay scales were the most important controversial aspects of the matter. The Commission has gone into them and made certain recommendations. That has to be gone into. About the other steps to be taken, I mentioned the housing problem and other problems. They have also been gradually dealt with. About whether tactlessness and high-handedness were not responsible for the present trouble, I would say 'no'. I do not say that there was not or there cannot be any but on this occasion which ultimately led to their morcha, etc., high-handedness was not responsible.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The discussion is over. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at forty-eight minutes past five of the clock, till 11 A.M. on Tuesday, the 6th June 1967.