

Consultative Committee meeting at Trivandrum in the month of October or September.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: I am not a Member.

SHRI P. S. NASKAR: Sorry. I do not know exactly what is the allegation that Mr. Kumaran made, but if he can give it in writing the definite allegation it would be looked into.

About the functioning of the Consultative Committee of Kerala, Mr. K. K. Shah has given a very vivid description as to how the Consultative Committee for Kerala functioned during the President's Rule and what business it carried out. Most of the recommendations made by the Consultative Committee were accepted by the Government and I personally attended the Consultative Committee meetings. I can tell you especially the Members of the Opposition Parties, who were very eloquent in criticising the President's Rule here, very rarely criticised the present President's Rule in Kerala in the Consultative Committee meetings that I attended.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The very sight of you demoralised them.

SHRI P. S. NASKAR: The very sight of you demoralises so many. With these few words I finish my speech.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation (G.S.R. No. 490) issued by the Vice-President of India, discharging the functions of the President, on the 24th March, 1966, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Kerala, for a further period of six months with effect from November 11, 1966."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the House stands adjourned and meets again at 6.00 P.M. today.

The House then adjourned at thirty-five minutes past five of the clock.

The House reassembled at six of the clock, the DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

STATEMENT RE DISTURBANCES IN DELHI

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hathi.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): We expected that the founder of the Sadhu Samaj should also be here, the Home Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is otherwise engaged. Mr. Hathi.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): Madam, this is rather a grim occasion and I come to report to the House the shocking events of this afternoon. I have no words to express my anguish at what has happened. The House will, I am sure, join me in condemning unequivocally the violence and the hooliganism indulged by sections of the procession which converged on the Parliament House shortly after midday. Full information has not yet been collected.

It seems that the procession organised by the organisations and groups supporting ban on cow slaughter reached Parliament House around 12.30 P.M. Even prior to its reaching Parliament House stray incidents of stoning of public and private property had been reported. The main procession continued to be peaceful till about 1.30 P.M. At that stage Swami Rameshwaranand addressing the gathering delivered a highly inflammatory speech. He asked the audience what the use of their sitting there was and exhorted them to go and surround the Parliament

[Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi]

House and prevent the Ministers from coming out. At this a large number of Sadhus and others started moving towards the Parliament House. The police had to resort to lathi charge to prevent them from advancing. They retreated a little and threw brickbats at the police. The police had then to use teargas. Mounted police followed by foot constables then tried to keep them under control. The crowd assaulted one of the mounted policemen who was knocked down. Some of them also set fire to the Guard Room of the Akashvani Bhavan. A large number of cars and scooters parked in the compound of the Transport Bhavan and Shrama Shakti Bhavan were completely burnt down. They also attacked Akashvani Bhavan.

As a results of firing the crowd began to retreat. While retreating it set fire to a large number of private and public vehicles parked in various offices and also tried to set fire to a number of office buildings. A full picture of the damage has yet to be received. According to the reports received so far; at least eight persons have been seriously hit. Two of them are reported to have died. The retreating crowd set fire to a petrol pump on Irwin Road and the Akashvani Bhavan has been considerably damaged and one N.D.M.C. and one postal van are reported to have been completely burnt near the Gole Dak Khana.

The police had a most difficult task and were up against heavy odds. I am sure the House will join me in expressing high appreciation of the police force for the manner in which they performed their duty.

Today's deplorable happenings underline the great danger from violence to the fabric of orderly society. I am sure hon. Members of the House will condemn strongly the miscreants who have indulged in these violent activities. It is clear that this grim situation has been brought about by sustained instigation to violence. We are taking steps

to put down firmly this lawlessness and vandalism. Government have decided not to allow any processions within a sizeable distance of Parliament. I am thinking that this might well be two miles distance.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मुझे बड़ा अफसोस है कि मंत्री महोदय का जो वक्तव्य हुआ उसमें पूरी तसवीर सामने रखी गई। जब यह दुखदायी कांड हुआ मैं उस समय वहां मंच पर मौजूद था। यह बात ठीक है कि स्वामी रामेश्वरानन्द जी ने जनता से कहा कि पार्लियामेंट व संसद भवन को घेर लो। लेकिन जनता उनके कहने पर संसद् भवन की ओर नहीं बढ़ी क्योंकि मंच पर जो नेता बैठे थे उनमें श्री जगद्गुरु शंकराचार्य जी, मुनि सुशील कुमार जी, श्री प्रभुदत्त ब्रह्मचारी जी थे। उन्होंने जनता से कहा कि हमारा प्रोग्राम संसद् को घेरने का नहीं है हम शान्तिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन करने के लिए आये हैं और लोगों ने उनकी बात को सुना। स्वामी रामेश्वरानन्द जी के बाद वहां पर प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री जी का भाषण हुआ जिसे जनता ने शान्ति के साथ सुना। यह ठीक है कि ५०, ६० साधु संसद् भवन के दरवाजे पर इकट्ठे हो गये थे और वे संसद् के भीतर प्रवेश करना चाहते थे। यदि पुलिस उन साधुओं को गिरफ्तार कर लेती और संसद् भवन के दरवाजे से हटा देती तो बाद की घटनाएं नहीं होती। पहले पुलिस ने थोड़ी ढिलाई से काम लिया। मैं पुलिस की उस समय की नीयत के बारे में आक्षेप नहीं करता पर शायद पुलिस समझती थी कि परिस्थिति नहीं बिगड़ेगी। लेकिन बाद में पुलिस ने टीयर गैस चलाई और वह टीयर गैस चलाने की जरूरत नहीं थी। भीड़ उत्तेजित तब हुई जब एक टीयर गैस शैल मंच पर गिरा। टीयर गैस शैल मंच पर गिरने के कारण जो नेता थे वे मंच से नीचे उतर गये और भीड़ ने समझा कि मंच पर आग लग गई है और उनके नेताओं का जीवन खतरे में पड़ गया है। आपने भीड़ को लीडर लैस बनाया। दिल्ली की पुलिस ने मंच पर टीयर गैस चलाकर जो ५ लाख

लोग इकट्ठा हुए थे उनको नेतृत्वविहीन कर दिया। जब भीड़ नेतृत्वविहीन हो गई तो वह उन्माद में फंस गई। बाद में भीड़ ने जो कुछ किया उसका समर्थन करने के लिए कोई भी व्यक्ति तैयार नहीं होगा।

महोदया आप जानती हैं कि मैं और मेरी पार्टी हिंसात्मक आन्दोलनों के खिलाफ है। जो भी दिल्ली में हिंसा हुई हम उसकी निन्दा करना चाहते हैं। मगर मंत्री महोदय इस बात का पता लगाने का प्रयत्न करें कि मंच पर टीयर गैस शैल कैसे गिर गया? मंच पर से भीड़ नियंत्रित की जा रही थी और मंच पर से किसी ने भीड़ को उत्तेजित नहीं किया।

दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि पुलिस ने गोली चलाई और गोलियों से लोग घायल हो गये और उन घायलों को कितनी देर बाद सड़क पर से पुलिस ने उठाया? अगर दो घायल व्यक्ति मर गये तो उनकी मृत्यु के लिए पुलिस की देर भी जिम्मेदार हो सकती है। घायल व्यक्ति सड़क पर पड़े रहे उनका खून बहता रहा और चारों तरफ से भीड़ देखती रही और इससे भीड़ को उत्तेजना मिली। मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने सारे मामले की अदालती जांच करने का आदेश देने का फैसला क्यों नहीं किया है? लोग मरे, गोली चली और हिंसा की घटनाएं भी हुई और इस बात का पता लगाना चाहिये कि हिंसा की घटनाएं क्यों हुई। पुलिस ने जो कुछ किया वह ठीक था या नहीं? इस के लिए एक ही रास्ता है कि ज्यूडिशियल इन्क्वायरी की मांग मान ली जाय और सारे कांड की ठीक तरह से जांच होनी चाहिये।

मैं मंत्री महोदय की इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि जनता को धैर्य और संयम से काम लेना चाहिये। हम अपने देश में हिंसा को प्रश्रय देने की गलती नहीं कर सकते हैं। यदि हम हिंसा का सहारा लेगे तो इससे हमारी आजादी खतरे में पड़ जायेगी और हमारा लोकतंत्र भीड़तंत्र में बदल जायेगा। लेकिन हिंसा का सहारा न जनता को लेना चाहिये और न हिंसा

का सहारा पुलिस को ही लेना चाहिये। दिल्ली की पुलिस आज अपने संयम को खो बैठी और उसके कारण यह घटना हुई। मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहूँगा कि ज्यूडिशियल इन्क्वायरी की मांग को स्वीकार करें। जनता को इससे बहुत अंश में संतोष मिलेगा।

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I associate myself with the feelings expressed by the hon. Minister. I have heard with surprise the statement given by my valued and hon. colleague, Mr. Vajpayee. Mr. Vajpayee himself has said that 50 to 60 *Sadhus* came to the gates of Parliament House. He says that five lakhs of people were under the control of the leaders who were sitting on the '*manch*' including himself and some *Jagatguru*—I do not know who are these people. What happened? Why this big leadership could not control these 50 or 60 people? This scuffle between those *Sadhus* and the police continued for more than one hour and all this time the police behaved with exemplary restraint. The police had the utmost forbearance and tolerance. No one from the *manch* had the courage to come down and persuade these defenders of *Go Matha* to go back to the crowd or to the *manch* and behave properly. The police should have restraint, the police should have discipline—I agree with Mr. Vajpayee. But very humbly I shall request Mr. Vajpayee: Can he give any reason why these 50 to 60 hooligans could not be controlled by all these *Gurus* who are *Jagat Gurus* and *Viswa Guru*? And another point I tell you. The Delhi police has controlled much bigger demonstrations at the gate of the Parliament House. I shall remind my friends, Mr. Vajpayee, and also Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that bigger processions came organised by their own parties. The police had never to fire a shell of tear gas. Nothing happened. Today everyone, every eye-witness, including Pressmen, Members of Parliament, public men, says that for two hours completely,

[Shri Chandra Shekhar]

the police was resisting all the pressures of these hooligans and after two hours when the police was attacked, when everything went out of control and when Mr. Vajpayee's advices were thrown to the wind, they had to act. His own colleagues and leaders incited the people to violence and for not only surrounding the Parliament House, but they said, why do you burn these motor cars and vehicles, why do you not burn this Parliament House where the Member has not got the freedom to plead for the ban on cow-slaughter, where fiery speeches are not made about it and why the Ministers and the Members should be allowed to go out of the House, when we have not got the freedom to protect the sacred mother cow? This was said.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Nobody said that.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: And not only said that, but I want to state.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I cannot allow his statement to go unchallenged. I was there on the dais. What Swami Rameshwaranand told the audience has been correctly reported by the Minister of State. Nobody incited the mob to burn the Minister. No.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I am in possession of the House. Not only is that my information but at one stage the mike was snatched away from Mr. Vajpayee.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a fact.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: He was not allowed to be heard his own voice. So in this situation, what can the police do? The police has to maintain law and order. I charge the Home Ministry that stricter action was not taken when in the streets of Delhi, in the Capital City of this country, certain hooligans allowed themselves to hold the whole

society to ransom. And I shall request especially the hon. Shri Bhupesh Gupta—are you going to allow these democratic rights to these reactionaries who want to set a nought the whole society and the whole democratic pattern of this country? I very humbly request you friends, everything should be allowed in a democratic way but no section to the society should be allowed to take law into its own hands and try to just take undue advantage of the democratic rights that our Constitution has given to every citizen.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are very many people. Mr. Dahyabhai Patel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL, (Gujarat): We heard the statement of the hon. Minister of State for Home Affairs. One must condemn violence if it is preached or even put into practice. But I will repeat what I said a little earlier. It is the failure of the Home Ministry to take action. Everybody knew what was going to happen in this city, that a large number of people were going to come. And when there are a large number of people, the police has a grave responsibility to shoulder. I do not wish to say one word against the behaviour of the ordinary policemen; they were carrying out their duty. But the people who were in charge of guiding them did not have the vision, a sense of responsibility; they were wavering in their duty as persons who were in charge of law and order in this city and persons who had been in the Sadhu Samaj before—"Shall I do my duty as Home Minister or shall I forget my Sadhu Samaj? What shall I do?"

शंशयात्मा विनश्यति

That is what our Home Minister is. I do not mean Mr. Hathi. Everybody knows whom I mean. He has been a शंशयात्मा since the time he has been the Home Minister. Since that time the administration of this country is going lower and lower. We have no law and order in the

whole city, in the whole of India. It is going down because guidance from the top is missing. It is time that the Home Minister realised that he failed in his duty to protect this city. Such attempts have been made in this city to stage demonstrations before, violent demonstrations, by determined, violent people and also by people who outwardly abjure violence and make demonstrations. But the police must be prepared for it. Does the police not know that in this country we have got an element that is always willing to take advantage of gatherings to incite crowds so that there is trouble? It only helps them. It does not help anyone else. There are a large number of people in this country who do not believe in violence, who want peace and progress, but unfortunately, the Home Minister is advised wrongly. The Government seems to be advised wrongly by continuing him as the Home Minister. I ask the Home Minister to resign; better still I ask the Government to resign.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, the Minister of state has not made a fuller statement. He has not given all the facts.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He cannot give all the facts.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: I know, I will reserve my judgment when he makes a fuller statement tomorrow. We condemn violence.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): May I interrupt my hon. friend for a minute? Surely, my hon. friend, the Minister of State, can make a statement regarding the injuries received by the police. That is part and parcel of the whole case.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has given whatever information he has with him.

1289 RS—9.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: We condemn violence resorted to either by the crowd or by the police. We demand a judicial enquiry into the whole affair. If the police had taken proper precautions or if their intelligence had given them proper information, these things would not have happened today. Either their intelligence as in the past has failed this time or the Government was reluctant to take proper steps to see that law and order was maintained. But some things have happened. We deplore; we do want that a judicial enquiry is instituted into the happenings that have taken place today. And we hope that in future proper steps will be taken by the Government to see that such things are not repeated now and then.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, what has happened today afternoon is a very dangerous portend. Never in the past, since partition, since independence, has such a tragedy occurred in this Capital City. I consider it an extremely bad sign. I am amazed and shocked to hear the speech of Mr. Vajpayee, my friend. In the name of the people, he was trying to justify the events or he was trying to find some scapegoat. He tried to point out that the crowd was leaderless. Some crowd, I understand, came in a procession under the leadership of some *Sadhus*. How did they become leaderless? Some leaders obviously were leading the procession. Secondly, even before the procession came to the very vicinity of the Parliament House, there had been incidents and I appreciate and commend the view expressed by my friend, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, that the police perhaps showed extreme forbearance, patience and restraint. I am afraid they did not act partly for the fear that Parliament is meeting here and the issue may be taken up and the police may be criticised for rash action. It may be that feeling. But I consider there was great restraint, rather, if I may say so, an

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy]
omission on the part of the police. But I am really pained and amazed that a responsible member from the Opposition like Mr. Vajpayee is trying to shield or, may I say, soft-pedal the whole event. It is wrong. The event is very dangerous and such a development should never be permitted at all.

I appreciate one thing which the hon. Home Minister said that in future—I take it that it is his intention—any demonstration, any agitation . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is we who suffer always.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Please do not interfere with me . . . will never be permitted within a certain radius that is being prescribed of our Parliament. May I in this connection make a suggestion that in future any damage done to public property by anybody in any part of the country should be severally dealt with. May I suggest that short of capital punishment, any punishment should be permissible and I wish that seven years' or even ten years' punishment should be imposed upon all those people who do any damage to public property in future.

May I in the end draw the attention of the hon'ble Members that it is a very serious situation that this has happened in the capital city and around Parliament. This is a sort of slur, a sort of challenge and a great danger to Parliamentary democracy, and I think all the Members here should view this from this point of view, in this light. It is not only a failure of law and order, it is a great challenge to the system which we are working today and this is a challenge to be met with all boldness come what may. This Government should either rule or keep out. This should be our demand. There should be no soft-pedalling, no peaceful approach, no tolerance, no patience to tolerate this vandalism and hooliganism.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, the statement of the Minister is rather strange and a bit contradictory. He says that certain elements were preparing for violence in this demonstration for a long time. If so, the Government never came forward to warn the country or warn the leaders, and the organisers of the demonstration that such an information was at their disposal. You should do your duty. It is strange.

It is also strange—I should place this fact before. I read that in the papers—that a Congress ticket was offered to Shri Jagatguru Sankaracharya who refused it and now perhaps the Congress wanted to absorb these masses and now these clashes have taken place. So there is anguish. No word can express their anguish. Such anguish I have not seen at other times.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: May I intervene to refresh the memory of the hon'ble Member on what I said? I said I am sure all Members of this House would condemn strongly the miscreants who indulged themselves in this violence.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: This is just the point. Sri Jagatguru Sankaracharya you were trying to absorb and then you tried to absorb these masses. Obviously there is a contention between the Congress and other parties and the things have come to this pass. Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri made a speech saying that you have suddenly come forward to ban cow slaughter in order to blunt the edge of this demonstration. That is what he says. He was perhaps the last speaker there as referred to by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee as far as I understand. Now nobody stands for violence and nobody should stand for violence. But the Government should remember that certain elements are inciting and encouraging dark and obscurantist forces in this country with whom now and then the Congress tries to have joint

fronts and finds common language. That is the tragedy of this situation. I am also at one with Shri Aal Bihari Vajpayee, my colleague, in his demand for a judicial enquiry. At 1-30 this happening took place. Now it is 6-30. The Government has now come forward with a statement but there is no mention of instituting a judicial enquiry into the whole happening though the implications of this whole event are far-reaching in their consequences.

Lastly, Madam, I strongly oppose the suggestion that peaceful demonstrations before Parliament should be banned. This is a dangerous thing.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): I understand that is the position in England. While the Parliament is meeting, for two miles there are no demonstrations.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Do you follow England in all respects?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right, Mr. Niren Ghosh.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: In many.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: In many in which it favours you but in many which do not favour you, you do not follow. I say that it would be a dangerous precedent. All demonstrations have more or less been peaceful, demonstrations organised before Parliament by all parties and no cases of violence occurred so far. Suddenly it arises on this occasion. The Government and its supporters should not come forward with a general suggestion to ban peaceful demonstrations before Parliament. We would take a dangerous note of that suggestion and strongly oppose it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, as far as violence is concerned, it is quite clear we are opposed to violence whether it

comes from the police or from the public. We do not want problems to be solved by violence. But that is not the only main issue here. First of all, I should like to point out why the Government suddenly decided, without the slightest reference to the Opposition parties, that there shall not be any demonstration, even if they are peaceful, near the Parliament gate. Madam, I say this is a mentality which precludes Government from getting co-operation on matters like this from the Opposition. Now by a decree we are told that no procession should come.

About enquiry, I say, yes it should be a judicial enquiry. But something more than that is needed. Madam Deputy Chairman, I think the Government should clarify its position. Government should have anticipated that a procession of this kind, which has been instigated in many ways not merely by the organisers who brought them here but by the Home Minister himself or the Government of the country might lead to this kind of incident. I should like to know whether it is not a fact that for two years or so Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda, the Union Home Minister, styled himself as the Founder of the Sadhu Samaj, circulated documents of the Sadhu Samaj to the Members of Parliament, wanted to bring the Sadhu Samaj to fight corruption and certain other public activities. I should like to know what he thinks of that kind of thing. Who inducted sadhus into public life and not so heavenly politics of our land?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You say the Home Minister is a psychiatrist.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The association of Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda with the Sadhu Samaj in different capacities should be enquired into. If you recall you will find newspaper reports and photographs where the Home Minister was consulting with the sadhus in order to tackle the secular problems of our country.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Then, Madam Deputy Chairman, I want to know whether it is not a fact that All India Radio made certain broadcasts and so on and how is it that naked *sadhus* could carry kerosene oil without being interrupted at any stage by the policemen? That also I would like to know. I should also like to know why Mr. Nanda who had built up the Sadhu Samaj, as its inspiring guide, philosopher and friend did not appear before the intransigent *sadhus* in order to pacify them because he had perhaps better affiliations in this direction. Now it was his duty, having built up this Samaj, to go there at the critical moment . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: He did.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No. Did he go to the *sadhus*?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. He should have gone to the dais and should have told them, "Here, I am the founder of the Sadhu Samaj. You know how I have helped you. I appeal to you in the name of the people of India, do not indulge in violence". Why did not Mr. Nanda do so? I would like to know whether it is not a fact that certain steps taken by the Home Ministry in general and Mr. Nanda in particular had created the impression among the *Sadhus* that they could have a free run in New Delhi if they wanted to. Is it not a fact that a circular letter had been sent to the States from the Home Ministry, from Mr. Nanda, in which a reference had been made to article 48—Directive Principles—of the Constitution pointing out that cow slaughter is something that should be banned and it was for the States to do so, thereby giving the impression that Mr. Nanda was basically in sympathy and support of the demand which the *Sadhus* were making and in order to establish which they came with their weapons naked and with kerosene, etc? These are also matters that should form

the matter for enquiry. Therefore I say this. I do not bring in any politics at all. I would request you to direct the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House at least all those papers circulated to us by the Home Minister regarding the Sadhu Samaj, boosting it. These papers should come here.

Regarding the police, I am not sitting on judgment upon anybody at this stage. To-morrow we may be in a position to say but according to our information the tear-gas shelling was injudicious and they were thoughtlessly fired upon the dais and when such a thing happened, people do get provoked. I should like to know what steps the police officers in charge there, in command of this affair, took to have consultations with people like Mr. Vajpayee there as to how to control the situation. It is also a very important omission that the dead bodies were not removed. I know from my own experience of direct action in Calcutta in August 1946 that when dead bodies were left, then it gave cause to provocation and it is also likely that the bleeding bodies might have caused provocation. As far as these people are concerned, we are told that some *Sadhus*—they may be naked or wearing something—came near the gate. We are told that they were wrestling. Do I understand that physically the police force is weaker than the *Sadhus*? They have to give proper explanation as to why it was not possible to deal with that particular explosive situation and cordon off these people and then make proper appeals and so on. All these things are to be gone into. I therefore suggest a judicial enquiry, into the incidents including the police firing and and so on, a political probe by a Commission of both the Houses of Parliament into the circumstances, and the background in which the anti-cow slaughter movement got sustenance and encouragement, inspiration, from the Home Ministry and to what extent the behaviour of the Home Ministry and the Home Minis-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]
 ter had contributed to the incitement of the *Sadhus* who appeared on the scene of the Parliament. It should not be merely a Judicial Enquiry. The Home Minister to-day is in the dock because of his very close association. I cannot detain him without trial; otherwise I would have suggested it.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR (Punjab): We are extremely sorry for what has happened. It is really shameful as to what has happened in Delhi to-day but I was surprised to hear the statement made by the Leader of the Jan Sangh, Shri Vajpayee, and I challenge his statement. He said that the crowd was under control till 1.30 and I beg to state that it was absolutely incorrect because looters and all sorts of people had resorted to violence already at 11.30 or round about 12. I will tell you. The Super Market was raided this morning at 12 and there were *Sadhus*, loafers and goondas going round. If, as the Jan Sangh leader said, the situation was under control, it should not be believed because it was not under control. It is probably all right, you know, for a Party to organise this kind of meeting or

procession but the public people cannot be absolved of their responsibilities because they should see that if it is meant to be a peaceful procession, it should have been so but as I have told you, I challenge the statement because it was not at all under control and he has tried to shift the blame on to the police because they tear-gassed. It is not correct because he says it is because of that that the crowd had become rowdy and resorted to violence. They had resorted to violence very much earlier.

Secondly, as he himself has admitted, Swami Rameshwaranand had made the statement that he had told a few people to come to the Parliament House and to enter Parliament House forcibly. They themselves incited the mob to resort to violence. That is why I beg to challenge his statement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have had enough. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrows.

The House then adjourned at thirty-seven minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 8th November, 1966.