

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): He must have known the information. Is the Home Minister coming?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is coming.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let us have a look at the new Home Minister.

SHRI P. S. NASKAR: You have already had a look at him, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Old furniture in a new place.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani.

MOTION RE STATEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH DEMONSTRATION NEAR PARLIAMENT HOUSE ON NOVEMBER 7, 1966.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh Madam Deputy Chairman, I beg to move the following motion:—

"That the statement in connection with the demonstration near Parliament House on November 7, 1966, made in the Rajya Sabha on the 10th November, 1966, be taken into consideration."

Members of the House are aware that the demonstration which took place opposite Parliament House on the 7th November has shaken the confidence of the people in the effectiveness of parliamentary institutions. These demonstrations have received very unfavourable publicity abroad and one of my friends informs me that he was rung up by a number of persons in the United Kingdom who asked him whether Parliament House had been occupied by the demonstrators. A number of people in the United States also feel that perhaps the kind of democracy that has been brought into existence in India during the time of Jawaharlal Nehru may not survive. It is quite clear that India has passed

from the stage of parliamentary discussion to the era of *morchas* and demonstrations. On another occasion, when the students' disturbances were being discussed in this House, I thought Parliament was ceasing to be an effective forum for the discussion of national questions. Now, the discussion of national questions has been taken on to the streets and demonstrations, people find, are far more effective than cut 'notions and amendment' moved on the floor of Parliament. This is an unfortunate feature because it was our pride that we, in Asia, have tried to work out successfully a parliamentary institution. I may recall in this connection that Lord Morely as far back as 1907 had expressed the view that he did not think that the British type of parliamentary democracy could be rooted in the Indian soil. And Mr. Churchill throughout his life held the view that it was not possible to work out a parliamentary institution in our country.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): That was the view of those who did not want to give freedom to India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Now that you have got freedom, you kill it.

SHRI A. D. MANI: When the Independence Act was passed by the British House of Commons, Mr. Churchill prophesied that in about twenty years' time there would be a complete break down in India and that there would be rioting and slaughtering all round. We did not expect that we would give justification for this most dire prophesy. I may agree with all that Mr. Churchill had said, for these events have shown that unless a strong Government comes into existence in India, which is capable of commanding not only the loyalty but also the confidence of the people, it may not be possible for us to meet here under the present Constitution. The question arises, who is responsible for the steadily deteriorating law and order situation in India, I do not want to cast any

reflections on the present leaders of the Government. Mrs. Indira Gandhi is bearing manfully, if I may use that word in connection with her, the responsibilities of administration, but somehow the country has come to feel that there is no effective leadership in the country. I am glad that the Prime Minister has come at this stage of the debate. Unfortunately, during the last few months the centre has been weekend and we have seen a drift of power from the Centre to the various States. We have seen also a repetition of an old episode in Indian history

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: To the various syndicates also.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Syndicates also. We have also seen a repetition of an old episode in Indian history during the Moghul rule when the Moghul empire cracked in India and the provincial satraps carried on the administration in the name of the Moghul ruler. I would like Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, to take note of these very serious developments in connection with the evolution of parliamentary democracy in our country. It has also been felt that in many important matters the Government is not able to offer effective leadership. I may mention here that on the question of devaluation not one Minister of the Central Government, so far as I know, has addressed public meetings in any part of the country. Now, what happens in Britain. If there is a wage-freeze or if there is a price-cut, the Prime Minister goes to the constituencies and defends the Government's decision.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Madam, is the hon. Member speaking on some motion put in his name or is he giving a general lecture on parliamentary democracy?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is advancing on to the motion.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am only mentioning it as a prelude to what happened on the 7th of November.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have twenty minutes.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I want to speak for five minutes more. If I had known it I would have cut all this introduction. The Mover of the Motion has got half an hour to put forward his point of view. I do not want to claim my constitutional right under the rules, but then I would like you to permit me to speak as much as I can within twentyfive minutes. There had also recently been the reported resignation of Mr. Sachin Chaudhuri and the resignation of Mr. Manubhai Shah, which were immediately withdrawn and at one stage we were wondering whether Mr. Nanda was going to continue as a Minister. All these uncertainties show that there is no effectiveness in their policies.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do all these things refer to your motion?

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to go on developing this point. On the question of cow slaughter, the Government does not know its own mind.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: It does.

SHRI A. D. MANI: For example, the Union Ministry of Food had issued instructions to the States not to enforce the ban on cow slaughter. Some years back, in pursuance of a decision of the Supreme Court in a certain case, where the cow slaughter banned by Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh was challenged by the butchers, the Supreme Court held at that time a total ban on the slaughter of the buffaloes, bullocks and cows which were not capable of yielding milk or worth as breeds or work as draught animals was unconstitutional and unreasonable. The Food Ministry also set up a Committee in 1954 which recommended that a complete ban on cow slaughter would tend to increase the number of cattle and jeopardies the well-being of our limited number of cattle capable of yielding milk. The Committee felt that an increase in the number of such

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

cattle would lead to a diminution of food crops. The Committee also said that a total ban would not be in the best interests of the country. I am a vegetarian. I have tried to be a non-vegetarian and I have failed. I do not believe in the killing of any animal, but if the Government want a total ban to be put on cow slaughter, they must follow a consistent policy. This has been the policy laid down by the Food Ministry. It has also been favourably commented upon by a Ford Foundation Team. In spite of the clear, past indications of the Food Ministry, that a total ban was not necessary, the Home Ministry issued a circular ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is due to the bovine intelligence of the Minister.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Because of the elections, not because of bovine intelligence. They issued a fresh circular to various States saying that a total ban on cow slaughter should be brought about and the Home Ministry, I understand, is already contemplating the introduction of a Bill to ban cow slaughter in the territorial limits of the Union Territories. *(Interruption)*—There is a ruling by the Supreme Court, it cannot be set aside. Madam, all these show that the Government does not know its own mind on many matters including the very important question of cow slaughter. When this is the state of mind of the Union Government on a very vital question on which they have issued instructions to the various State Governments—and there has been an announcement which was made by Mr. Nanda in the other House the other day—the question arises who is responsible for these demonstrations. I have been trying to read the various journals which have commented on the demonstrations and given information on the subject. The "Link" magazine, for example, claims that R. S. S. volunteers and Jan Sangh workers were found in the demonstrations, and I understand from Mr. Vajpayee, who produced before me a

pamphlet, that this was organised by a Sangh for protection of Cows. Whatever it is, I would like to say this, with great respect to Mr. Vajpayee for whom I have got very high regard, that the persons who took part in these demonstrations did a disservice to this country. They should have understood that a serious situation would develop if on an issue, which is capable of arousing religious sentiment, a big demonstration was taken to Parliament House. Unfortunately the persons, either the R. S. S. or the Jan Sangh, who had taken part in these demonstrations in an individual capacity, have not served the country well. I know the R. S. S. leader, Shri Gol-walkar, for the past thirty years as a resident of Nagpur. I have known him¹ for a long time, and whenever the R. S. S. or the Jan Sangh has organised demonstrations of its own, there has been no disturbance, but they should not have got themselves mixed up in those rowdy demonstrations that took place near Parliament House.

Madam, I would like to say further that the Home Minister has tried to blame the services for their inability to handle the situation in a way which would commend itself to the approbation of Parliament. Madam, I would like to say here that since 1900 not even in the days of the British has the British Government tried to hold any civil servant responsible for any action taken by Government. I do not remember one case in the old Central Legislative Assembly when the Home Member stood up and said "I was not responsible for it, my Secretary was responsible."

AN HON. MEMBER: He had charged the Prime Minister.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to remind you here that Mr. Herbert Morrison in his book "Government and Parliament" mentions his own view about this matter, which applies more or less to Mr. Nanda. He says;

"Indeed it is my experience that if the Minister in-charge knows

what he wants and is intelligent in going about it, he ^c & ⁿ command the support of his civil servants. The kind of Minister who is most tiring to the officers of a department is the Minister who does not know his own mind and cannot make it up. If the policy of a department is heavy and vacillating ineffective, it is after all the responsibility of the Minister and it is quite as likely to be his fault as that of his civil servants."

Madam, Mr. Nanda is a man of character but he is also known to be a very weak man, and a weak man with character can be worse than a wicked man without conscience.

SHRI SYED AHMAD (Madhya Pradesh): You say that after Mr. Nanda has gone away. You never said any such thing about Mr. Nanda while he was in power.

SHRI A. D. MANI: We never had a demonstration of that kind last year.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Ministers make sensible statements after their resignation; so does Mr. Mani's speech also.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would also like to say that Mr. Nanda says in his letter to the Prime Minister that some circular which he wanted from the officials of the Home Minister were supplied to him only on that day. Mr. Morrison again says:

"Occasionally however something may go wrong or the Minister may be badly served. If a ^{mis-}take is made in a government department, the Minister is responsible even if he knew nothing about it until, for example, a letter of complaint is received from an M. P. or there is criticism in the press or a question is put down ^{or} ^{answered} ⁱⁿ the House. Even if he has no personal responsibility whatever the Minister is held responsible. He will no doubt criticise whoever is

responsible in the department in mild terms if it is a small mistake and in strong terms if it is a bad one, but publicly he much accept responsibility as if the act were his own."

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Whom the hon. Member is quoting?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Mr. Herbert Morrison.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Are we still in the British Empire?

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is patterned on the British system of Parliament. Mr. Nanda says that he wanted the political side of the Home Ministry to be changed. I do not know what political side he means. Does he mean the C. B. I., the Vigilance?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There are syndicate groups. He means, "I do not have a proper group."

SHRI A. D. MANI: Why are you speaking for Mr. Nanda? He can speak for himself.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Do you accept his interpretation?

SHRI A. D. MANI: No. What is the political side? The Home Ministry has got the powers of surveillance of political parties and political leaders.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Don't we know" that?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Very often these powers are misused. The time has come for the Prime Minister to consider whether the post of Home Minister should be held by a fanatical party man. In the office of Home Minister a certain judicial attitude is wanted, particularly when Mr. Nanda says he wanted the political side of the Home Ministry to be changed or altered. It means that he was finding that the powers he had in respect of surveillance were not adequate.

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

Madam, I am¹ very sorry that Mr. Nanda has not accepted responsibility for these events, and I would like to mention here that not only Mr. Nanda but the entire Government is responsible for what happened. On the 7th of November, Madam, it has been said that the police force and their officials concerned with the handling of the disturbances were ineffective. I am afraid that in regard to this matter the Home Ministry as well as the Delhi Administration were not careful about taking adequate precautions against the disturbances. The Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Jha, said as a post-mortem report that in view of past experience of the Communist Party in Hariyana demonstrations and the assurance given by the organisers of the anti-cow slaughter demonstration he did not expect violence on such a scale. He expected violence but not on such a scale. Were precautions taken even in regard to controlling violence on a small scale? On that day I was one of the two who went with Shrimati Sha-kuntala Paraniyye outside. We had our share of the teargas and all the time I was asking her when she came to see me whether she was weeping. She said she had teargas, and I went out to see what the sample of teargas in Delhi was. The teargas could come right up to the gates of Rajya Sabha—Even in regard to police precautions on that day persons with explosives, with bottles of sulphuric acid entered the All India Radio office. They were allowed to do so. The Government should have taken steps to see that the vital installations are safeguarded on that day. The radio station is more or less the mouth-piece of Indian democracy. Whenever dictators have attempted any coup, they have always tried to seize the radio station first. No adequate precautions were taken. The houses of many persons were subjected to vandalism. A leader like Mr. Kamaraj Nadar was asked to get out and people were shouting, "Where is Mr. Raghu Ramaiah?" It is not that Mr. Raghu Ramaiah had anything to

do with the disturbances or with cow-slaughter or with the ban on cow-slaughter. They wanted the Ministers to get out and face the public. I am afraid whatever Mr. Jha might say, the precautions taken on that day were totally inadequate. It has also been said by Mr. L. P. Singh, again after another post-mortem report, that the Home Ministry had expected the disturbances and taken precaution to deal with the situation. He claimed that the disturbances were controlled within one hour. Were they controlled within one hour? There was a complete breakdown and paralysis of law and order . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Impeach this man.

SHRI A. D. MANI: There is one warning which I want to utter here. This demonstration . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chavan, kindly note it . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is a very bad portent . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: because we are told that he is your favourite, I hope he is not.

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is a very bad portent because if these demonstrations are allowed to continue, a day may come and I mentioned it in another connection—when the Ministers will be pulled out of their houses, when people will invade the precincts of Parliament House. In our effort to put down these disturbances . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): He is giving suggestions to those people.

SHRI A. D. MANI: We should also be quite anxious to maintain civil liberty in the country. The right of demonstration is a democratic right of a free nation. We should not, in our frenzy to see that law and order is maintained, create circumstances which will lead to the emergence of a Police State because a Police State will be a complete negation of all that we have stood for

SHRI A. D. MANI: Two miles radius. Mr. Patil said that a circular was issued some years ago. Mr. Nanda was trying to get a copy of it but he could not get a copy. I would like to say this that New Delhi houses the missions and residential houses of various foreign embassies. Parliament House is in New Delhi. There should be a right of demonstration. But I would not like the right of demonstration being exercised during Parliament sessions in Delhi. It is quite necessary that in New Delhi . . . (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY
(Mysore): It is only to rouse

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would also like to say that in regard to public demonstrations, the Ministry concerned or the officials concerned should ask from those who organise these demonstrations for some kind of a satisfactory assurance that there would be no violence. We have got a right to ask . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: If necessary, a public law should be passed for this purpose to see that some kind of assurance is given and that the responsibility is fixed on those persons who take part in the demonstrations.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yesterday, Mr. Chavan victimised.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr Chavan, you have done it.

SHRI A. D. MANI: He said that he tried to ring up Dr. Zakir Husain, our Vice-President, and inform him that he had been arrested. He said that he had been arrested, that he had done no offence, and because he was sympathising with the student leaders and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was with him at that time talking to him

SHRI A. D. MANI; He was done the singular favour of not being arrested with Mr. Rajnarain, despite the extreme leftism of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Mr. Rajnarain was arrested.

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

Madam, these demonstrations should not be used as a pretext for curbing the activities of opposition political parties . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yesterday it was done.

SHRI A. D. MANI: The elections are coming and it is necessary that all the political parties must have an adequate opportunity of putting forward their points of view before the electorate and I do hope that as a result of these changes which had taken place, a stronger Government will emerge in Delhi. I would like to remind Mr. Chavan . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But it must be democratic.

SHRI A. D. MANI: We have got the vivid memories of the past of the British rule. In Bombay there was always one slogan before the British rulers at that time: "Govern or get out". And I would like to repeat it here to this independent Government—the time has come for them to save parliamentary democracy. You govern or get out.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI (Haryana): Madam, I move:

1. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government should forthwith—

(i) institute a judicial inquiry by a Supreme Court Judge into the incidents of November 7, 1966;

(ii) impose ban on cow-slaughter, and to meet the consequent economic losses, nationalise all religious funds and levy a suitable tax on cows;

(iii) pay full compensation to affected persons and organisations?"

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I move:

2. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added,

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that immediate steps must be taken to institute a judicial enquiry into the incidents of November 7, 1966, with a view to determine—

(i) whether the incidents of arson and violence were the result of sporadic mob fury or whether they were pre-planned;

(ii) whether there was any failure on the part of the law and order machinery either to take adequate precautions in advance or to deal with the situation after the incidents started;

(iii) whether there was adequate co-ordination between the Home Ministry and the Delhi Administration in the handling of these events;

(iv) whether on the apprehension of the trouble all due steps were taken to declare the assembly as illegal and allow the gathering an opportunity of dispersing peacefully before tear gas shells were thrown on the rostrum and microphone communications disrupted;

(v) whether the amount of force used by Police was justified;

(vi) whether the actual number of casualties corresponds with the number officially given out;

(vii) whether all necessary steps were taken to inform the relatives of those killed in the firing in regard to their death and whether there was any surreptitious disposal of dead bodies."

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab):
Madam, I move:

3. "That at the end of the Motion,
the following be added, namely: —

'and having considered the same, this
House is of opinion that during the time
of the holding of a Parliament session,
no public procession or demonstration
should be permitted to be held within a
two-mile radius of Parliament House."

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala):
Madam, I move:

4. "That at the end of the Motion
the following the added, namely: —

'and having considered the same this
House is of opinion that steps should be
taken to hold a comprehensive public
enquiry into all matters connected with
the anti-cow-slaughter demonstration of
November 7, 1966 and the happenings
thereafter'."

The question were proposed.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:
Madam, I have also tabled an amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Before you
start, are we going to have Mr. Chavan's
statement with regard to the students'
demonstration or after this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your
amendment has come too late. It is not even

(Interruptions)

Now, I call upon Mr. Govinda Reddy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When are we
going to have Mr. Chavan's statement on the
students' march—now or after. Well, after
this discussion, today at the end, can we have
it? You kindly ask Mr. Chavan.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): They had given a
Calling Attention Notice.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has not
been . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We
have given notice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chavan
can certainly do that in view of the fact that
people have been arrested including
Members of Parliament.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am
informed that you have given it, it has just
been received and it is in the process of . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the morning
I have given it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has not
yet been admitted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There it was
admitted, in the Lok Sabha . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : On
a point of order. The Chair considers the
matters to be of vital importance. And, if the
Minister has already made a statement, may
be in reply to a Calling Attention Notice, it is
for the Chair here to decide whether the
statement should be made or not. It is not for
the Minister. If you ask for the statement to be
made here, he has to make it. And once it has
been made in the other House, what objection
is there for him in making the same statement
here even if there is no Calling Attention
Notice admitted?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Home
Minister has stated that there was a Calling
Attention Notice in the other House. I do not
know what the substance of that Calling,
Attention Notice was to which he has made a
reply in the other House. I do not know what
the substance of the Calling Attention notice,
which was given this morning, is . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
Similar.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: . . . Until I see it and I know I cannot give my decision on it. Therefore, this debate will continue. Mr. Govinda Reddy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have given it this morning.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me look into it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: An hon'ble Member of this House has been arrested.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI: On a point of order, Madam.

جب میسٹر راج نرائن جی نے یہ سوال اٹھایا تھا جب انہوں نے اسٹوڈنٹس والا سوال اٹھایا تھا اس وقت چور میں صاحب نے یہ یقین دلائیہ تھا کہ جب ۷- نومبر کی سچویشن پر بحث ہوگی تو اس میں اسٹوڈنٹس کا بھی معاملہ آئے گا۔ اس لئے میں نہیں سمجھ سکا کہ اس میں یہ کیوں نہیں آ سکا۔ چور میں صاحب کا کہا ہوا کیا غلط تھا؟

†[جب میسٹر راجنارایون جی نے یہ سوال اٹھایا تھا جب انہوں نے اسٹوڈنٹس والا سوال اٹھایا تھا اس وقت چور میں صاحب نے یہ یقین دلائیہ تھا کہ جب 7 نومبر کی سچویشن پر بحث ہوگی تو اس میں اسٹوڈنٹس کا بھی معاملہ آئے گا۔ اس لئے میں نہیں سمجھ سکا کہ اس میں یہ کیوں نہیں آ سکا۔ چور میں صاحب کا کہا ہوا کیا غلط تھا؟]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: About statement.

شری عبدالغنی : اس پر تو راج نرائن کو پکڑ لیا - تو پھر اسٹوڈنٹس اس سلسلہ میں کیوں نہیں ہو سکتا -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : इस पर तो श्री राजनारायण को पकड़ लिया। तो फिर स्टूडेंट इस सिलसिले में क्यों नहीं हो सकता ?]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We fr not want to disturb you by speeches. We gave the Calling Attention notice in the morning. You said you have received it but you have not gone through it. I do not want to quarrel over that. But the issue, Madam, has been discussed in the other House and it has been raised here also. An hon'ble Member of this House has been arrested and the Home Minister can see the wisdom of agreeing to a discussion in this House. Madam, you may say . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In th meanwhile let Mr. Govinda Reddy speak.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, the events on the 7th November were most regrettable and cannot be considered in isolation. They have to be viewed, Madam, in relation to the incidents of the kind, of all magnitudes that are happening in recent times in several States—why in several States, in almost every State. Considered in the context to these events, the events, of the 7th have a great significance. Madam, people who consider they have some grievances, whether real or imaginary instead of resorting to proper channels of expression of their grievances to get a redress take to lawlessness, destroy property and cause loss of life. Even in cases where the grievances are small, hunger strikes are resorted to. Where the grievances are against the State Government, the property of the Government of India is destroyed.

Where people want to assert their rights, they forget that it is wrong on their part to violate the rights of others causing trains to be held up, passengers to be held up for days together on the way. All sorts of things are happening. These, I think, are an eye-opener, and they have to be viewed very seriously by the Central Government as well as the State Governments. If things of this kind are allowed to happen, where nobody can have a sense of security, where nobody's property can be protected, where Government property cannot be protected, where the people who hold office of Ministership are not safe, where respectable people of the country are not safe . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Where the Congress President is not safe.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: . . . if such things are allowed to continue our democracy can as well be a failure.

I do not agree with Mr. Mani in his agreement with Churchill's statement that democracy in India would mean slaughter of persons everywhere.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I do not agree with him. I only quoted him

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Mani! Psychologically even now he is in the British Empire.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I am glad you do not agree with Churchill. Although I do not agree with Churchill's view, democracy is facing a challenge and I think we have to face that challenge and, therefore, before I go to make my remarks on the events of the 7th, I only suggest to the Government that the Home Minister should now convene a conference of Home Ministers and try to evolve a policy which will apply to all the States in the matter of demonstrations and disturbances. If a meeting of Chief Ministers is not possible to be called early, let their attention be

drawn to it. I also suggest that a Governors' conference be called and they be asked to look after this situation.

Madam, the events of the 7th have revealed that there is some thing wrong, very seriously wrong. I am not one with the view that the demonstrations of the kind we have seen, not once in Delhi but many times, are the proper means at all to redress grievances. They are not even the legitimate channels of expressing a public grievance. When we allow lakhs and lakhs of people to be brought into the capital city for purposes of demonstrations and still expect this huge conglomeration of people of different views, of different creeds, of different character to meet in the capital and yet expect the procession to be peaceful, it is something which goes against the grain of common sense. I had this apprehension when we had a procession of this magnitude, I think, in relation to the Jains' grievances. It was one of the hugest processions I have seen which commenced from near the Red Fort and ended somewhere near the Prime Minister's House, a huge procession which had on the way all the equipment of feedings, water, food, everything for the processionists. I think a Government is not fit to govern if it does not sense danger in allowing such a situation to develop. Similarly on the 7th when hundreds of buses brought in lakhs of people into the capital, it should have been foreseen that there would be chances of the breaking out of violence.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL; who paid for them?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Innocent people have paid with their lives And, Madam, * Minister is the casualty. Therefore, I say that there is something very seriously wrong. Therefore, the Government must very seriously consider whether they should, as a matter of policy, allow

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] such demonstrations to take place at all. I agree with Mr. Mani most sincerely that demonstrations before Parliament House are not called for . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So that you can be very comfortable.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: . . . because Parliamentarians are devoted to legislative business and they should not be disturbed by events which are happening outside the precincts of the Parliament House. Whatever the justice of the case of those who want to seek redress of their grievance, still they have no right to disturb the Legislature, either of the States or of the Centre. Therefore, I think no demonstration should be allowed in front of the Parliament House or near the Parliament House. I am glad that they have taken a decision—I hope the information is correct—that demonstrations within a radius of two miles of the Parliament House will be banned.

I am also glad, Madam, that the Prime Minister has taken this situation into consideration and circulated to the Chief Ministers about the law and order position in each State. The Government have to stiffen their attitude; otherwise the Government has no business to rule, as Mr. Mani said. There can be other ways open for the expression of grievances but they must take a decent way and not violate the rights of others and endanger the life and property of others.

With regard to the events on the 7th, as I was saying, when a huge conglomeration was allowed together near the Parliament House there was outbreak of violence. The first signs of violence were somewhere near 10 or 10-30. Madam, these disturbances have been attributed to one party. But I do not think that these disturbances* could be attributed to any single party or any single political party.

The students were on one side and the hooligans joined the procession

on the other. Whatever may be position, the outbreak of violence was to have been expected. It is learnt that the people who dispersed after the first lathi charge or firing went aside into the lanes and began to set fire to the cars, lorries, vehicles and also houses. Rags, oil, petrol, etc. do not appear out of magic. They must have been carried by them along with them. I would like to know what the police were doing when they started miles ahead of the procession, when people were carrying bottles, rags, etc. which were of an incendiary character. Why was it not detected and what were the police doing? So there is something very seriously wrong. When one peruses through Mr. Nanda's statement and considers these incidents that have happened, unfortunately there seems to have been a divergence of opinion or a difference in approach or in the steps taken by the Police Administration and the Home Minister. The Home Minister may have advised properly and the Police Administration may not have followed him but it cannot be expected that a Minister himself should go and look into the details of execution of the orders. He can only give direction and he can only insist on a certain thing to be followed but the Police Administration which naturally had to deploy thousands of constables from outside, did deploy them at various points but everybody failed to report to the head of the Administration as to the people carrying incendiary things. What were the intelligence doing? I am not of those who believe that our intelligence is very weak. In fact not only in our home affairs, but in our external affairs, also our intelligence is weak as several things have come to light but this is not the proper place but our intelligence is weak. Here it is demonstrably proved that on the 7th they had no place at all. That lakhs of people gathered and at least hundreds of them must have been carrying incendiary articles like bottle, rags, etc. and that it should not have come to the notice of the

police is something which * surpasses my comprehension.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The Central Intelligence was not with Nandaji

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I am not blaming Nandaji. A Minister cannot be expected to look into the details of the arrangements. It is primarily the duty of the Administration itself.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The Head of the Police Department.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Administration means Head of the Department. In fact the interruption of my friend brings to my mind another idea and that is we may have to view the organisation of the Police in Delhi very seriously. A Bill has been passed in this House and I think it is a proper step that the Government have taken. What has come to my personal knowledge is that the union which was supposed to have been formed already in Delhi has taken hold forcibly of the premises and they are meeting there every day and the policemen are meeting, thousands of them, in parks at nights and this thing is going on openly and I am also told that they have some persons marked on their list. When so much is going on right under the nose of the Central Government, in the Capital, that the Intelligence should not be aware of it—that a man who was said to have been here for 11½ years, who was a Pakistani spy, who was a Chinese spy, a barrister who was supposed to have collected lakhs of rupees and was not detected till 11½ months back, that the Pakistan broadcast announced something of the serious disturbances going on in the Police here and then the Central Vigilance or whoever is responsible now traced this man and I am told that he is no longer here and that he has been deported—that all this should not have come to the notice of the Police Administration is something which is really disconcerting—1297 RS—5.

ing. All these things have to be considered. The Police Department of the Delhi Administration is to be set right. There should be no cleavage between the bureaucracy and the Ministry. Whoever is the Minister must have full powers to do what he likes in his portfolio, provided he is acting within the rules and unless he does so . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: That power he did not have.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: From his letter it looks as though there were some difficulties in his way but in regard to what difficulties there are and what is the truth of it, we have to believe Mr. Nanda. We know him to have been a very sincere person, devoted person. What arose or caused these difficulties in the administration and the differences of opinion between his Secretary and himself, about that I am not a judge and I cannot express any opinion on that. But the very fact that there were differences prevailing is not desirable for the Government. The Delhi Police Administration has to be set right and we have to strengthen the police also. Several friends have now complained of the hardship of the police. I am one of those who believe that the police are working under very strenuous conditions. That these hardships must be mitigated—in that, I do not yield to anyone as also in the demand for monetary enhancement and for providing other facilities to the policemen. When a Foreign Minister or a V.I.P. comes, these policemen are lined ahead hours before the V.I.P. comes and they stand in the hot sun but there is no arrangement for even supplying water and I have myself supplied water to these men. Such very simple things which may ameliorate the condition of the police can be looked into but the Police Administration in Delhi should be set right. The Intelligence of our Government should be strengthened. The Vigilance Department should be strengthened and the Home Minister, whoever he is, should have full powers in regard to his Ministry.

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

The overall situation that is developing in the country should be taken into consideration and a policy should be evolved applicable to the whole country with regard to allowing demonstrations of the kind that we have unfortunately witnessed.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, 7 नवम्बर की घटनाओं के बारे में श्री जयमुखलाल हाथी ने 10 नवम्बर को जो वक्तव्य दिया था और जिस वक्तव्य पर हम आज विचार कर रहे हैं, उसमें यह कहा गया था कि पुलिस की गोली से 8 आदमी मारे गये और 41 घायल हो गये। उन्होंने मरने वालों में से 5 के नाम सदन में बताये थे। श्री राम रखा, स्वामी अजुयानन्द, श्री एस० के० जैन, श्री जगन नाथ और कांस्टेबल श्री जय प्रकाश। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि उन्होंने मरने वालों में जोधपुर के श्री झूमरमल आसोपा का नाम क्यों नहीं बताया? उन्होंने कहा, तीन व्यक्ति पहिचाने नहीं जा सके। क्या मंत्री महोदय को मालूम है कि श्री झूमरमल आसोपा के पुत्र साढ़े दस बजे रात विलिंगडन हास्पिटल में गये, उन्होंने वहां अपने पिता की लाश देखी, उस लाश के साथ वहां सोलह लाशें और भी थीं। उस एक लाश में से, श्री झूमरमल की लाश में से, उनका आइडेंटिटी कार्ड निकला। वे रेलवे के रिटायर्ड आफिसर थे, उस आइडेंटिटी कार्ड में उनका नाम और जोधपुर लिखा हुआ था। वह आइडेंटिटी कार्ड, उनका चश्मा, उनका मन बैग, डाक्टर के पास ले गये हैं। उनके बेटे ने जाकर कहा कि हमने पिता की लाश पहिचान ली है, वह लाश हमें वापस कर दी जाय। डाक्टर ने कहा, कल सबरे आना, लाश मिल जायेगी। जब वे सबरे गये तो उनसे कहा गया यहां कोई लाश नहीं है। उन्होंने श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को एक पत्र लिखा है और मेरे पास विलिंगडन हास्पिटल के डाक्टर की लिखी

हुई चिट की फोटोस्टेट कापी मौजूद है। जब दूसरे दिन सबरे वह डाक्टर के पास गये और बताया कि आपने कहा कि सबरे आना लाश लेने के लिये तो डाक्टर ने उन्हें 'सिस्टर' के पास भेजा है। डाक्टर ने लिखा है सिस्टर को : "Sister, please tell this gentleman who has taken the body of Mr. Jumarmal." वह विलिंगडन हास्पिटल के डाक्टर का लिखा हुआ है। विलिंगडन हास्पिटल के रजिस्टर में मरने वालों के सत्रह नाम हैं जिनकी लाशें विलिंगडन हास्पिटल में थीं। वे सत्रह लोग थे जिसमें एक श्री झूमरमल आसोपा भी थे। वे सत्रह लाशें कहां गईं? श्री झूमरमल, आसोपा की लाश कहां गई। उस लाश को घर वालों को क्यों नहीं दिया गया? अगर मरने वाले 8 थे तो वे विलिंगडन हास्पिटल में सत्रह लाशें कहां से आईं? इसका जवाब कौन देगा? क्या लोकतंत्र में, क्या स्वराज्य में मरनेवालों की लाशों तक का पता नहीं दिया जायेगा? क्या रात के अंधेरे में और बिजली के मरवटखाने में लाशों को जला दिया जायेगा? मैं गृह मंत्री श्री चव्हाण से कहना चाहता हूं कि यह लाशों का मामला बहुत गम्भीर मामला है। इसको आप 7 तारीख के प्रदर्शन से जोड़कर मत देखिये। अगर 7 तारीख के प्रदर्शन के लिए हम जिम्मेदार हैं, अगर हमसे कोई गलती हुई है, तो हम अपने पाप का प्रायश्चित्त करने के लिए तैयार हैं। मगर जो मर गया, वह किसी का बाप था, जो मर गया वह किसी का पति था, किसी का पिता था या किसी का पुत्र था। उसकी लाश को आपने उसके घरवालों को नहीं दिया। इतना ही नहीं, आपने इस सदन को अंधेरे में रखा और देश को अंधेरे में रखा। मैं उस आदमी को पेश करने के लिए तैयार हूं और मैं गृह मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि विलिंगडन अस्पताल के रजिस्टर पर कब्जा करिये। उसमें मरनेवालों के 17 नाम लिखे हैं। फिर हाथी जी ने कैसे कहा कि 8 लोग मरे?

फिर हाथी जी ने क्यों कहा कि श्री झूमरमल आसोपा नहीं मरे ? इस तरह की जानकारी उन्हें किसने दी ?

महोदया, यह कहा जाता है कि उस दिन का प्रदर्शन भारतीय जनसंघ ने, राष्ट्रीय स्वयंसेवक संघ ने आयोजित किया था। काश, उस दिन का प्रदर्शन हमने आयोजित किया होता। राजधानी में हम इससे पहले भी प्रदर्शन कर चुके हैं और उन प्रदर्शनों में कोई घटना नहीं घटी। यदि यह प्रदर्शन हम करते तो 7 नवम्बर की दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण घटना न होने पाती। दुःख यह है कि प्रदर्शन हमारा नहीं था, मगर हम लोगों को बदनाम करने की कोशिश की जा रही है।

महोदया, प्रदर्शन का आयोजन सर्वदलीय गौ-रक्षा महाभिमान समिति ने किया था।

श्री महाबोर प्रसाद भातंव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उसमें आपके लोग थे।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : भारतीय जनसंघ उस समिति में शामिल नहीं है और उस समिति में कोई भी राजनीतिक दल शामिल नहीं है। हां, मेरे लोग शामिल थे और मेरे लोगों को पूरी छूट है उसमें शामिल होने की, मगर यह कहना गलत है कि प्रदर्शन हमने आयोजित किया। क्या आप जानते हैं कि गोरक्षा महा अभिमान समिति के अध्यक्ष श्री प्रभुदत्त ब्रह्मचारी जी हैं ? क्या आप जानते हैं कि नामधारी सिखों के सद्गुरु उसके उपाध्यक्ष हैं और श्री हनुमान प्रसाद पोंहार उसके कोषाध्यक्ष हैं ? उसमें जन समाज, आर्य समाज शामिल है, सनातन धर्म शामिल है, सिख सम्प्रदाय शामिल है और जलूस में मुसलमानों का भी एक जत्था आया था जिसके नेता मास्टर नुरुद्दीन थे और जिन्हें पुलिस ने हवालात में बंद कर दिया है।

महोदया, प्रश्न यह है कि क्या दिल्ली की पुलिस ने आवश्यक अहतिदायी कार्यवाही

की ? जो प्रदर्शन के संगठनकर्त्ता थे, उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया था कि प्रदर्शन में किसी प्रकार की गड़बड़ नहीं होगी और वे आश्वासन को अमल में लाना चाहते थे। लेकिन पुलिस की जिम्मेदारी थी कि दिल्ली के गुन्डों को पकड़ती। जब हमारा, जनसंघ का कच्छ के अवसर पर प्रदर्शन हुआ था, तो 400-450 के करीब गुन्डे गिरफ्तार किये गये थे। गृह मंत्री महोदय पता लगायें कि इस बार कितने गुन्डे गिरफ्तार किये गये ? दूसरा इस बात का भी पता लगायें के संसद् भवन के सामने पहुंचने से पहले, जो बायीं तरफ संसद् भवन के बैरकों बनी हुई हैं, उन बैरकों पर पुलिस ने लोगों को इकट्ठा क्यों होने दिया ? वे लोग प्रदर्शन से संबंधित नहीं थे, वे लोग प्रदर्शन के अंग नहीं थे और वे लोग प्रदर्शन से पहले ही आकर बैरकों के ऊपर अड़्डा जमाकर बैठ गये थे। हम पता लगाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि वे कौन थे। उनके पास एक लाउड स्पीकर भी था। जो प्रदर्शन की इजाजत दी गई है मंत्री सर्वदलीय गौ रक्षा महाभिमान समिति को, उसमें लिखा गया है कि प्रोसेशन के साथ कोई लाउड स्पीकर नहीं होगा, मगर दिल्ली की पुलिस देख रही थी कि बैरकों पर जो लोग खड़े थे उनके पास लाउड स्पीकर था। मंच से नारे लगाये जा रहे थे "गौ हत्या बंद करो; हम शांति से अपनी मांग मंगवाने के लिए आये हैं", मगर बैरकों के ऊपर खड़े लोग दूसरे नारे लगा रहे थे। जैन मुनि सुशील कुमार जी ने हाथ जोड़कर उनसे प्रार्थना की कि आप यह नारा न लगाइये, यह नारा अधिकृत नारा नहीं है और जो नारे हमने तय किये हैं वही नारे लगेंगे। मगर उन लोगों ने यह बात नहीं मानी और पत्थर फेंकने वालों में सबसे आगे वही लोग थे। उन लोगों को कैसे इकट्ठा होने दिया गया और वे लोग कौन थे ? मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूं कि श्री कामराज पर आक्रमण करने वाले कौन थे ? यह जांच का विषय है। आप अनाप-शनाप आरोप मत लगाइये। कामराज महोदय के घर में आक्रमण पहले

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

हुआ और पुलिस की गोली बाद में चली थी। अगर गोलों चलने से प्रदर्शनकारी तितर बितर हुए थे तो फिर उन्होंने बाद में जाकर आग लगाई होती, पहले नहीं।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : पहले लगाई।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : गलत बात है। दिल्ली एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के लैपटोपेंट गवर्नर जनरल ने टाइम टेबल दिया है। आप आखें बन्द करके मत चलिए, मैं आपका साथ देने के लिए तैयार हूँ।

महोदया, अगर यह साबित हो जाय कि जनसंघ के लोगों ने हिंसा की, जनसंघ के लोगों ने गाड़ियां जलाई, तो मैं कोई भी सजा भुगतने के लिए तैयार हूँ। मैं जनसंघ से सम्बन्ध तोड़ लूंगा, मैं राजनीति से सन्यास ले लूंगा। मैं ऐसी पार्टियों में नहीं रह सकता हूँ जो हिंसा करती है। मगर आप हमें सफाई का मौका नहीं देंगे, तो यह हमारे साथ अन्याय होगा और हम अन्याय को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे। (Interruption)

आप सुनिये जरा मुझे मौका दीजिये। अगर प्रदर्शनकारी कामराज महोदय के घर जाते, तो कामराज महोदय के बंगले के पहले श्री अशोक मेहता का बंगला था, श्री टी० एन० सिंह का बंगला था। क्या प्रदर्शनकारी केवल कामराज महोदय से ही नाराज थे, अशोक मेहता से नहीं थे, टी० एन० सिंह से नहीं थे?

विद्वान् चमन लाल : अशोक मेहता प्रेजीडेंट नहीं हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : महोदया, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि सिक्योरिटी फोर्स से पता लगा लिया जाय कि वे कौन लोग थे? क्या प्रदर्शनकारी थे या कोई और लोग थे? हम इस बारे में पता लगाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं और आप मदद करेंगे तो पता लगेगा। अगर उसमें हमारे लोग शामिल होंगे

तो हम उनको सजा देंगे। मगर आप हमें कन्विन्स कराइये कि हमारे लोग थे।

एक बात महोदया मैं कहना चाहता हूँ और यह मैंने उस दिन भी कहा था कि उस दिन प्रदर्शनकारियों के सामने मुझे बोलने नहीं दिया गया है। मंच पर एक साधु ने मेरे हाथ से माइक छीन लिया था। वह साधु कौन था? वह साधु पहले मंच के नीचे बैठा था और वह साधु जैन मुनि के भाषण में गड़बड़ कर रहा था। बाद में उस साधु को पकड़कर प्रदर्शनकारियों ने पुलिस के हवाले कर दिया था। मगर बाद में वह साधु फिर मंच पर आ गया। और उसने मेरी खोपड़ी पर एक हाथ मारा और लाउडस्पीकर छीन लिया। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह साधु पुलिस की गिरफ्त से कैसे छूट आया। वह साधु अब कहाँ है? मैं उस साधु को जेल में डूँढ कर आया हूँ क्योंकि मैं उस की शक्ल को पहचानत हूँ जिसने मेरे हाथ से लाउडस्पीकर छीना था। वह साधु आज पुलिस की हिरासत में नहीं है, जेल में नहीं है। क्या वह पुलिस का आदमी था क्या वह दिल्ली एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का आदमी था अथवा क्या वह उनका आदमी था जो नन्दा जी को बदनाम करना चाहते थे?

यह मामला इतना सरल नहीं है जितना दिखलाई देता है। उस साधु को पेश किया जाना चाहिये।

महोदया, 20-25 साधु, जिनमें नागा भी थे, संसद भवन के दरवाजे में जाकर इकट्ठा हो गये। उधर हम भीड़ को शांत करने का प्रयत्न कर रहे थे। अगर पुलिस उन 25-30 साधुओं को पकड़ लेती तो उस तरह की गड़बड़ नहीं होती। मगर उन साधुओं को पकड़ा नहीं गया, क्यों नहीं पकड़ा गया? मंच पर टीयर गैस का गोला क्यों फेंका गया जबकि मंच पर से शांति बनाये रखने की कोशिश हो रही थी? स्वामी रामेश्वरानन्द जी के भाषण के बाद भी सेठ गोविंद दास बोले, प्रकाशवीर

शास्त्री जी बोले, मगर जब मैं बोलने को खड़ा हुआ तो मुझे उस साधु ने पकड़ लिया। वह साधु अगर नहीं होता और 20-25 साधुओं को संसद भवन के दरवाजे पर इकट्ठा न होने दिया जाता, तो यह घटना नहीं होती। मगर पुलिस ने मंच पर टीयर गैस शैल छोड़ दिया, पुलिस ने तार काट दिये। क्या पुलिस ने भीड़ को गैर कानूनी घोषित किया था? क्या अश्रुगैस चलाने से पहले, लाठी चलाने से पहले, पुलिस ने भीड़ को मौका दिया था कि वह तितर बितर हो जाय? क्या गोली चलाने से पहले चेतावनी दी गई थी? इस देश में कोई कानून है या नहीं, इस देश में कानून का सम्मान है या नहीं? भीड़ को चेतावनी नहीं दी गई और लोगों को तितर बितर होने का मौका नहीं दिया गया और मंच पर टीयर गैस चला दिया गया जिससे भीड़ में यह आशंका पैदा हो गई कि मंच पर बैठे हुए नेताओं को मारने की साजिश की जा रही है। प्रदर्शन में लाखों लोग थे। वे एक भावना को हृदय में लेकर आये थे। वे संसद के दरवाजे को खटखटाने आये थे। वे लोकतंत्रीय तरीके से अपनी मांग को मनवाने आये थे। उनकी मांग से किसी को मतभेद हो सकता है। कोई कह सकता है कि कानून से गोहत्या बन्द करना ठीक नहीं है। मगर जो सरकार कानून से शराबबन्दी करती है उसके मुंह से यह बात शोभा नहीं देती है। लेकिन जो लोग आये उनकी भावना का आदर करने के बजाय जब मंच पर टीयर गैस का घुंआ निकला तो लोग समझे कि गड़बड़ हो गई है, मंच पर आग लग गई है और उनके नेता खतरे में पड़ गये हैं।

दूसरी बात यह हुई कि जब लाउड स्पीकर के तार काट दिये गये, मंच पर से नेता हट गये तो भीड़ को नियंत्रण में कौन रखता। भीड़ को नेतृत्वहीन किसने बनाया? कुछ तत्व ऐसे थे जिन्होंने परिस्थिति का फायदा उठाया, जिन्होंने आग लगाई, मोटरें तोड़ीं। महोदया, आप विश्वास करेंगी कि जो कारे जलाई गई हैं

उन में जन संघ के कार्यकर्ताओं की तीन कारें जली हैं, जो स्कूटर जलाये गये हैं उनमें हमारे कार्यकर्ताओं के भी स्कूटर जले हैं। क्या हमने अपनी कारें जलाईं? क्या हमने अपने ही स्कूटरों को आग लगा दी? इन कांडों में हम विश्वास नहीं करते। यह काम करने का हमारा तरीका नहीं है। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सारे मामले की अदालती जांच होनी चाहिये। दूध का दूध और पानी का पानी होना चाहिये। सांच को आंच क्या है? अगर सारी गड़बड़ के लिये हम जिम्मेदार हैं तब तो आप को जांच का स्वागत करना चाहिये। आपको चुनाव के समय हम पर दमन का दुधारा चलाने का मौका मिलेगा।

महोदया, आप विश्वास करेंगी कि जन संघ के ऐसे कार्यकर्ता और नेता जेलों में बन्द कर दिये गये हैं जो उस दिन दिल्ली में नहीं थे। प्रोफेसर बलराज मधोक जो हमारी आल इंडिया पार्टी के प्रेसीडेंट हैं, वे 7 नवम्बर को सवेरे बम्बई में थे और हवाई जहाज से दिल्ली आये। वे जलूस में शामिल नहीं थे। वे मंच के ऊपर मौजूद नहीं थे। गोली चल गई, उसके बाद वे पार्लियामेंट भवन में पहुंचे। वे जेल में बन्द हैं। कल रात मेट्रोपोलिटन काउंसिल में हमारी पार्टी के लीडर, मि० अडवानी को गिरफ्तार कर लिया गया। अगर वे 7 नवम्बर की घटना में शामिल होते तो पहले ही पकड़े जाते। अगर वे 13 नवम्बर के हमारे प्रोटेस्ट के कारण पकड़े गये हैं तब भी दो दिन रुकने की जरूरत नहीं थी। कल रात में उनको पकड़ कर ले गये। हमारा आफिस सेक्रेटरी, जो टाइपिस्ट था, जिस का पार्टी से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था और जो नीकर था, उसको भी पकड़ कर ले गये। अंधाधुंध गिरफ्तारियां की गई हैं।

श्री अजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार) : विद्यार्थी।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : आपने देखा भी नहीं है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हम भड़का रहे हैं विद्यार्थियों को ? यह इंटेलिजेंस है जिस का कांग्रेस के सदस्य नमूना पेश कर रहे हैं । अगर इसी इंटेलिजेंस के भरोसे शासन चलेगा तो यह शासन . . .

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह इंटेलिजेंस है कांग्रेस के एक सदस्य की ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : कांग्रेस के सदस्यों की इंटेलिजेंस का यह हाल है तो छोटे छोटे कमचारियों का क्या हाल होगा ?

महोदया, यह अंधाधुंध गिरफ्तारियां बन्द होनी चाहियें । अब दिल्ली में शांति भंग होने की कोई आशंका नहीं है । कम से कम हमारी ओर से शांति भंग होगी, यह सवाल पैदा नहीं होता । फिर ये लोग क्यों पकड़े जा रहे हैं ? फिर जन संघ के विरुद्ध एक तूफान क्यों खड़ा किया जा रहा है ? क्या इसलिये कि जन संघ की बढ़ती हुई लोकप्रियता से कांग्रेस के नेता परेशान हैं ? अगर 7 नवम्बर की दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण घटनाओं का लाभ उठा कर राजनैतिक प्रतिशोध लेने की कोशिश की गई तो यह कांग्रेस सरकार और इसके मंत्री खाद्य संकट पर विरोधी दलों से सहयोग लेने का मुंह नहीं रख सकते । अगर 7 नवम्बर की घटनाओं का आप लाभ उठावेंगे तो फिर खाद्य संकट का हम भी लाभ उठावेंगे और फिर यह देश कहां जायेगा ।

महोदया, मैं नये गृह मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूं कि बड़े संकटकाल में उन्होंने गृह मंत्रालय का भार संभाला है । इस संकटकाल का लाभ देश की बिखरी हुई शक्ति को इकट्ठा करने में भी हो सकता है ; जो बाहरी भीतरी संकट हैं उन पर विजय प्राप्त करने के लिये भी हो सकता है और इस संकट का लाभ उठा कर के विरोधी दलों को दबाया भी जा सकता है, कुचला भी जा सकता है ।

आप को ताज्जुब होगा, एक दैनिक पत्र "पैट्रिएट" निकलता है उसने मेरे मुंह में यह

भाषण रख दिया कि मैंने मंच पर कहा कि खून का बदला खून से लो । मैं वहां बोल तक नहीं सका । मैंने सिर्फ इतना कहा था "बहनो और भाइयो, आप इतनी बड़ी संख्या में आये हैं, मैं आपका अभिनन्दन करता हूं ।" क्या मैं ऐसी बात कह सकता हूं कि खून का बदला खून से लो । यह "पैट्रिएट" पेपर जो एक प्रोग्रेसिव पेपर बनता है उसने यह लिखा है । एक "लिक" वीकली निकलता है । उसने लिखा है कि मि० गोलवलकर मंच पर मौजूद थे । मि० गोलवलकर यवतमाल में थे । उनका उस दिन का भाषण छपा हुआ है । मगर "लिक" को वे मंच पर दिखाई दे रहे थे । बहुत सी चीजें बहुत से लोगों को दिखाई दे रही हैं । मगर इस तरह से देश में शासन नहीं चलाया जा सकता । इस तरह से लोकतंत्र की रीढ़ नहीं की जा सकती ।

जो कुछ 7 नवम्बर को हुआ उसे ढाला जा सकता था । जो कुछ हुआ वह दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण था । हिंसा की निंदा की जानी चाहिये । हिंसा का बहिष्कार करना चाहिये । एक दिन पहले मैं नागपुर में था और मैंने एक जन सभा में बोलते हुये कहा था कि अगर हम हिंसा का बहिष्कार नहीं करेंगे, अगर हम सार्वजनिक जीवन में हिंसा का परित्याग नहीं करेंगे तो हमारी आजादी खतरे में पड़ जायेगी और यह लोकतंत्र भीड़तंत्र में बदल जायेगा । क्या मैं और मेरी पार्टी हिंसा को भड़काने में प्रयत्नशील हो सकते हैं ? मगर एक बात मैं कहना चाहूंगा । अगर 7 नवम्बर की घटनाओं का राजनैतिक फायदा उठाने की कोशिश की गई तो एक राजनैतिक दल के नाते शांतिपूर्ण तरीकों से हम उसका प्रतिरोध करेंगे । हमें जेलों में बन्द करके जन संघ को लोकप्रियता को खत्म नहीं किया जा सकता । दमन का दुधारा चला कर के लोगों की भावनाएं नहीं दबाई जा सकती ।

महोदया, मैं फिर मांग करता हूं कि 7 नवम्बर की घटनाओं की पूरी जांच की जाय, अदालती जांच की जाय, सुप्रीम कोर्ट या हाई

कोर्ट का कोई जज तय किया जाय । तब सब तथ्य सामने आयेंगे । हम कठघरे में खड़े होने के लिये तैयार हैं । मगर बिना हमको अपनी सफाई का मौका दिये फांसी पर चढ़ाने की कोशिश मत करिये क्योंकि हम मरते मरते भी लड़ेंगे और लड़ते लड़ते भी मरने के लिये तैयार रहेंगे ।
घन्यवाद ।

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR (Punjab): Madam Deputy Chairman, I have been listening with great interest to the speeches of the Members of the Opposition. I fully share the sentiment expressed by the hon. Member Shri A. D. Mani when he said that India's image has been tarnished by what had happened here on the 7th November. I am sure all of us are agreed on that point. Listening to all these speeches, I would like to say that what happened is something disgraceful and as has been stated here, a great deal of attention has been focussed on the unfortunate happenings of the 7th November. Yet the Members of the Opposition by their demand to have this discussion today, do they want to focus a little more attention on what happened on that day? If we carry on this discussion for some five or six hours would not the attention of all the foreign Press be focussed on this?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then why speak now?

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: I have to speak because you of the Opposition pressed for a discussion now. I know the Opposition is ever on the look-out for fresh ammunition to attack the Government with. I do not want to deny them the right to seek such fresh ammunition. But at the same time I do feel that there should be some consistency and some regard for ethics. I know that the Opposition never had very much of sympathy for Mr. Nanda. Far from it. Then why this sudden concern? As I said, there should be some regard

for ethics and some consistency even in politics. They were seeking fresh ammunition to attack the Government with and so they have developed sympathy and compassion for Mr. Nanda overnight, because of this letter which came to them as a godsend.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A newspaper man sent it to me, not God.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: Again I would like to say that even on that day of the incidents, Mr. Nanda was their main target of attack. But since they were looking for fresh ammunition for attacking the Government this letter when it came, they took advantage of it and they got the ammunition they were looking for. Mr. Mani said that certain political issues were involved in that letter. We shall come to that later. I am saying only one thing and it is painful for me to say that, because Mr. Nanda is a member of our party and he has been a great leader of this country and a man of eminence who had made great sacrifices.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Why say, "He has been?" He still is great.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: I am not saying anything about him except that the publishing of that letter was very unfortunate. He could have written to the Government, to the Prime Minister, if he had disagreement on certain things. But to release it to the Press, I do not think it was a proper thing for Mr. Nanda to do.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: In his letter itself he had said he was releasing the letter. The Prime Minister could have asked him not to release it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: How could she?

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not wait.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: Mr. Arjun Arora can say what he likes. I will come to that later.

[Shrimati Mohinder Kaur.] Certain basic issues he has raised in that letter. Personally I hold Mr. Nanda in great esteem and respect and that is why I am saying that it is very painful for me to speak but since he has raised these issues, that is why I have to say something. He has said that he disagreed with the officials in his Ministry and that is why law and order broke down on the 7th. This is a very flimsy argument because we know it is the function of the Home Minister, it is the responsibility of the Home Minister to maintain law and order in the country and how can he deny that responsibility? He says that he had no knowledge that those demonstrations would turn violent. When the Central Bureau of Intelligence is directly under him and how can he say that? Madam, it was as early as the third week of October when the officers of the Home Ministry met him and they had advised the Home Minister to take certain precautions but he disregarded the advice of those officials. It was as early as the third week of October that it was brought to his notice that there were so many forces, so many religious bodies involved in this. As far as religious bodies are concerned I feel they are equally dangerous if you want to know my point of view because if they are absolutely religious bodies they have no need to enter into the civic life at all but since they do I consider them to be equally dangerous. There were several other, political organisations which were going to participate to this demonstration. I would particularly like to take the name of the R.S.S. The militant communal character of the R.S.S. is on'y too well known. With all this how could have Mr. Nanda anticipated that this was going to be a peaceful demonstration? I therefore feel that he has failed in his duty by not having taken adequate precautionary measures to see that law and order did not break down.

I know from this very House when I went out during the lunch break I myself discovered that since 12 noon

violence had broken out in the capital but the Home Minister was sitting here and I never noticed any slips or anything coming to him at all. I thought that everything was peaceful but as it happened it was not so. And then most of the policemen who were supposed to be guarding the Parliament were unarmed and naturally several of them died.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: If they were unarmed how could they open fire? They opened fire.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: There were a large number of policemen who were unarmed, and that is the reason for all this loss of life and property. And who is responsible for this loss of life and property? After all, it is the duty of the Government to see that there is peace in the country. And the Home Minister cannot escape the responsibility by taking cover that the officers of the Ministry did not agree with him. "Madam, I am afraid I do not agree with that statement of his. I am not here trying to advocate the cause of any civil servant but I personally think that it is a wrong thing to bring in the name of civil servants in Parliament because the Service Rules do not give them the right to defend themselves either in this House or outside. So I feel it is wrong for the Government to do this. If we continue to carry on in this way taking the name of the civil servants here—whether it is a Minister who does it or any hon. Member of the House—I think in principle it is wrong and if we continue to do this we shall be absolutely shaking up the administrative structure of this country and we shall be demoralising the services and we shall ultimately end up in paralysing the Administration. I feel we all should agree on this point and evolve some convention of not naming the civil servants in the House if we want a sound administration in this country and if we want the work to be carried on.

Then the second thing is this. As I said, Mr. Nanda has raised certain basic issues in this letter. Here again I know perhaps Mr. Arjun Arora may not like it, but I do not know what exactly Mr. Nanda means when he says that he did not enjoy the full confidence of his party and that he felt helpless. He says that he did not feel that he had the full confidence of the Prime Minister or of his Government colleagues or of his party. I have a feeling that Mr. Nanda must have been carried away by the heat of the moment because a man of his stature if he had really felt that he did not enjoy the confidence of the leader of his party or his colleagues in Government or the members of his party, he was the last man to have clung on to his office so long. Therefore I again say that he was carried away by the heat of the moment, and he did not exactly mean that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have come to bury Caesar, not to praise him.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: Madam, we have the very recent example of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari. It was not even a year back, it was only a few months back, in the last days of Mr. Shastri, when Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari was in the dock in this very House. I know he resigned because he presumed that the Prime Minister did not have confidence in him though Mr. Shastri never expressed it for a moment. So I again say that Mr. Nanda did not mean exactly what he said, that he did not enjoy the confidence of the party.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: But Mr. Shastri asked him to submit himself to an enquiry on the charge-sheet and he ran away from the enquiry by resigning.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: You are welcome to presume anything you like.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is no presumption; it is a fact because I delivered the chargesheet.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: Again so far as the letter which Mr. Nanda wrote is concerned, I say you cannot account for human emotions, you cannot say how people will react in times of emotional stress. That is probably the reason why he reacted in this way. In fact it was a shock to many of us that a man of his standing, a mature politician like Mr. Nanda, should have reacted in this manner. One cannot predict human behaviour, as to how people would react at times of emotional stress and strain.

Now in that letter another basic issue was raised that . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr Nanda in his Ministerial death said certain good things and perhaps still more can be said by removing Mr. L. P. Singh.

SHRI SYED AHMAD: Madam, my submission is Mr. Nanda is not in the pillory; he is not on trial here. Why should his name be continuously maligned as if to put Shri Chavan on good behaviour?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): I have to make a request to the hon. Lady Member. She says that the Secretaries should not be mentioned. So I would say to her that as Mr. Nanda has resigned for whatsoever reason it may be it is a courtesy that if a Minister has resigned due to certain parliamentary difficulties or procedures he should not be condemned in the House because he is not here either to reply to those charges or comments. So I would simply request the hon. Lady Member not to refer to Mr. Nanda so very often unless and until it is unavoidable.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now on a point of order. Here is an attempt in the narrow party interests to silence the speaker although she belongs to>

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] the ruling party. Certainly Mr. Nanda is a private man now and not a Minister but he has made a certain document and in the context of that document he is certainly subject to discussion. It is open to any Member to refer to it and obviously then Mr. Nanda also comes in. Here is the hon. Home Minister; he can say whatever he likes. He can defend his officers whom he has not yet sacked. It is for him but I feel that the Maharani of Patiala is absolutely in her rights to say whatever she likes.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Madam, I protest at what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said. I hope Mr. Bhupesh Gupta knows the meaning of the English language he uses. He says that I have been motivated by narrow party interests. It is not so; I am motivated by parliamentary decorum and decency. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should know . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of personal explanation, I never said that he was motivated. I say he was merely doing it, maybe with the best of intentions.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am extremely sorry if I had given the impression that I was trying to condemn Mr. Nanda.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Don't get afraid.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: I am only trying to say . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is not fair.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Give her more time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may continue.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: I was only trying to make out that Mr. Nanda acted under an emotional stress and he did not mean all that, the basic points to which he has referred in his letter. I am not at all trying to condemn him.

Now, another issue that Mr. Mani has raised is that in that letter there are certain political aspects involved or issues involved. My interpretation is that perhaps he was referring to the statement wherein he has said why he should only be victimised for the breakdown of law and order, when that is the general condition in the country. Why could not the Chief Ministers be made accountable for it? That is one point that I would like to answer.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Are you defending the Chief Ministers?

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: Mr. Mani has just said that there are political issues involved in this resignation.

SHRI A. D. MANI: On a point of order, is it proper for Members on that side of the House to interrupt their own Members, because what she happens to say seems to be embarrassing to them?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Continue please.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: This is lack of chivalry.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: This is my interpretation of what Mr. Mani said.
(Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. No noise please.

SHRIMATI MOHINDER KAUR: I understand the constitutional propriety. I feel that the Chief Ministers

are only responsible to their State Legislatures. They are not accountable to the Prime Minister. Certainly they are accountable at the political level, but the Chief Ministers of the States are not responsible to her, as the Prime Minister. I feel that law and order is the responsibility of the Home Minister. If, as he has said, there was anything wrong or the picture was as gloomy as it was made out to be, it was for him to have advised the Prime Minister to take appropriate measures or in a particular case suspend the Constitution. I am answering Mr. Mani's point, because that is how he interpreted it saying that political issues are involved in this letter. I will not take very much more of your time. I feel that the political parties, some of them, have resorted to these tactics on the eve of the election to create chaotic conditions in the country. I would like to say that it is not a very nice thing. I feel that our "Prime Minister, her Government, and her Party have the strength to curb lawlessness in the country and to ensure the safety of the life and property of the people of the country. I feel that it is the responsibility of the Government. I have the fullest confidence in our Prime Minister and she has the strength in her to ensure this very basic condition to the people of this country. I will not take very much more of your time, but again I submit that it is for the political Parties. I am not referring to anyone by name. For what happened, why blame anybody? Most of the people were responsible for it, because it was an organised attempt, what happened in Delhi. And, again, I would like to say this. Perhaps it may be very painful for people to hear me say if, but I do feel that if we want to have law and order in this country, such demands should not be brought forward. Particularly a very respected Member like Mr. Vajpayee has just now said. I know he is a very rational man. I am always impressed by him. Speaking about the student unrest he himself had said that political Parties had a hand in it and my respect for him

went up when he said that on the floor of the House. But I was surprised when, a little while ago, he had demanded a judicial enquiry. Now, Madam, as it is we are all worried about the law and order problem. I feel that the Government should not concede that demand for the simple reason that first of all the Civil Service would be demoralised. The administration would be demoralised. If you order a judicial enquiry, it demoralises the police. I do not suppose, Madam, that we should give a free hand to lawlessness. I feel that the Government should not concede this demand. Once again, I would like to say that if anyone has any misapprehension that I have tried to accuse Mr. Nanda, it is not at all a fact. I have the highest regard for Mr. Nanda. He is a member of our Party and I have the highest regard for him.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The very gracious lady is wrong.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Patel.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, a few days back in this House, when questions were being asked, I had asked the question why the Home Minister had not been able to keep order in this House, had failed to keep order in this city, because the Government should have been well prepared and well informed,

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): In this House also, you said.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It was a slip of my tongue and. I corrected it myself immediately, the next minute. What has happened to you people, I do not understand. Madam, it was well known that there was going to be a huge demonstration in this city. The papers were full of it, even before the session of Parliament began and it was a legitimate question to ask, what steps the Government was taking in the matter? That was the question I asked. I did not know the circumstances under which the Home Minister, who has handed over charge, was working. I suggested

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

that after that he should be the first person to resign, but I added, it was not only he, but the whole Government should resign because they had failed miserably.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE
(Bihar): And you come in.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The letter of the Home Minister, which is released to the Press, amply proves this. When the occasion had arisen, Mr. Nanda had been able to assert himself, sometimes after a little wobbling, after a wishy-washy statement. There have been occasions when the Centre has been asked to intervene in cases like the case of Mr. Biju Pat-naik, for instance, and Mr. Nanda, to his credit, stood firm. But on this occasion, a reading of the letter o'f Mr. Nanda gives one the impression that he was not a free man, that his officers were not free or they were not under him. If this is the real state of affairs, it only supports what I said that day that it is not Mr. Nanda alone who should go, but this whole Government should go. They have failed the country. How can you have a Government, where somebody is the Minister-in-charge, but he is a dummy and his officers are controlled, as you see in a pantomime show, by somebody pulling the strings not observed by us? I submit that this is not a democratic way of functioning. Perhaps this may be suited to totalitarian countries. Certainly it is not democracy that we are trying to establish in this country. The 4 P.M. manner in which things are going does not do credit either to our country or help to establish or to make the roots of democracy firm in this country. They are taking us the wrong way. We hope, as they affirm, that the Congress Party are also anxious to build a strong democracy in this country. But their actions do not convince us. They have got a vacillating policy. When it suits them they talk of democracy. They do not hesitate to take action that a totalitarian government takes or the

imperialist Government took in this country when we were fighting for freedom.

My hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, has just now mentioned very revealing facts. We would like to know what Government has to say about it. I also understand that whereas the police force of Delhi needs to be supplemented, augmented, in the case of such demonstrations, we have had such demonstrations before Parliament House in large numbers before; we had brought a large number o'f peasants at the time of the Seventeenth Amendment; and so also other parties had brought them; we have had no trouble, and the police force that was brought usually was from the neighbouring States of U.P. and Punjab. This time I understand the police force came from Madhya Pradesh. I should like to know whether this is true and why.

Madam, I do not know whether the Government have real reasons to arrest persons like Mr. Balraj Madhok who were not in Delhi. It will take a lot of material to convince many of us to believe that Mr. Balraj Madhok had any hand in this violence. He is a citizen of Delhi. He is a professor. He has been a Member o'f Parliament before. Many of us know his views. We may not agree with all of them, but he is a firm believer in democracy; that cannot be doubted. To treat him as he has been treated is trying to negate democracy, and that is what I charge the Government with. If you attach values to democracy, moral values to democracy, not copy the ways of the British Government, how they used to oppress people when they were asking for freedom and fighting for freedom. That is exactly what this Government is doing. Madam, this Government may have reasons to arrest Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia who is a Member of the other House, or our colleague, Shri Rajnarain. But certainly I protest against the manner in which he has been asked to deposit a security

This is usually asked in the case of criminals and felons. A person who is a Member of this House must be treated as a gentleman as long as he behaves. It should be enough that he gives his personal surety and cognisance. He undertakes to appear in court when he is asked to do so. Members of Parliament should be treated with a little more dignity if 'you want democracy in this country to be respected, and you are now out to establish a totalitarian sort of Government which the Congress Party has been trying to do particularly in the last ten years. There has been erosion of civil liberties in all respects except perhaps for the little forum of speeches here in this House. Is this the way to try to remove outspoken people? People who are critical sometimes resort to extra-parliamentary methods which I never approve of; everybody in this House knows that I never approve of them; I have always condemned them. But for that reason I cannot support the ways in which this Government is dealing with this matter. We need to be convinced much more that the steps that the Government has taken are the correct steps.

I am sorry the new Home Minister is not here.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was here.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I would like to say a few words to him. Madam, the new Home Minister, yourself and I come from the same part of this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And that is our problem.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is not a problem. But we are sorry to see to what state that city of Bombay is being reduced. When there is water shortage, somebody says the non-Maharashtrians must leave Bombay. Two thousand shops and establishments in Nagdevi Street have been closed since October because of the failure of the police to give them

adequate protection. What are Mr. Chavan and his Government here for and what is the Government of his dear friend, Mr. Naik, doing in Bombay? Madam, on the 5th of November, only a few days back, 30,000 shops and establishments in Bombay closed in sympathy with the 2,000 establishments that were closed because the Bombay Government refused or they have failed to give protection. What is the reply of this wonderful Bombay Government that we have? "Loot the shops of the poor coffee shop-owners from South India who make such delicious 'idli' and serve coffee which the people of Bombay have not yet learnt to make, because they are so popular." The ordinary lower middle-class people, the office clerks, all these people go and frequent these hotels. Why do they go there? Because they are cheap, they are clean and they give wholesome food. Why do you want to drive them out? If that was not enough, another class of hotel-keepers who have been in Bombay for a long time, who have been an institution by themselves, the Iranis, were also chased. That is the law and order situation in the City of Bombay. Mr. Chavan comes from that State.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: We are dit-cussing Delhi.

SHM DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: We are discussing law and order and what the Home Minister is going to do. I hope the Minister will see that this does not happen, that what happened in Bombay is not repeated here.

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE (Maharashtra): Does he mean that the Minister or the State Government said so that those people should leave Bombay? Will he quote it?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is only describing the conditions as they exist in Bombay.

SHR^TIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE: He has said that the Government has said that they should leave Bombay.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has not alleged it against the Home Minister or the Government.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I had actually asked the Chairman's permission to raise a call attention so that I could make my questions more specific on this issue. Unfortunately my call attention notice on this matter has not been allowed. I would like to know what the Central Government is doing in this matter. Two thousand shops and establishments are closed from October; 30,000 shops and establishments closed on one day in sympathetic protest because of the failure of the State Government to afford protection to people who want to follow their legitimate calling, follow their legitimate trade practice and live peacefully with their neighbours doing a useful service to the community that they have been doing for so many years. The question I pose is that Mr. Chavan comes here on behalf of the same party, he is an important member of that Government, and his dear friend, the hon. Mr. Naik, is behind him. What is he doing? What are their views? What are they doing to allay the fear of the people? I want to know, that is the question, and I think I am entirely justified in asking whether this is going to be the shape of things here.

Madam, I would like to look a few years earlier even before that. During our struggle for independence Satara wherefrom the hon. the new Home Minister comes was known for the regime of the 'Patri' Sarkar. Are we to get the regime of the Patri Sarkar in Delhi or in this country? (*Interruptions*). That is what I am asking.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: It was the Patri Sarkar in Satra which expelled the British people during those days of 1942 August Revolution.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Is law and order going to be maintained in Delhi under the regime of the Patri Sarkar or in a democratic way? I was saying that democracy is in danger and

I was pointing out the danger. Is it so very uncomfortable for my friends on the opposite side to listen to me when I develop my arguments and point out the dangers that are facing us, that are facing the democracy that we are trying to establish here? We are about to go ahead towards a new general election. Is this the attitude of the ruling party that is going to face the polls? Is it so very inconvenient for them to face the polls that they go on interrupting us every minute? That is the question that I want to pose. (*Interruptions*). Whether the Government failed to keep order at that time or not, is a matter that needs to be enquired into. I would like the Government to honestly face an enquiry, a judicial enquiry. My friend, Mr. Vajpayee, has posed that question. I support the enquiry that has been demanded from all quarters as to what was the real reason for the trouble, for the riots and who were the people. Were agent-provocateurs also mixed up with the people? Mr. Vajpayee has pointed out a particular case of which he has the experience. Were a large number of agent-provocateurs let loose in the city in that big crowd that day? That is a very serious question that we would like to ask. And until that question is answered, what we say on this or do is not important, but what is important is that there is a serious threat to the democracy that we want to establish in this country.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Madam Deputy Chairman, unfortunately the debate has gone off at a tangent. The hon. Mover of the motion put the whole debate in the wrong perspective by giving long lectures on the demands of parliamentary democracy, on the changing personal equations between the Government of India and the State Governments and so many other matters. I do not want to add my irrelevance to that irrelevance. But let me assure him and let me assure this House and this country that today in India we have an extremely purposeful and efficient Government, a Government which has

given good leadership to this country to times of crisis and which, I am sure, history will judge to be an efficient and purposeful Government.

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

Unfortunately, after some time, there was an attack from unexpected quarters on a certain gentleman who has ceased to be a Minister. Well, it was a happy thing, in my opinion. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Nanda is an old man, too much involved in the Sadhu Samaj and this puritanic type of business. He may not appreciate that charge. But let me assure you—if I were in Mr. Nanda's position, I would have welcomed and appreciated this charge from a charming brigade . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
Charming brigade or charging brigade?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): But he is a man of the highest integrity.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He is an honest man.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Let me assure this House that people at large feel that Nandaji is an honest and dedicated type of man and that he did try his best to do good to this country. If his failure to control the situation in the vicinity of Parliament House is enough to condemn him, then let me remind those who have seen the days of 1942 and earlier—Bengal was full of British and American armies but when the people rose, when emotions were roused, for near about a year in Mirzapore there was no British Government. Bihar at that time was full of foreign troops and Indian troops. But I can assure you that in some areas of Bihar when people rose, for several months there was no Government.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: There was no government in Azamgarh and Ballia.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: There was no government, say, in Ballia, where a provisional government was being run by the late lamented Chitto Pande. One swallow does not make a summer. Maybe it was an unexpected upheaval and therefore it could not be controlled. But then mightier governments with mightier resources at their disposal were not able to control such a situation and this situation—it goes to the credit of the then Home Minister—was controlled with the minimum use of force.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, there are two things which should attract our notice about the incidents of the 7th. One is the massive nature of the demonstration, I have witnessed other demonstrations also in this Capital near the Parliament House. But it was the Press people who assured me that in numbers this demonstration had no precedent. It attracted the largest number of people. Of course, certain unsavoury incidents ultimately took place which led to the use of force. But in taking note of the trees, let us not ignore the wood. The wood was the massive demonstration; the trees were the unhappy incidents that took place.

Mr. Mani, the hon. Mover, talked of the Ford Foundation. I am afraid he is living too much under the influence of the West and its psychology. As I said earlier, he is still living under the umbrella of the British Empire because he is fond of quoting Churchill, Morrison and others . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: You also quote British people.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: ... and some people there, foreign people. Max Muller once said the Indians . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I withdraw.

Any way, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Mani is too much obsessed with these

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.]

things. He quoted the Ford Foundation. He said that this Government does not seem to have a decisive mind on the issue of cow-slaughter. Let not Mr. Mani forget that every human endeavour, even if it is an endeavour in the domain of Government, is by a process of trial and error, experimenting, watching the result of that experiment and then modifying it or proceeding with that experiment. May be at a certain stage certain views might be held by certain Ministers of the Government. But if Government were to stick to a view which they had held at a particular time, then I am afraid there will be such a great rigidity in the affairs of the Government that Government would cease to be the representative of the people. And therefore, rightly, when the Government saw the emotions of the people, the feeling* of the people, the then Home Minister {come [out with a wiser statement on the issue of cowslaughter. People may call us anti-secular, people may call us get that th3 Prime Minister of this country is the leader of these obscurantist people. Let us not forget that this Government operates in a ,million of obscurantist-people. Those who have been trained in Western traditions may call the . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do you mean to say . . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Obscurantist. No Government can afford to ignore the feelings and emotions of the people on such an issue. Therefore while discussing the incidents, let us not ignore the fact that the emotions and the feelings of the great people of this country are bound up with cow-slaughter. They would not like cow-slaughter to continue. Therefore the decision that was announced by the ex-Home Minister is a proper decision . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Absolutely wrong, the manner in which you say it.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: . . . and it should be implemented.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the Constitution article 48 looks upon it as an economic problem, to promote agriculture and animal husbandry, and not from the angle in which we see it here, for example, in this Deepava issue of the Organiser. Below written: "Cow in tears", "The mother cow", "The mother in tears". Not from that point of view. Cow is not considered the mother of our Constitution.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: "The Organiser" is not the Constitution. A paper has every right to hold its own view.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not pleading for it. Certainly our Constitution is not "the Organiser," I agree. He says . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: In Soviet Russia even Comrade Stalin was termed as father and preceptor by everybody. Why?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I wonder if you at all have a political father or a preceptor.

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

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: He has Stalin as "his political father."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I ask if the hon. Member has any political parentage at all. Mr. B. K. P. Sinha is a Constitutional lawyer. I believe he is.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am not talking of the Constitution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You said our people are obscurantists. Cow was in view. Now the Home Minister is expected to act in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Constitution. Article 48 of the Constitution is a directive principle which is not enforceable. It looks upon the problem from the economic point of view. In the marginal note it says: "Organisation of agriculture and animal husbandry."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you will have your say. Mr. B. K. P. Sinha is in possession of the House. Please take your seat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I obey you. But I was seeking a little light.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta seeks light. But then let me remind him of the English proverb, "Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise." Let him remain in that bliss.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, unfortunate incidents took place in the vicinity of the Parliament House and then force had to be used. I think it is not for me, sitting in this House, when I did not watch the whole series of events, to pass judgment either on the incidents or on the use of force. But taking a general view, it appears to me that use of force become necessary and inevitable. I also feel assured that the use of force was minimum; otherwise when there was an assembly of more than two or three lakhs of people, if force had not been controlled, if force had been excessive, there would have been large-scale shooting which was avoided. In this context a demand has been made for a judicial enquiry. Well, I have always been of the view, and I have expressed it on many occasions in the Consultative Committee of the Home Ministry, that unless the use of force is patently and manifestly of an excessive nature, no judicial enquiry should be held, because when judicial enquiry is held those who have maintained law and order have a difficult time. They have to be subjected to a long harassment. Though ultimately in many cases they are absolved and the Government meets their expenses, all the same there is harassment of the personnel and it leads to the demoralisation of the law and order authorities. In this case, as I have already said, there is every indication that the force used was minimum and therefore there should be no judicial enquiry because if we have a judicial enquiry in such a

1297 RS—6.

situation we have to wind up our law and order machinery.

I am reminded in this connection, Mr. Vice-Chairman, of two incidents, one from India and another from the U.S. Recently there were race riots and pictures appeared in many of the American journals where policemen were standing and watching the race rioters damaging property and carrying away property. When they were asked why they were not taking any action they said that if they took action, there would be shouts in the country for an enquiry and they would have to face a lot of harassment. Judicial enquiry always has an adverse effect on the morale of the law and order authorities.

A similar situation arose in Bombay some years back when some property of the Aarey Milk Colony was destroyed by rioters. There was a gentleman who was probably the Police Commissioner then and I had occasion to have a talk with him. I asked him why it was that though according to the reports, the Police force was present within the colony, they did not take any steps to save public property. And his reply was that twice or thrice before there had been judicial enquiries and the result was that the police force was demoralised. Therefore, they thought that discretion was the better part of valour and they kept quiet. Therefore, a judicial enquiry in such a situation should never be conceded.

But then I am aware that there is a regular procedure when loss of life takes place and there are demonstrations. I hope that enquiry is proceeding and will proceed after some time accordingly to that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have suggested a public enquiry into everything.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: But then there are other aspects of the matter about which the nation must get authentic information based on a proper

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.]

probe and proper assessment to find out whether the incidents really were preplanned, what were the forces that were working towards certain ends which led to the unhappy results on the 7th ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Communalists, religionists. . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: . . . whether incendiary articles were brought to the scene of occurrence as alleged by the press people. These are matters which have to be enquired into and it is better that the Government of India the Parliament and the nation knows after a proper enquiry as to who was really responsible for that, whether it was a preplanned affair or just an incident which occurred on the spur of the moment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. S. K. Patil wanted to utilise it for his ends.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am sorry I have very little time. Sir, I am afraid he has taken five minutes of my time.

In this connection an issue has been raised whether demonstrations near the Parliament House should be allowed or they should be banned. I am not talking of the immediate precincts of the Parliament House. Our Constitution guarantees the right of association and expression of opinion through demonstration. Therefore, we cannot ban it absolutely. But then it will be proper if we ban demonstration within a certain area of the Parliament House because Parliament, if it has to apply its mind to the business that is before it . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have an exhibition of how it is being applied.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: You will never allow us to apply our mind, I know that. A distance, say, of two miles in my opinion seems to be a rather little too long a distance. I would urge that one mile would be sufficient. If within a one mile radius of the Parliament House no demons-

tration is allowed that will serve the purpose.

In this connection, Mr. Vice-Chair-man, I am reminded of my experience in my own district. These incidents when they take place, there is something in the air two, three or four days before and anybody who is a political worker or anybody who moves amongst the people can easily sense that something unusual is going to happen. In such situations instead of allowing the situation to develop and then use force and make arrests thereafter, it is always better to take recourse to preventive arrests. I am sure this thing will be borne in mind by the present Home Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, he is doing that.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I come from a famous city which was a plague spot so far as communal rioting is concerned. It has been my experience as a Congress worker that the situation really becomes tense only when irresponsible elements from liquor and toddy shops join it. It has been my experience that when trouble flares up, it is the criminal element which takes advantage of the situation. In Delhi particular care should be taken because every big city is the abode of undesirable, anti-social and criminal elements who take advantage of the situation. Care should be taken in cities like Calcutta . . . (Interruption by Shri Arjun Arora) including Kanpur.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I do not exclude Kanpur. Whether it is Calcutta, Bombay or Delhi, a list of the criminal elements should be kept by the guardians of law and order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I wonder whether Mr. Kamraj will supply the list.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Mr. Gupta will supply the list.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: When my undesirable situation begins to develop, at that stage large-scale arrests

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.] system but then it was reported time in the newspapers that many Members of the Communist Party spread themselves throughout the Soviet Union to convince what Khrushchev had said and done was the correct thing. Even a dictatorial Government was under that necessity. I will respectfully add that a democratic Government is under a greater necessity. Let that bridge be not kept snapped and let it be re-established and rebuilt and if the Prime Minister and the Home Minister take it into their heads to rebuild that bridge it can be rebuilt in a very short time.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, nobody will feel happy at what happened on 7th November. We all feel ashamed of the entire happenings of that day. There was violence let loose by the crowd and greater violence was let loose by the police. It was all known that preparations were made for organising a mammoth demonstration in front of the Parliament House on 7th November. I would ask the Government why adequate preparations were not made to meet this situation. We have now sacrificed and dismissed Mr. Nanda from Home Ministership and from the Government. Mr. Nanda has revealed very important things which were not known all these days. He has said that he was given to understand that preparations were made and deployment of forces was arranged so that if there was any mishap or any violence breaking out, that would be put down. We have different, conflicting and contradictory versions given to us by Mr. L. P. Singh, the Home Secretary and by the Lt. Governor, Shri Jha. Mr. Jha says in his press conference that he never expected that this big demonstration will develop itself into a position where violence will be used on an unprecedented scale. On the other hand the Home Secretary says that he had sufficient information to warrant such things happening, that violence would break out and that he

had taken proper precautions to see that it was put down. Mr. Nanda, the former Home Minister, has stated in a series of statements that he had issued to the press that the Home Secretary was not giving him the proper cooperation that was necessary to discharge his functions. Not only he has made this charge but he has made a very grave and serious charge against the Prime Minister of India. That he did not get proper cooperation from the Prime Minister and that the Prime Minister did not have that confidence in him which is necessary to make a Home Minister discharge his duties properly, fairly and effectively and he has charged the Prime Minister that in spite of repeated requests to her, that the Home Secretary was not giving proper cooperation to him and should be replaced, whereas the Prime Minister says that it is decided by a Cabinet Sub-Committee. Who are the members of this Sub-Committee—the Prime Minister the Home Minister and the Minister concerned. In this particular case the Home Minister is the Minister concerned and he is the Home Minister. He was acting in two capacities and his request was turned down by the Prime Minister. It clearly shows that the Home Secretary, Mr. L. P. Singh, had greater support from the Prime Minister and some of the other Ministers in the Cabinet. It clearly shows from the statement that the former Home Minister was given to understand that proper steps and adequate steps were being taken to meet the situation but that, unfortunately—he has given us to understand—the Home Secretary did not co-operate, that even the papers which he called for from the Home Secretary were not given to him for a month.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He ' was disarmed on his appointment as Home Minister.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: It is quite clear from the statement of the Prime Minister as well as from

the statement of the Home Minister that the Home Minister was dismissed not because of the incidents that had taken place on the 7th of November—this is the statement made by the Prime Minister—but that there were other reasons for his removal from the Cabinet. It is evident from the statement of the Home Minister that there were greater forces working in the Cabinet to oust him from the Cabinet. He has stated clearly that he wanted to put down corruption and that he wanted to bring politicians in high places to book. To some extent he succeeded in the case of Mr. Biju Patnaik, but he was not able to succeed in the case of Mr. Nijalingappa who is a member of the syndicate which actually runs this Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Member or associate member.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Not a full-fledged member.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: And he has also referred to another point in his statement that a conspiracy was hatched at Ranchi where the little A.I.C.C. met. So it all points to one clear fact that the Home Minister, who wanted to put down corruption, who wanted that whoever is guilty of corruption should be booked, was not allowed to do so because the big business was behind his ouster move. Mr. Atulya Ghosh and Mr. S. K. Patil, from the very beginning, played a hand in seeing that Mr. Nanda was ousted from the Cabinet; and the Prime Minister has played into their hands in ousting Mr. Nanda from the Cabinet. I am not holding any brief for Mr. Nanda. It is good that he has gone. Every Minister who is in charge of any Ministry should quite whenever serious things happen in his Ministry. Many Chief Ministers have to go to many places as has been already pointed out by Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, there was wanton break down of law and order in many States. These demonstrations, violent demonstrations, were organised by Congressmen themselves, and in some States with the blessings of the

Chief Ministers. Photographs have been published in newspapers that the police were standing by the side of the demonstrators who were pulling down or who were stopping trams. It all shows that whenever it suits them, the Congress and the Ministerialists will organise demonstrations, and violent demonstrations at that.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is not a mere question of law and order. If there are grievances, genuine grievances of the people, it should be the duty of all political parties to ventilate them through demonstrations, to organise peaceful demonstrations, so that the people's authority may open up their eyes and solve the problems of the people. You cannot expect political parties who are in opposition to sit silent and watch the spectacle of people dying of starvation, of people suffering innumerable miseries because of the policies of the Government. It is our bounden duty to organise peaceful demonstrations and to bring the grievances of the people to the notice of the persons in authority, so that their grievances might be redressed. We abhor violence. We do not want to remove the present Government through violent methods. We believe in the ballot box. We believe that we will oust the Government in the 1967 elections with the support of the people and through the ballot box. But this change of Government can take place once in five years. But then, for five years you cannot expect the opposition parties to sit idle and watch the grand drama that is being enacted by the Congress Party which is ruling this country and which is ruining this country.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: In Parliament and Assemblies you can protest.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Therefore it is necessary that demonstrations should be organised wherever there are genuine grievances of the people, for their redressal. (Interruption.)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The pity is that the Congress has more extra-parliamentary activities than in Parliament.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Lokanath Misra, when you have to interrupt, please get up.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Yes, Sir, but there was another interruption by Shri Akbar Ali Khan sitting.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Therefore Sir, I do not agree with some of the people who said that demonstrations should be completely banned and that within a two-mile radius of the Parliament House no procession or no demonstration should be organised. I do not agree with that, but we do want that whenever any demonstration is held, it should be non-violent, it should be peaceful. It is quite likely that, when big demonstrations are organised, some hooligans, some unsocial elements, some rowdy elements might take this opportunity to incite the mob to act in a violent way, to disturb the peace of the land, to burn property, take to looting and arson. We condemn them. But just because certain people, certain elements indulge in such things, the whole mass of the people should not be condemned, and parties should not be prevented from organising such demonstrations.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, what has happened on 7th of November is a matter which should be thoroughly examined, thoroughly gone into. There should be a comprehensive public enquiry presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court, or of a High Court. It is necessary to enquire into these things because so many issues are involved. Big business is involved. The working of the Government is involved. Splits in the Cabinet are also there. We would also like to know

who were the persons who were behind this whole movement. It was reported in some papers that Mr. S. K. Paul, the Railway Minister, ordered his Railway Board to run special trains to bring volunteers to Delhi. So he is not free from the fact that he was one of the organisers.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: How -
Do you know?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: It has been reported in the press.

SARDAR RAGHBIR SINGH PANJHAZARI (Punjab): In which paper? There has been no such news.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: In the 'Evening News', in the "Hindustan Times" Evening News of November 7th.
(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whether it is *it* or not, let us get it through the inquiry.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: The 'Evening News' of November 7th has said that special trains were allowed to be run to bring volunteers to Delhi in order to participate in this massive demonstration. There has been no contradiction of that report in any of the newspapers so far. So we take it that the Railway Ministry had arranged to run special trains to bring volunteers from different parts of the country to Delhi. And so I say there are so many allegations made against the Ministers. The former Home Minister, Mr. Nanda has made very serious allegations not only against the Home Secretary, but he has levelled serious charges against the Prime Minister. There is a serious charge against Shri Atulya Ghosh and also against Mr. S. K. Patil that they all conspired to oust him from power. These are the charges which he has made. And the Prime Minister may have to say something about all this. Therefore, it is

necessary to have a comprehensive enquiry to go into the whole matter so that all the facts might be revealed and the responsibility may be fixed on the guilty and such occurrences may not occur again. In order to see that such occurrences will not happen again and there is a good and clean administration in this country, this comprehensive public enquiry is an imperative necessity and the demand for such an enquiry should be accepted. I entirely agree with the movers of the amendments, Mr. Vajpayee and Mr. Govindan Nair, who have said that a public enquiry should be ordered into the happenings of November 7th and also into the preparations that went for them, as also into the failures of the Government to rise to the occasion in order to meet a situation of this nature. I demand that the Government should accept the amendment and see that a public enquiry is ordered.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Shrimati Shyam Kumari Khan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): What about the statement on the students' agitation?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We will come to that.

SHRIMATI SHYAM KUMARI KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, my predecessors have gone in great detail into the disputes that the former Home Minister had referred to in the letter published in the press. I stand neither to bury Caesar nor to praise him. I welcome this debate because I think we could do a little loud thinking and find out why all this happened, I mean all this violence, and how it could be stopped. So far as I know, there is absolutely no difference between the Opposition and us, because in every speech of the Opposition emphasis is laid that they want peaceful and orderly processions, peaceful orderly life. Where then does the rub lie? I am afraid for everything that happens we are apt to put

the blame on the authorities and we are not taking the blame ourselves even if we are open to it. When we have processions, when we rouse passions, when we rouse religious passions and when we go to the extent of inviting ascetics and those people who have retired from this world to take part in public, political demonstrations, then I am afraid we have to shoulder the responsibility for the results of that also. I merely wish to tell my brother Shri Vajpayee that whereas I feel that if there is any truth in any of the allegations that he has made, strong measures should be taken and strong action should be taken by the Home Ministry, at the same time he cannot get rid of the fact that if political parties will join hands with *nagas* and other religious parties, then they will not be able to control these ascetics who have been away from the world and who do not know what is peace or orderly life. You cannot control them or make them go a particular way.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Therefore, I submit, Madam, that there is some blame attaching to those parties also who organised these processions. So far as their charges against the Administration and the Government are concerned, that the Government did not take enough precautions, that the Government was not prepared for this violence, I have to say this. Mr. Vajpayee himself told us that when the Jan Sangh brought out a procession it was orderly. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has told us that when the Communist Party of India brought out a procession it was orderly and it was non-violent. All the processions that have been brought out so far have been orderly. We are living in State where democracy is prevailing, not autocracy and every procession is allowed by the State. When the organisers of the processions themselves say that the processions will be non-violent, then the authorities have no business to make mass-scale arrests in the town before the

[Shrimati Shyam Kumari Khan.]

procession became violent. They could take action only afterwards. It would be illegal for the authorities in Delhi to take any action against anybody before the procession took place. How could the authorities order a search of every man in the procession? Would Mr. Vajpayee allow it? Would he like it? He has put the question why these persons were not searched for the possession of kerosene. The crowd that had collected had done so in private houses. How can you go and search the houses of the people? I come from Allahabad where the *naga sadhus* come for religious festivals and whenever the *naga* procession comes out there are thousands in this country who come to pay homage to them. I have seen the same thing happen on 7th November. Ladies were given seats in the front when the procession came and volunteers of the Jan Sangh preached from the loudspeakers, "Please be orderly. Let ladies be put in the front seats. Let them have darshan." I was a personal witness to this. This procession was not only a political procession, it was not only a procession against cow slaughter, but it was a procession which combined politics with religion and once that combination comes about, then we cannot be sure that the democratic set-up will remain, and non-violence will prevail.

Now, as for the question of protection of the cow in this country, the question of putting a ban on cow slaughter in this country, various States have differing opinions. Many States have prohibited cow slaughter. There are some States which, for reasons of their own, have not prohibited it. But violence of 7th November is not the way to enforce it. Everyone knows that Congressmen and non-Congressmen are all of the same opinion that there should be the utmost protection given to the cow in this country. We have a sentiment about the cow. It is a national sentiment. Mr. Vajpayee himself told us that a jatha of Mhs-

lims had also joined them. What would happen if religious fanaticism is roused? If the Muslims in India bring out a procession not to slaughter pigs, would you support it? You will not. This is a secular State and if we want to continue as a secular State we cannot mix the two, politics and religion, and organise such mixed processions.

About the charges regarding happenings in the hospital, about bodies being removed and all that, I have no doubt that they will be looked into in great detail by our Home Minister. If there is any truth in the charges I presume there must be, because an hon. Member himself has satisfied himself about it—then I think the severest punishment must be given. I do not want any misuse of official power. Official power must be used with the greatest consideration for the people's sentiments. It is because of this that violence broke out. The police found themselves absolutely ineffective to stop it. They threw the tear gas bomb only later on when they had no other option. They could not do anything to make the procession disperse. I was an eye witness from the first floor and I saw some twenty-five *nagas* physically grapple with the police, attempting to enter Parliament.

There is a great hue and cry that processions should come to Parliament. In my opinion not a single procession should come to Parliament because of the fact that there is physically no land outside and empty space where a meeting could take place. A procession should terminate at a place where there is an open plot of land so that the leaders may sit, so that the general public may not be disturbed and the traffic may go on all right and where

the procession can terminate 5 P.M. with a public meeting. If that

land is within one mile the procession may come within one mile. Surely, Parliament does not listen to the processionists. Parliament sits here within closed doors and the leaders

of the various parties present petitions.. Therefore this demand that every procession must terminate at parliament House is an unreasonable demand in my opinion. So far as the charges against the administration are concerned, when the riots did take place, I must praise the authorities that in spite of all the confusion, in spite of all the conflicting statements that were given within twelve hours the situation was brought under control.

AN HON. MEMBER: Within one hour.

SHRIMATI SHYAM KUMARI KHAN: Actually it was under control within one hour as my friend here says, By 7 A.M. next morning normal life had returned to the town except for that the precaution was taken of closing down the schools and colleges for one extra day.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The curfew did not last for more than four hours.

SHRIMATI SHYAM KUMARI KHAN: Now, an hon. Member complained that extra police was requisitioned and it was requisitioned from Madhya Pradesh and not from Uttar Pradesh or Punjab. Well, I do not know how we can interfere from Parliament with the administrative arrangements as to from where the particular police force must come.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): That was not the question. The question was why it was brought from Madhya Pradesh.

SHRIMATI SHYAM KUMARI KHAN: I can reply to that. It is quite possible that Uttar Pradesh and Punjab may not have had enough police force to spare because they have various movements in their own States. I say this is absolutely an administrative matter and to suggest that . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Some Members suspected that it was because

they had the previous experience in Bastar.

SHRIMATI SHYAM KUMARI KHAN: Bastar is very far off and this is another point that I wanted to raise, Madam, that the Opposition tries to see in very little incident some political motive. The Government has to govern; the Government is responsible for maintaining law and order. If the Government had wanted to kill all the processionists they could have armed the police fully and instead of tear gas shells there would have been bullets but the Government did not want to do that. The Government did not even take any precaution because the Government wanted to be nonviolent. It had absolute faith in the processionists that they would be nonviolent and therefore they did not do it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Misplaced faith.

SHRIMATI SHYAM KUMARI KHAN: I do not say that the members of the procession went out and indulged in all the violence. That is a matter for enquiry and every incident has to be enquired into in detail but I do say that the result of the procession was this spate of violence in the town. Madam, I have dealt with the question of processions coming to the Parliament House.

In the end I will say that every side of the House is agreed that violence should not take place. I have not heard even a single member of the Opposition say that even if violence takes place processions should be allowed and taken out. They have all said, 'you make an enquiry and find out what has happened.' They want to put the blame on us and on the administration. When we are all agreed that violence should not take place, then why should we not agree that we will apply a little restraint also? Merely finding out political motives, merely looking to the resignation of a Minister and trying to find out an excuse to condemn the Prime Minister will not

[Shrimati Shyam Kumari Khan.]

do. The Prime Minister is fully entitled to have the Cabinet of her choice. It is a democratic set-up we have and I will not go into that because the Prime Minister is fully competent to deal with the situation herself and it is nobody else's business to interfere in that matter. It may be that she is correct, it may be that she is incorrect. As my friend, Mr. Reddy, said none of the hon. members opposite has any love lost between him and the hon. Minister who resigned. Nobody liked him before but everybody started liking him only because they wanted to impute a political motive against the present Cabinet. Therefore I humbly submit that we are not looking to the main thing. The main thing is that there is violence in the air; the main thing is that we are all agreed that a lot of tightening up has to be done. Whether that tightening up is going to be done through dismissal of officers or reinstatement of officers or making those officers greater men, that is the business of the Home Ministry and I appeal to my friends on the opposite side to help us so that we have orderly Government, we have peaceful life, in this country and the democratic set up is strengthened. The objective of all of us is the same.

Thank you.

**STATEMENT RESTUDENTS MARCH
ANNOUNCED FOR 18TH
NOVEMBER, 1966**

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal):
Now, the statement; I am waiting for that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, the call attention notice in the other House dealt with, I think, the ban on students' procession and the call attention notice that you, Mr. Gupta, gave in the morning deals with the arrests . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Everything.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the Home Minister so desires he may say something.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why 'so desires'? Let him make the statement.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN). I would certainly make the statement which I have made before the Lok Sabha. I would like to make the same statement; that was purely dealing with the ban on the National Students March as they call it.

A demonstration before Parliament by students from different parts of the country described as "National Students March" has been announced for 18th November. According to information available to us, the demonstration is being organised by Samajvad Yuva Jan Sang, the Students' Federation and the U.P. Student's Action Committee. Efforts are being made in several States, and on a particularly large scale in Uttar Pradesh, to mobilise students for the projected demonstration. An order under Section 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure prohibiting processions, public meetings, etc. in the neighbourhood of Parliament House, Connaught Circus and Chandni Chowk has been in force for a long time. The Delhi authorities however, used to allow processions to be taken out to the Parliament area subject to conditions prescribed by them. Following the disturbances in Parliament Street and other neighbouring areas on 7th November the Deputy Commissioner, Delhi, has issued an order under Section 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure prohibiting processions, public meetings, etc. in the entire Union Territory of Delhi Taking into account the general climate of violence in the country, the very unfortunate involvement of certain sections of students in acts of violence and destruction of public property,