

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : मैं एक मिनट में हो खत्म करे देता हूँ। तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि इस बिल के पास होने के बाद जब कोठारी कमेटी फिर रिपोर्ट देगी तो क्या एक माडल बिल फिर ले आएंगी? मैं, श्रीमन्, आपसे यह कहना चाहूंगा कि शिक्षा-संस्थाओं में अनुशासन के सवाल पर विचार करते समय ज्यादा सजीदगी से, ज्यादा सौच-समझ कर और भावनाओं से ऊपर उठकर इस सवाल को हल करने के लिये कोई कदम उठाया जाये तो उचित होगा और मैं माननीय शिक्षा-मंत्री जी से आप्रह कहेगा कि इस बिल को वापस लें। कोठारी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आने पर या किसी एक्सपर्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट से माडल बिल प्रस्तुत करें जो यूनि-वर्सिटी की आटानामी दे सके, जो विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासन के लिए प्रेरणा दे सके, जो बाइस चान्सलर को सन्तुष्टि दे सके कि वे अपनी जिम्मेदारियों को संभाल सके। धन्यवाद।

# CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

STATEMENT MADE BY SHRI G. V. KETKAR REGARDING THE PLAN OF NATHU RAM GODSE TO ASSASSINATE MAHATMA GANDHI—contd.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA): Sir, following the recent release of the three convicts of the Mahatma Gandhi Murder Case, certain reports have appeared in the Press which have caused intense pain and resentment. According to these reports, which have subsequently been confirmed by the State Government, a meeting was organised at Poona on November 12, 1964 to felicitate two of the convicts—Gopal Godse and Vishnu Karkare—on their release. Presiding over the meeting, Shri Ketkar, Editor of Tarun

Bharat, claimed that he had known of the intention of Nathuram Godse to assassinate Mahatma Gandhi and had conveyed this information to the late Shri B. G. Kher, the then Chief Minister of Bombay, through Babu Kaka Kanetkar. He is further reported to have said that he had made an attempt to dissuade Nathuram Godse from carrying out his intention. Shri Ketkar repeated the statement substantially at another meeting held on November 15, 1964 at Poona to mark the death anniversary of the assassin of Mahatma Gandhi. As both Babu Kaka Kanetkar and Shri Kher are now no more, it has not been possible immediately to verify Shri Ketkar's claim of having communicated his knowledge of the intention to assassinate Gandhiji to Shri Kher. Government are making a thorough inquiry into the matter with the help of old records and in consultation with the Government of Maharashtra.

Whatever the truth or otherwise of this matter, the fact that the death anniversary of the assassin of one of the greatest men of all times, whose memory is highly venerated and cherished not only in this country but throughout the world, should be observed and that the other ex-convicts should be felicitated on their release at a public function has come as a profound shock to the Government and the people of this country. It is amazing that an act so revolting to human decency and the highest values cherished by this ancient land since the dawn of time should hold an appeal even to an infinitesimal section of our people.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I would like to know from the Home Minister whether he has received a detailed report on what happened at the meeting. According to what has been published, Mr. Ketkar disclosed that for about three months prior to Gandhiji's murder, Nathuram "used to discuss with me the pros and cons" of his idea to kill Gandhiji. He was opposed to the idea and "used to

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

tell Nathuram to consider the consequences, both social and political." Mr. Ketkar said that after the first incident—this is important—(Madanlal had exploded a bomb at Gandhiji's prayer meeting a few days before the murder), Badage (who turned approver) had come to Poona and told him (Mr. Ketkar) of "their future plans." Mr. Ketkar added that he thus knew that they were going to kill Gandhiji. As Mr. Ketkar said these things, Mr. Gopal Godse asked him not to speak "more about it." But Mr. Ketkar said that "they will not arrest me now for that." Sir, I should like to ask the Home Minister and the Leader of the House, who happens to be here . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): I did not follow the last sentence.

SHRI A. D. MANI: The last sentence was this. As Mr. Ketkar said these things, Mr. Gopal Godse asked him not to speak "more about it." But Mr. Ketkar said that "they will not arrest me now for that." Sir, I should like to ask the Home Minister and the Leader of the House, who is an eminent Judge, whether under law the conspiracy to kill Gandhiji ended with the murder trial of Godse or the conspiracy is a continuing conspiracy. If some persons had known more about it, that fact should be ascertained from them by the Government. It is not a question of making an enquiry through the Government of Bombay. The person said that he knew about the murder plan. I would like to ask the Home Minister whether any attempt has been made by the Government of India to ask Mr. Ketkar to give all those details which he knows.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): There are some Members who had given the notice. Would you like to answer one by one or would you hear them all and then reply?

SHRI A. D. MANI: One by one, so that he may not get confused.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: As you like, Sir. So far as this particular question is concerned, it is a matter not of my opinion, but what the proper legal course and possibilities would be and I understand that it should be possible to take action against a person for having been an accessory before the act. In that sense possibly the conspiracy would not have terminated at that point. But in this case how exactly that has a bearing on the situation, I am not able to say immediately. We are in touch with the Maharashtra Government. So far as now ascertained, the position is that this gentleman claims, of course, knowledge, but also that he had tried to dissuade this person and further that he had tried to prevent such a thing happening by giving an early intimation to some persons who could have done something about it.

SHRI ABID ALI (Maharashtra): In the notice which I had submitted, this was also mentioned. I had requested the Government to kindly mention their reaction to the receptions which are being organised for the ex-prisoners recently released. In this connection, I would also request the hon. Minister to let the House know about the action they contemplate with regard to what has been mentioned. In this connection, as he knows, a copy of the Bhagawat Gita and a picture of Lord Krishna, which were with the person who was hanged and a Bhaguva Jhanda of the Hindu Maha Sabha, which he had pinned on his shirt, when he was hanged, were also displayed at this meeting. The photo of the hanged Godse was decorated and displayed there. Sir, in this connection it is known that the Government of Maharashtra has sought the advice of the Government of India. May I know whether they have received their communication and what they contemplate to do in this behalf? The situation is full of anxiety very much, not

only of this Godse, but also the photo of Mao is being decorated and displayed at many places. It is a very serious question that such traitors should be going on in this way and their photos are displayed, decorated, garlanded and respected. The Government has to be alert. Of course, it is alert about it. But the House would like to know what is contemplated by the Government, so that such things are stopped.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): One by one. Let him reply to this.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA From what we have known from both press reports and the other information that we have obtained, it is obvious that what occurred there at that reception can only be called in the nature of an atrocious manifestation of an ugly mentality bordering on insanity and I cannot characterise it in terms less severe. Now, what has to be done about it? What Government can do is merely one part. I see that there is a report that Mr. Naik, the Chief Minister, told pressmen here yesterday that the State Government would take necessary action against those who had recently arranged a public reception at Poona to felicitate Gopal Godse and Vishnu Karkare on their release from prison, etc.

So, it appears that the Maharashtra Government is considering this question.

The other part of the question was about the dangers, the hazards that it creates. I think the best answer to that certainly is an awakened community sensitive to all these happenings and therefore creating a widespread feeling against such manifestation. That social awakening is really the best and most adequate answer for this. Whether anything in the nature of a legal action is possible or not I cannot say, but we are in touch with the Maharashtra Government.

We have not received any communication from them, which the hon. Member referred to, but we shall certainly be in touch with that Government, and any information or help or advice that that Government seeks from us certainly we shall be prepared to give.

About the other thing which was brought into this question, I think there may be some other occasion to answer that unless the idea of the hon. Member is that there are instigations to violent activity which are associated with certain names. Wherever there is any violent activity, certainly we have to put it down or any effort or attempt or any kind of a feeling generated for that purpose.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, with your permission I may read only a few lines of the report that appeared in the Indian Express of November 15th:

"Several of those present offered pooja to a photograph of Nathuram Godse hung decoratively in an outline of undivided India. Those who offered pooja included Gopal Godse, Vishnu Karkare, both of whom were sentenced to life imprisonment and were released last month and a freelance journalist."

The report further says:

"Speakers on the occasion including Mr. N. G. Abhyankar, RSS leader, Mr. P. V. Davare and Mrs. Shantabai Gokhale said that Nathuram was a "martyr".

Mr. Abhyankar described Nathuram as a "true follower of Bhagwan Krishna and Chatrapati Shivaji".

I am more concerned about that aspect of the question. It is not only that certain people held a reception for Godse but these people are guilty of a criminal offence for perpetuating a cult of violence, a cult of political assassination that Nathuram Godse

[Shri Chandra Shekhar.]

represents. It is not a question of people getting awakened as the hon. Home Minister has said. As it is a criminal offence under the present law of the land, why did not the Government move in the matter, whether it is the Maharashtra Government or the Union Government, to take action against those persons who are trying to glorify a person who is the symbol of political anarchy, who is the symbol of political shame? This is the supreme affront that the Indian nation can face that the assassin of the Father of the Nation is being glorified as a martyr and indirectly people are inciting that this cult of violence and political assassination should continue. It is a peculiar thing that the particular editor who is mentioned by the Home Minister sends in a report to say that the published reports of that speech are generally correct. This is a clear confession. I wonder why the Home Ministry here and the Government of Maharashtra did not move in the matter and arrest all those persons. Those persons who are preaching only for economic interests of poor people, are being dealt with under the Defence of India Rules. But these murderers who are preaching political assassination are going scot-free, and it is a very sorry affair that the Home Minister should say that the people should get awakened and boycott these people and not see eye to eye with them. May I know from the Home Minister what positive, immediate action he is contemplating? Why was no action taken? This is a criminal offence under the present law of the land.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: If the hon. Member had followed my earlier reply, he would have found an answer to the question that he has raised. I said that whatever has to be done in the matter, legal action or whatever it is, that is being considered by the Maharashtra Government, and there is no question of any kind of consideration being given to

any person who is culpable in this matter. I said that in addition it is the community which has to resist and to see to it that such things are not possible.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, there are clearly two things with which we are concerned here: (1) disclosures about the plan to murder Mahatma Gandhi that were made at that particular meeting by Mr. Ketkar; (2) the organisation of the reception itself. With regard to the first, I should like to make the following submission. I should like to know the position of the Government in the matter. At the time of the assassination of Gandhiji there was a feeling abroad that there had been some dereliction of duty somewhere, that he had not been given the protection which should have been given to him. Now this is a startling revelation after all that. A person publicly states that the intention to murder was communicated to him and that he had also communicated the same through an intermediary to the then Chief Minister of the Bombay State, and this report he has owned up—and Mr. Ketkar is there, others may not be there. Am I to understand that in view of the circumstances of the case and having regard to the grave misgivings that we had in 1948 when Gandhiji fell to the assassin's bullet, all that we have to do is to find out things from old records? Is it not a fit case for a very high-powered enquiry into the whole revelations that had been made in order to find out whether and in what manner the information was received, the communication about the intention was received by Mr. Ketkar, what he did later on, to whom he went, and so on? I think that if it had been so much talked about at that time, the would-be murderer coming and talking to Mr. Ketkar, it is tantamount to an admission that the matter had been discussed in a conspiratorial manner amongst others also. What was the Bombay Government doing at that time? We would like to know whether the Bombay Government and the

Central Government and the Central intelligence had any inkling or indication with regard to such things. This is very very important.

I think it is not enough for the Union Home Minister today, after the startling revelation that had been made by Mr. Ketkar, to say that the records will be looked into. The country would like to be assured of a thorough, searching enquiry into the entire episode, the entire circumstances in order to find out whether there was a deliberate dereliction of duty on the part of some people, whether some people in high authority suppressed it after having got the news through Mr. Ketkar directly or indirectly. This is what I would like to know. Therefore, I would suggest here a high-powered enquiry into the whole matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have made your point about a high-powered enquiry.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I cannot imagine this matter being treated in this manner, the manner in which the Central Government now wants to treat it. Our suspicions have been roused again, the country's suspicions have been roused again. I do not know whether Mr. Ketkar had been summoned here to make his disclosures or whether the Home Minister had sent emissaries to Mr. Ketkar to get statements from him as to what he knew at that time, what he did, and so on. Therefore, I charge the Government of India of not moving in this matter with the alertness and agility that are called for in a situation of this kind. Secondly, with regard to the reception, Mr. Naik's statement had been brought in. What Mr. Naik said is rather shocking. Mr. Naik made a statement. He said that it was not organised by any party but by only some individuals and asked, "Why blame the party for some individuals' action?" and so on.

Now, am I to understand that the Bombay Government is going to deal

with this matter properly? First of all, we would like to know whether the Government of Mr. Naik knew about the proposal for holding a reception which was held on the 12th. We know from the newspapers that invitations were sent, arrangements had been made prior to that date, and certainly there is a thing called Intelligence there, the State Intelligence, the Central Intelligence. What were they doing? Did they know that the plan was afoot in order to organise a reception to felicitate the murderers of Mahatma Gandhi on the 12th of November? Arrangements were made. And you see, the very organisation of the meeting itself would show that lots of things had been done. It was not suddenly done or too secretly done that the Government could not have known about it. Therefore I take it that the Government was in the know of things, that some such thing was going to take place. Why did not the Government act before it was late? I would like to know whether the Central Government was sent any report, what the Central Intelligence or its subsidiary Bureau or whatever it is there was doing in Bombay, what the Intelligence of the Bombay Government was doing, what the administration in Poona, its police and CID were doing. We would like to know these.

Secondly, when the meeting was in progress, there was no interference whatsoever; it went on. Do I understand then that, when the news that the meeting was in progress, that the reception was being held, reached the Government of Bombay did not send any police or officials of the Government to watch that particular meeting and find things out? I would like to know that thing also. If they were present, what were they doing? If they were not present on behalf of the Government of Bombay or the Poona Administration or the Poona authorities, why were they absent? Therefore, there also we have very strong grounds to complain against the Bombay Government. I therefore

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] demand that the Central Government should take the initiative in this matter wholly and fully and must not leave things in the hands of Mr. Naik. Mr. Naik's statement is utterly disappointing. He has shown utter incompetence in this matter. He did not act even when the meeting was in progress nor had he acted after the thing was over. Now we are told that some action will be taken after so many days. Yet, it was open to them to act immediately.

Therefore, I think that this is a very serious matter, this holding of the meeting. Imagine Mahatma Gandhi is not just one person killed in India among persons killed. It is not the case of an ordinary assassin or a political assassin. Mahatma Gandhi was killed and the killers were these people. There are no two Mahatma Gandhis, there have not been two. And we cannot think of such monstrous killers and assassins as we say in this particular case, and this is how the Government of India is reacting to this matter. And the hon. Minister says, the nation's conscience will be roused. Yes, the nation's conscience has been roused. But we should like to know what the nation is getting from the Government of India and the administration of the State Government which are financed by the nation. I should like to know whether they, after having failed to protect Mahatma Gandhi's life, are today going to allow these kinds of things. All these things have to be explained.

SHRI ABID ALI: And also about Mao.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The Home Minister.

SHRI ABID ALI: Do not forget him.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: If the intensity of feelings on a subject is to be judged only by the pitch of one's voice, he may score over me but I cannot, I do not have words to say. But personally, I can myself

feel it. I think as if that scene of murder is being enacted before us again when I read about that meeting and the description of what had occurred there. But what is to be done? This question arose in some form even at the time of the trial. I have before me the judgment of the High Court. When this point was raised—not in the context of any information that this gentleman got or gave to anybody—it was then urged that some persons in authority in the Bombay Government then had not acted in time. This question was very thoroughly dealt with, examined, and the Court pronounced that all that was possible in those circumstances was done. Therefore, I am now taking the one point which the hon. Member raised, as to what the Government then did. There are specific pronouncements on that subject. The Maharashtra Government and ourselves are in close contact about this. We have instituted, started, initiated a search into the records and everything possible, anything, any clue that could be obtained from it, will certainly be obtained and similarly, the Maharashtra Government are also engaged in this. Whatever it may lead to, whatever kind of enquiry is left to be pursued, well, that is going to be taken up. And as far as any action by the Maharashtra Government is concerned, as I said, Sir, we are awaiting the reply of the Maharashtra Government.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh): On behalf of the Jana Sangh, I strongly condemn the statement of Mr. Ketkar and the functions held at Poona on the 12th and 15th of this month. The Jana Sangh would support every move of the Government of India when it deals firmly with all the culprits who believe in violence as a method of revolution, whether those culprits proceed from Poona or Telengana.

Then there are certain questions, Sir. Is the Government aware that Mr. Ketkar . . .

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Go on with your questions.

SHRI D. THENGARI: Is the Government aware that Mr. Ketkar subsequent to his statement that has been referred to resigned from the editorship of "The Tarun Bharat"?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. D. MANI: Let him ask questions.

SHRI D. THENGARI: Again, may I know whether Mr. N. G. Abhyankar whose statement has been referred to has resigned from the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh after this statement?

Again, Sir, may I know whether the Government is aware of the statement by Mr. M. G. Kanitkar, son of Mr. Balukaka Kanitkar, in the course of which he stated that the Government was forewarned by Mr. Balukaka Kanitkar and was urged to take precautions?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Sir, the hon. Member chooses to give this information.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras): I would like to know whether the Government has enquired into the fact of the allegation that he had given that information to the late Mr. B. G. Kher. Has the Government got anything definite to say on that matter? And has the Home Minister found out anything from the records of the Central Government to say that such information was received by the Central Government?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: It is now available; there is no clue to that at all.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): The statement of Mr. Ketkar, if reported correctly, splits up his knowledge into two parts. The first part was when he was informed in the beginning, he

vaguely had the notion that there was a vague idea—in their mind to murder Mahatma Gandhi. Secondly, when there was the bomb explosion, then he became definite that the plan was going to be executed. I would like to know whether the communication that he sent was in between these two stages or after he had formed the definite opinion after the bomb blast that there was a definite plan to murder Mahatma Gandhi. When was that information sent? Was there anything specific and definite in that information that a full-fledged plan had been hatched and was going to be executed to murder Mahatma Gandhi? That is part number one.

Number two is this. I hope that the hon. Minister for Home Affairs is aware that while in civil law a period of limitation is prescribed for action, under the Indian criminal law no period of limitation is prescribed for prosecutions for criminal actions. In the circumstances, does he realise that even now, whether 17 years or even 70 years might have elapsed, if a crime has been committed, people can be brought before a court of law and tried and punishment can be meted out to them?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: We shall endeavour to obtain precise information on the aspects mentioned by the hon. Member. With regard to the latter part of it, I have already myself stated that it should be so.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Abdul Ghani, you will get your chance. Please sit down.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): The Home Minister's statement was full of very high sentiments. I listened with profound regard to the fine statement he made. I only missed one thing in that statement, and that was the quick ring of action. Even later, when some hon. Members from this side challenged the Home Minister, he said, "Yes, this is true. But the whole problem is what shall"

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]

we do?" That is just the crux of the whole problem. My friend, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, said it is not the particular event that rouses distress and unhappiness and, if I may say so, strong resentment in the minds of the people. How did this happen? My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, with whom for once I thought I was in agreement today—had a passionate ring in what he was saying and the manner in which he brought up the subject. He analysed the matter there must have been the notice of the meeting, there must have been preparations for the meeting. He analysed the whole thing like a lawyer, brilliantly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He is a lawyer.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): What is your point, Mr. Ramachandran?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: I am coming to that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Please make your point. Do not repeat what has already been said.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: One of the major things he mentioned has to be repeated that the statement of the Chief Minister of Maharashtra was wholly disappointing, and something has to be done with that kind of a statement. I want to go a little deeper into this matter. Many years after the event this thing comes up again. If it reveals anything it reveals this that there is a cancer in the body-politic of this country. It is persisting and it is going to persist unless something is done about it. What can be done? The Home Minister may take penal action. But I say just penal action is not going to solve this problem. It is a problem of the culture and conduct in the national life of a great people. What has become absolutely necessary is to study this

phenomenon? Who are behind this whole thing, this whole phenomenon, because it appears there are people keeping this cancer alive in the body-politic of India. We have to approach this problem—and if I may say so with our Education Minister sitting here—from an educational angle. This is an educational problem. Have we educated the youth of Maharashtra and India against this cancer? Have we educated our young people to reject this kind of poison in the life of our people? Let us organise a project of study. Let the Education Minister take it up. Let the Home Minister take it up. Let there be a complete study of this phenomenon in Poona and roundabout. On behalf of the Gandhi Peace Foundation, of which the Chairman is sitting here, and of which I have the honour to be the Secretary, we offer to associate ourselves, not in order to take any penal action, not in order to punish anybody, but to go into the roots of the matter to find out why this phenomenon is persisting in the life of a section of our people. If we do not do that, we will be guilty of high treason against the people and the Republic.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Any reply?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: It does not call for any reply because I fully reciprocate the sentiments and that is what I started with. I agree, Sir, that this poison persists. There is evidence of it concentrated somewhere and thinner somewhere else, and it has to be dealt with by governmental action whatever possible.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: If you knew that this poison was persisting, what did you do about it?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: We took several steps, for example, national integration, emotional integration and also dealing with communalism, rapid communalism from whatever source it comes and in whatever form it comes. I have been trying



to study this. And I think the hon Member and the institution which he represents, along with others, will initiate a big movement in the country. And we shall be all in it.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN (Maharashtra) May I know, Sir, if the Government is aware that at the reception meeting there was reading of the will of Mr Godse? Will the Government secure that will and place it on the Table of the House? There is another thing. After the will was read out, oaths were taken that they would further the expectations of the oath. That means, the persistence of the cult of Mr Godse. That is my one question.

My another question is that Mr Ketkar, who was the editor of *Tarun Bharat*, has not resigned but he was made to resign. But I would like to know if Mr Ketkar was not the editor of *Kesari* when Mahatma Gandhi was murdered. And before that event, were not articles irritating the people written by Mr Ketkar, though not exactly encouraging the murder of Mahatma Gandhi but spreading disaffection against him.

SHRI ABID ALI Hatred not only disaffection.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN I withdraw the word "disaffection". It should be "hatred". Replace it by "hatred".

The third question is when his event, this reception took place according to my information, more than 500 cards were distributed. How is it that the police did not come to know of them? And when that meeting was held, it was attended by not less than 300 persons. How is it that the police intelligence department could not come to know of it?

My fourth question is that Shri Thengari referred to Shri N G Abhyankar who attended the meeting. He was and he is the leader of RSS.

He resigned. In his resignation he has stated that he is resigning simply because his speech there may not embarrass the position of RSS. Not that he has given up his views. He has stated therein that his views are there, and that whatever he spoke in the meeting are his correct views. But he said that he was resigning simply because his speech might not embarrass the position of RSS.

And my last question is Will the Government when it goes into a thorough enquiry, also go into this matter that how far RSS was connected with this event when its leaders were present there and they also took active part in it.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA I am grateful to the hon Member for some information given which was a repetition of what other Members had said.

SHRI R S KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh) I want to ask one or two questions. Firstly, may I know, Sir, why these two convicts were released when their application was pending in the Supreme Court? Is the Government not aware of an earlier Supreme Court decision regarding the interpretation of 'their claims'? Therefore I want to know why they were released at all. Why did the Government not wait for the final disposal of their application in the Supreme Court?

Secondly—this is a repetition—may I know, Sir, whether the Government have found out from their records where it was suggested, during the trial also and it appeared in the newspapers also, that the Maharashtra Government had referred the matter to the Central Government? They had also prior information about this. May I know, Sir, whether the Government have examined their old record after it appeared in the newspapers?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M P BHARGAVA) Please repeat your second part of the question.

**SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR:** The first part of the question is why they were released. The second part is that there were reports in newspapers that even the Maharashtra Government—the then Bombay Government—referred the matter to the Central Government. I should like to know whether the Government of India have searched their old record regarding this matter. As the hon. Minister said, something of this came in at the time of evidence during the murder trial. But apart from it, whether now the Government have searched their own old record and found out whether they had received prior intimation from the Maharashtra Government and, if so, what did they do with that information?

**SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA:** About the first part of the question, this release occurred as in the normal course. Under the present rules whatever is the normal action that was taken.

Secondly, about the other thing, the information which the hon. Member wants—he referred to the judgment—I have already stated, Sir, that we are trying to search for any piece of information that may be available in this connection.

**PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh):** Sir, I wish to ask two or three questions. Mr. Ketkar has tried to prove his innocence by two statements. The first is that he tried to dissuade Mr. Godse from committing the murder, and the second is that he communicated the news to some one in authority in Bombay, that a thing like that was going to happen. But the fact that he presided over the meeting indicates that he is not so innocent as he tries to prove himself to be. Just now a Member of Parliament also revealed to us that at that time he had written a number of articles inciting hatred against Mahatma Gandhi. Therefore, I feel, Sir, that he cannot be taken as a very innocent person.

The second point that I wish to point out is this. Now we know a person who says he knows about the conspiracy. Is it not time for us to institute another enquiry and force him to place all the facts before that enquiry committee and institute a thorough enquiry into the conduct of those who are noted to be involved in this matter? Sir, as a Member of Parliament, I am not prepared to condemn the then Government of Bombay outright. But I do feel that an enquiry is needed. I have great regard for Mr. Kher who was then the Chief Minister of Bombay and I am perfectly sure that he must not have been a party to any complacency in this matter. But his own name requires to be cleared and a thorough enquiry has to be made so that it may be possible for us to say that while such a horrible incident happened, that man who was associated with Mahatma Gandhi for so many years, should not be accused of complacency in the matter. If unfortunately, being engaged in many other matters, he got himself involved in complacency, then the poor man, with due respect to him, will have to suffer from the verdict of that enquiry. I feel that the question is not merely that of the Government of Bombay. The question is of those who were involved in that conspiracy, and I feel that in the United States of America and other places high-power enquiries are held after many years, when a clue is found out.

The second thing to which I wish to invite the attention of the Government is whether this reception to assassins and the worship of assassins is allowed under our law or is not allowed under our law. This is a very important question. The question is whether a person who had assassinated another person and has been convicted by a law court for assassination, can be welcomed, the way he was there welcomed and whether persons who are sentenced for assassination by a competent court can be

deified the way Mr. Godse was deified on that day. And just now a person asked, "Why not?" Perhaps he was saying it as a joke. But if it is a fact, then I would request the Government to look into the matter, whether the law needs to be revised in this respect or not. The hon. Home Minister is in no way less concerned than myself in this matter, the Home Minister was more closely associated with Mahatma Gandhi than I was,—still I am sorry to say that he has not given us the impression that he wishes to move in the matter with the necessary speed.

**SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA:** How do I move? I cannot move out to him and shake hands with him. Anyway, as I said, I am moving. I agree that my glorification of such hideous crimes is certainly a heinous act, if not a crime in itself. My hon. colleague sitting here may know more about the precise intent of the law on the subject. But I say it is hideous, this glorification of such murders and such acts, any act of assassination of any person—nothing to speak of a person like Mahatma Gandhi.

Regarding the other part of what he said, about his suggestion that he has made for an enquiry, certainly it is being vigorously pursued. I would only rather request hon. Members and say let us not anticipate. He said something may go against Mr. Kher . . . .

**PROF. M. B. LAL:** I am not anticipating. I wish his position to be cleared.

**SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA:** It is not necessary. Whatever is needed is going to be done in this matter.

**PROF. M. B. LAL:** Will it be possible for the Leader of the House to give some opinion on the legal aspect of the question?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA):** This is not the occasion. Mr. Gujral.

**SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi):** While I am one of those who have been considerably satisfied with the feelings expressed by the Home Minister, I only like to remind him that when Gandhiji was murdered a particular organisation was banned because we felt that it was giving way and giving expression to certain trends in life which are not healthy for democratic growth. Later on that party was again legalised on the understanding that they had given up their methods. Now a prominent leader of theirs goes and delivers speeches and participates actively and perhaps took over himself. Later on he resigns from that party. The question I wish to put Sir, is this. In view of the fact that such extreme communal parties have for long past given vent to, have expressed their views with hatred, have even preached hatred, would the Government now consider taking active steps against their *modus operandi*, particularly the indoctrination which they do to the young children in the mornings? Would the Government see to it that this particular type or cult, not only of hatred but of Fascism, is now nipped in the bud. On this incident I will just read out what has appeared in a local Urdu paper. It is like this:

دد یہ تقریب نٹھو رام گاتے اور  
نارائن آیتے کی چنہیں گاندھی جی کے  
مقدمہ قتل میں سزائے موت دی گئی  
تھی - ۱۶ ویں سالانہ برسی کے سلسلہ  
میں منعقد ہوئی تھی - کئی اشخاص  
نے جو اس تقریب میں موجود تھے  
نٹھورام گاتے کی تصویر کی پوجا کی -  
ان میں کوپال گاتے، وشنو کرکے اور  
مستور اے - جے کرماکر چورانسٹ شامل  
تھے - نٹھورام گاتے کے ایک چھوٹے  
باتی نے نٹھورام کی وصیت پڑھ کر

[Shri I. K. Gujral.]

سلانی - جسموں لکھا تھا - مجری  
راکھ سبز جھلکے کے نیچے نہیں بلکہ  
بھگورے جھلکے کے نیچے رکھ کر دریائے  
سندھ میں پرواہ کی جائے - اس  
موقعہ پر وشو کرکے بھگوت گیتا -  
بھگوان کرشن کی تصویر متصوہ  
ہندوستان کا خاکہ اور ہندو مہا سیمہا  
کا بھگوا جھنڈا تقریب میں پیش کیا -

اس موقعہ پر تقریریں کرنے والوں  
میں اشتدیدیہ سویم سہوک سنگھ کے لیڈر  
شری این جی ایہلمکر - شری پی - دی  
داورے اور مسز شاننا بائی گوہلے شامل  
تھیں - انہوں نے کہا کہ نتھو رام شہید  
تھا - شری ایہلمکر نے کہا کہ نتھو رام  
بھگوان کرشن اور چھترپتی شیدا جی کا  
سچا بھکت تھا - گوپال گوہلے اور  
کرکے نے چھل میں اپنے کچھ تجربات  
بھان کئے - ۴۰

†[ "یہ तकریب नथूराम गोडसे और  
नारायण आष्टे की जिन्हें गांधी जी के मुकदमा  
कतल में सजा-ए-मौत दी गई थी । सोलवी  
सालाना बरसी के लिसिले में मुनक्कद हुई  
थी । कई अशखाश ने जो इस तकरीब में  
मोजूद थे नथूराम गोडसे की तस्वीर की पूजा  
की । इन में गोपाल गोडसे, विष्णु करकरे  
और मिस्टर् ए० ज० करमारकर जर्नेलिस्ट  
शामिल थे । नथूराम गोडसे के एक छांट  
भाई ने नथूराम की वसीयत पढ कर सुनाई ।  
जिस में लिखा था, मेरी राख सब्ज झंडे के नीचे  
नहीं बल्कि भगवे झंडे के नीचे रख कर दरयाये  
मिन्ध में प्रवाह की जाये । इस मौके पर विष्णु  
करकरे ने भगवद् गीता, भगवान कृष्ण की

तस्वीर मुत्तहदा हिन्दुस्तान का खाका और  
हिन्दु महासभा का भगवा झंडा तकरीब  
में पेश किया । इन मौके पर तकरीरें करने  
वालों में राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक मघ के लीडर  
श्री एन० जी० अभयकर, श्री बी०वी० दावरे,  
और मिसिज शान्ता बाई गोखले शामिल थी ।  
उन्होंने कहा कि नथूराम जहीद था । श्री  
अभयंकर ने कहा कि नथूराम भगवान कृष्ण  
और छनरपति शिवाजी का सच्चा भगत था ।  
गोपाल गोडसे और करकरे ने जेल में अपने  
कुछ तजुर्बात ब्यान किये । ” ]

Sir, the simile may not apply, but  
I only want to bring to your notice  
that whenever Fascism . . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P.  
BHARGAVA): What is the name of that  
paper?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Pratap, dated  
the 17th November.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: An enquiry  
should be made.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Whenever  
Fascism is allowed to raise its head  
in democratic countries, these are the  
beginning symptoms, and if democracy  
does not rise in good time and curb  
them, then it becomes dangerous. I  
suggest that the Government should  
take strong action in this matter. I  
should also like the Home Minister to  
assure us that not only will he take  
strong action but that it will not be  
left to the State Government alone  
and that he also intends to see that  
such communal parties which are the  
breeding grounds of hatred and  
Fascism are also dealt with properly.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: The  
question of communal parties is  
being considered separately. The  
parties which promote communal  
hatred is a separate question which has  
to be considered.

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب) : کیا

آنریبل ہوم منسٹر صاحب بتائیں گے  
جب بایو جی شہید کئے گئے تھے تو  
اس وقت شی جے پرکاش جی نوائن  
نے بایو جی کی شہادت کے سلسلہ  
میں کچھ بیان دیئے تھے اگر دہلی تھے  
تو اس کو سینٹرل گورنمنٹ نے کیا  
انکوائری کی تھی - دوسرے جو بایو کو  
شہید کرنے والے ہیں ان کی اس سیدھا  
میں جہاں کہ ان کی تعریف کی گئی  
تھی اس کے پہلے کوئی مضمون ایسا  
لٹریچر سینٹرل گورنمنٹ کے سامنے آیا  
جس میں گوتے اور دوسروں کی بڑی  
تعریف کی گئی تھی تو اس سے  
سینٹرل گورنمنٹ یا مہاراشٹر گورنمنٹ  
نے کیا ایکشن لیا - دوسرے یہ سب  
کچھ گورو گوالکر جو راشٹریہ سوئم سہوک  
سندھ کے نیتا ہیں ان کی پردھان  
منڈی جی کی ملاقات کے بعد ہوئی -  
اگر بعد ہوئی تو اس سلسلہ میں  
پردھان منڈی جی کو گورو گوالکر  
جی سے بات چیت ہوئی تھی -

†[شری ابرہیلانی (پنجاب) : کیا تب  
آنرےبل ہوم منسٹر صاحب بتائیے جب  
باپو جی شہید کیے گئے تھے تو اس وقت شی  
جی پرکاش جی نارایان نے باپو جی کی شہا-  
دت کے سلسلے میں کچھ بیان دیے تھے اگر دیے  
تھے تو اس پر سنٹرل گورنمنٹ نے کیا ایکشن لیا  
کیا تھا ؟ دوسرے جو باپو کو شہید کرنے والے  
ہیں ان کی اس سب سے جہاں کہ ان کی تعریف  
کی گئی تھی اس کے پہلے کوئی مضمون ایسا  
لٹریچر سینٹرل گورنمنٹ کے سامنے آیا  
جس میں گوتے اور دوسروں کی بڑی  
تعریف کی گئی تھی تو اس سے  
سینٹرل گورنمنٹ یا مہاراشٹر گورنمنٹ  
نے کیا ایکشن لیا - دوسرے یہ سب  
کچھ گورو گوالکر جو راشٹریہ سوئم سہوک  
سندھ کے نیتا ہیں ان کی پردھان  
منڈی جی کی ملاقات کے بعد ہوئی -  
اگر بعد ہوئی تو اس سلسلہ میں  
پردھان منڈی جی کو گورو گوالکر  
جی سے بات چیت ہوئی تھی -

میں گود سے اور دوسروں کی بڑی تारीف کی گئی  
تھی تو اس میں سنٹرل گورنمنٹ یا مہاراشٹر  
گورنمنٹ نے کیا ایکشن لیا ؟ تیسرے یہ سب  
کچھ گورو گوالکر جو راشٹریہ سوئم  
سب کے نیتا ہیں ان کی پردھان منڈی جی  
کی ملاقات کے بعد ہوئی ۔ اگر بعد ہوئی تو  
اس میں مل سیکے میں پردھان منڈی جی کی گورو  
گوالکر جی سے بات چیت ہوئی تھی ؟ ]

شری گولجاری لال منڈا : جو تھکی  
اور تھکی ہوگا اس کے اندر ان سب  
باتوں پر غور کیا جائیگا ۔

شری عبدالغنی : میں یہ پوچھنا  
چاہتا ہوں کہ ان کی گورو گوالکر  
جی سے بات چیت ہوئی تھی یا  
نہیں -

†[شری ابرہیلانی : میں یہ پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں  
کہ ان کی گورو گوالکر جی سے بات چیت ہوئی  
تھی یا نہیں ؟ ]

پرو۔ منڈی بھاری لال : جب انکوائری  
ہوگی تو پردھان منڈی جی سے یہ بات پوچھی  
جائے گی ۔

شری عبدالغنی : میں پوچھتی  
جائے گی پردھان منڈی جی سے -

†[شری ابرہیلانی : یہ پوچھی جائے گی  
پردھان منڈی جی سے ]

شریمتی انیس قذوائی ( انڈیا ) :  
پریش : میں آنریبل منسٹر  
صاحب کو بدلانا چاہتی ہوں کہ  
اتفاق سے ۱۹۴۷ کے اس سلسلہ اور  
وہ دن منڈی آنکھوں کے سامنے

[श्रीमती अनिस कदौली]

ग़दरे हैं - कान्ग्रेस सीवा दल से मेरा तعلق रहा है - कान्ग्रेस सीवा दल के लोकों ने मुझे बताया कि गांधी जी के कतल करने की इतला बम्बई से आई है और यहां पर तीन आदमी इन्हें मारने के लिए आये है और यह खबर गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को दे दी थी । मेरा मुतालबा यह है कि इस सत्तरह साल पुराने किस्सा को जो गांधी जी के मर्डर का था इन की अब आपको पूरी पूरी इन्क्वायरी कर देनी चाहिये । अगर इतनी सी बात सामने आई है तो न मालूम कितनी और बातें सामने आएंगी ।

दूसरी चीज मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि श्री गोडसे को किन लोकों ने फाइनांस किया था । इस बात को भी इन्क्वायरी में शामिल कर लिया जाना चाहिये । इन दिनों दिल्ली बम्बई और ग्वालियर में ऐसी इनफार्मेशन मिली थी जिस से यह शुबह होता था कि ये सारी स्कीमें बम्बई में बनाई गई थी और इस के बाद जो लोग आये वे वहां से आये । मैं सिर्फ यही अर्ज करना चाहती थी । ]

दूसरी चीज मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि श्री गोडसे को किन लोकों ने फाइनांस किया था । इस बात को भी इन्क्वायरी में शामिल कर लिया जाना चाहिये । इन दिनों दिल्ली बम्बई और ग्वालियर में ऐसी इनफार्मेशन मिली थी जिस से यह शुबह होता था कि ये सारी स्कीमें बम्बई में बनाई गई थी और इस के बाद जो लोग आये वे वहां से आये । मैं सिर्फ यही अर्ज करना चाहती थी । ]

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Madras): Sir, the crux of the problem is this. I would like to know what organisation or organisations were behind the reception, or what political organisations had organised the reception to these assassins of Mahatma Gandhi. That is the most important thing, Sir, that this House should know. And when the information about the political organisations that organised this reception is known, what action is proposed to be taken to deal with these organisations? I would like to know.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Vice-Chairman . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): There are others. Your turn will come.

[श्रीमती अनिस कदौली (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब को बतलाना चाहती हूं कि इत्तफाक से १९४७ के इस महीना और वह दिन मेरी आंखों

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA :  
Whatever is necessary will be done

श्री गिरिराज किशोर कपूर (मध्य प्रदेश) : क्या माननीय मंत्री जी यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि राष्ट्रपिता की हत्या के १७ साल बाद भी जनता को राष्ट्रपिता की हत्या का पूरा राज नहीं बतलाया गया है ? क्या इसलिये नहीं बतलाया कि जो शासन कर रहे हैं वे जब चाहें तब जिस के नाम पर उनकी हत्या का आरोप लगा कर अपना राजनीतिक प्रचार पूरा करें ?

दूसरी बात मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह तमचा किस का था जिससे आपू जी की हत्या की गई थी ? सरकार को वह तमचा मिला, वह गोली भी मिली, लेकिन उसका राज जनता को आज तक क्यों नहीं बतलाया गया ?

तीसरी बात मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज जब कि देश में फिर ऐसी चीज हो, तो यह देश का दुर्भाग्य ही है कि आपू जी के हत्यारे की देश में पूजा हो। हमारा जो गृह मंत्रालय का विभाग है, उसका जो इंटेलिजेंस डिपार्टमेंट है और यह जो सरकार है वह सिर्फ यह कह कर कि हम इन्क्वायरी करेंगे, इन्क्वायरी करेंगे, सदन को विश्वास में नहीं ले सकेगी। क्या हमारे गृह-मन्त्रा जी हमको कोई ठीक समय बतलायेंगे जब कि मुल्क को यह बतला दिया जायेगा कि आखिर महात्मा गांधी जी की हत्या का पूरा राज क्या था और जो भी अधिकारी होंगे, उनको बगैर किसी कंसिडरेशन के पूरा पूरा दंड दिया जायेगा। और तब ही देश की सुरक्षा हो सकती है।

श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा : इस बड़े अप्सोसनाक मामले में जिस पर बहस हो रही है एक अच्छी चीज मालूम होती है कि मेम्बर साहब ने जो कुछ कहा, जिन जजबात का इजहार किया, जिन भावनाओं को दर्शाया, वह एक अच्छा चिह्न है। तो आज

जरूरत इस बात की है कि जो आपने कहा कि इस वक्त क्या हो रहा है उसका असर आगे वाक्यात पर पड़ सकता है। इसलिए उनकी पार्टी और सब पाटिया इस बात में शामिल हो जायेगी कि हम ऐसी कोई चीज नहीं होने देंगे जिसका असर भविष्य में पड़े, तो बहुत अच्छी बात होगी।

श्री उद्धवराव साहेबराव पाटिल (महाराष्ट्र) : मैं हुकूमत से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि महात्मा गांधी जी का जो कत्ल हुआ वह पाकिस्तान के वजूद में आने के बाद जो लोग अखंड भारत बनाना चाहते थे, जो अखंड भारत के कहने वाले हैं, उनमें से ही चन्द नौजवानों ने यह कत्ल किया था। इसलिए जिन लोगों ने कसम खाई थी कि अखंड भारत होकर रहेगा, तो क्या हुकूमत को ऐसे लोगों के बारे में पूरी पूरी जानकारी है और उनकी जो गोजाना की एक्टिविटीज है उन पर वह कड़ी नज़र रखनी है या नहीं ? क्योंकि न सिर्फ पूना में यह हलचल है बल्कि इन ख्यालात का इजहार हर प्रान्त में किया गया है और वे लोग अपने को अखंड भारत का बतलाते हैं और इस तरह के लोगों का साथ देते हैं। तो ऐसे लोगों पर कड़ी नज़र रखी जानी चाहिये चाहे उन्होंने आर० एस० एस० से रिजाइन क्यों न कर दिया हो, मगर उनका आर्गनाइजेशन हर प्रान्त में है और वह काम कर रहे हैं। इसलिए मेरी हुकूमत से यह दरखास्त है कि इस तरह के लोगों के ऊपर कड़ी नज़र रखी जानी चाहिये।

श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा : यह कड़ी नज़र रखनी चाहिये और सिर्फ आगे फैमला करने की बात नहीं है। जहाँ तक मेरा सम्बन्ध है, मैं इस चीज को बहुत गम्भीर समझता हूँ और इस पर हम कड़ी नज़र रख रहे हैं।

SHRI P N SAPRU : Mr Vice-Chairman, what I would like to say is that the matter is of a most serious character and the inquiry should be

of a high-powered character. It would be desirable to have a judicial inquiry or quasi-judicial inquiry such as they had in the United States under the chairmanship of Chief Justice Earl Warren into the assassination of President Kennedy. I think the inquiry should not be left in the hands of the police only.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: This will be kept in view.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, as I gather, Mr. Ketkar has been naming two persons, who are no more to whom he had passed on the information. One is Mr. Kher and the other is Babu Kaka Kantekar. But both of them are no more, and it may be that he is trying to get away by saying that he had passed on the information to persons who can never now be consulted about the matter about whether he had passed on any such information. Because he knew that the things were developing according to the designs of the murderers, did he think it proper to pass on the information to the Centre? Or, is there any evidence here at the Centre now to show that he absolved at least himself of the responsibility of keeping secret such an important information? This is one. The second is whether the meeting in Poona had taken place in a public premises or in a private premises. If it had taken place in a public

premises, I think the Maharashtra police failed completely in their duty as they did not obstruct it. (*Interruptions*) I would charge the police for not having prevented such an objectionable assembly carrying on objectional proceedings in a public place. If the Intelligence Department had failed, the police should not have failed. The District Magistrate should not have failed. The S.D.O. should not have failed, because they were all persons who could have taken action on the spot. What happened to them? Why was this particular meeting, which was thought to be objectionable, not prevented? Why was such an unlawful assembly allowed to proceed with such an objectionable affair?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: These questions have been raised by other Members also, but I must add this that whatever may be said by this gentleman in defence, that he had communicated this information, there is no answer to this that he again associated himself with a similar function subsequently. Therefore it reveals his spirit.

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

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 25th November, 1964.