

THE DEFENCE OF INDIA (TENTH AMENDMENT) RULES, 1964.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification G.S.R. No. 1097, dated the 30th July, 1964, publishing the Defence of India (Tenth Amendment) Rules, 1964, under section 41 of the Defence of India Act, 1962. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-3018/64].

THE INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT (FOURTH AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1964.

THE MINISTER OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS IN THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under section 43 of the Copyright Act, 1957, a copy of the Ministry of Education Notification SO. No. 2351, dated the 30th June, 1964, publishing the International Copyright (Fourth Amendment) Order, 1964. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-3019/64].

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CENTRAL WAGE BOARD FOR THE IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY re. THE GRANT OF INTERIM RELIEF TO THE WORKERS

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Labour and Employment Resolution No. WB-II(4)/64, dated the 8th September, 1964, publishing the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for the Iron and Steel Industry regarding the grant of interim relief to the workers. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-3055/64].

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE GOLD (CONTROL) BILL, 1963

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the

Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide, in the economic and financial interests of the community, for the control of the production, supply, distribution, use and possession of, and business in, gold and ornaments and other articles of gold and for matters connected therewith.

EVIDENCE TENDERED BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE GOLD (CONTROL) BILL, 1963

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the evidence tendered before the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide, in the economic and financial interests of the community, for the control of the production, supply, distribution, use and possession of, and business in, gold and ornaments and other articles of gold and for matters connected therewith.

ENQUIRY RE NOTICE OF MOTION FOR PAPERS

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I have given notice of a Motion for Papers. I would like the Home Minister to make a statement on the reported decision of the Jammu and Kashmir Government not to proceed with the Hazratbal Relic Theft Case. It was the Home Minister who gave a categorical assurance on the floor of the House that appropriate action would be taken against the culprits in the theft case. But now it seems that the Government of Jammu and Kashmir has decided to drop the entire case which lends weight to the reports circulating in the capital that the Central Government gave certain assurances to the culprits while asking them to restore the relic. We are told that the relic was restored on the guarantee given by the Central Government that the culprits will not be proceeded against. I shall be very glad if the reports appearing in the press are found to be baseless, but I should like to have an assurance from the

hon. Home Minister that nothing will be done without consulting the Central Government which stands committed that the culprits will be proceeded against.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, I would like to ask one question. Is Government of India aware of this fact that very recently one of the police officials who was connected with this relic case investigation was found murdered in his house? If so, have Government of India sent some one to find out how he was killed, by whom he was killed and at what time? Have Government of India received any post-mortem report from the Jammu and Kashmir State in this connection?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA): Regarding the hon. Member's sense of apprehension about something that is circulating here that the Government of India gave some kind of assurance to some one that the course of law will not be followed in their case, that is, Sir, not at all correct. It is not so. I know these things, and the hon. Member should feel quite easy on that score that no such assurance was given to anybody. This is my information. Regarding whether this case is being dropped the latest that I know about it is that no such decision has been taken. It is true that the representatives of the Central Government who had gone there to help the State Government—the case was that of the State Government obviously—came back, and the matter has been pursued by the State authorities, and there the case stands. It is for them now to decide. The case may be to an extent, up to a stage, perfectly all right. If it goes to a court, for that purpose certain data have to be collected, and the Government has to be satisfied that it has reached the stage when it can go to a court of law. That is a matter for the State Government. I am keeping in touch with the State Government.

Regarding the other thing, it is again within the purview of the State Government to deal with those matters.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): May I know from the hon. Home Minister whether, if the Jammu and Kashmir Government decides to prosecute the real culprits, the Government of India would not come in the way to stop that prosecution?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: The Government of India will certainly be happy to pursue any culprits so that he gets what he deserves.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : Some time ago when this matter was raised in this House, the Home Minister stated that he would have the matter enquired into by a Judge not from Kashmir but from outside Kashmir to try this case. Has the Government of India seriously pursued the matter of a judicial investigation of this case, through a judicial enquiry, with the Kashmir Government?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: That stage has not been reached.

SHRI G. M. MIR (Jammu and Kashmir) : I would like to know from the Home Minister whether it is a fact that one of the accused in this case has been reinstated by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Where?

AN HON. MEMBER: In service.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I am not in a position at the moment *oft* hand to give the information.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The position in regard to this matter, as far as the Central Government is concerned, was that it directly took over the investigation of the matter. Even the Secretary of the Home Ministry was sent, and the Home Minister in that House gave not once but several times the assurance that the matter would be pursued and a case would be started. All the statements have been made. The Central Government therefore is

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] directly responsible for satisfying the Parliament as to whatever is done. At present they are under commitment of launching a prosecution, and on top of it in order to allay any public misgiving they have even publicly accepted the suggestion that a Judge from outside the State would be appointed in order to carry out the investigation. Now the Central Government is piping down on this matter. I would like to know exactly where the Central Government stands because if the Central Government was acting within its authority at that time when it gave the assurance before the House about the prosecution, etc., then it should follow up this thing and should act under its authority now also in this matter and should not wash off its hands. If the Central Government was not acting under its authority at that time, then, of course, it is a different matter. But they have not said it. This matter needs proper explanation on the part of the Government so that not only people in India but people all over the world know exactly what they are going to do with regard to the shocking sacrilege that was committed.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Since the House is seized of this question, it is entitled to know about its further developments, and I feel that it is my duty to enlighten the House whenever there are any further developments which the House would like to know. But even then it was a question of the Central Government's giving help to the State Government in pursuing that matter and it was not that the Central Government should itself take that up.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: One very important point. May I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this fact that the sacred relic theft case was exploited on the international forum against the people of India and the Government of India? Leaflets were distributed that it was the Government of India which was behind this theft. Is it not also a fact that the present Prime Minister himself went there with top officials of the Government of India

and installed the relic there and gave an assurance? Is it not also a fact that the hon. Home Minister in this House and in the Lok Sabha gave an assurance that the Government of India would see that the culprits are brought before a court of law and a Judge would be sent? And the result of that theft was the killing of some innocent people in the neighbouring country and some innocent people in our country. So, keeping all these things and the international aspect in view, is it not the moral duty of the Government of India to see that the culprits are brought before a court of law and that too immediately?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: That is only an exhortation. Sir.

INACCURACY IN REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE IN THE INDIAN EXPRESS'

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the sitting of the House on September 9 last . . .

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD (Maharashtra): On a point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No point of order when I am making an announcement.

At the sitting of the House on September 9 last, Shri Arjun Arora referred to a report appearing in *The Indian Express* of the same date concerning a statement by Shri A. M. Tariq in the House on September 8, 1964. I told Shri Arjun Arora that he might write to me in the matter and that I would look into it. Before, however, I received Shri Arjun Arora's letter, I received a letter from the special correspondent of *The Indian Express*, who was responsible for the report referred to by Shri Arjun Arora, explaining that his report was based on the impression he formed of the proceedings of the House, sitting in a back row of the Press Gallery where the proceedings were not fully audible. He has expressed his regret that he