

[Secretary.]

signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:—

(I)

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Companies (Second Amendment) Bill, 1966, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 14th November, 1966."

(II)

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Metal Corporation of India (Acquisition of Undertaking) Bill, 1966, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 14th November, 1966."

Sir, I beg to lay a copy of each of the Bills on the Table.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have taken so much time over these questions that we have to sit through the Lunch Hour. We shall now proceed to the discussion of the motion on the statement in connection with the demonstration near Parliament House.

The Prime Minister will intervene at about three in the afternoon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Yes, I think the Prime Minister should intervene. It is good.

Now, Sir, we are discussing a very grim development that has taken place in the country. None amongst us is in support of what has happened. All of us are undoubtedly upset for what has happened but it is not enough to express only condemnation of the violent incidents. We must go behind them; we must understand as to why such a thing could happen and how it is going to be tackled. We must know not only what happened on the 7th but what had happened before and what has followed after, all these we should discuss, and understand. That is why, Mr. Chairman, we have proposed to the Government a comprehensive public enquiry into all the circumstances and factors leading to the events and happenings of November 7 and thereafter; I underline the words 'events thereafter'.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me start with one or two things and I hope I will be discussing this matter in an absolutely non-partisan manner. First of all I should like to point out to this House that the demonstration that took place is not as innocent as it looked, quite apart from the violent incidents. Well, the violent incidents only aggravated it. It was a demonstration of political reaction in the country. That is Number one. Number two, it appeared under an innocent sounding slogan 'cow protection'. Number three, it rallied on the sentiments of Hindu revivalism, which the political reaction of the country not necessarily identified with a communal organisation, wanted to exploit and the purpose of this demonstration was to direct a blow to the principles of secularism and principles of democracy. Therefore, the demonstration was essentially organised and planned against secularism and democracy in the country. Now, first of all, let us make one thing clear. Naked *sadhus* are not very expert in organising demonstrations. They go about the country, as you know, but they do not organise demonstrations. Our Sanatanists, saints,

Sanyasis and the Jagat Gurus are not very much experts in organising such massive demonstrations. I belong to a political Party which has organised many demonstrations during its history and recently also. We know what it means to organise a demonstration of this kind. When we organised our march here before Parliament this year and in 1963, we had to mobilise our entire Party in order to bring it about. Leaders and workers went out in the country to make preparations for it. Therefore, do not imagine that suddenly by some call of divinity some people suddenly converged on the city of Delhi. They had planned and organised this demonstration and behind that there were masterly hands in its organisation and in the design of it. That is what I would like to point out. Now, they arouse the passions of Hindus, as I said, for what? Not so much for the protection of the cow. The cow is their mother, I know, but it is not for the protection of the cow. The mother had not been protected for many years in that form. The demand has been made for cow protection suddenly. Why was this particular slogan chosen, rather than any other slogan? It is because political reaction wants to link it up with religion and then gain political advantage and the area chosen was very significant, Central and Northern India from where come the overwhelming seats in Lok Sabha and which account for the bulk of our seats in the Legislatures. Therefore, the political reaction should utilise Hindu sentiments and utilise them in the coming elections. Having roused them through demonstration, if necessary by creating incidents, the political reaction in the country thinks that it would be on the high road to authority and power. Now, I say it is not directed against the Communist Party only. It is directed against even those people in the Congress Party who are secular in their outlook and have still some fading respect and love for democracy. I put Shrimati Indira Gandhi in that category. Perhaps she is secu-

lar, I believe, while her respect for democracy is very faint. I know it, but still the order about shoot at sight and similar things are frightening me and what is happening to the country?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not the order. It has been said that the order about shoot at sight is not right.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, I said 'faint'. Otherwise, she becomes a dictator. I have understood it. I believe other Members opposite are there, some pseudo-progressives, others real progressives, some are opportunists and so on. All parties are there, but there are some democratically-minded people in the ruling Party. After all, the tradition and inheritance is common. It is a tradition and inheritance from the national movement. Some have fallen on the way. Some have a wavered outlook on such things, but they are there. Therefore, it is directed against that. This is the way things have developed.

Now, with regard to the preparations I have got before me the "Organiser". I have very carefully studied the "Organiser" from the beginning of the year till the November 11 issue. I have got the issues here from August till the last issue of November 11, which actually came out here in Delhi before the 7th November demonstration. Read the editorial here and see the picture of the cow in tears or the mother in tears. Well, I am an agnostic and an atheist, but I too have some sentiments. Now, the sentiments of our people are likely to be aroused in the matter of cow protection. There are people who have very great reverence and respect for the cow and to arouse their sentiments, it is written on this paper: "The Mother in tears". Why a section of the Government is behaving in that particular manner? Now, if you look at the editorial, immediately before that parti-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

cular issue, it says Ministers are opposed to ban cow slaughter. You will kindly note it in the "Organiser" of November 6. "At the Cabinet meeting held to discuss the issue banning cow slaughter, the Home Minister, Mr. Nanda, said that while he had his personal views in regard to the question, with which other colleagues may or may not agree, he would like the Cabinet to look at the problem from the law and order angle. Mr. Nanda told the Cabinet that if the people's sentiments in regard to the issue were not satisfied, it would result in a serious law and order situation which he might not be able to handle." I do not know what passes in the great gathering of our great Cabinet, unless, of course, the Cabinet members meet their favourite pressmen and let them know of what they had discussed from their own angularities. But here it says that even in this regard, Mr. Subramaniam, it seems, was among those who disfavoured a ban on cow slaughter. Mr. Sachin Chaudhuri, Mr. Subramaniam, Mr. Asoka Mehta and Mr. Fakhruddin were against it. The decision on the matter was put off to a later date. Now, if they had opposed it, it is a good thing and you should know that I have a kind word for Mr. Subramaniam. I am a just man. Now, this is the position. Now, read the other issues of the paper. I have scanned through them in order to bring to the notice of the House how the preparations had been going on for this demonstration. It is not that accidentally it happened. I am referring to an editorial in the "Organiser" of 21st August on cow protection and it says Government is curbing the efforts of Parliament. Now they put it not from an economic angle. They say cow protection is the key plank of religion. That is the line of the editorial hurting Hindu sentiment. Cow protection is the key plank of religion and it is an article of faith with them. On August 20 Guru Golwalkar ad-

dressed a meeting in Nagpur where he said:

"Is the Government going to heed the demand only after some bloodshed?"

I hope the Guruji's demand will not be still heeded.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh): I object to this. If he wants to quote Mr. Golwalkar, he should give his entire statement, but not tear it out of context.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are perfectly right. I can read out the whole speech delivered on August 20, but that will not be very palatable to you. I will read out all my speech will be taken up by Mr. Golwalkar. How can I do that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it is not necessary to read all that. If there is something else, then some other Members might point that out.

SHRI D. THENGARI: I was myself present at the meeting and I can say that it is torn off the context and it is misleading.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will never do such a thing. I have marked all those portions, but it will take time. It says here:

"They who can have the cow killed, can also have the country sold."

This is the heading. I am not misleading you. Then Shri Guruji commented:

"Hasn't the Government been campaigning that people should change their food habits? Why can't

they who take beef be asked to change their food habits and switch on to some other diet?"

Shri Guruji wryly recalled that a Congress Minister had lately advised people even to eat rats. Why not give this counsel to the beef-eaters?

The approach is communal. Now I do not read this thing.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Where is it said bloodshed? Sir, he cannot be allowed to misquote a speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You may not put my interpretation. I am quoting it correctly.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Golwalkar is not here in this House to defend himself. I cannot allow that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vajpayee, please do not get angry.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I thought he was going to quote it. Let him quote it. He has misquoted. He should withdraw it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda.

(Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you had a quotation from somewhere about bloodshed in the streets of Delhi. That you might quote.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will search it out. I will do it. I think I can find it out. I will do it. Just do not disturb my speech. If it is not there, let me admit the mistake. Here it is. "Is the Government going to heed the demand only after some bloodshed?"

SHRI D. THENGARI: We want him to quote the whole speech. He is quoting it

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is quoting something which suits his argument. If there is something else in the speech which does not suit his argument, you can in your turn point it out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They do not quote the whole thing. On the 11th September there was a meeting.

"यह गऊ हमारी माता है"

It is headlined here. They will not object to it. Now, Sir, it is here, our friends are objecting to it; on September 15th, Cow Protection in Delhi. It was a Hindu feeling, I can understand the position. If we cannot defend the cow, we cannot defend the country. Therefore, defence of the cow is everything; defence of the cow is defence of religion, defence of the cow is defence of the country; defence of the cow is everything that is noble and good in this world.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): May I interrupt? Defence of the cow is also defence of the election symbol.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will come to that. Here he said, this is the speech: "Is the Government going to heed this demand only after bloodshed?" It is in bold print. I think he followers of Guruji . . .

SHRI D. THENGARI: I am very sorry to interrupt. Here again to take out one single sentence out of context and quote it is mischievous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I said, he is quoting something that suits his argument and he is quoting it from a paper.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You challenged my statement. That was my objection. You may not agree with it. Mr. Chairman, it went on like that. Then is it not a fact that preparations went on all over the country and some gentleman by the name of Shri Prabhu Dutt Sharma went in a special train, starting his journey from the 22nd of

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

September to preach his cow protection ideas? If you read his speeches from the Organiser, you will find the manner in which it has been preached. Therefore, I say that those are preparations. But that is not all. Am I to understand that the people who came there came unprepared? Kerosene tins, petrol and other things were brought in and they certainly could not be mobilised suddenly, all of a sudden, in Delhi on the 7th of November. They have been preparing for it. They have assigned jobs to various people. Therefore, a charge had been made that the R.S.S. people were organising this thing. It has to be looked into. I am not saying that Mr. Vajpayee was organising personally, but the R.S.S. people were doing it. Therefore, it should be gone into as to who organised these things. The All India Radio was attacked in what manner we know. We had done something in Telengana. We know the business. We had done it in the old days of the war. I know of these things. It is not easy to organise such things. Therefore, there was a master-mind behind the organisation. Surprisingly enough an attempt is being made even by some people in the ruling party as if suddenly a flare-up took place. I wonder myself sometimes what would have happened if such a thing happened in a demonstration which we brought to Delhi. We would have been pilloried and lambasted; detention without trial would have come and Mr. Nanda would have made a statement and the Congress big guns would have fired their salvoes against us one after another. They even do not take the name of the R.S.S. when they speak. Scratch a Congressman, he is essentially a Hindu, scratch a reactionary Congressman, he is a communal, obscurantist Hindu. Therefore, this preparation went on and this preparation was helped by Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda and I wish to tell that to the former Home Minister and I am not trying to make political capital out of it.

I shall come to Mr. Nanda's other point. Why did he issue that circular to the States on November 4th in which he asked that cow protection should be enforced at once? Certainly he knew that the West Bengal Government was against it; certainly he knew that the Madras Government was not even consulted on it. Why suddenly such an overall suggestion was given instead of explaining properly what cow protection means, what the article of the Constitution envisages how the problem should be tackled? Why he did not develop a democratic, secular, political approach towards this demand for cow protection remains to be explained, and it has not yet been explained. Therefore, that gave the impression that you are in sympathy, that gave the impression that the Home Minister will not do anything, and when people have the Home Minister on their side, people think that they can do many things. Is it not a fact that certain Sadhus met him and made certain representations and they expressed certain feelings and so on? Therefore, I say that this Delhi Administration was politically paralysed. I do not accuse Mr. Nanda for failures arising out of administrative lapses. I accuse him for his political failures mainly to tackle the problem. Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda—you know how he uses force when he wants to nip in the bud a democratic movement in the country. He writes in his letter that it was correct that he had been using force all over the country, D.I.R. and other things, but in this particular case he went soft over this matter precisely because of his wrong sympathy, wrong understanding, wrong approach with regard to a problem which should be treated with a secular, democratic outlook, keeping in mind that there are millions of obscurantist forces who would like to exploit particular articles of the Constitution to rouse communalist, revivalist passion in order to secure certain political advantages

when they see that in a particular region the going is good if you can rouse such passion. Therefore, his failure came. About others, I should like to point out, do not only blame the noted, the named, certified communal party. Name also others who are behind it. Why Kamalnayan Bajaj went to the dais to speak? We did not go there. Why some Congressmen went there? Did they take the permission of the party to go there or did their party direct them to go there? I do not know. It seems that this movement had been heavily financed. You know a demonstration of this kind in Delhi cannot be organised unless some people find the finance for it, and plenty of money was found in order to bring about this massive demonstration with the intent to violate law and order. Am I to understand that these people just by chance attacked Mr. Kamaraj's house? Am I to understand that these people just by chance set upon Mr. Kamaraj's house? Well, why did they make it an occasion to go to Mr. Kamaraj's house? Why should Mr. Kamaraj be singled out? This needs to be explained and the Home Ministry has not yet given any explanation, and any attempt to hush up this matter will be disastrous because it is quite possible that the reactionary people within the ruling party who do not like Mr. Kamaraj's link-up with the non-communal and non-obscurantist forces, instigated such an attack on his house. At least, Sir, I find that many people enjoyed the attack on Mr. Kamaraj's house in a sort of indirect way, people who do not belong to the Jan Sangh or the RSS.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair].

All these things create a doubt in our mind. Therefore, I would ask the House to consider it. I am not blaming anybody at this stage. But hold an enquiry. But why was Mr. Kamaraj singled out? He was singled out perhaps because some people did not

like him for communal and obscurantist reasons and the others did not like him for factional or political reasons. The two forces combined to single out his house for the attack. I am very glad that Mr. Kamaraj was not hurt; I am very sorry that his house was attacked. Now this kind of thing happened. Therefore I think the whole thing should be enquired into.

Now I come to the police. The first question I ask is this. Mr. Nanda has made it clear in his statement that nobody suggested to him a ban on processions, excluding the two mile radius from such a thing. Mr. Nanda in his statement and letter to Mr. J. L. Hathi and some of his friends like Mr. Jagannath Pahadia, M.P. has denied it that he did not approve of imposing a ban on the anti-cow-slaughter procession on the 7th of November—"No such suggestion or proposal was ever made and the question of my ruling it out therefore never arises." You study this statement. Mr. Nanda said it. But it was open to Mr. Nanda himself to suggest some kind of preventive measures. I do not say what they are. Now, it is not good for the Home Minister to say that. But it is also true that if we believe—and many people think personally, that Mr. Nanda is an honest man—that nobody in the Delhi Administration even supported or made a suggestion of this kind to him, then why this ban of two-mile radius? I do not understand it. Mr. Jha, the present ruler of Delhi, said that the idea originated from the Delhi Administration. Mr. Nanda said that he did not have any such proposals from any quarter. Now, we should also like to be clarified on that point whether at all there was any suggestion of this kind and if so, who originated the idea and who made the suggestion. These facts are to be ascertained and it cannot be done if there is political hush-hush about this matter because it is a serious matter.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Now, how is it that the Central Intelligence did not have any information to pass on to the Delhi Police in order to act upon it. Either the Central Intelligence did have information or it did not have. If it did not have, the Central Intelligence has committed a grave dereliction of duty. If it did have the information and did not pass it on to the Delhi Administration, again it has committed a great crime. We should like to be clarified on this subject. Mr Jha tells us that they did not have any information that there might be some disturbances and so on. Mr Vice-Chairman, I would ask you if the Central Intelligence was studying the Organiser, watching the developments as they watch our activities, would it be possible that they did not come to the conclusion that there was no danger of certain violent incidents and provocations? When we brought in a demonstration, I would tell you that though there were preventive arrests and so on, they put more police to look after our demonstration than the police they put to look after the anti-cow-slaughter demonstration. Yet our demonstration was peaceful. Even a traffic rule was not violated but this demonstration led to violent incidents.

Now, let me come to Mr L. P. Singh, the Secretary. Hon Members have said that Mr Nanda should not have accused the Secretary in a letter of this kind, in a letter of this kind, certainly he can question him. The question is whether the letter should have been released to the Press. In the public interest, I think, he has done a good thing. Mr Gulzarilal Nanda had done a good thing by releasing his letter to the Prime Minister to the Press although in normal conditions I would not like a letter written by the Home Minister to the Prime Minister to be released in the normal official course of work. But here it was a question

of public policy. Mr Nanda had been put out of office, rightly so, he had to resign when as Minister he failed because of political and administrative policy. But the point is that some people were trying to make him a scapegoat and then escape themselves. In such a situation, Mr Nanda was rightly advised in releasing that particular letter to the Prime Minister. I would only wish that he also had released, with the permission of the Prime Minister, the letter he received from her. That would have given us perhaps a clearer picture. About what Mr. Nanda has said in his letter, the Government should ponder. He was your Home Minister, not a member of the Communist Party or the Opposition. The first charge was made in that letter that he was not getting co-operation from the Prime Minister. It is a serious charge by all accounts. And Mr Vice-Chairman, what did he say? "I was made to feel that I had no say in the making of decisions at policy level. Have you ever thought to yourself how I was expected to function with the kind of tools you gave me to work?" It is a serious allegation. Do not treat it lightly. Now, it is out. You have to give a satisfactory answer to this grave indictment made by the number two in the Cabinet, the Home Minister of the country, who acted twice, as stepney Prime Minister, stepney Prime Minister because that is how he was called stepney in the constitutional term. You cannot evade his charge now since it has been made publicly. Did the Prime Minister refuse to give Mr Nanda the necessary tools for discharging his duties as the Home Minister of the country or she did not? If the Prime Minister failed to provide the tools, then she is guilty of a very grave offence. If Mr Nanda is lying and did not use the tools that had been given to him, Mr Nanda had committed again a grave crime against the Constitution and against our people. I should

like to know who is to be blamed, the Prime Minister or Mr. Nanda. Both cannot be right in this matter. The matter has to be clarified and I hope the Cabinet will discuss this matter and come out and not have the righteous indignation and injured innocence and say, well they will not make anything public. You have to clarify it. That demoralises the administration. Mr. Nanda said, 'unreciprocated confidence'. He accused the Prime Minister, the leader of the Government of not giving her confidence to the Home Minister. For such an allegation to have come from the Home Minister of the country, not any other Minister, not the Irrigation Minister—that he does not have the confidence of the Prime Minister—what comes to pass is paralysis, demoralisation, all bottlenecks in the administration. Now, it is for the Prime Minister to clarify, not by mere assertion but much more convincingly, how Mr. Nanda's statement, if at all, is wrong and it is a false accusation. Mr. Nanda will not be here to speak for himself but since he believes in making public statements, I am sure he will know how to defend himself. Now, Mr. Nanda can also answer. Therefore, we would like to know who sabotaged the Delhi Administration over this matter and related matters.

Here comes the question of Mr. L. P. Singh, the Union Home Secretary. Well, I do not know this gentleman. In fact, personal quarrel I have not in this world, I believe. Mr. L. P. Singh is the Union Home Secretary. We had the impression that he was very much trusted by Mr. Nanda. One day I asked Mr. Nanda when he had issued that famous statement regarding what they called the Left Communists in February, 1965. Here I told him, "Do not read out things just because a Secretary has given them to you." By reading that statement, I felt that it was Mr. L. P. Singh's English, it was his accent, his idiom, his simile and his phrase. I thought

that Mr. Nanda had many qualities but not much in writing English or making a statement in English. I just advised him as a junior political worker that it was not perhaps advisable for the Home Minister of the country to eat out of his Secretary's hand in this rather crude manner. Now what has happened to that statement you have seen. The statement has gone to the dustbin. Mr. Nanda has passed away from the Ministerial seat. Now explain. Therefore, what Mr. Nanda said now should be examined from both angles. If Mr. Nanda lost confidence in his Secretary when was that? We should like to know at what point of time that confidence was lost. At what point of time he wanted the removal or replacement of his Secretary by another one. Thrice Mr. Nanda asked for it. Why was it refused by the Prime Minister? Again, it is a serious charge. One is telling the truth. Either the Prime Minister is telling the truth or Mr. Nanda is telling the truth. We on the Opposition and the country at large would like to know on proper enquiry and examination as to who is telling the truth in this matter because whoever is telling the falsehood is committing a double crime, first of all, dereliction of duty and, secondly, an attempt to bluff the people. Therefore, we want a clarification over this matter.

As for Mr. L. P. Singh, our information is that he is factual. Mr. Nanda has revealed it in the press. Mr. Nanda has done a good job that way. He is very frank and he reveals everything. Mr. Krishnamachari is a clever guy, lean and hungry. I am reminded of Cassius when I think of Mr. Krishnamachari. But Nandaji is falsified that way. Therefore, sometimes he comes out with things. He said that Mr. L. P. Singh was acting over the head of Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda, the Home Minister. He was in the Cabinet room. He was there for one hour,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

and when the Cabinet met, suddenly he sprung the surprise telling the Home Minister as to what was in his mind and the Secretary opposed the proposal of the Minister. Is it not a serious charge? In England there will be a Royal Commission to enquire into them if such things come to light, to enquire into their entire conduct. If Nandaji charged his Secretary, the Secretary is a saboteur, the Secretary is a factional man, the Secretary is a protege of some power brought within the Congress Party behaving without any decency for imperialist and other reasons.

As far as the Secretary's daughter having her education in the United State of America and employed here in a sumptuous job is concerned, I am not going into it because, after all, the daughter is not guilty for that. But his connections with the Americans are well known. Therefore, we are getting a little apprehensive.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do know that the C. I. A. is operating in our country in a big way specially in this capital city of Delhi. What is the situation here that would make me think otherwise? I fear that the C.I.A. had been in it in the entire thing. Well, through whom they operated I do not know. But again and again, I tell Mr. Chagla and Mr. Subramaniam to read what appeared in the April issue of the *New York Times* about the activities of the C.I.A. In one of its five articles and editorial it was stated by the *New York Times* that the C.I.A. have their man in a room next to President Nasser's room. What guarantee I have that the C.I.A. do not have their agents placed in high places here and utilised even this opportunity of the Anti-cow-Slaughter Movement to create provocations and incidents at least to foment them, in order to discredit the country, discredit this Government because they are interested in discrediting even this Government and creating difficulties against a democratic movement and

so on, creating all kinds of apprehensions and mutual suspicion.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, in this connection I would demand the removal of Mr. L. P. Singh immediately from the Union Home Ministry, a thorough probe into the affairs of the Home Ministry, as to how files passed, how things happened, and Mr. Chagla will bring in his judicial mind in the same way as he looked at the Mundhra deal to find out who was guilty. It is very essential for the sake of the country. The Anti-cow Slaughter demonstration here points to sinister, multipurpose conspiracy in which not only communal and obscurantist forces but others of right reaction may have participated and joined hands.

And after this thing Mr. S. K. Patil appears on the scene in order to seek the ouster of Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda has made two statements in this connection. Therefore, we should like it to be clarified. He said that the move to oust him had started in that little A.I.C.C. meeting held in Ranchi when the Syndicate met with Mr. S. K. Patil and Mr. Atulya Ghosh and others. I have many differences with Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda but it is a fact that they have been trying to oust him ever since that time.

Again, Mr. Nanda has revealed that vested interests had been against him. It is true that Mr. Nanda met Mr. G. D. Birla in Calcutta but the vested interests never took kindly to him. It is possible, in order to get Mr. S. K. Patil into higher positions, the vested interests actively participated in it. That is the presumption. Therefore, Mr. Nanda's statement should not be just ignored and brushed aside. If the vested interests could do such things, well the connected presumption arises that they might have also encouraged the Anti-cow-Slaughter demonstration. That also you should not rule out that way. Therefore, Mr. Nanda suggested that the socio-economic roots should be gone into. That is true and it should be looked so.

Now I know hon'ble Members from the Congress benches would like to say that many of them were actuated by a sense of Parliamentary responsibility I do not question their motive because you may, as a Member of Parliament, be feeling that way. Therefore, I do not question that. But there are others who have an axe to grind over this matter. I put it to the House from my knowledge that one of the steps Mr S K Patil took immediately after securing the ouster of Mr Gulzarilal Nanda was that he got his name sponsored for the Home Ministry. Let them deny it publicly. Then when they found that Mr. S. K. Patil's name was not acceptable, you will be surprised to hear—I heard that in the lobbies of the ruling party here—that there was consultation between Mr S K Patil and Mr Morarji Desai. As a second alternative a suggestion was made that Mr Morarji Desai should be taken as the Home Minister of the country. And that explains why there must be strong and firm administration. The problem was socio-economic. The problem was not of defence or secularism or democracy. Yet the Congress Party—the name sponsored by some people—say that there must be a firm and tough administration in order to push Mr Morarji's name. I am glad that Mr Morarji Desai is not in the Home Ministry.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) Why should you refer to persons?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Government, not persons. You are referring to everybody. Therefore, I say these are serious matters. The collapse of an administration has taken place. Therefore, it is not the events of the 7th November alone but much earlier and we are having an upsurge of it sometimes in the form of what happened on the 7th November, sometimes in the form of Cabinet reshuffle and Cabinet crisis. I would like to know whether it is not a fact that Mr S K Patil, who has not yet criticised the R S S demonstration, who

has not condemned what happened on the 7th November was condemning Mr Nanda already privately. But, as far as I know, we have not got any statement from Mr S K Patil. But is it not a fact, Mr Vice-Chairman when Mr Sachin Chaudhuri and Mr Manubhai Shah were dropped from the Cabinet, Mr S K Patil and Mr Atulya Ghosh became very active so that they could remain where they were? These are serious matters. There is political manoeuvre. We cannot look after law and order in Delhi if you like that thing, nor can we fight such communalists, revivalists, obscurantist movements as the Anti-cow Slaughter movement by this kind of factional, political, unprincipled manoeuvre in the ruling circle, by unprincipled Cabinet reshuffle or by unprincipled tactics or pressures which are going on. That is a serious matter. What would the people think? Mr Nanda has gone but the people are asking us why Mr Patil has not gone after so many lives have been lost in accidents. Here 10, 15 or 20 people have died but if Mr Nanda can go, how is it people ask that when hundreds of people die as a result of accidents in the railways, Mr Patil did not either offer his resignation or was not removed. The question is being asked. The Government is in shame. Therefore all these things need to be explained, through a public enquiry. Mr Nanda has flung a challenge against our moral conscience. Mr Nanda has revealed something which needs proper investigation and consideration by this House. We have got rid of Mr Nanda. Let us not discard what he has left behind in his statement in so far as they point to very serious ills and diseases in the way we are running the country. The trouble about Mr Nanda is this that instead of relying on really progressive forces within the party and the country as a whole, he sought to cling to the office by facing the man-eaters and the big business and the right reactionary forces there the culmination of which took place in his open sympathy with the anti-cow-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
slaughter demonstration. He has tragically failed in the wake of such things. Therefore we have to look into two sides of it, one the negative side of Mr. Nanda's fall and another, the positive side of it. The positive side is, his fall has brought to light certain very bad things which need immediate attention of the nation. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Delhi Administration failed here badly. In Bengal when the communal riots took place, the administration failed and even the Congress Party demanded an enquiry.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Therefore the incidents which took place on the 7th November were the culmination of a deep-laid conspiracy in which many in their own ways, have played their part. The aftermath of it emphasises the existence of such a controversy. I wish to submit that I charge the communal elements, I charge the R.S.S. for organising but we should not accuse the R.S.S. only. We should accuse the others also. Therefore I say here that not only the communal revivalists outside the Congress Party but within the Congress Party are also guilty. They should be located and Mr. Nanda's fall has brought out the rottenness of the administration. In the Home Ministry of India such rottenness, such confusion, such bickerings, such factionalism are going on. What example are we setting before the country? Is it not a fact that the Border Police and the Central Reserve people were given the main task only at a later stage? The Delhi Police were put in operation. Anyhow the Delhi Police have not been properly working, we know it. As far as security is concerned, the entire episode underlines that there is a sinister conspiracy of communal reaction, right reaction and certain I.C.S. officials who may be oriented towards America. All have combined in order to have their axes to grind, in their own way but they were all in this issue but it is a good thing that this has failed. I congratulate

the people of Delhi and that is our moral victory. You know demonstrations we find in the different parts of the country. When there is firing on a demonstration, then come hartals, protest strikes, etc. Here there was no such thing even after firing. We condemned the firing. Even after the firing there was revulsion against the demonstration. People do not want the demonstration. That shows the difference between the two types of demonstrations—one, when you attack it gives rise to hartals and another, when you attack people are not swept off their feet and support the cause of democracy. You should draw lessons from it but unfortunately I find that instead of drawing lessons correctly from it, relying on the leftist forces, the Government is trying to treat this problem as an administrative problem, as a law and order problem. I tell you that Mr. Chavan's toughness will not help you in finding a solution to the problem facing us in the present context. I tell you that in order to find a solution you must rely on progressive and democratic forces and seek a democratic solution out of them, eliminating from the seats of authority the opportunists, factionalism, rightists of the worst type and the I.C.S. officials who flout the Ministers and parliamentary democracy.

I again congratulate the people of Delhi for the manner in which they have reacted. Before I sit I only appeal to the nation that in this matter at least all progressive sections and democratic forces should be united so that such religious factions cannot be used for political purposes to serve the designs of not only domestic reaction but foreign reaction. This is all that I have to say.

SHRIMATI SHYAM KUMARI KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): May I intervene? I intervene to request Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to support me in requesting you kindly to expunge the remark about Mr. L. P. Singh's daughter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all. It cannot be done.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will look into it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You cannot. The question does not arise. On a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I was not here. I do not know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have not made any remark. Only I said what is in Mr. Nanda's statement. Did not I say about Mr. Patel or about Mr. Bhoothalingam? We can make remarks unless and until they are unparliamentary. Why this defence of Mr. L. P. Singh, I cannot understand.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI V. C. SHUKLA): May I say this that people who are not present in the House, normally any reference to them is avoided unless it is necessary to bring a point home.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: We only request you kindly to go through the proceedings and if you find that the reference is there to persons who are not at all connected with this matter which is under discussion . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: After that, if you find that that reference has been made in an unwarranted manner, you might consider expunging it but if you think that . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You cannot.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: . . . it is proper to have done so, then you might allow it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. We seek your protection now because I see that all that I said against Mr. Nanda is not to be expunged and Mr. Nanda is not in the House and all that I have said against Mr. L. P. Singh is to be expunged.

HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Against his daughter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I say that you should not even entertain such a suggestion because then Mr. Bhoothalingam could not be discussed or Mr. Patel could not be discussed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Having said that Mrs. Khan, now you have expressed your views and they have expressed their views. If it is warranted, I will look into it. I do not know but I shall look through the record.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You cannot, you need not . . .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Gupta, you were speaking for an hour, I know, we did not interrupt but it does not mean that you should shout down everybody. This is not the way to behave in Parliament. The only request Mrs. Khan has made is that Mr. Gupta has made certain remarks against the daughter . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not want to go into it now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, it is a strange thing that . . .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I have been called and I have a right to speak and I shall speak.

[Shri Chandra Shekhar.]

Is this the way to interrupt me? I have not finished even my sentence.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please sit down, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I cannot be shouted down. This is not the way to interrupt me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not shouting you down.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am raising the point whether it is proper that in this House daughters and sons of officers should be mentioned. We are not objecting to anything which is said against Mr. Nanda or against Mr. L. P. Singh. We do not say anything in objection if he demands an inquiry. But daughters and sisters and mothers and wives of Secretaries are brought into the discussion. It is most disgraceful, and I hope Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will concede that it is not a proper thing to bring them in, and he will not appreciate that daughters and sisters and wives and mothers should be discussed in this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order? You have expressed your opinion . . .

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM: On a point of order. Is it open to any Member of the House to threaten the Chair with gesticulation, and try to dominate the Chair? Madam, I will request that, since you have heard everybody, the different points of view, you please take your own decision in the matter and stop further discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order; I am not threatening you. I will threaten . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What you want to say on the point of order, please say quickly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point of order is this. I am surprised why all this fuss. When I was speaking, there was a Chairman. Chair was chair. Chair was not dead, and the Chair never said that what I said was wrong.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM: How is it a point of order? I am not able to understand. (*Interruptions*) If a Member of this House wants an opportunity to repeat things, it is not a point of order. You please declare whether this is a point of order or something else

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This may not appear a point of order to ex-Governors of this type, who have no faith in public life.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): On a point of explanation. So long as I was in the Chair, I did follow the debate, Madam, and I did not hear anything about the 'daughter'. If I had heard anything, I myself would have taken objection to it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is clear.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: About daughter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why can't I mention 'daughter'?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I have heard also Mr. Akbar Ali Khan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a former occasion, did we not mention 'Mr. Biju Patnaik's wife'?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But it is within the right of the Chair to go through the proceedings of the day, and that right of the Chair is reserved by the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On which point?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Therefore we shall go through it after listening to Mr. Akbar Ali Khan also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On which point?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: On all points.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: On the point of 'daughter'.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right; on the point of 'daughter', but I tell you, Madam Deputy Chairman, you cannot give a ruling like that in the face of the fact that on a former occasion mention of "Shri Biju Patnaik's wife" was made in this very House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you must have some reasoning here; you cannot go on like this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But just because Shri Biju Patnaik belonged to the Congress, on that ground I cannot afford to ignore the fact that on a former occasion mention was made in this House of "Shri Biju Patnaik's wife". I am just suggesting to you the precedent so as to enable you to come to a proper conclusion.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman before I come to the subject I want to lodge a protest against the indulgence given by the Chair to the hon. Member, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. There are certain rules observed in this House, and the rule about these Motions is that the mover of the Motion gets about 25 to 30 minutes, and all other Members get 15 minutes each. I do not know under what rule Shri Bhupesh Gupta, even if he is the mover,

has been given 55 minutes. This curtailed the time available to other Members, and I would appeal to Shri Bhupesh Gupta to remain within the rules in future.

(Interruptions)

Now I join all my other friends here in condemning violence wherever it has happened in the country, and in this connection I want to remind my countrymen who have indulged in violence, who have indulged in destroying public property, that by doing so they have destroyed their own property, and they have added to the difficulties of the country. The country is already passing through an economic crisis, and it is the duty of every patriotic citizen to see that the country's economic difficulties are not increased. There are constitutional ways to ventilate one's grievances if people have any genuine grievances, and I shall appeal to the Government also to be more responsive to constitutional and peaceful appeals and give them sympathetic consideration.

The incidents of the 7th November in Delhi are not isolated incidents. They fit in with what has been happening in the country in the last few months. If I may say so, the law and order situation is a culmination of several factors. It is not a single incident here or a single incident there, and if I may place some of the points which brought about the present law and order situation, they are (1) the economic distress, specially combined with the difficult food situation; (2) the students' unrest. I shall not go at this juncture into the causes of the student unrest which I should better take up on some other occasion; (3) Government's weak-kneed policy against agitational approach; (4) indecision by Government and lack of contact between the Government and the

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

people at large, (5) the coming General Elections and the anxiety of all the parties to attract attention of the voters in as good a manner as they think, and when a party finds that it is weak at the ballot box, that party has to take recourse to other methods, and (6) I place the high-handed behaviour by high Government officials and their treatment to their juniors. Those are some of the causes which have brought us to the present law and order situation.

Now to make a correct assessment of what happened in Delhi on the 7th of November we will have to review the condition of Delhi before the 7th of November and the condition, if I may put it, was that there was an atmosphere of violence in the country, all over, for several months. There was the student unrest and there was the exploitation of that situation by the anti-social elements, which were working at large at all the places, wherever one incident or other happened. I would like to know from the Home Ministry whether all the anti-social elements in Delhi, I am referring to the known anti-social elements in Delhi, were they rounded up before the morning of the fateful 7th of November 1966? In this connection I would like to invite the attention of the House to a conference called by the Home Minister Shri Gulzarilal Nanda on the 6th of November. This conference was called by him to find out from the officers whether they had taken adequate steps to prevent any likely untoward incidents on the following day. And here the question arises whether the officers present there had the correct assessment of the situation and whether they had taken all precautionary measures in this vital matter, keeping in view, of course, the atmosphere of violence in the country and the agitational approach which has been practised by my countrymen in small numbers for some months

now. That was the situation which had to be met on the morning of the 7th November. If I may say so, the signal of the coming events came very early that day and if proper precautions had been taken by the authorities, probably the incidents of that day could have been avoided. Earlier, at about 9 or 9.15 in the morning, some ten or fifteen boys, armed with lathis, moved out from Daryaganj. They went to some offices in Daryaganj and started breaking the glass-panes wherever they found them. From Daryaganj, they went over to Asaf Ali Road. That was round about ten in the morning. In Asaf Ali Road they went on marching from one shop to another, breaking all the glass-panes. In this connection I would like to know where were the police all this time? Was there no police right from Daryaganj to Asaf Ali Road? From Asaf Ali Road they moved on to Ranjit Hotel and they ransacked Ranjit Hotel. I am not prepared to believe here that nobody from Daryaganj, that nobody from Asaf Ali Road or nobody from Ranjit Hotel, informed the police or the authorities who are supposed to be in charge of law and order. But where were they? What were the authorities doing? Were they having their breakfast? Or were they preparing for their lunch? Where was the strong police force of Delhi deployed? I ask this question because according to the figures available to us from newspapers a very small force of policemen were available in Delhi was stationed at Parliament House where ugly incidents happened later on in the day. What precautionary measures were taken to secure the life and property of the Delhi citizens? Were police pickets posted at all important points? Was it not their duty to do so?

I do not agree with the pleadings made by some of the hon. Members that the acts of violence were instantaneous in Delhi after Swami Rameshwaranandji's speech. Lot of incidents had happened before Swami Ramesh-

waranandji reached the rostrum. What were those incidents and who were responsible for those incidents? I would like the Home Ministry to make a full enquiry to find out who were those boys and whether they had any connections with any of the political parties.

And then my hon. friend Mr. Vajpayee—I am sorry I have to differ from him, since we have been very close friends and we have lived together abroad in Canada and in other places—he says that his party had nothing to do with this demonstration.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I did not say it had nothing to do with it.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: He said that his party as such had nothing to do with it. I have got his speech with me.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Madam, what I said was . . .

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I know. This is what you have said:

भारतीय जनसंघ उस समिति में शामिल नहीं है और उस समिति में कोई भी राजनीतिक दल शामिल नहीं है। हा, मेरे लोग शामिल थे और मेरे लोगों का पूरी छुट है उसमें शामिल होने की, मगर यह कहना गलत है कि प्रदर्शन हमारे आयोजित किया।

Now, either you are in the show or you are out of the show. It cannot be an intermediate position. You were on the rostrum and yet you say you were out of the demonstration. You were present to control the crowd because later on you have gone on to say that the crowd became leaderless. Where were the leaders, may I ask, when some 50 or 60 sadhus became uncontrollable

after Swami Rameshwaranand made his speech? Where were the leaders? What were they doing?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Just one minute, Madam. The leaders asked the police to arrest the sadhus, but the police did not arrest them.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I am coming to that angle also. But did anybody from the *munch* or rostrum come down and did they have the courage to face the crowd? If they profess to be leaders of that crowd, they should have walked down the rostrum and told the sadhus that this was not their policy, that this was not the thing for which they had come there. They should have controlled the sadhus, and then I would have said, yes, they had done their duty but the crowd was uncontrollable. Now he says it was for the police to arrest them. The police, I must say, had done a wonderful job in the situation they were faced with. If they had arrested the sadhus, then Mr. Vajpayee and other leaders would have come forward and told this august House that because the sadhus were arrested the situation was precipitated. Now, you cannot have it all your way. The police resisted. I have seen it with my own eyes trisuls being struck against the police. I was standing at the gate of Parliament. The police behaved marvelously well. I would like to know from the authorities where from the stones came which were pelted at the police? What precautionary measures had they taken to see that no stones were near about the place where the demonstration was to be held? I learn that this precaution was taken when the two other processions organised by the Jan Sangh and the Communist Party were held. There were tin barricades. There were bamboo barricades. There were precautions to control the crowd. What happened this time that the

[Shri M. P. Bhargava.]

authorities had forgotten to take all these precautions?

Now I come to another statement of my hon. friend, Shri Vajpayee. He has thrown a challenge and said that he will have nothing to do with a party which believes in violence. I hope, he, being a senior member of that party, has some say in that capacity about the discipline of his party members. May I ask him respectfully and humbly, has he raised his voice against his own party member Swami Rameshwaranand about whom he says that it was after his speech that the crowd became restive?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: One minute, Madam. Even on that day, Madam, I said Swami Rameshwaranand should not have made such a speech. But my hon. friend Mr. Bhargava will appreciate that Swami Rameshwaranand did not exhort the people to take recourse to violence.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: What is violence?

घेरा डालो, पार्लियामेंट पर चढ़ जाओ ।

What else is it if not violence?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There can be *ghera dalo* without violence. There can be *satyagraha*; there can be *dharna*.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Mr. Vajpayee, can there be occupation of the Parliament House without violence?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Nobody said that Parliament House should be occupied. Let us be fair to Swami Rameshwaranand. I did not agree with him but . . .

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: Madam, cross talking is going on in the House.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Madam, he is asking a question and I

am trying to reply and why is the Deputy Minister getting restive?

श्री नेकीराम (हरियाना) : क्या मेरे भाई अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी यह बात साफ करेंगे कि उसी रोज सेंट्रल हाल में उन्होंने मुझसे कहा था कि स्वामी जी ने मेरे हाथ में लाउड स्पीकर छीन लिया ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैंने कहा था एक और स्वामी ने लाउड स्पीकर छीन लिया था । आपने नहीं सुना होगा ।

श्री नेकीराम : स्वामी का मतलब क्या लेते हैं ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : क्या स्वामी का मतलब है रामेश्वरानन्द ?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am prepared to pay tribute to Shri Atal Bihar Vajpayee for his balanced views. He did express in the House that Swami Rameshwaranand should not have done that but I am asking something else and I hope he will appreciate the point. Has he raised in his party that Swami Rameshwaranand's speech was undesirable? That is what I would ask him and nothing else.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Bhargava, you will please have an eye on the clock.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Just a few minutes, Madam.

Now I come to another aspect of the whole question, that is, the aftermath of what happened on the 7th. What happened after that. Shri Nanda, the Home Minister, went out. I am not one of those who ever admired Shri Nanda or his policies or his actions but the way Shri Nanda released his letter is most unfortunate.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Why unfortunate?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: He had the constitutional right of making a statement before the House if he wanted to do so, instead of releasing a private letter which he wrote to the Prime Minister.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
Not a private letter.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): It was the letter of resignation.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: You may not agree with it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It was not a private letter; it was his letter of resignation.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Well, it may be anything but I do not agree with that approach. But although I do not agree with his views, I do not agree with the manner in which he has been sent out. Nandaji is being charged with the present disorder in the country and he has resigned. It is the responsibility of the Home Minister and he has to be in overall charge of the law and order situation in the country. That I am prepared to concede but law and order is a State subject. We should not forget that and the Chief Ministers and the Ministers in charge in the States are responsible for it. The Union Home Minister cannot be held responsible for what has happened in the States like Bengal, U.P. and what is happening in Andhra. We remember what had happened during the reorganisation of the States in the cities of Bombay, Ahmedabad and many other places and also the ugly things that have been happening in a number of States in the shape of bundhs. In Calcutta trams and buses are burnt every day and the normal life of the city is held to ransom. Had any of the Ministers or the Chief Minister resigned at any place? If we take the 7th November incident into account

we will have to find out how far the Home Minister was responsible for it. He can be responsible in three ways. First, a Minister is responsible for a situation if that comes out of some decision taken by him, or secondly because of some decisions not having been taken by him at the appropriate time and thirdly because of some policy decisions which he has taken leading to bad results. The Lieutenant-Governor of Delhi is in charge of law and order in Delhi, and not the Home Minister. The police force is there and the police officials are there. (*Time bell rings*) One minute more. Now, did Mr. Nanda ask any of these people not to take such measures which could have avoided the 7th November incident or did he take any such measures that led to that day's incident? Or did he take any policy decision which led to that situation? The answer to all these questions would be an emphatic no. And if it is no, I do not know how we should say that Nandaji should have sent out on this issue. However, after Mr. Nanda has resigned I must pause here and pay a tribute to the Prime Minister who has been handling the situation in a most manly fashion in spite of great odds. And I welcome the appointment of Shri Chavan as the Home Minister. The House will recall that Mr. Chavan was asked to take charge of the Defence Ministry in very difficult circumstances and he did a good job of the Defence Ministry. I do hope and pray that what he did in the Defence Ministry he will be able to do in the Home Ministry and I do hope that it would be possible to meet all the challenges in the future.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल (बिहार) :
डिप्टी चैयरमैन महोदया, जो यह मोशन
आया हुआ है इसके सम्बन्ध में मैंने भी कुछ
संशोधन दिये थे, लेकिन आज जो पेपर मुझको
मिला उस पेपर में मैंने उन संशोधनों को
नहीं देखा। खैर, जो भी हो, जो कुछ मैंने

[श्री बी० एन० मडल]

सशोधन में दिया था उन बातों को अपने भाषण में भी कहगा ।

आज इस देश में जो घटना घट रही है उस घटना में जो 7 नवम्बर की घटना है वह घटना कोई ऐसी घटना नहीं है जो इस देश में आकस्मिक तौर से हुई है । उस घटना के पहले जितनी बातें इस देश में हुई हैं उन सारी बातों के मिलमिले में वह घटना एक कड़ी मात्र है । जो शासन आज 19-20 वर्ष तक इस देश में कांग्रेस पार्टी का चला है और उस दौरान जिम दग में शासन चलाया गया है उसी का नतीजा है कि आज समूचे देश में लालमनेम और वायलेम का बोल-बाला हो गया है । आज कोई भी एक छोटी सी बात होती है तो वह हिंसा का रूप धारण कर लेती है । कांग्रेस की सरकार चलाने वाले लोगों ने इस स्थिति को पैदा किया है । जो मन्त्रिपरिषद् का उद्देश्य था कि स्वतंत्रता के आधार पर, न्याय के आधार पर, भाईचारे के आधार पर शासन चलाना, उस दग से शासन चलाने की इन लोगों ने कोशिश नहीं की । इसलिए जो कुछ हुआ है वह इन लोगों की करतूत है । अपने स्वार्थ के लिए, अपने परिवार के स्वार्थ के लिए, अपनी पार्टी के स्वार्थ के लिए या जिन लोगों में इनको पैसा मिलता है उनके स्वार्थ में इन लोगों ने शासन चलाया है । इन बातों को लेकर गलत और भ्रष्ट नीति के चलते देश में अन्याय की परिस्थिति कायम हुई है उस अन्याय के प्रतिकार के लिए जितने भी यहिमात्मक आन्दोलन हुए हैं उन यहिमात्मक आन्दोलनों का कोई प्रभाव इस सरकार के ऊपर नहीं पड़ा । बीच-बीच में जब कभी नान-वायलेट एजिटेशन ने वायलेट रूप धारण किया, तभी थोड़ा बहुत अमर इस सरकार के ऊपर हुआ । इन सारी बातों को देखते हुए, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता आज समझ बैठी है कि इस सरकार से यहिमात्मक आन्दोलन के

जरिए कोई फल निकलने वाला नहीं है । इसलिए इसमें फल निकालने के लिए यह जरूरी समझा जाता है जो आन्दोलन को हिंसा पर आधारित किया जाय क्योंकि तभी किसी फल की आशा की जा सकती है । इसलिए 7 तारीख के आन्दोलन को हिंसात्मक रूप देने की कोशिश हुई । उसकी जड़ में यही भावना काम कर रही थी कि हिंसात्मक रूप धारण करने के बाद ही सरकार इन बातों पर सोचेगी और इसका कोई उपाय निकलेगा । इसलिए उस आन्दोलन का जो आखीरी हिस्सा हुआ उस हिस्से में इस तरह की बात हुई । उस आन्दोलन के लिए ऐसा समझना कि सिर्फ इसमें नन्दा जी का दोष है, उनके एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव लैपमेज की वजह से इस तरह की स्थिति आई, ठीक नहीं, ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है । उस दिन की घटना की जड़ में जो एक नई बात देखने में आई है वह यह कि आज शासन में जो गड़बड़ी आ रही है, जो देश में ला एंड आर्डर में गड़बड़ी आ रही है उसमें जो शासक पार्टी का पावर के लिये जो आपसी होड़ है उस होड़ का भी अमर है । मुझे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि उस दिन जो कुछ हुआ वह जानबूझ कर शासक पार्टी के कुछ लोगों ने उस समय के होम मिनिस्टर श्री नन्दा को, बदनाम करने के लिये उस दग की कार्यवाही करवाई गई है । जैसा कि अखबार में नन्दा जी के स्टेटमेंट से मालूम होता है कि वह जिस डिपार्टमेंट के हेड थे उसमें उनकी कोई बात नहीं चलती थी, उनके मेन्ट्रेरी उनके खिलाफ काम किया करते थे, वह उसको बदलाना चाहते थे लेकिन जो मन्त्रिमंडल की नेता है उस नेता को यह बात पसन्द नहीं थी कि उसमें कोई हेरफेर हो । इसलिये मैं नहीं समझता कि नन्द जी का इसमें दोष है, अगर दोष है तो सारे मन्त्रिमंडल का दोष है । इससे लिये श्री नन्दा का हटाना ही पर्याप्त नहीं है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी

के सदस्यों को पार्लियामेंट के दीगर सदस्यों का, देश की जनता को एक बुलन्द आवाज उठानी चाहिये कि मारा मंत्रिमंडल इस्तीफा दे और एक नई मिनिस्ट्री बने। कांग्रेस पार्टी की ही मिनिस्ट्री बने लेकिन वर्तमान मंत्रियों को छाड़ कर कांग्रेस पार्टी के दीगर लोगों को लेकर मिनिस्ट्री बननी चाहिये। ऐसा मैं समझता हूं कि देश के कल्याण के लिये जरूरी है।

उस दिन जो कुछ इंतजाम हुआ था उस इंतजाम के सिलसिले में मैंने यह भी पाया कि दिल्ली भर की सारी पुलिस पार्लियामेंट के दरवाजे पर खड़ी कर दी गई थी लेकिन दिल्ली के जो दूसरे रहने वाले हैं, जो ब्राइवेट लोग हैं, उन लोगों के लिये सरकार की ओर से कोई इंतजाम नहीं किया गया था। उमी समय जब कि यह भीड़ एकट्ठी थी मुझे टिफिन के सिलसिले में विट्ठल भाई पटेल हाउस जाने का मौका हुआ। इसी बीच यहा गोली चली, लोग भागे और हजारों लोग विट्ठल भाई पटेल हाउस की ओर भी भागे और उममें से एक बैच वहां गया और जा कर जिनने शीशे के किचन थे उसको तोड़ डाला, सब मोटरों को जला डाला और वहां जो इनमें थे उन पर पत्थर और ढेले चलाना उन लोगों ने शुरू कर दिया अगर थोड़ी और देर तक वहा पुलिस न पहुंचती तो मैं समझा नहीं सकता कि विट्ठल भाई पटेल हाउस में रहने वाले जितने संसद् सदस्य हैं और जो आफिमर हैं उनके परिवार वालों की क्या दशा होती। तो आज इन मारी बातों पर विचार होना चाहिये क्योंकि आये दिन में बराबर प्रदर्शन होता रहता है, आन्दोलन होता रहता है, हिंसात्मक रूप वह धारण करता है, तो ऐसी स्थिति में किस तरह से सरकारी आदमियों के अलावा जो दूसरे आदमी हैं जनकी रक्षा इस दिल्ली में हो सकेगी।

इन मारी बातों पर आज इस सदन को विचार करना चाहिये। अगर वर्तमान सरकार ला एंड आर्डर को नहीं मेनटेन कर सकती है तो जनतंत्र का यह नकाजा है कि यह सरकार इस्तीफा देकर अलग हो जाये। कोई शासक ऐसा नहीं समझे कि हमारे जरिये ही काम चल सकता है हमारे जाने से काम चल ही नहीं सकता है और वह अगर अपने को अयोग्य समझते हों तो उनका यह फर्ज है कि देश को साफ कह दें कि "हमसे शासन नहीं चलता, हम देश के पीस एंड आर्डर को मेनटेन नहीं कर सकते हैं, हम चाहते हैं कि तुम दूसरी मिनिस्ट्री बनाओ, दूसरा चुनाव करो, दूसरे मिनिस्टर बनाओ," इनको ऐसा करना चाहिये था, लेकिन इन लोगों ने वैसा नहीं किया।

इस सरकार का दिमाग इतना खोखला हो गया है वह समझ नहीं पाती कि अभी स्टूडेंट्स का जो प्रदर्शन होने वाला है उसके लिये क्या करना चाहिये और क्या नहीं करना चाहिये, इसका कोई शऊर इस सरकार का नहीं है और इस आड़ में, इस बीच डा० राममनोहर लोहिया, राजनारायण और गंडे मुराहरि, इन लोगों को गिरफ्तार कर के जेल में रख दिया गया है। यह सरकार समझती है कि आज की जो हालत है उस हालत में इस काम को करने में स्थिति बिगड़ जा सकती है, जो छात्र आन्दोलन है वह और भी भडक जा सकता है; अगर वे हिंसात्मक कार्यवाही नहीं भी करना चाहते हों तो भी हिंसात्मक काम हो जा सकता है। उत्तेजित हो कर इन कारणों से भी वे हिंसा पर उतारू हो सकते हैं। जिस ढंग से वह काम किया गया है वह पार्लियामेंट के लिये भी एक चेतावनी है और देश के लिये भी। देश में जो जनतंत्र चल रहा है वह चल पायेगा या नहीं, इस पर भी सोचने की जरूरत हो

[श्री बी० एन० मंडल]

गई है। सरकार की कार्यवाही से भारतीय जनतंत्र पर बहुत बड़ा खतरा उपस्थित हो गया है। गोड़े मुराहरि जो कि 10 दिन तक दिल्ली से बाहर थे वह दिल्ली पहुंचते हैं और पालम हवाई अड्डे पर उनको गिरफ्तार कर लिया जाता है। इसलिये गिरफ्तार किया जाता है कि उन्होंने स्टूडेंट्स को भड़काया है अपनी स्पीच से। जो आदमी 10 दिन तक दिल्ली में नहीं था और उसके बाद हवाई अड्डे पर पहुंचता है उससे कहते हैं कि आपने लड़कों को भड़काया है इसलिये आपको अरेस्ट करते हैं। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि आज कानून का बहाना बना कर विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों को पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को, नीचा दिखाने की कोशिश की जा रही है, उनको आतंकित करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। परिस्थिति के इस पक्ष पर भी मैं इस हाउस में इस का ध्यान खेंचना चाहता हूँ।

जो डिबेट आज चल रही है उस डिबेट के एक प्रस्तावक श्री राजनारायण भी थे, उनके पास सरकार को एक्सपोज करने के लिये सरकार का भंडा फोड़ करने के लिये बहुत सा मसाला था, उन्होंने उसको एकट्ठा करके रखा था।

श्री एन० पात्र (उड़ीसा) : वह आपको देकर जाना था।

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : बैठिये, इस तरह से बीच में मत बोलिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज अगर राजनारायण को मौका मिलता तो इस सरकार का भंडाफोड़ होता लेकिन भंडाफोड़ होने के पहले..

श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव : उनका भंडाफोड़ हो गया।

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : जिस दिन यह मोशन आने वाला था उसके पहली रात को राजनारायण पकड़ लिये गये और उसको यहां हाउस में नहीं आने दिया गया। राजनारायण का एक तार भी कल शाम को मुझे आया था। उसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि आप ऐसा इंतजाम कीजिये जिस से हमको हाउस में जाने का मौका मिले जिससे कि हम इस सरकार की तानाशाही और इस सरकार की जो गड़बड़ी है उन सारी बातों को सदन के सामने ला सकें। मैंने चेयरमैन से भी कहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि चेयरमैन को अधिकार है कि उनको अरेस्ट की हालत में, प्रिजनर की हालत में भी मौका दे सकते हैं इस हाउस में आने के लिये और अपनी बातों को कहने के लिये इसलिये मैं फिर आपके जरिये चेयरमैन से आप्रह करूंगा कि राजनारायण को इस डिबेट में भाग लेने के लिये अगर आज खत्म हो तो आज ही और आज नहीं खत्म हो तो कल उनको जरूर इस हाउस में लाया जाय और तब उन को पास जो भी मसाला इस संबंध में है उस पर सारी बातों को रखेंगे जिससे कि इस सरकार का भंडाफोड़ हो सकेगा।

इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो मोशन आया है इस मोशन का यह परिणाम निकलना चाहिये कि सिर्फ नन्दा जी के जाने से ही नहीं बल्कि सारा मंत्रि-मंडल जाय ऐसा कोई प्रबन्ध इस हाउस को निकालना चाहिये और वह किस तरह से निकाले इस पर मोक्ष विचार यह हाउस करे, मैं यह चाहता हूँ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Madam Deputy Chairman, a very important question arises out of the statement made by Mr. Hathi and that question is who were the organisers who gave the Delhi Administration the assur-

ance and the undertaking that there shall be no violence. They were obviously not able to keep their promise. I want to know whether the Government, the Home Ministry, has tried to find out why and with what aim in view they gave this false assurance to the Delhi Administration and whether any action is contemplated against them. From the whole show another question arises, who were the financiers? Obviously big money was involved in organising such a huge demonstration and maintaining the demonstrators in four or five camps for a number of weeks, because the people did not come all of a sudden on the 7th of November. People were brought slowly for weeks together. **Six** or seven camps were run and in those camps all the inmates were fed on Halwa, Puri, *Tarkari* and *Achar*. Who were these financiers? I am told that Rs. 25 lakhs were collected for this demonstration? Who were the donors? Who were the collectors and what was their aim?

Then, Madam, repeatedly it has been said that a few days before the 7th November itself special trains were run to bring the demonstrators. Obviously special trains are not run without the knowledge of the Railway administration.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh): Even the ticketless Sadhus were taken without any detection by the Railway staff.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: This is an additional thing. Obviously special trains are not run without payment. It should be the duty of the Government to find out and tell the House how many special trains were run to bring the demonstrators, who paid for them, and why, as Mr. Shukla has correctly pointed out, severe steps were not taken to prevent ticketless travel by demonstrators.

Then, Madam, a number of people have been arrested. The Delhi

Administration has only been giving the number of people arrested. It should be the right of this House and the country at large to know how many people have been taken under preventive detention and how many people have been arrested for specific offences. There was arson, there was looting, there was beating, there was killing. So a number of specific offences were committed. We want to know how many people have really been arrested for specific offences. While I am opposed to preventive detention and those who have been taken into preventive detention will obviously be released by the Government sooner or later, those arrested for specific offences should be put to trial. There is one big reason for lawlessness in the country today that people commit specific offences, they are charged with specific offences, but then they are not put on trial and no convictions are secured. Political pressures, expediency and convenience lead to their being released without trial. I think I have the support of this House and the country at large and even the Members of the opposition, who have faith in courts, when I say that those arrested for specific offences in connection with the November 7 incidents should be put on trial, and then much will be proved and much will be disproved.

There has been a demand for a judicial enquiry. Mr. Vajpayee for whom I have the highest respect demanded a judicial enquiry. I personally feel, Madam, that in a case like this judicial enquiry will produce nothing. Judges go on evidence. This is not a case in which we want somebody to judge on evidence produced by two sides. I also want an enquiry, but I want the enquiry by an agency which will go into facts and find out and unearth the mystery. Judges cannot do that. The worst crime of our times has been the murder of President Kennedy in 1963 and an enquiry into that crime was entrusted to a very high judicial authority, Justice

[Shri Arjun Arora]

Warren the Chief Justice of America. But the Warren Commission report has produced nothing new and the Warren Commission report has not unearthed the mystery behind the Kennedy murder. Similarly if there is a judicial enquiry on these disturbances, no mystery will be unearthed and the real culprits will go scotfree even after the judicial enquiry. I urge upon the new Home Minister to appoint an agency of his confidence and his choice which should go into the whole thing, collect evidence, unearth the mystery. And that report should come to this House and to the country at large and we will then know which are the mysterious forces behind this episode.

Obviously the whole thing was pre-planned. Kerosene tins were with some demonstrators. Kerosene in the country is not easily available. It is never available in the Parliament Street. Somebody had brought them. I am told that people had cloth bags on their shoulders, and those bags were not containing halwa puri for Members of Parliament, they were containing buckbats aimed at Parliament House and other buildings. Now the whole disturbance and the violence behind it were pre-planned. We should be able to know on authoritative basis who planned this violence. Mr. Hathi's statement is obviously silent about it.

Then, Madam, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said many irrelevant things, but he was very correct when he highlighted the attack on Mr. Kamaraj's house. I know from an eye-witness that the people who came to Mr. Kamaraj's house were pre-determined people who came to burn him alive. They first entered Mr. Raghuramiah's house. Then the leader of the gang said, "No, no, no, this is not Shri Kamaraj's house, let us leave this house." They left that house and went to Shri Kamaraj's house. So obviously there was somebody behind

these disturbances who wanted particularly to harm our Congress President. The Government should be powerful enough to find him out and punish him.

Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee in his eloquent speech yesterday pleaded innocence for Jan Sangh. Madam, I am told that Swami Rameshwaranand, whose speech undoubtedly sparked off violence, is a Member of the Jana Sangh group in the Lok Sabha. I hope one member of Jan Sangh is as good as another and Swami Rameshwaranand is as important in the Jan Sangh as Mr. Vajpayee.

SHRI D THENGARI Is Mr. Arora as good as Mr. Kamaraj?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA Why not? I hope Mr. Thengari also will become as good as Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN You please wind up. There are many more to speak.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA Everybody has spoken from 15 minutes to 55 minutes and I have spoken only for 5 minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Everyone need not speak at length.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA I am not everyone.

I feel there is a great deal of confusion about the responsibility of maintaining law and order in Delhi. Who is responsible? The Delhi Administration or the Home Ministry of the Government of India? I want to know whether the Prime Minister, the Home Minister or the Government have ever applied their mind to this question as to who is responsible for maintenance of law and order in Delhi, whether it is the responsibility of the Home Ministry as such or of the Delhi Administration. The com-

mon-sense conclusion is that the primary responsibility is that of the Delhi Administration. But we find strange things happening. Nobody in the Delhi Administration has been touched by anybody, no action has been taken against anybody in the Delhi Administration. Nobody in the House has criticised the Inspector-General of Police of Delhi; nobody in the House has criticised the District Magistrate, the Deputy Commissioner, the Chief Commissioner, the Lieutenant-Governor of Delhi Administration. If they are not responsible for the maintenance of law and order, why is this big paraphernalia maintained? Why are they kept if they are not responsible and the dispute is only whether the Home Minister or the Home Secretary is responsible. I personally feel that it is the primary responsibility of the Inspector-General of Police of Delhi. I do not know who he is but he is responsible and he should have been sacked. I want to know why he did not discharge his duty. There is, of course, the big dispute about the Minister-Secretary relationship. That dispute has been a perennial feature of the Government of India. There have in the past been disputes between Secretaries and Ministers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not of this kind.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Not of such an ugly kind. But there were Secretaries like Mr. Venkataraman and Mr. C. C. Desai, in the Ministry of Industry and Commerce and at one stage they became so powerful that the Ministers whom they did not like had to go. And ultimately what was proved? Mr. Venkataraman was convicted of a corruption charge and Mr. C. C. Desai has become a businessman, possibly a corrupt businessman. Every time we sacrifice politicians, every time we sacrifice elected representatives of the people who become Ministers and give a pat on the back of bureaucracy, we are endangering democracy. We are endangering cor-

rect political practices. We are only strengthening the hands of bureaucracy which has never fared well.

A lot has been said in this House about the resignation of Mr. Nanda. I would have been personally happy if Mr. Nanda had made a statement in the Lok Sabha on his resignation. That is the right of a Minister. But I find that after 1956 no Minister has made a statement in the House after his resignation. If I remember correctly, Mr. C. D. Deshmukh is the only Minister who, after his resignation, made a statement in the Lok Sabha. That practice should be restored.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): The only honest man.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The Prime Minister should be generous enough to give every resigning Minister—and of course, there are not many who resign, people stick to their posts....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is very difficult.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The Prime Minister should be generous enough to give every resigning Minister the right to make a statement. And then if the House wants to discuss it, if the House wants to question it, it can do so. Because that democratic practice which exists in Britain has been given the go-by since 1956, it appears that Mr. Nanda had no other option but to release his letter to the press.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry. You have to wind up.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Just two more minutes. Mine is going to be the briefest speech in this discussion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not imitate anyone else. You can be very brief and give more substance.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am going to be very brief.

Then, Madam, in these disturbances Sadhus played a unique role. I personally feel that Sadhus are an irresponsible people, people who run away from their responsibilities of civilised life. It is wrong to bring them into politics.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It is absolutely criminal to bring irresponsible people into political life. I must say . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the cow.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: . . . that Mr. Nanda is amongst those who welcomed the intrusion of Sadhus into politics. He made that mistake and by chance, he has paid for it. But others have done it on a larger scale. Mr. Nanda only organised the Bharat Sadhu Samaj in the hope that Sadhus will become responsible to the country, become alive to the needs of the country and do something constructive. They are incapable of doing so. Now, irresponsible people, people determined to break democracy in this country, brought Sadhus in larger numbers and we have seen what has happened. The intrusion of Sadhus and the raising of the cow-protection cry on such an occasion is a sign of revivalism, of obscurantism. That is the danger. Jawaharlal Nehru all his life tried to train our people in thinking on rational lines. Now obscurantism, revivalism, is raising its head and instead of adopting a scientific attitude towards things, many of us, for political purposes utilise Sadhus and cow. Madam, I am not against protection of economic cows. But I think civil liberties, the fundamental rights of the people and the feelings of one section of the people, when they clash with the feelings of a major-

ity of people are important. The majority should be tolerant and not try to exploit cows for political purposes. Madam, this practice. . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arora, please wind up. You have taken. . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I have been interrupted so much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have spoken far too long. Please wind up. I am calling the next speaker.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: One or two sentences and I am done.

This practice of using Sadhus for politics is a dangerous thing. And no responsible person should try to bring Sadhus into politics. Nobody who has a rational appeal in view should try to go and worship Sadhus publicly and they should not try to distinguish between one Sadhu and the other. It was strange that soon after the November 7 disturbances everybody in Delhi who counts went to one Shankaracharya to distinguish him from the other.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: They can go to the Pope.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It is disgraceful.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Nobody objected when you went to the Pope.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): What happened on the 7th November was the sight of ugly reaction raising its head against the progressive forces and against the traditions of liberal thought and liberal-mindedness that the saner sections of the people have been cultivating for years in India. It was a blunt and naked expression of revivalism and I should say, naked expression of reactionary obscurantism and revivalism.

Madam, it is no use rubbing one's eyes and waking up in assumed wonder that such a thing should have happened in the Capital of India. As a matter of fact, it is the ruling party circles who, in spite of their protestations, have been rearing this ugly monster in their laps and in their midst. And because they have reared this ugly monster and nursed it and kept it alive in their midst, therefore, this ugly monster often raises its head in these horrid dimensions.

3 P.M.

Madam, it is no use saying that they did not know about all these incidents which would happen in Delhi. As a matter of fact, we have been finding for the last few months that certain circles in the ruling coterie have been trying to assist in the revival of these obscurantist forces. Some of them have been assisting directly. Some of them have been assisting indirectly, and I say that those who indirectly assist in the recrudescence of the revivalist forces, they are no less guilty than those who come into the forefront to encourage these reactionary forces. They also serve who stand and wait. These Ministers and Deputy Ministers and Secretaries have also served the reactionary forces though behind the screen.

Madam, even now we find with shame and regret that persons trained in liberal traditions of thought, persons educated with European orientation should go to Jagadgurus for asking blessings at their feet and for taking *prasad* at their houses. I need not name the honourable person who went to take *prasad* in the house of Jagadguru Sankaracharya, may be of Sringeri or may be some other thing. Every one knows that. It was out in the Press. You have also seen it. When the Jagadguru came to the gates of Delhi then there was a procession of high dignitaries.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, may I just for a moment intervene because it is a very objectionable reference. Ours is a secular State and the people here are free to have their faith. As a State we do not go to anybody but if somebody has some faith, surely he has the liberty to have it. When His Holiness the Pope came here our Government, our Prime Minister, our President went there. That did not mean that they were showing faith in all Pope believes but a respect which is his due. We want to go to show our respect to eminent leaders of religion. Simply by going there he did not become a Christian or unsecular. Similarly, Jagadguru Sankaracharya was one of those whom he visited. Many of us had visited him, not I, but many others. (*Interruptions*). I am sorry I could not go.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: He is a member of the Reception Committee.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Madam, no reference should be made to any Member's religious faith so long as it does not encroach on the State. Names should not be mentioned like this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Pande's observations are correct.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Madam Deputy Chairman, I have not blamed anybody. I tell you, Madam, that it is a question of man and man . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: I know what you are referring to. Why do you and your party worship Mao Tse-tung as your God? He is more than God to you. Your garland him. (*Interruptions*). You worship him. . . . (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot carry on with the debate like this.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: You belong to the Chinese Communist Party.

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE: I do not know whether Mr Pande regards the cow as his mother. But I pity such children of the mother cow . . .

SHRI C D PANDE: You are a Red Guard.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE. . . . we have seen the children of the mother cow on rampage in the streets of Delhi.

SHRI C D PANDE Shame on you

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE. I remember the sayings of Swami Vivekananda who was not a lesser Hindu than any of the Hindus here. When somebody went to him for the purpose of cow protection, he looked at that well-fed man who went to him for cow protection. Do you know what Swami said to him? "You seem to be a very worthy son of the cow. You are so anxious for the purpose of protection of the cow that you are not doing anything for the protection of the orphans, of the children who are dying of starvation, for the protection of those who cannot have a single drop of medicine, who are dying in their mothers' laps in the villages". These children of the cow are not more Hindu than Swami Vivekananda. I think these are the persons who are really a blot on our secular society.

Madam Deputy Chairman, we have been hearing some observations in this House. They say that secularism means that we should have a combination of all religions. I have never heard such a definition of secularism. Secularism is not a synthesis or a combination of religions.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We have respect for all religions.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Secularism in the State means that the dignitaries of the State, the Government in the States, must see that one parti-

cular religion or other religions should not be shown any favouritism whatsoever. Religion should be rooted out completely from the field of public life. This is what is secularism.

SHRI C D PANDE No, no.

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE It is a pity, Madam, that in the present age one can be so obscurantist and so behind the century that we can go to one Jagadguru or two Jagadgurus or a naked Naga whom we saw in the procession in the Connaught Place. Flowers were showered on these naked sadhus. I wonder at the sense of decency, at the sense of decorum of these sadhus who came naked and of the persons who showered flowers upon them. Yet, Madam I can understand the idiocy of those who go to take blessings at the feet of the naked Nagas. I can understand the idiocy of these people. But I cannot understand the attitude of the high dignitaries of the Government. I cannot understand the attitude of the dignitaries of the Cabinet going for *prasad* and blessings to the Jagadguru.

SHRI C D PANDE Madam: Deputy Chairman, it is wrong of him to name . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI P N SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): He is hurting the religious feelings of a community (Interruptions)

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE: It is one thing when an individual goes but when an individual who is a Minister goes to the Jagadguru, he is not going in his individual capacity. He is still looked upon as a Minister.

SHRI C D PANDE A Minister too has a religion of his own (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Order order

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Madam, it should be pertinent to find out whether the Ministers went there in official cars or in their private cars.

THE MINISTER OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION (SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM) Madam, it is wounding the feelings of everybody. I am proud of my tradition I am proud of my spiritual tradition Who can say that I am not an Indian or a secular Indian if I am a Hindu? I am proud of those people who speak . . .

SHRI C D PANDE What about his worship of Mao Tse-tung?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE The cow has been looked upon by Swami Vivekananda and Raja Ram Mohan Roy and by all those liberal leaders of India (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: How has he become the follower of Swami Vivekananda overnight?

(Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Order order

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE: Madam Deputy Chairman, I was, therefore, pointing out to you that it is not a question of paying lip service to secularism. It is not a question of merely saying that I do not support the demonstration .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr Chatterjee, what are you speaking on? Please come to the demonstration on the 7th November.

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE: I am speaking on the Delhi Demonstration of November 7 .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Your time is running out If you have to say anything more on the subject, you say it

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE You will kindly agree that I have been more interrupted than anybody else

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN That is not the point.

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE I will try to finish I was saying this that this Hindu revivalism—yes, I will accuse it this way—this revivalism of orthodox Hinduism that is being nursed .

SHRI C D. PANDE. You are following in the footsteps of the Red Guards of China You are a Red Guard

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE . in the ruling party is being done only for their own pernicious ends (Interruption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta).

SHRI C D PANDE: We will take care of you also You, too, are in danger from your Chinese friends.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order order (Noisy interruptions).

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE: I am saying that this very disturbance among the Congress Benches shows that the mask of hypocrisy has fallen from their faces when they said that they are not with the Delhi demonstrators Now the mask of hypocrisy is off their faces and it is clear that the fangs of the furious and ferocious beast of communalism are now apparent from the faces of these innocent Congressmen who are now rising to support the Hindu revivalism in the fashion in which they are doing now

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh) Why does he say all that?

SHRI A P CHATTERJEE: I say that certain elements in the ruling circles were assisting the communal revivalists directly and indirectly I have given some instances of indirect support of revivalism I shall now give certain instances of direct support to revivalism Look at the circular that was issued by the Home Ministry on cow slaughter. Every sane man—I am not speaking of insane men and there are insane men outside and in-

Nov. 7, 1966

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee.]

side—or scientific man has expressed the view in the country that the banning of cow slaughter is uneconomic, is unscientific and yet the Home Ministry sent a circular against the provisions of the Constitution, against the judgment of the Supreme Court that you cannot totally ban cow slaughter. Now Nandaji issued a circular from the Home Ministry that cow slaughter has to be banned in all the States. I am not sorry at all that Nandaji has left the Ministry. After leaving the Ministry, everybody becomes a hero or tries to become a hero. I am not holding any brief for anybody but what I say is this that the Cabinet responsibility is there. There must be indivisible cabinet responsibility. If Nandaji has gone, as the Prime Minister is here, will the Prime Minister assure this House that she will withdraw the circular issued by the Home Ministry?

HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: If she does not do it, if the Government does not do that, then I will say that the Cabinet is hand in glove with the reactionary trend of thought which found its ugly expression in the streets of Delhi, and which found its obnoxious expression in the files of the Home Ministry because if the files of the Home Ministry are to remain untouched, then I will say, whatever you say, whatever platitudes you may utter, you are really the criminals, you are really the persons who are guilty of the arson and murder which took place in the streets of Delhi on the 7th November. It is you who should be in the dock, who should be brought to book and I am quite sure that the progressive forces of India will not tolerate this obscurantist forces which are either in the open in the streets or hiding in the bosoms of the Ministers. We have seen the Preventive Detention Act. Mr. Arora has referred to that. When we fight for our daily demand, when

we fight for our living, when we fight for our democratic rights, you issue orders under the Preventive Detention Act or under the Defence of India Rules, arresting us but why against these persons who were trying to disrupt the life politics and the life public in the city of Delhi orders under the Preventive Detention Act were not issued and why the Railway Ministry allowed special trains to run in which these naked sadhus came to Delhi? Why the Railway Ministry again comes forward and says that the railway accidents are due to sabotage when even the Defence Headquarters have said that it is not so and the Police have sent a preliminary report that the charge of the Railway Ministry that it is due to sabotage is absolutely false? Why should the Railway Minister lay charge of sabotage when he could not protect the railway passengers, when according to the report it is due to the neglect of the Railways that hundreds of passengers died? Why the Railway Ministry ran special trains in which these sadhus came to Delhi asking for banning of cow-slaughter. These are the persons who are really guilty. It is no use finding them guilty, it is no use saying that the persons were misguided who got lathi-charge in the streets from the police. They are the guilty persons. the guilty persons are there before you and they are there in this House. They ought to be brought to book first. We have always found how actually persons and persons are treated. We have seen it. The students' procession is coming on the 18th November and two Members of Parliament have been arrested under section 107. It is unprecedented. Section 107 is only attracted against goondas and habitual offenders and it has been invoked against Parliament Members and Rs. 25,000 in bonds have been asked from them. Look at those Mundhras and blackmarketeers and hoarders who commit crimes against human beings by taking away the food

of the people from their mouths and these people, when they are brought to trial before the courts, the courts give them bail, personal recognition bails and now under the orders of the Home Ministry these Members of Parliament are being asked to produce Rs. 25,000 of bonds. They should have released on personal recognition, I believe they are more honourable than the persons who are bringing them to trial. They are more honourable than those who go and seek *prasad* at the feet of Jagadguru Sankaracharya.

The Delhi demonstrations of November 7 have laid bare a very deep-rooted disease in our body politic. The root is not down, the root is up, it is a peculiar kind of plant, it is the communal plant whose roots are in the air and the air is in the air of the Cabinet Secretariat of New Delhi. Unless we can cut down those roots which are flourishing in the Cabinet of New Delhi, we cannot do away with the communalism in India and unless we do away with the communalism in India our India will not progress. We of course assure you that as far as we Opposition Members are concerned, our Party is concerned, we are dedicated to the uprooting of communalism and we shall see that the communal forces of reaction are rooted out from this country. That day is coming.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity of saying a few words. It is always a little amusing to see some Members of the Opposition being swept off their feet by their own arguments and eloquence. Much of what has been said has not been relevant to the question which is under discussion. I want to confine myself to those points which have been raised, many of them, by

1298 RS—

Shri Gupta. Some of them relate to Mr. Nanda's letter to me and his statement to the Press at the time of his resignation. I might inform Shri Arjun Arora that Shri K. D. Malaviya also made a statement after his resignation in 1963.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: He did a correct thing.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I want also to inform him that it was certainly not my intention to prevent anybody from making a statement and in fact I would like to urge that we should observe that convention that if a Minister wishes to make any statement, if a Minister resigns when the Parliament is sitting, it is much better that he makes a statement on the floor of the House rather than in the Press.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Such an event is very rare.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Well, we happen to be discussing such an event. This was the convention before. I think during Speaker Mavalankar's time Dr. Ambedkar made such a statement and that statement was shown to the Prime Minister as well as to the Speaker of the House before it was made. And I think the same procedure was followed at the time of Dr. Deshmukh's resignation, and I personally think that this is a very good convention, one which we should follow.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope the first to come will be from Mr. S. K. Patil.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order order.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You are allergic to Mr. S. K. Patil, it seems.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Apart from being a healthy convention for us to accept this sort of procedure, I feel that it would enable us to keep to certain proprieties.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]—

In his letter Nandaji has referred, for instance, to a Cabinet discussion. Now Cabinet discussions are secret and they are not recorded; only the decision of the Cabinet is recorded and, therefore, I do not think it is proper for me to say anything about it even though the impression given may not be absolutely correct.

Madam Deputy Chairman, it is not my intention here to join issue with Nandaji, or comment in specific terms on some of the observations which he has made. I feel also that he has perhaps made these observations at a time when he was under a great mental strain, and I do not think that his letter reflects the totality of his experience of working in Government. As hon. Members are aware, he has been a Member of the Cabinet since 1951; he has held different portfolios and he has been closely connected with the formulation of our policies in the economic, social and political spheres, and it is difficult to believe the impression which his letter has created, of his deep differences with the policies of Government and implementation of those policies, with the performance of Government. It is one which he would really not have conveyed, had he given more thought to the matter in calmer moments. His letter as Home Minister was written to me on the 8th November actually, and his resignation was not accepted till the next day—that was the 9th November.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Does it change the situation?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It does a little bit; yes, because he was still a Minister.

Now in his letter there were certain observations and those have been remarked upon by several Members who have spoken; and they were regarding a civil servant who was working under him. Now this also, Madam, is a departure from certain

well-established conventions. The responsibility of the Government, for whatever the Government does or does not do, is that of the Minister concerned, and it is, I think, a convention also that we do not either praise or criticise a Government servant on the floor of the House, because it is not possible for him to reply for himself.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But he has criticised you.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: One by one, let me come to that. Anyhow, the responsibility lies on the Minister, not only in name, but it is a real responsibility; that is, while it is the duty of a civil servant to put his views before his Minister, whether right or wrong, to give his own assessment of a situation, it is for the Minister to accept that assessment, to accept those views, or not. That responsibility is always the Minister's regardless of whether it comes up in Parliament or not. (*Interruptions*).

As for what has been said about me, I do not know what hon. Members expect me to say on the subject. Obviously, while Shri Nanda was in my Cabinet, I gave him my fullest co-operation; I mean, there was no question of withholding cooperation.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: This is the disputed question.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Well, it is also the privilege of the Prime Minister to take certain decisions. Shri Nanda has mentioned two specific cases, something about his wanting a particular junior Minister, and also about his views about his Secretary. I do not think it is proper for me to go into details except that it is for the Prime Minister to judge in what manner and with whom he or she can function. It is for the Prime Minister to choose his or her Cabinet. If somebody does not approve of the

policy or the manner of working, well, there are ways open. I do not think I can say more than that.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The door is also open for everybody to go.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He was not given the tools, he says.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Well, the tools. I did not accept the suggestion which he had made regarding his Secretary and of his wanting to have a particular junior Minister under him. Now the choice of a Minister cannot be considered on personal likes and dislikes but in the larger picture, and the same holds true of the choice of Secretaries. It is true that the Minister should be able to work with the Secretary he has. Although I have no mind to go into this question, here I might take the House into my confidence by saying that when Nandaji felt strongly about this, I had agreed to make the change. But there are certain procedures to be followed. Somebody has to be found, and if that person is moved, somebody else has to be found to fill his place, and so on. And all this takes time, and as we were facing difficult situations in different parts of the country, that also caused the delay. So I do not think that at any time I was guilty of withholding confidence from Nandaji, and I am very sorry that he got this impression.

There were some, and among them Shri A. D. Mani who branched off into many things which were unconnected with the resignation and the happenings on the 7th. He talked about our explaining devaluation to the country. So I may just also branch off for a second and say to him that I, naturally, cannot speak for my other colleagues, but I personally did speak about devaluation several times a day during all my tours. I toured during the period immediately after devaluation in Andhra Pradesh.

I had a very big meeting in Madras. I toured in Kerala. I went to several other States—I do not remember all the names but I did it at every single place; I talked about devaluation not only in passing but in very great detail. Mr. Mani is normally a very great believer in what appears in the newspapers, but on this occasion he seems to have slipped up. (Interruptions).

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: He reads only his own newspaper.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Now there was one extraordinary suggestion which was made by Nandaji, which I must refute with great emphasis, and that was that his exit from the Government had something to do with his campaign against corruption. Now this is an astounding suggestion. Shri Nanda knew very well that his campaign against corruption had my fullest support and, in fact, that of the entire Government, and I can therefore only regret that he should have made this extraordinary charge.

Now much was said, Madam, regarding rational thinking and mother cow. Now this is a matter which I have been facing in every single General Election since we had our very first General Election. It has been one of the major planks used against my father in his constituency and, therefore, this whole campaign is not new to me, and I did point out to the people who came to see me in this regard that it was very strange that their concern for mother cow came up only at a particular time, that is, every five years. Incidentally, one did not know, was not aware of anybody, in the intervening period, asking that anything should be done. Now it happens that in our Constitution, in the Directive Principles of our Constitution, we have mentioned the protection of the cow, and animal husbandry, and so on, and we hold to

Nov. 7, 1966

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]

that, and it was in that connection that Nandaji had written to some of the Chief Ministers. No circular was issued from the Home Ministry, but he did write to Home Ministers to look into this matter. I might also say that . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did he consult you?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: He did consult me and I thought it was right that he should have sent this communication to the Chief Ministers. At the same time I do feel it is a State matter and it is for the Chief Ministers to look into this themselves.

There is one other point which I have to meet and it concerns this subject and it is I think, an important point which has been touched upon by some hon. Members. We are aware of the terrible drought conditions in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. We know not only that there is hardship which the people will suffer, but there is the greater hardship which the animals will suffer. I think all those who are interested in the cow might try to do something about the sufferings of the cattle of the peasants in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. The Government is doing what it can in these drought-affected areas. Obviously where it is a question of human beings and cattle, human beings must get preference and they will get preference.

AN HON. MEMBER: And the cattle?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I know the people there are concerned about their cattle. I may tell you that because I have visited these areas and I have seen how very deeply these people are concerned about the plight of their cattle. But those people outside who have funds to organise such tremendous demonstrations and to bring people from far-off corners of India, could divert at least

some of those funds for the purpose of looking after these cattle which, as some hon. Members have said, are roaming in the streets here.

I am sorry—not for this, but for what I have to say next. I happen to love animals. I love all animals. Those of us here who claim to have special love for the cow do not extend that love to the cow when it is hungry or sick or when some cruelties are practised on her. Unless we change this attitude I am afraid this slogan of protecting the cow rings a little hollow.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I plead guilty to visiting Shri Sankaracharya here. Why did I go to him? Not to worship but I went to him because he is a person of great scholarship. I had also enquired whether he had in any way been mixed up with or had even remotely encouraged the demonstrations which have taken place. I was assured that he was not for such demonstrations, that he did not believe in religion being mixed up with politics. I did go to him and I had a most interesting conversation with him—not about cows.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Did you take prasad?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, let us hear that.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Rational thinking does not mean that one does not talk to people because they happen to belong to a religion or because they have a certain reputation. I fully agree with those hon. Members who have said that there is a great deal of superstition in this country. There is a great deal of obscurantism and there is a great deal which we must wipe off if we are to go ahead. But at the same time we cannot sweep away what is good in our country that has given strength to the country, things which are good.

we have produced great men, men who have been of high thinking, men who, I believe have value and it is good to meet them and hear their views on certain things. One does not always agree with things that one hears. But a person of scholarship has always interested me and I think it is part of the duty of the Head of the State to keep in touch with all shades of thinking.

I think I have covered all the main points which I had jotted down. Now I would like to go back to the question of Shri Nandaji's resignation and say how unhappy I am that he should have resigned from his office. I have known him for many years and have worked in close contact with him in and out of Government. I sincerely hope that his help and advice will continue to be available to me and to the country even though he has ceased to be a Minister.

شری عبدالغنی (ہریانہ) : مہدم

ذہنی چہرہ من -

آنکہ جو کچھ دیکھتی ہے

لب پہ آسکتا نہیں

محوِ چہرہ ہوں کا بھارت

کہا سے کہا ہو جائے گا

۷ نومبر کو جو حادثہ ہوا ہے وہ

ہم سب لوگوں کے لئے ایک دردناک

حادثہ ہے اور وہ سب کے لئے گہرے

سوچ و چار کا موضوع ہے۔ اس موقعہ

کو اگر اچھا لگائے تو میں یہ عرض

کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ بجائے اس کے

کہ ہم سب کو مل کر ٹھنڈے دماغ

سے یہ وچار کرنا چاہئے کہ ایسے حادثے

دیکھ میں نہ ہوں اور اس کا بہتر

علاج ہو۔ یہاں پر پارٹیوں کا
 پروپیگنڈا چلے یا کسی نے گناہ پر
 پردہ ڈالنے کی کوشش کی جائے یا
 کسی کو زبردستی گناہ گار ٹھہرانے کی
 کوشش کی جائے تو مہدمی رائے میں
 یہ بالکل غلط بات ہے۔

مہدم ذہنی چہرہ من - بجائے اس
 کے کہ میں اس بات میں جاؤں یہ
 کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ بھارت
 صاحب نے جو اسٹیٹمنٹ دیا ہے
 وہ صحیح ہے اور باجپٹی جی کی
 بات بھی بڑی ہے۔ یہ آپ جانتے
 ہوں کہ یہ دردناک حادثہ ہوا ہے اور
 اس میں کئی باتیں ہیں جو میں
 آپ کے فوراً طلب کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔
 یہاں بات تو یہ ہے کہ یہ آپ کو ماننا
 پڑے گا کہ اس پروسیشن میں جس
 کی وجہ سے کچھ ہوا کہوں کہ اس کی
 کئی مہملوں سے چرچا چلتی تھی
 کہ لہڈیز اور بچے تھے اس لئے مہدم
 دماغ اس طرف نہیں جاتا کہ جو گٹو
 سے پریم کرنے والے تھے۔ ان کے دماغ
 میں کس طرح سے یہ بات آئی کہ
 وہ فساد کریں، وہ آگ لگائیں، وہ
 گاڑی چلائیں، وہ لوگوں کو ماریں اور
 کام راج کی کوششیں کریں۔ کہوں کہ
 کام راج نے گٹو ہتھیار کے بارے میں کوئی
 اسٹیٹمنٹ نہیں لیا تھا جس سے انہیں
 فضا آتا۔ اگر لہتے تو شری اشوک
 بہت سے لہتے لیکن وہ ان کی کوشش

[شری عبدالغلی]

پر نہیں کہے۔ ان سب باتوں کو دیکھتے ہوئے اور سمجھتے ہوئے کہ اس میں کافی گہرا ہاتھ کچھ لوگوں کا ہے جو کہ ان سوشل ایجوکیشن میں یا ان پارٹیوں کا ہے جن کا دماغ ابھی تک صاف نہیں ہو پایا ہے کہ کس طرح سے اس دماغ کو آگے لے جایا جائے۔ کچھ انٹرسٹڈ لوگ ہیں جن کو اپنی ذات دماغ کی ذات سے بہاری ہے یا وہ لوگ ہیں جو اندرا جی کے ہاتھ کو کمزور کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔ طرح طرح کی باتوں سے۔ جیسے نڈہ جی کا استیعفی ہے چاہے پائل صاحب کی کہانی ہو۔ میں یہ بڑے ادب سے عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس سے دماغ میں جو وائلڈس کا جذبہ بوجھ رہا ہے اگر اندرا جی کی جگہ کوئی دوسرا آجائے اس سرکار کی بجائے کوئی دوسری سرکار آجائے کیا وہ اس وائلڈس جذبہ کو پسند کرینگے۔ اور جو اس دماغ میں لائیس۔ نوٹس پھیل رہی ہے کیا وہ اس کو پسند کرینگے۔ مہرا یقین ہے کہ کوئی ہمت نہیں کرے گا کہ یہاں آ کر یہ بیان کرے پھر اگر یہ حالت ہے تو سب پارٹیوں کو مل کر اس وقت یہ دیکھنا ہے کہ کس طرح سے ہم اس گورنمنٹ کو جو بھی اس وقت موجودہ گورنمنٹ ہے اس کے ہاتھ کو مضبوط کر سکیں اور یہ جو قصہ ہے وہ ختم

ہو۔ ان کی ذات یا ان کے اندرونی ساتھ یہاں یہاں کریں اس سے کوئی لاپہ نہیں ہوگا اور نہ بھری پھس کھتا کو ہی کوئی لاپہ ہونے والا ہے۔ کیوں کہ اے۔ جائے گا اور بی۔ آ جائے گا۔ نڈہ جی کی جگہ نہ بھری پھس آنے والے ہیں نہ عبدالغلی آنے والا ہے اور نہ مسٹر باجھٹی جی آنے والے ہوں۔ اس لئے اس بات میں نہیں پونا چاہئے بلکہ یہ دیکھنا چاہئے کہ یہ حادثہ کبھی ہوا ہے۔

سچائی یہ ہے کہ اگر ریفرنڈم کرایا جائے اسی دماغ میں کہ گٹو ہتھیار بند کر دی جائے تو اندرا جی کو معلوم ہو جائے گا کہ زیادہ روت ان کی طرف اٹھنگے۔ اس میں مجھے کوئی سندیہ نہیں ہے اور میں اس لئے یہ بات کہوں کہتا ہوں اور میں نے ایجوکیشن کو دیا ہے وہ اس لئے دیا ہے کہ گٹو ہتھیار ہوں لگانا چاہئے اور اس کے تین کارن ہیں۔ پہلی بات یہ ہے کہ میں جانتا ہوں کہ ذہن کو جانز ہے عیسائیوں میں بھی ذہن کو جانز ہے اس کے باوجود بھی میں دیکھتا ہوں کہ اسلام یہ بھی کہتا ہے کہ کسی بھائی کسی بہن کسی بہتی کا دل نہ دکھایا جائے اور مجھے اس میں کوئی شک نہیں کہ گٹو کے ذہن کرنے سے کروڑوں بھائی بہنوں کا دل دکھتا ہے۔ اس لئے

ایک تو گارن یہ ہے اور اسی لئے میں
یہ سنسودھن لایا ہوں کہ گاؤ کو ذبیح
کرنے پر بہن لکایا جائے۔

دوسری بات یہ ہے کہ گاؤ کے ذبیح
کا چرم ہوا یا نہ ہوا۔ اگر ہوا تو
بھی بستوں کی بستیاں اجازت دی
گئیں مسلمانوں کی۔ رات کو جو گاؤں
بستیاں تھا صبح نہ کوئی انسان تھا نہ
حیوان تھا نہ کوئی مکان تھا نہ کوئی
نشان تھا۔ کہا بھوپدھن گپتا چرن نے
اور مسٹر چنر جی نے ان لوگوں کو
پڑا دی۔ اس لئے مسلمانوں کا
انٹرسٹ اس میں ہے کہ اندرا جی سے
ہاتھ چوڑ کر ریگورسٹ کریں کہ آپ
کی سرکار جو ہے وہ — اکانامک مسئلہ
کو حل کرنا ہے کرے اچھے سیکولزم کو
زندہ رکھنا ہے رکھے جو انسانیاں دوسروں
تو دینا چاہتے ہیں دیں۔ اس بات
کا خیال رکھے کہ مسلمان کی زندگی
گاؤ کے نام پر تھا کی گئی ملک
میں بار بار ایک جگہ نہیں اٹھک
جگہ مسلمان کا آج اس میں انٹرسٹ
ہے کہ ذبیحہ گاؤ جو اس کا مذہب
حق ہے اسے چھوڑ دے اور ریگورسٹ
لوے کہ اس پر بہن لکایا جائے۔

تیسری بات جو میں کہنا چاہتا
ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ اس وقت مسئلہ
یہ ہے کہ گاؤ کو کھانا کون ہے۔ اگر
کوئی گاؤ سلوٹر ہوتا ہے تو کچھ بچے
ہوئے لوگوں کے لئے بڑی بڑی انڈسٹریز
کے لئے ایسے لوگوں کے لئے جو مذہب
کو پسند نہیں کرتے شاید یہ کہیں
سے باہر سے منگاتے ہوں۔ جہاں تک
میں جانتا ہوں دیس میں گاؤ سلوٹو

نہیں ہوتا۔ اس بات کو دیکھا جائے
کہ گاؤ سلوٹر کا مسئلہ دیس میں ہے
یا نہیں۔ چند قریب کس جگہ پر
آ جاتے ہوں تو بات دوسری ہے عام
آدمی کھاتا ہو مسلمان کھاتا ہو
مہسانی کھاتا ہو ایسا میں نہیں
مانتا۔ اس لئے ایسے موقعوں پر جب
الیکشن آیا ہے تو ایک اچھی چیز کو
جو خوب صورتی کے ساتھ ایسے مہمورندم
کے ذریعہ اندراجی نے سامنے رکھ سکتے
تھے انہوں نے اس موقع پر غلط بات
کی۔ ان کے پاس سادھن نہیں تھا۔
سوشل منی جی کے پاس غلطہ گردی
کے الیمینٹس کو روکنے کا سادھن نہیں
تھا ان الیمینٹس کو جو ان کے جلوس
کوہ ان کے آدرش کوہ ان کے مقصد کوہ
ان کے دل کی آواز کو سہوٹیج کرنا
چاہتے تھے۔ اس لئے میں یہ سمجھتا
ہوں کہ جب ایسی حالت ہے کہیں
بھی گاؤ سلوٹر نہیں ہوتا ذبیحہ گاؤ
نہیں ہوتی تو یہ بہن اندرا جی
کہوں کہتی ہوں کہ ہم اس کو نہیں
کریں گے ہم سیکولر اسٹیٹ ہیں۔
سیکولر اسٹیٹ کے معنی یہ نہیں ہیں
کہ اس کے نام پر ہزاروں مسلمانوں کو
ہرباہ کیا جائے۔ کس جگہ ہلایا دے
سکے جب مسلمانوں کو بھگایا گیا۔
نہیں دے سکے ہلایا۔ میرے خیال
میں ارجن اروڑا کا یہ کہنا صحیح ہے
کہ چلہوں نے سادھوں کا استعمال کیا
فلپٹ کیا۔ سادھو سماج کس نے ہلایا۔؟

Nov. 7, 1966

[شری عبدالغنی]

جن سڈک نے بنایا یا بھوپیش جی نے بنایا یا راج نرائن نے بنایا؟ نہیں بنایا۔ اس کے لئے بھی نڈہ جی ذمہ دار ہوں اور میں نے اسی ہاؤس میں کہا تھا کہ کیا کیا کل کھلے ہیں سادھو سماج کے۔ یہ الزام آپا دے سکتے ہیں کہ جو اپوزیشن کے ممبر اس حادثہ کو اس لئے استعمال کرتے ہیں کہ کانگریس کو ہرایا جائے تو وہ دیہ کے ہت میں نہیں ہے وہ دیہ کے نیک خواہ نہیں ہیں وہ بد خواہ ہیں۔ کیوں کہ سچائی یہ ہے کہ اس موقعہ کو اس طرح اچھالنا دیہ کو نقصان پہنچانے والی بات ہے۔

اب مہتمم - دوسری بات جو میں اس کے ساتھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ انکوٹری ہو - کوئی کہتا ہے کہ پبلک انکوٹری ہو - مہتمم بھائی ارجن اروزا نے کہا ہے کہ پبلک انکوٹری کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں ہے - اس میں منسٹر لہول سے لے کر نیچے تک شکایتیں کی جاتی ہیں - پارٹیوں کے بارے میں کہا جاتا ہے کہ وہ اس میں ہیں - انہوں نے کہا کہ کوئی اپنی ٹیم ایسی چن لیں جس پر ہوروسہ ہو جو وہاں صاحب، وہ انکوٹری کرے - میں اس میں جانا نہیں کسی طرح بھی ہو لہکن اندرا جی کے

پاس یہ بات صاف صاف آئی چاہئے کہ یہ تعزیر کن لوگوں نے کس نتیجے پر کی اور کس نے سپورٹ کیا کئیوں نے دیہ کے اس امن کو برباد کرنے کی کوشش کی - آج کے بعد 18 تاریخ آ رہی ہے - اس 18 کے بعد میں نہ جائے کئی اتھارہ آئینگی میں نے اسی ہاؤس میں اپیل کی تھی اسٹوڈنٹس سے کہ وہ ایسے مظاہرہ کرنے سے باز آئیں - وہ ہاتھوں کا یہ کام نہیں ہے کہ وہ نڈہ لوگوں کو سنبھال سکیں - ان سوشل ایملٹس کو سنبھال سکیں - اس لئے کوئی بھی پارٹی اسٹوڈنٹس کو اکساتی ہو تو ان کی ہاتوں میں آنا اسٹوڈنٹس کے ہت میں نہیں ہے - اگر اسٹوڈنٹس کی زندگی برباد ہوگی تو دیہ کی زندگی برباد ہوگی -

میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ جہاں تک 7 تاریخ کا واقعہ ہے وہ کوئی معمولی واقعہ نہیں ہے - بھوپیش جی اور چہترجی صاحب ریشٹنزم کے نام پر چاہے کچھ کہیں ان کو 20 پوسٹل ووٹ بھی اس دیہ کے نہیں ملے گئے - ان کا خیال ہے مسلمان دیکھے - مسلمان کا ایک ووٹ نہیں ملے گا - اگر ریفرنڈم کیا گیا - مسلمان کو اپنے بچوں کی جان نہوزا ہی دینی ہے - مہتمم یہ رائے ہے اور میں اپنی اپنی

اندر اُچی کو اور ان کی سرکار کو
 یہ مشورہ دینا ہوں کہ وہ اس بارے
 میں اپنے سامع کر صاف کریں کہ
 جب کہیں ہوتا ہی نہیں ہے
 کاؤ سلوٹر تو کیا جھگڑا ہے کسے لے
 کر جھگڑا ہے۔ دہہ چند انہیں کسی
 ہو تیل میں یا کسی ایبھیسی میں
 تو ان سے ہم اپیل کر سکتے ہیں۔
 کونسا ان کے لئے یہ ضروری ہے پرماتنا
 نے فرض واجب کیا ہے کہ وہ ہوف
 کھائیں۔ ان کا حق نہیں چھلنا ہے
 وہ نمائندہ دوسرے دیشور کے جو
 ایبھیسیاں ہیں یا کچھ لوگ ہیں
 جو بہت نمائندہ ہیں ان کا حق
 نہیں چھلنا ہے۔ سرکار کاسٹی ٹیوشن
 کا حوالہ دیتی ہے کہ کاسٹی ٹیوشن
 میں ہے۔ کاسٹی ٹیوشن ہمارے لئے
 ہے، 45 کروڑ ہندگان خدا کے لئے ہے
 کاسٹی ٹیوشن کو خدا کا لفظ نہیں
 ماننا چاہئے۔ کیا اس کو بدلہ
 نہیں جا سکتا۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں
 کہ کاسٹی ٹیوشن کی آرزو نہیں۔
 وہ لوگ جو مذہب کے خلاف ہیں
 جو مذہب کو روندنا چاہتے ہیں
 اپنے پاؤں کے نیچے ان کو کاسٹی
 ٹیوشن کا بہانہ نہ لہنا چاہئے۔ ہم
 چند آدمیوں سے یہ کہہ سکتے ہیں
 نو کروڑ سے میں ریکوسٹ کر سکتا
 ہوں کہ تم اپنے مذہبی حق کو
 رضاکارانہ طور پر چھوڑ دو۔ افغانستان

میں سہلت پر سہلت تو 98 پرسنت
 مسلمان ہیں 95 فی صدی سے زیادہ
 ہیں وہاں بھی ذبیحہ گاؤ پر پابندی
 لگا دی گئی ہے۔ مہری مودبانہ
 درخواست ہے کہ ذبیحہ گاؤ جو ہے
 جس کو کٹو و دھہ کہتے ہیں اس
 پر ہون لکائیے۔ اگر نلدا جی نے کہا
 تو انہوں نے تھپک کہا۔

دو پوائنٹ اور عرض کرنے ہیں
 اس کے بعد بیٹھ جاؤں گا۔ ایک
 کمپنیشن کا وہ ہر جگہ دینا چاہئے
 انکوائری بھی ضرور ہی ہوگی۔ چاہے
 ارجن ارزا کے طریقے سے ہو۔ میں
 دو باتیں کہنا چاہتا ہوں ایک اس
 ہاوس میں بار بار یہ کہہ کر اس
 بات کو اچھالا گیا ہے کہ کچھ لوگ
 چاہتے تھے کہ مارجی ڈیسائی ہوم
 ماسٹر ہوں۔ مہدم۔ اس میں
 کوئی شک نہیں کہ ہندوستان میں
 جن چار پانچ آدمیوں کو مضبوط
 ترین کہا جا سکتا ہے جن کو اپنے
 وچاروں میں کنڈا ہی غلط کہوں نہ
 سمجھا جاتا ہو۔ جن کو دلی رشواس
 ہے اپنے وچاروں میں؟ مارجی ڈیسائی
 ان میں ہیں۔ اگر اندراجی اپنے
 ہانہ ان سے مضبوط کرنا چاہتی تھیں
 تو کسی کو کہا صدمہ ہے ہو پویش
 جی کو کیا تکلیف ہے۔ میں مانتا
 ہوں کہ چائنا کو جو کرنے والے
 ہوں اس حالت میں جب کہ چائنا

[شری عبدالغلی]

ہمارے ساتھ دشمنی کا ہوتا کر رہا ہے۔ ان کو کچل کر رکھدیں گے۔ میں مانتا ہوں کہ نلدہ جی سادھو سماج میں چلا جانا چاہئے۔ پولیٹیکس میں رہنا کوئی ضروری نہیں ہے۔ جس کے جہاں سادھن ہوں اس کو وہاں رہنا چاہئے۔ سراجی ڈیسائی کے بارے میں میری ڈیفینٹ رائے ہے کہ وہ ان دوستوں کو جو چائنا کی غلط طور پر حمایت کرتے ہیں جو اپنے آپ کو بوا پروکریسٹو کہتے ہیں ان کو وہ کچل کر رکھدیں گے۔ میرا دل یہ نہیں مانتا کہ اندوا جی کے دہتے ہوئے وہ کسی کو غلط طور پر کچل کر رکھدیں گے جب تک یہ پتہ نہ چلے کہ دیس میں نقصان ہونے والا ہے۔ اس لئے میں بھریس کھتا جی عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ بار بار یہ نہ کہیں کانگریس کی سرکار ہے وہ جسے چاہے بنائے جسے چاہے نہ بنائے۔ جب کمونیسٹ سرکار بنے وہ سراجی ڈیسائی کو پاس نہ پھٹکتے دے۔ لیکن کانگریس سرکار میں داخل دیلے کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں۔

آخر میں میں بھریس جی سے صوبہانہ ایہل کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔
دہايل - پی۔ سلگھ مسٹ کوہ، اس

سرکار کی طائف نہیں ہے کہ
ایہل - پی۔ سلگھ کو اس جگہ پر رکھ
سکے۔ یہ دنہا میں آج تک ہوا
نہوں کہ سارے ملک کی آواز کو
ایہل - پی۔ سلگھ پر قربان کر دیں۔
ایہل - پی۔ سلگھ میں کہا ایک
سیکرٹری ہیں۔ ٹوہک ہے ہمارے
لئے قابل عزت ہیں ان کا بوا اچھا
برہن ہے وہ اونچی پدوی پر ہیں
لیکن اس کے معنی یہ تو نہیں کہ
دیس کے ہت کو اپنے گھر میں بیٹھ
ہوئے جس طرح سے چاہیں برباد کر
دیں۔ آخر اگلے نلدہ جی ہی
ذمہ دار نہیں ہیں۔ 7 نومبر کے
حادثہ کے لئے ایہل - پی۔ سلگھ بھی
پورے ذمہ دار ہیں لیکن میں بھریس
کہتا ہے ادب سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ
ان کی بھتی نے کہا کہا۔ کہوں اس
کا ذکر آیا کس بہادری کے لئے؟
میدم۔ جب آپ نے کہا تھا جہی
میں نے ایک ہمیل ایہل کی تھی
اور جب میں کہتا ہوا ہوں تو پھر
ایہل کرتا ہوں کہ اگر ایہل - پی۔ سلگھ
نے غلطی کی ہو تو ان کے بارے میں
ضرور کچھ کہا جائے۔ میں شری
چندر شیکھر سے متفق نہیں ہوں کہ
ایہل - پی۔ سلگھ کا نام نہیں آئے۔ ضرور
آئے ہوتے لکنم کا آئے، ایہل - پی۔ سلگھ
کا آئے، عبدالغلی کا آئے، چندر شیکھر
کا آئے۔ جس نے غلطی کرے

دیش کہ نقصان پہنچایا چاہے وہ
 کوئی ہو اس کا قصہ تو آئے گا ہی اس
 ہاوس میں کسی کو بخشا نہیں جا
 سکتا۔ جب نندہ جی کا اسٹوڈنٹس
 ہو ہوا اندرا جی کا جواب ہو اور
 پھر بھی اہل - پی - سنگھ کو بخش
 دیا جائے۔ لیکن ان کی بیٹی نے
 کچھ نہیں بگاڑا ہے اس لئے میں
 افسوس کرتا ہوں کہ وہ خود چہرے
 دیکھو بہت کرینگے کہ ان لمظوں کو
 حذف کر دیا جائے۔

آخر میں ایک بار پھر میں کہتا
 ہوں کہ ہندوستان کی بھلائی کے لئے
 ہندوستان نے عوام کے جذبات کی
 نوجمانی کے لئے مسلمانوں کی حفاظت
 کے لئے مسلمانوں کی با عزت زندگی کے
 لئے مسلمان ناک سے ہانسے سکھیں اس
 نے لئے گٹو ہذا پر آپ بیٹن لگاؤ
 اندوا جی - آپ لگاؤ اور لگا کر آپ
 پانچ کروڑ مسلمانوں پر بڑا رحم دکھائیے۔
 ان کی زندگی سے کہلا نہ جائے۔ میں
 نے دیکھا کہ ہزاروں لوگ قتل کر دیئے
 گئے جرم کیا تھا - صرف یہ کہ عوام کو
 یہ بھکا دیا گیا کہ یہ گٹو ہتیا کرتے
 ہیں یہ گٹو ہمارے ہیں یہ گٹو کو لئے
 جا رہے ہیں گڑوں کے گڑوں اجازت دئے
 گئے کوئی پوچھنے والا نہیں ہے - یہ
 بات جو ارجن اروڑا نے کہی تھی کہ
 گرفتار کرو اور سزا دو تو کہاں سزا دیتے
 ہیں ؟ لاکھوں قتل ہو گئے مسلمان

میں کوئی سزا ہوتی ہے ؟ مہاراشٹر
 اور مہسور اور گجرات کا جب معاملہ
 ہوا تو کرن کونسے گڈا ہیں جو کہ
 ہمیشہ میں نہیں ہوئے لیکر کتلے
 لوگوں کو آپ نے پکڑ کر پھانسی کے
 تختہ پر لٹکایا یا ہو - پی - میں جو
 ہو رہا ہے شری چندر بھان کپتا
 شریتمی سچھتا کیلانی کو گردانے کے لئے
 اسٹوڈنٹس اور - پورٹینٹس سروایسہز
 کا استعمال کیا لیکن اس میں کتلوں
 کو پکڑ کر پھانسی کے تختہ پر لٹکایا
 کہا - تو اس بات پر نہ جانے اس پر
 حانہ کہ بیماری کہا ہے - بیماری یہ
 ہے کہ رائٹنس کا جذبہ بڑھ رہا ہے
 اور کسی نہ کسی طریقہ سے مل مل
 کر تہذیب دماغ سے تہذیب تہذیب سے
 اس کو بکھا جائے - لائسنس کم سے
 کم کرنے کی کوشش کی جائے - کانگریس
 سرکار سے کہئے کہ وہ اپنے لا ایبل آؤٹر
 کو ٹھیک کرے تاکہ مسئلہ جو ہے وہ
 ٹھیک ہو جائے - تہذیب کو صدمہ -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी (हरियाना) :
 महिम डिप्टी चेयरमैन,

आंब जो कुछ देखती है,
 लब पे आ सकता नही ।
 महवे हैरत हूँ कि भारत
 क्या से क्या हो जाएगा ॥

7 नवम्बर को जो हादसा हुआ है वह हम
 सब लोगों के लिए एक दर्दनाक हादसा है और
 वह सब के लिए गहरे सोच विचार का मौजू

Nov. 7, 1966

॥

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

है। इस मौके को अगर उछाला जाए तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि बजाए इसके कि हम सब को मिल कर ठंडे दिमाग से यह विचार करना चाहिए कि ऐसे हादसे देश में न हो और इसका बेहतर इलाज हो। यहाँ पर पार्टियों को प्रापेगंडा चले या किसी के गुनाह पर पर्दा डालने की कोशिश की जाए या किसी को जबर्दस्ती गुनाहगार ठहराने की कोशिश की जाए तो मेरी राय में यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है।

मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन, बजाए इसके कि मैं इस बात में जाऊँ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि भागवा साहब ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है वह सही है और वाजपेयी जी की बात भी बड़ी है यह आप जानते हैं कि यह दर्दनाक हादसा हुआ है और इसमें कई बातें हैं जो मैं आपके गौर-तलब करना चाहता हूँ, पहली बात तो यह है कि यह आपको मानना पड़ेगा कि इस प्रोसेशन में जिसकी वजह से कुछ हुआ क्योंकि इसकी कई महीनों से चर्चा चलती थी कि लेडीज और बच्चे थे इसलिए मेरा दिमाग इस तरफ नहीं जाता कि जो गौ से प्रेम करने वाले थे उनके दिमाग में किस तरह से यह बात आई कि वे फसाद करें, वे आग लगाएं, वे गाड़ी जलाएं, वे लोगो को मारे और कामराज की कोठी पर जाएं। क्योंकि कामराज ने गऊ हत्या के बारे में कोई स्टैंड नहीं लिया था जिससे उन्हें गुस्सा आता। अगर लेते तो श्री अशोक मेहता से लेते लेकिन वह उनकी कोठी पर नहीं घुसे। इन सब बातों को देखते हुए और समझते हुए कि हममें काफी गहरा हाथ कुछ लोगो का है जो कि अनसोशिल एलीमेंट है या उन पार्टियों का है जिन का दिमाग अभी तक साफ नहीं हो पाया है कि किस तरह से इस देश को आगे ले जाया जाए। कुछ इण्टरस्टिड लोग हैं जिनको अपनी ज्ञात देश की ज्ञात से प्यारी है या वे भोग हैं जो इंदिरा जी के हाथ को कमजोर

करना चाहते हैं तरह तरह की बातों से, जैसे नन्दा जी का इस्तीफा है चाहे पाटिल साहब की कहानी हो। मैं यह बड़े अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस समय देश में जो वाइलेंस का जजबा बढ रहा है अगर इंदिरा जी की जगह कोई दूसरा आ जाए, इस सरकार की बजाए कोई दूसरी सरकार आ जाए क्या वह इस वाइलेंस जजबे को पसन्द करेगे? और जो इस देश में लालेसनेस फैल रही है क्या वह इसको पसन्द करेगे? मेरा यकीन है कि कोई हिम्मत नहीं करेगा कि यहाँ आकर यह ब्यान करे फिर अगर यह हालत है तो सब पार्टियों को मिल कर इस वक्त यह देखना है कि किस तरह से हम इस गवर्नमेंट को जो भी इस वक्त मौजूदा गवर्नमेंट है उसके हाथ को मजबूत कर सके और यह जो गुस्सा है वह खत्म हो। उनकी ज्ञात या उनके अन्दरूनी साथी यहाँ ब्यान करे इससे कोई लाभ नहीं होगा और न भूपेश गुप्ता को ही कोई लाभ होने वाला है। क्योंकि ए० जाएगा और बी० आ जाएगा। नन्दा जी की जगह न भूपेश आने वाले हैं न अब्दुल गनी आने वाला है और न मिस्टर वाजपेयी जी आने वाले हैं। इस लिए इस बात में नहीं पडना चाहिए, बल्कि यह देखना चाहिए कि यह हादसा क्यों हुआ है?

सचाई यह है कि अगर रेफंडम कराया जाए इस देश में कि गोहत्या बन्द कर दी जाद तो इंदिरा जी को मालूम हो जाएगा कि ज्यादा वोट उनकी तरफ आएंगे, इसमें मुझे कोई सन्देह नहीं है। और मैं इसलिए यह बात क्यों कहता हूँ और मैंने एमेंडमेंट जो दिया है वह इस लिए दिया है कि गोहत्या पर बैन लगाना चाहिए और इसके तीन कारण हैं। पहली बात यह है कि मैं जानता हूँ कि ज़िबह गऊ जायज है इसाइयो में भी, ज़िबह गऊ जायज है इसके बावजूद भी मैं देखता हूँ कि इस्लाम यह भी कहता है कि किसी भाई, किसी बहन, किसी बेटे का दिल न दुखाया जाए और मुझे इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि गऊ के ज़िबह करने से करोड़ों

भाई बहनों का दिल दुखता है। इसलिए एक तो कारण यह है और इमी लिए मैं यह संशोधन लाया हूँ कि गऊ के जबह करने पर बैन लगाया जाए।

दूसरी बात यह है कि गाय के जबह का जुर्म हुआ या न हुआ, अगर हुआ तो भी, न हुआ तो भी बस्तियों की बस्तिया उजाड़ दी गई मुसलमानों की। रात को जो गांव बसता था सुबह न कोई इंसान था, न हैवान था, न कोई मकान था, न कोई निशान था। क्या भूपेश गुप्ता जी ने और मिस्टर चटर्जी ने उन लोगों को पनाह दी? इम लिए मुसलमानों का इन्टरेस्ट इसमें है कि इंदिरा जी से हाथ जोड़ कर रिक्वेस्ट करें कि आपकी सरकार जो है वह—इकानोमिक मसले को हल करना है करे अपने सैक्यलरिज्म को जिन्दा रखना है रखें जो आसानियां दूसरों को देना चाहते है दें—इस बात का ख्याल रखें कि मुसलमान की जिन्दगी गाय के नाम पर तबाह की गई, मुल्क में बार बार एक जगह नहीं अनेक जगह, मुसलमान का आज इसी में इन्ट्रेस्ट है कि जबह गाय जो इमका मजहबी हक है इसे छोड़ दे और रिक्वेस्ट करे कि इस पर बैन लगाया जाए।

तीसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि इस वक्त मसला यह है कि गाय को खाता कौन है। अगर कोई काऊ-स्लाटर होता है तो कुछ बडे बडे लोगों के लिए बड़ी बड़ी इण्डस्ट्रीज के लिए ऐसे लोगों के लिए जो मजहब को पसन्द नहीं करते शायद यह कही से बाहर से मंगाते हों। जहा तक मैं जानता हूँ देश में काऊ-स्लाटर नहीं होता। इस बात को देखा जाए कि काऊ-स्लाटर का ममला देश में है या नहीं। चन्द डब्बे किसी जगह पर आ जाते हों तो बात दूसरी है आम आदमी खाता हो, मुसलमान खाता हो, इमाई खाता हो, ऐसा मैं नहीं मानता। इस लिए ऐसे मौकों पर जब इन्वैशन आया है तो एक अच्छी चीज को जो खबसूरती के साथ अपने मेमोरेडम के जरिए

इंदिरा जी के सामने रख सकने थे। उन्होंने इस मौके पर गलत बात की। उनके पाम साधन नहीं था। सुशील मुनि जी के पास गुडा पार्सी के ऐनीमेंट्स को रोकने का साधन नहीं था। इन ऐनीमेंट्स को जो उनके जन्म हो उनके आदर्श को, उनके मकसद को, उनके दिन की आवाज को सेबोटैज करना चाहते थे। इस लिए मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जब ऐसी हालत है कही भी काऊ-स्लाटर नहीं होता जबह गऊ नहीं होती तो फिर बहन इंदिरा जी जो कहती हैं कि हम उसको नहीं करेंगे। हम सेक्यूलर स्टेट हैं। सेक्यूलर स्टेट के मायने यह नहीं है कि उसके नाम पर हजारों मुसलमानों को बर्बाद किया जाए। किस जगह पनाह दे सके जब मुसलमानों को भगाया गया? नहीं दे सके पनाह। मेरे ख्याल में अर्जुन अरोड़ा का यह कहना सही है कि जिन्होंने साधुओं का इस्तेमाल किया गलत किया। साधू समाज किस ने बनाया? जनसंघ ने बनाया या भूपेश जी ने बनाया या राजनारायण ने बनाया? नहीं बनाया। इसके लिए भी नन्दा जी जिम्मेदार हैं और मैंने इसी हाउस में कहा था कि क्या क्या गुल खिने है साधू समाज के। यह इलजाम आप दे सकते हैं कि जो अपोजिशन के मेम्बर इस हादसे को इस लिए इस्तेमाल करते हैं कि कांग्रेस को हराया जाए तो वह देश के हित में नहीं हैं वे देश के नेकखाह नहीं हैं वे बदखाह हैं। क्योंकि सचाई यह है कि इस मौके को इस तरह उछालना देश के लिए नुकसान पहुंचाने वाली बात है।

अब मेडम दूसरी बात जो मैं इसके साथ कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि इन्क्वायरी हो। कोई कहना है कि पब्लिक इन्क्वायरी हो। मेरे भाई अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने कहा है कि पब्लिक इन्क्वायरी की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। इसमें मिनिस्टर लैंग से लेकर नीचे तक मिनिस्टर्स की जाती हैं। पार्टियों के बारे में कहा जाता है कि वे इस में हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि कोई अपनी

Nov. 7, 1966

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

हीम ऐसी चुन लें जिस पर भरोसा हो चह्वाण साहब, वो इन्व्वायरी करे। मैं इसमें जाता नहीं किसी तरह भी हो लेकिन इंदिरा जी के पास यह बात साफ साफ आनी चाहिए कि यह तहरीक किन लोगों ने किस स्टेज पर की और किस ने सेबोटेज किया, कि होने देश के भ्रमन को बर्बाद करने की कोशिश की? आज के बाद 18 तारीख आ रही है। इस 18 के बाद न जाने कितनी अठारह आएंगी। मैंने इसी हाउस में अपील की थी स्टूडेंट्स से कि वे ऐसे मुजाहरे करने से बाज आएं। विद्यार्थियों का यह काम नहीं है कि वह गुंडा लोगों को सम्भाल सकें। अनसोशिल एली-मेंट्स को सम्भाल सकें। इस लिए कोई भी पार्टी स्टूडेंट्स को उकसाती हो तो उनकी बातों में आना स्टूडेंट्स के हित में नहीं है। अगर स्टूडेंट्स की जिन्दगी बर्बाद होगी तो देश की जिन्दगी बर्बाद होगी।

मैं समझता हूँ कि जहां तक सात तारीख का वाक्या है वह कोई मामूली वाक्या नहीं है। भूपेश जी और चटर्जी साहब रेशनेलिज्म के नाम पर चाहे कुछ कहें उनको 20 परसेंट वोट भी इस देश के नहीं मिलेंगे। उनका ख्याल है मुसलमान देंगे। मुसलमान का एक वोट नहीं मिलेगा। अगर रेफ्रेंडम किया गया। मुसलमान को अपने बच्चों की जान थोड़ा ही देनी है। मेरी यह राय है और मैं अपनी बहन इंदिरा जी को और उनकी सरकार को यह मशवरा देता हूँ कि वे इस बारे में अपने दिमाग को साफ करे कि जब कही होता ही नहीं है काऊ स्लाटर तो क्या झगड़ा है, किसे ले कर झगड़ा है? डिब्बे चन्द आए किसी होटल में या किसी इम्बेसी में तो उनसे हम अपील कर सकते हैं। कौन सा उनके लिए यह जरूरी है परमात्मा ने फर्ज वाजब किया है कि वे बीफ खाएं। उनका हक नहीं छीना है वे नुमाइन्दे दूसरे देशों के जो इम्बे-सियां हैं या कुछ लोग हैं जो बहुत धनाढ्य हैं उनका हक नहीं छीना है। सरकार कांस्टी-

ट्यूशन का हवाला देती कि कांस्टीट्यूशन में है। कांस्टीट्यूशन हमारे लिए है। 45 करोड़ बन्दगायें खुदा के लिए है। कांस्टीट्यूशन को खुदा का लफ्ज नहीं मानना चाहिए। क्या इसको बदला नहीं जा सकता? मैं समझता हूँ कि कांस्टीट्यूशन की आड़ न लें। वह लोग जो मजहब के खिलाफ हैं जो मजहब को रोंदना चाहते हैं अपने पांव के नीचे उनको कांस्टीट्यूशन का बहाना न लेना चाहिए। हम चन्द आदमियों से यह कह सकते हैं नौ करोड़ से मैं रिक्वेस्ट कर सकता हूँ कि तुम अपने मजहबी हक को रजाकाराना तौर पर छोड़ दो। अफगानिस्तान में सेंटपरसेंट तो 98 परसेंट मुसलमान हैं 95 फीसदी से ज्यादा है वहां भी जबा-हाए गऊ पर पाबन्दी लगा दी गयी है। मेरी मोदबाना दरख्वास्त है कि ज़बह गऊ जो है जिसको गो वध कहते हैं उस पर बंद लगाइए। अगर नन्दा जी ने कहा तो उन्होंने ठीक कहा।

दो प्वाइंट और प्रर्ज करने है इस के बाद बैठ जाऊंगा। एक कम्पेसशन का वह हर जगह देना चाहिए; इन्व्वायरी भी जरूर ही होगी चाहे अर्जुन अरोड़ा के तरीके से हो। मैं दो बातें कहना चाहता हूँ। एक इस हाउस में बार बार यह कहकर इस बात को उठाला गया है कि कुछ लोग चाहते थे कि मुरारजी देसाई होम मिनिस्टर हों। मैं इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान में जिन चार पांच आदमियों को मजबूत तरीक कहा जा सकता है जिनको अपने विचारों में कितना ही गलत क्यों न समझा जाता हो, जिनको दिल्ली विश्वास है अपने विचारों में, मुरारजी देसाई उनमें हैं। अगर इंदिरा जी अपने हाथ उनसे मजबूत करना चाहती थीं तो किसी को क्या सदमा है? भूपेश जी को क्या तकलीफ है? मैं मानता हूँ कि चाईना को जो प्यार करने वाले हैं इस हाजत में जबकि चाईना हमारे साथ दुश्मनी का बर्ताव करे। रहा है। उसको कुछ न कर देंगे। मैं मानता हूँ कि नन्दा जी साथ समाज में थे उनके

साधू समाज में चला जाना चाहिए। पालिटिक्स में रहना कोई जरूरी नहीं है। जिस के जहां साधन हों उसको वहां रहना चाहिए।

मुरारजी देसाई के बारे में मेरी डेफिनेट राय है कि वह उन दोस्तों को जो चाईना की गलत तौर पर हिमायत करते हैं जो अपने आप को बड़ा प्रोग्रेसिव कहते हैं उनको वह कुचल कर रख देंगे। मेरा दिल यह नहीं मानता कि इंदिरा जी के रहते हुए वे किसी को गलत तौर पर कुचल कर रख देंगे। जब तक यह पता न चले कि देश का नुकसान होने वाला है। इसलिए मैं भूपेश गुप्ता जी से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि वे बार बार यह न कहें कांग्रेस की सरकार है वह जिसे चाहे बनाए जिसे चाहे न बनाए। जब कम्यूनिस्ट सरकार बने वह मुरारजी देसाई को पास न फटकने दें। लेकिन कांग्रेस सरकार में दखल देने की कोई जरूरत नहीं।

आखिर में मैं भूपेश जी से मोदबाना अपील करना चाहता हूँ। "एल० पी० सिंह मस्ट गो" इस सरकार की ताकत नहीं है कि एल० पी० सिंह को इस जगह पर रख सके। यह दुनिया में आज तक हुआ नहीं कि सारे मुल्क की आवाज को एल० पी० सिंह पर कुर्बान कर दें। एल० पी० सिंह हैं क्या? एक सेक्रेटरी हैं ठीक है हमारे लिए काबिले इज्जत हैं उनका बड़ा अच्छा ब्रेन है वह ऊंची पदवी पर है लेकिन उस के मायने यह तो नहीं कि देश के हित को अपने घर में बैठे हुए जिस तरह से चाहें बरबाद कर दें। आखिर अकेले नन्दा जी ही जिम्मेदार नहीं हैं? 7 नवम्बर के हादसे के लिए एल० पी० सिंह भी पूरे जिम्मेदार हैं। लेकिन मैं भूपेश गुप्ता से अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनकी बेटी ने क्या किया? क्यों उसका जिक्र आया किस बहादुरी के लिए? मैडम जब आप ने कहा था जभी मैंने एक हम्बल अपील की थी और जब मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ तो फिर अपील करता हूँ कि अगर एल० पी० सिंह ने गलती की हो तो उनके बारे में जरूर कुछ कहा जाए।

मैं श्री चन्द्र शेखर से मत्तफ़िक नहीं हूँ कि एल० पी० सिंह का नाम नहीं आए। जरूर आए, भूतलिंगम का आए एल० पी० सिंह का आए, अब्दुल ग़नी का आए, चन्द्र शेखर का आए। जिम जिस ने गलती करके देश को नुकसान पहुंचाया चाहे वह कोई हो उसका किस्सा तो आएगा ही इस हाउस में किसी को बख़्शा नहीं जा सकता। जब नन्दा जी का स्टेटमेंट भी हुआ, इंदिरा जी का जवाब हो और फिर भी एल० पी० सिंह को बख़्श दिया जाए। लेकिन उनकी बेटी ने कुछ नहीं बिगाड़ा है इसलिए मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि यह खुद चेयर से रिक्वेस्ट करेंगे कि उन लफ़्ज़ों को हफ़्ज़ कर दिया जाए।

आखिर में एक बार फिर मैं कहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की भलाई के लिए हिन्दुस्तान के अवाम के जज़बात की तर्जमानी के लिए मुसलमानों की हिफ़ाज़त के लिए, मुसलमानों की बाइज्जत जिन्दगी के लिए, मुसलमान नाक से सांस ले सकें उसके लिए गो हत्या पर आप बैंन लगाइये इंदिरा जी। आप बैंन लगाइए और लगा कर आप पांच करोड़ मुसलमानों पर बड़ा रहम दिखाइये। उनकी जिन्दगी से खेला न जाए। मैंने देखा कि हज़ारहा लोग कत्ल कर दिए गए जुर्म क्या था? सिर्फ़ यह कि आवाम को यह बहका दिया गया कि यह गऊ हत्या करते हैं यह गऊ हत्यारे हैं यह गऊ को लिए जा रहे हैं? गांव के गांव उजाड़ दिए गये कोई पूछने वाला नहीं है। यह बात जो अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने कही थी कि गिरफ़्तार करो और सज़ा दो तो कहां सज़ा देते हैं? लाखों कत्ल हो गये फसादात में कोई सज़ा हुई है? महाराष्ट्र और मैसूर और गुजरात का जब मामला हुआ तो कौन कौन से गुनाह हैं जो कि बम्बई में नहीं हुए लेकिन कितने लोगों को आपने पकड़ कर फासी के तख़्ते पर लटकाया? या यू० पी० में जो हो रहा है श्री चन्द्रमान गुप्ता, श्रीमती सुचेता-कृपलानी को गिराने के लिए स्टुडेंट्स और

Nov. 7, 1966

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

सबोर्डिनेस सविस्जिज का इस्तेमाल किया लेकिन इसमें कितनों को पकड़ कर फांसी के तख्ते पर लटकाया गया। तो इस बात पर न जाइये, इस पर जाइये कि बीमारी क्या है। ब मारी यह है कि वाइलेंस का जन्म बढ रहा है और किसी न किसी तरीके से मिल मिला कर ठंडे दिमाग से, ठंडे ढेंग से इसको किया जाए। लालेजनेस कम से कम करने की कोशिश की जाए। कांग्रेस सरकार से कहिये कि वह अपने ला एण्ड आर्डर को ठीक करे ताकि मसला जो है वह ठीक हो जाए। थंक यू मैडम।]

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): Madam Deputy Chairman, it is very unfortunate that in this discussion we have, some of us, indulged in attacking religious heads. This is very unfortunate because it does not lead to clear thinking. To some people the Shankaracharya is a very great man. To others the Pope is a very great man. And there are people sitting in the Opposition to whom Mao Tse-Tung or Lenin are such leaders. I was in Moscow, I was in Russia, and I want to tell you that I have never seen in any country in the world such worship of a man as the Russian worship of Lenin. So, each one in his own place and it is not for us to get excited over somebody else worshipping his own Guru, when we worship our own Guru in our own way. It clouds the issue. Even such a quite person like Shri C. Subramaniam got so excited when Shankaracharya was attacked that I almost thought that he was behaving like some of the Members of the Opposition, shouting, gesticulating and so on.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated): Four of them. We are democratic.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: That was an unfortunate episode in the whole of this business.

If the Prime Minister were here, I would have asked her a question and I will take it that she is still in the Chamber and ask a question which somebody else can answer on behalf of the Government. The first question is, what shall we do with these Sadhus? We have brought them into the arena of national politics, created a Sadhu Samaj and given them patronage and so on. Mind you, I was personally an eye-witness to the antics of a number of them on that particular day. There were a number of fellows who were semi-naked with Trisuls in their hands and they were dancing and skipping like savages on the roads of New Delhi. How did they get here? Mind you there are lakhs of them in this country. We have to reckon with them. We have pandered to them. We have brought them up. Now, they are asserting themselves. I would have asked the Prime Minister whether she would initiate some suitable legislation by which there would be a complete survey and scrutiny into the lives of these millions of our Sadhus. How do they earn their living? What do they do in the country? How can we deal with people like them, who do no productive work and are often vagrants and vagabonds? Can we not establish work camps and make them do some productive work there for the people? They have nothing to do. Most of them are addicts of ganja and opium and if you want to find out who consume the largest quantity of ganja and opium in this country, it is this group of people. But mind you, I am not making a sweeping assertion that all Sadhus are that type of people. I remember Swami Vivekananda, Swami Shradhananda and others who were Sadhus and who could have been greater men in this country than they? There have been many other illustrious examples. I am not talking of them, but I am talking of this group of people who go about. You do not know but at the slightest provocation, they jump at you with their

Trisul. Violence is embedded in their hearts. We will have to reckon with these people. Something will have to be done to make them not members of the Sadhu Samaj, but productive citizens of this country, doing some useful work. Let us bring them into State farms and ask them to work on the land or do something like that. Would the Prime Minister undertake some kind of legislation of that type? This is of the utmost importance.

Then, I come back to another question. I am glad my friend, Mr. Arora, stressed a certain point a great deal. We talk of secularism. There are fifty to sixty millions of Muslims in this country. There are ten to fifteen million Christians in this country. There are others also. Now, they do not consider eating beef as sinful. Then, what right has the dominant majority community to compel them to give up eating what they wish to eat? Is this secularism? What will the Muslims do? Supposing tomorrow the Muslims start a movement saying "Do not kill pigs in India, or do not sell pig's flesh or ham in the bazars."

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There is a world of difference. What I want to say is that Muslims' feeling about the pig is negative, while Hindus' feeling about the cow is positive.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: To you it is negative but not to Muslims. To-day "Cow-protection has become very negative. It was some time back positive, but today it has become a damnably negative attitude, a stick to attach a party or the Government I think the Prime Minister was right when she said that once in five years the question comes up before general elections.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It is because the Government listens only in the election year.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: So do the cow protectors. Now, this is a secular country. I remember what Mahatma Gandhi said about the cow. The cow is a poem of pity and he said love of the cow, looking after the cow, taking care of the cow is part of the tradition and culture of compassion in India. But he would not by compulsive legislation bring about this kind of cow-protection. He said again and again during his life-time. "Let the Hindus plead with the Muslims and let the Muslims and Christians and others who hold a different view, be converted to this point of view by persuasion." Shri Sankaracharya himself has now said that he does not want legislation for this kind of thing. He is a great Acharya of the Hindu religion. I am suggesting, Madam, that in regard to this particular matter what is at stake is not compassion for the cow. I do not think any people in the world ill-treat cows and bullocks more than the Hindus of India. How often in the villages have I not had to intervene on behalf of the cow and bullock being tortured and cruelly misused!

4 P.M.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not all.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Nothing can be said about everybody. Is there a single point about which all can be brought into a matter of this kind? I am only saying, and this has been said again and again, that in no other country are the bullock and the cow so ill-treated as in this country.

Some years ago, Madam, there was a fantastic custom in the City of Calcutta, the 'Phooka' system. You do not know what it is I do not want to speak about it here; then I will have to disinfect my tongue. The milk is drawn till the blood comes and through a process of extracting milk which is diabolical, and who did it? Not the Muslim, not the Christian,

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]

but the Hindu owner. Finally Gandhiji moved in this matter, initiated legislation and stopped this kind of thing. If I were convinced that this thing is based on compassion for the cow, then I would have a great deal of sympathy, but compassion must be shown in practical ways and we do not show it in practical ways. It is made into a political instrument of action; that is what happened here. This cow protection business has to be very carefully considered. No one protected the cow more than Gandhiji. He started the Go Seva Sangh. Even today under the Chairmanship of Mr. U. N. Dhebar there is a tremendous effort going on to protect the cow, upgrade the cow, lift up the cow. That is the constructive way of doing it.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): May I put one question? The hon. Member is putting the case against cow protection by pleading that Muslims do it and Christians do it. I can assure him that there are Christians in Bihar and there are a lot of Muslims and it is those Muslims who are demanding, as Mr. Abdul Ghani demanded, that there should be an absolute ban on cow slaughter, and they do it for good reasons.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: I have heard this. My time is short and I must go on with my speed. But I tell you, Madam, this is simply begging the question. What do I say? If we can carry the Muslims with us, if we can carry the Christians with us, God help us, and let us do this but let us take care that we carry them with us. I know many Muslims who do not share this feeling. We have to take them with us. And do you know who is today selling cows across the border to Pakistan? Somebody will have to stop it. It is the Hindus who are selling cows across the border to Pakistan. If we

mean this business. truthfully, really, then we must sit together and put up constructive proposals and not do this kind of war-dance in the streets of Delhi. They want to protect the cow by killing man! They want to protect the cow by destroying public property. Is this protection of cow or is this pure and simple vandalism?

I would only refer to one other thing before I close. I think since independence there is a very crude revivalism of antiquated religious outlook. Mahatma Gandhi was profoundly a Hindu, and I am proud to be a Hindu, but Gandhiji's way of improving Hinduism was by purifying Hindus, not by playing ducks and drakes in this way with the destiny of Hindu doctrines and the Hindu way of life. I am afraid that in independent India there is a subtle support even from the inner circles of Government, from the inner circles of the ruling party and many others concerned for this kind of a low-level religious revivalism. This is one of the greatest dangers to the Republic of India today. Let us turn the searchlight upon our religion, purify our religion, get rid of superstitions in our religion, take every constructive step to build up our religion. In that way religions can help each other and strengthen each other. I am not one of those like many friends on the other side who think that religion is the opiate of the people. On the contrary I think religion has been the vehicle of some of the highest cultural developments in history. I am not repudiating religion. I am speaking as a man of religion. I am speaking as a man who knows the value and the place of religion in life. But let us not sidetrack religion; let us not exploit religion in this manner for political and party purposes. This is what has been going on and we must set our face against it. Thank you.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am glad that the Prime Minister referred to the question of relationship between the Minister and the Secretary. If there is one lesson which is to be clearly drawn from Mr. Nanda's resignation, it is that the Government should give urgent attention to this question. First of all we must realise that so far as the Civil Service is concerned we are still working on the basis of the old precedents. At present the control over the All India Services is partly in the Ministry of Home Affairs and partly in the Ministry of Finance. This I think is an antiquated system and has to go. The sooner the better. In Britain, as the Estimates Committee has pointed out in its study of the subject in a recent report that it submitted to Parliament, the permanent head of the Civil Service reports directly to the Prime Minister on major questions of Civil Service policy and promotion. The important point to note is that there should be a single agency which should exercise control over the Services, and this centralised agency for personnel management of the All India and the Central Services should be placed under a body which is independent of any administrative ministry. The defect in the present system is that the control is distributed over two Ministries. Under the British system the organisation which they have evolved is completely independent of any Ministry, and they give a prominent place to the head of the Civil Service. In India the obvious person to whom we can look as being the head of the Civil Service is the Cabinet Secretary. He may nominally be designated in that fashion, but actually he does not exercise that power and that authority which the permanent head of the Civil Service exercises in England. I will not go into details but I would invite the attention of the Home Minister to the recommendation made by the Estimates Committee at page 19 of their

93rd Report where after a review of the whole position they state:

"As head of the Services the Cabinet Secretary should be made responsible for advising the Prime Minister in the matter of appointment of senior officers of the rank of Joint Secretary and above. This arrangement is expected to generate greater cohesion in the Services. That should also ensure that the Prime Minister would be fully in the picture in the matter of appointment of officers to key posts and that inter-Ministry preferences and prejudices would not be allowed to operate."

Recently the Prime Minister passed an order that the Secretaries who discharge their duties in the various Ministries should be persons of the highest calibre. In pursuance of that policy, a system was devised under which it was decided that certain Secretaries were not up to the mark and they were asked to go. Now, one of the Secretaries has challenged that decision and the matter is before one of the High Courts. This in itself shows that the present system is defective. It is very odd to find that after so many years of service a Secretary should be declared as unfit. Surely, the system which resulted in his promotion to that office is at fault. There may be—very rare cases but it should not normally happen that a person who is selected as Secretary should afterwards be declared as unfit. Therefore it is vital that the whole question is re-examined and proper methods, as are functioning in the United Kingdom, are adopted. And a central single agency headed by the Cabinet Secretary should be created and he should be responsible for advising the Prime Minister. I do not think the present system of having a Cabinet Committee consisting of the Prime Minister, the Minister concerned and, I think, the Home Minister, if I recollect rightly, has

[Shri M. N. Kaul.]

been an effective instrument in controlling the Services.

I next come to the vital question of the relationship between the Minister and the Secretary. Now, as one great statesman observed, it is the top relationship that must be solid. If the top relationship is not working effectively, the whole administration is weakened. And as regards what happened in Delhi on the 7th of this month, the correspondence released by Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda clearly shows that there was tension between the Minister and the Secretary. Now, the organisation, which I have suggested will, to some extent, remedy the situation. But the important point to remember is that this relationship has not yet been established in India on a firm basis. We have to appreciate the fact that the Secretary's right, in the traditional phrase, is to advise, to encourage, to warn and to be consulted. His right is to advise and it is the right of the Minister to accept that advice or reject that advice. That position constitutionally was correctly stated by the Prime Minister. But in practice, personal equation always plays an important part. I remember a great constitutional authority speaking on the question of the relationship between a Minister and a Secretary put it in the simplest possible words. He said that the relationship should be such that the Secretary should feel that he is working with the Minister and not under the Minister. I think that in that short statement he brought in all the ideas on the subject that have been stated by the various authorities. The Minister, in the first instance, has got to create the feeling that the Secretary is equal in the sense that he has a right to advise. Of course, the Secretary is patently subordinate in the sense that the right of rejecting the advice vests in the Minister. Now, I have

read many biographies of civil servants and Ministers and they make interesting reading and I wish that some of our own Ministers read those biographies. For instance, there is the question of how a Secretary should tender his advice. I remember Dr. Katju who is a very old and good friend of mine, when he was functioning as a Minister, told me that the Secretary's function is to set out the alternatives and let the Minister choose. I felt that, perhaps, was not a correct position and I consulted authoritative memoirs.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I remind the hon. Member that Sardar Patel had read no such books and India has not produced a Home Minister like him, a great administrator like him.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: And I found that the view was that the Secretary must advise as to which of the alternatives he proposes himself because mentally it is not possible for you to concentrate on a subject unless you are prepared to advise. It was reported that Mr. Campion was advising the Speaker and explaining the whole position to him and the pros and cons. The Speaker was very anxious; he had to go to the House. He said, "Mr. Campion, let me know what is your advice."

My hon. friend referred to Sardar Patel. I know of one sentence which I had noted which was reproduced to me by a British Civil servant at the time of Sardar Patel. As we know, Sardar Patel, in his initial days—his daughter who is a Member here will bear me out—was working not only with Indian officers but also for a time with British officers who rendered him good, loyal service. And one of those British officers once told me that what he liked about Sardar Patel was that the Minister knew his mind and above all they were able to gauge in advance what his reaction would be. Now, that is the sort

of feeling that a Minister should create in the mind of his Secretary, not that he is wavering, shivering and vacillating. But he should give the impression that he has a mind and a policy on various problems. And it is then that the Secretary feels encouraged because every Secretary has the responsibility of going ahead and recording many decisions without consulting the Minister. He should always have in the background of his mind as to what the Minister is thinking on the particular subject.

Now, there are Ministers and Ministers. It is said of Mr. Thomas who was one of the Ministers in the days of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald that in the early days of his office he sent for his Civil Servant and said, "I want to abolish unemployment. Will you produce a scheme for me?" The Civil servant said, "I will look into the precedents." He examined all the precedents and ultimately wrote a note saying that there was no panacea; no panacea had ever been found for solving unemployment as a whole at one stroke. The Minister pressed the bell and sent for him again. He said, "You have told me that it cannot be done. What I want to know is how it can be done." Surely, that sort of Minister will never command the respect of the Services.

There is another tricky question. Some Ministers are in the habit of sending not only for the Secretary but for other officials also in the Ministry. Now, that does not work well in practice. It is the Secretary who is the principal adviser of the Minister and the Minister should always look to him. It is necessary that the Secretary should so devolve his work that he is in effective control of the whole department. I have on another occasion commented on the practice of having more than one Secretary in a department. Some British officers asked with regard to the External Affairs Ministry and the

Home Ministry as to who was the Secretary in the Ministry. They are accustomed to having one principal Secretary. I think we should revert to the old practice.

Then there is the question of the disagreement between the Minister and his Secretary. The Estimates Committee of Parliament has several times commented upon and deprecated the system where on important matters the Secretary records a one line note—"Discussed with the Minister. Such and such steps should be taken." Now, we know it from actual experience, even from recent cases, that notes of that kind have brought the Secretaries and Ministers into trouble. I recollect one case in Britain where a Civil Servant was relieved of his responsibility because he did not record his own reasoned opinion and did not invite the Minister to record his contrary opinion in a matter of importance. I think the notes should be more carefully written. It is better that the Ministers should clearly record the reasons for their important decisions. I remember Shri Jagjivan Ram once telling me when he took up the office of Minister in 1946. He went to Dr. Rajendra Prasad for advice and Dr. Rajendra Prasad told him, "Whatever you may do, please remember that you have to operate through the Secretary. And, therefore, you should not do anything which should undermine the authority of the Secretary". Now that important principle has always to be borne in mind by every Minister.

So far as officials are concerned, I have been associated for a long time with Parliament and I do feel strongly that they have not yet attained that standard which the civil service has attained in England in so far as Parliamentary work is concerned. It is one of the duties of the civil servant in England to save the Minister—if I may put it in a simple

[Shri M. N. Kaul.]

language—from Parliamentary difficulties. But here in India—I will not quote cases—sometimes statements have been prepared for the Minister which from the Parliamentary point of view brought the Minister into difficulties. Therefore, the civil servants should always be conscious of the fact that after they have tendered advise the Minister has to come and face the Parliament unattended by anybody. We see that phenomenon every day. That factor has always to be borne in mind. The civil servants should frequently come to Parliament. They should watch the trends in Parliament. The civil service has, to some extent, not attained the highest standard, and that is perhaps one of the reasons why Ministers are not able to anticipate and face Parliamentary difficulties with the same measure of success as, for instance, in Great Britain.

There is only one other point which I would like to touch upon and it is with reference to staff contacts. Prime Minister Nehru had a very good convention. Each morning, so far as possible, he summoned all the senior officers in the Ministry and asked them to state their problems and gave them the necessary directions. These staff contacts, if conducted, are very useful, but the one essential condition for them is that the Minister should come fully prepared. It is no use attending a meeting and then generally asking questions of the Secretaries who are present. The Minister should be ready in advance about the case and know the different points of view. What the Secretary wants at all times is direction and that should be given in an ample measure. Thank you.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi): Madam, I have heard the very learned discourse of Mr. Kaul. I have also

heard some speeches which have addressed themselves either to cow slaughter being justified or not. But I think we must come back to what happened on the 7th of November and it is that which matters more in the context of the discussion here.

I am sorry that cow protection as a proposition was discussed here in longer details than the incident of the 7th November, I am not going to draw myself into the discussion or the merits or demerits of cow protection because I think that on the 7th November neither cows were protected nor the cause of the banning of cow slaughter was furthered. Unfortunately, like the old legend of the Trojan Horse, a political cow was created that day and the political party which was mainly responsible for the slogan is trying to get out of its responsibility. I am sorry that Mr. Vajpayee, who is unfortunately not here at the moment, had chosen to address himself to the task of denying the entire responsibility on the part of the Jana Sangh for all that happened on the 7th November, and my entire intention this evening will be to try to prove that it is the Jana Sangh and the R.S.S. which were mainly responsible . . .

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA (Madhya Pradesh): That is a political approach.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: This is a political approach because it was a political agitation, because it was a political party which is guilty and it is a political subject which must be discussed politically.

SHRI NIRANJAN VERMA (Madhya Pradesh): For political advantage.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Political advantage was taken by the Jana Sangh and I want to prove that.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA. Therefore, we demand a judicial inquiry. Why do you deny that?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Judicial enquiry into what? Enquiry into holding those people guilty who really brought shame to this town and to the nation . . .

SHRI NIRANJAN VERMA Who-ever is found guilty must be punished.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Whoever are guilty are not far to find. If my friend will allow me to proceed I will point my finger at those people who were guilty of it and I will prove my case. If I sit down without proving it, then my friend will have all justification to ask for a judicial enquiry if he does not feel satisfied with the evidence that I produce

{THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M RUTHNASWAMY) in the Chair.]

Mr Vajpayee in his very learned discourse, Sir, tried to prove that the Jana Sangh was not responsible. Unfortunately in the Jana Sangh politics itself he does not belong to the inner core. He is himself in a minority

SHRI V M CHORDIA Question.

SHRI I K. GUJRAL because the real politics is controlled by the section of the R.S.S. which is the inner core of the R.S.S. to which Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee has no access.

Mr. Vajpayee in his speech here has mentioned that while he was speaking on the platform on that particular day, that is, on the 7th November, somebody came and hit him on his head, removed him from the microphone . . .

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA. Was it from the R.S.S.?

SHRI I K GUJRAL Who was that person? Whether that person

was an R.S.S. man or not, I think Mr. Vajpayee should understand that it was the symbolic language of the R.S.S.

SHRI V M. CHORDIA: Question.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: He was removed from the microphone because his voice on the mike was the voice of sanity as his generally is. Therefore, all those friends of his who draw inspiration from Nagpur and not from the Jana Sangha itself wanted to remove him from the mike.

SHRI NIRANJAN VERMA Question

SHRI I K GUJRAL: Perhaps he might have seen to it that the town was not reduced to that shame that it was done.

Sir, the 7th November incident was not an isolated incident but this was a culminating point of a series of incidents that we have been facing for some time now, and I draw your attention to all that was done in Chandni Chowk in March this year. Are my friends in a position to deny the responsibility for all that happened in March? Can they deny that it was entirely engineered, sponsored and done by the Jana Sangh with the hand of R.S.S.? They did not demand any enquiry then because they knew that all those who were leading those riots in Chandni Chowk in March were there to be seen

The second chain of the series was Panipat

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I do not want to interrupt my friend but then we did not demand an enquiry because we were involved and now we are demanding an enquiry because we are also involved. Is this logic?

SHRI I K. GUJRAL No, my logic is different. I will come to

[Shri I. K. Gujral.]

that. Unfortunately, Shri Vajpayee was not here when I spoke about that. If I repeat it I will be running short of my time.

So I say, Sir, that in this very series was the incident of Panipat when Kranthi Kumar and his friends were burnt alive. By whom?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: On a point of order. The matter is *sub judice* and the hon'ble Member cannot be allowed to refer to a case which is *sub judice*. Prominent citizens are being tried in a court of law. I want your ruling. That should be expunged.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY): What is the point of order the hon'ble Member is referring to? Is it a matter before a court of law?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am not referring to any individual. I am referring to an incident which is not *sub judice*. What is *sub judice* is whether A, B, C or D were actively involved in that case or not. That is *sub judice*. I am not naming those who were responsible. I am only saying that this series of incidents have been engineered by a political party, and I refer to the Chandni Chowk incident. I refer to the Panipat incident. I also refer to a similar incident which took place in Udaipur.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, I seek your protection. I represent a party whose members are being tried in a court of law for what happened in Panipat. Now he is referring to my party, and then he is referring to the Panipat incident. The case is *sub judice*. How can he refer to it?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I would like to submit again . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY): The party is not before a court of law. It is individual members who are before the court of law.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Individual members, members belonging to my party. What is under enquiry of the court is individuals.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have said that and I will not repeat. This is a chain of incidents. If I refer to more of such incidents and address myself to them my friends will get more agitated because nakedness of truth is stark for them and very shameful. The Udaipur incidents are also in the same series. And when this game culminated on the 7th November, the sordid, old history was re-written. It has a history because from the very beginning it was a foreseeable fact that there would be violence. Is Mr. Vajpayee denying the responsibility that the Jan Sangh was one of the very active participants in the Organising Committee that was formed? He does not deny that. He does not deny the fact that the Jana Sangh was one of the very active participants of the Gow Raksha Sammelan in which the Jana Sangh participated very actively. Their paper, Organiser, again and again went on building up the case as Shri Bhupesh Gupta pointed out. On 22nd October in Nagpur, a function was held which was called, the Shastra Puja-worship of the weapons. It was not the worship of any particular person, it was generally the worship of strength and of violence. In his inaugural speech—I am quoting from Organiser of the 30th October—it was said:

"Earlier in his inaugural weapon worship, Shri Guruji said Puja was symbolic of cultivation of strength. The ancient Rishis had said that strength was necessary for survival, for success."

If you follow what follows, perhaps you will be more surprised.

"Shri Guruji added: Once I told a VVIP that strength was necessary."

He proceeds and says:

"The VVIP was disturbed by emphasis on strength. I told him the use of strength where it was un-called for, was beastly, but failure to use strength where it was necessary was cowardly."

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: Against Pakistan and China.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: That is a clue to the story.

SHRI D. THENGARI: You are telling the same thing to the Home Minister.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am bringing the same thing to your door when I come to this. After Shri Golwalkar had praised the use of strength, the case started being built up. I am quoting from another weekly, called 'Link'. One week before the incidents of 7th November Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra, the Jana Sangh Member of the Corporation, speaking in the Corporation itself said; I quote:

"A week before the outbreak of the storm, Jana Sangh councillor Vijay Kumar Malhotra had told the Delhi Corporation that a revolution would take place on November 7th if the Government failed to ban cow slaughter."

Worship of the strength, threat of the revolution—it did not end there. It proceeds and it does not end anywhere till the culmination comes.

SHRI NIRANJAN VERMA: Have you heard about the French Revolution?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The French Revolution was neither non-violent, nor strength was not known and blood was shed but every revolution when it is called a revolution does not become a revolution. Every reactionary move is a counter-revolution and even counter-revolutions can shed blood. Merely by giving a good and great name of revolution every sabotage act, every unleashing of violence on the citizens does not become a revolution or a praise-worthy act.

(Interruptions)

I am again quoting from 'Organiser':

"Shri Prabhudutt Brahmachariji is on a country-wide tour calling upon the people to get ready to protect the cow or perish in the attempt. A big storm is gathering. It is extremely rare in this country for sadhus....."

for whom Shri Vajpayeeji denies all responsibility—

"who have renounced all worldly interests—to resort to direct clash with the Government."

This is from 'Organiser' of the 16th October.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): What was the Government doing when all these preparations were going on?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It is very embarrassing, do not ask that.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: On 16th October this was the line that the Organiser was taking. On 30th October the Organiser was organising the worship of the strength and of the weapons. On the 7th November all that happened is there and to crown it all, the trouble of 7th November outside the Parliament is unleashed on

[Shri I. K. Gujral.]
whose slogan? on Swami Rameshwaranand's speech. Who is Swami Rameshwaranand—a Jan Sangh Member of Parliament. Even Mr. Vajpayee does not deny that. Even Mr. Vajpayee does not deny that he made an irresponsible, provocative speech. Even he does not deny that he called the people to go and 'Ghera dalo' the Parliament and see that no one comes out and it was that signal which started the whole trouble.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
No.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: It is a series or chain of events—Guruji's worship in Nagpur, V. K. Malhotra's speech in the Corporation, Brahmachari's quotation I have given to you and about Swami Rameshwaranand's speech on that day, I have no access to the C.B.I. reports or Intelligence reports that the Government of India may have received but from their own newspapers and journals I have proved to your satisfaction, I hope.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY): Not to mine—the Chair. The hon. Member must prove it to the satisfaction of his fellow Members.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The main point is that the trouble is going to continue. Even after the incidents, the Organiser does not go and repent for whatever they have done. It continues. On the 11th November again comes on the scene. Guruji has not called off, he is not satisfied. He says further:

"It is not possible, nor profitable for the Gurus and Acharyas to confine themselves to their Ashrams now and expect Dharma to be protected and the disciples to be protected and the disciples to be secured for them. They will have to. I pray them, come out of their Ashrams, leave their 'Asanas....'"

This again is from the Organiser. Therefore Guruji's call to the Sadhus continues and even if Mr. Vajpayee tries to deny the responsibility for all the Sadhus did, the hand of the R.S.S. Sakas is there. It is a long tale. We saw the R.S.S. hand in 1948 also when that dastardly act took place. After that we were assured that it was a cultural organisation. It will only confine itself to culture and then the Jan Sangh was formed. Unfortunately into the Jan Sangh's fold also some wise and sane people like Mr. Vajpayee are there who now try to give a cover to those sinister designs behind which is the R.S.S. hand and which is trying to undo all that this country stands for. The R.S.S. has always been active. It has been organising this trouble quite for some time there and we have been demanding from the Government again and again that the R.S.S. should either be declared political or it should be banned. Declare it a political organisation because it interferes in every political issue. Declare it political so that the Government servants or the youngsters do not get strayed away or led away in the name of religion. Therefore I feel that the Government at least now will be wise enough to see that this is not done any more.

The Communist Members there have taken pains to say that they think this was a wrong move, they think it is a bad movement and they want to dissociate from it themselves. I wish they were true. Unfortunately, of late, particularly the Right Communists, have taken a habit to take advantage of every opportunity. Since they take advantage of every opportunity, when there is a cow-slaughter ban movement, they want to say that it should be banned. The proof is this and when this Bill was brought before the Metropolitan Council of Delhi. Mr. Farooqui, the Secretary of the Communist Party of

Delhi who was living in a hospital with heart attack, whom the doctors had told not to speak in the Metropolitan Council, comes to the Metropolitan Council specially and there he says—I quote:

“My Party was keen that I should support this measure.”

This is the Communist Party's line and this a gain from the Organiser.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: About cow protection

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: It was a Bill before the Metropolitan Council for banning cow slaughter. Therefore instead of delivering the type of speech that was delivered today by Mr. Chatterjee or somebody else, dissociating themselves from all these things and accusing the Government of these things, they should have had the courage at that time also.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Kerala): What is the point you are making?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The point is, my friend's Party is always riding on the band-wagon of popularity. Opportunism is their main slogan.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: Attacking cow-slaughter?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am saying that you should have some consistency in your line. Either you support the movement or oppose it but do not try to take advantage both ways. Sir, I have said enough about the role of the Jana Sangh and the R.S.S. in this thing, but I would like to say one word about the Delhi Administration also. Unfortunately, whether it was the March incident or the incident now, the role of the Delhi Administration has not been to our satisfaction. I know that it has always been the role of the Home Minister—constitutionally given to him—that he must get up and defend

all that the Administration may have done, and not to recognise their failures. He may not tell us what he is doing inside, but I hope the new occupant of this high office, Shri Chavan, will look into and also overhaul the entire Delhi administrative machinery, because we have found that whenever there is a challenging situation, they are not up to it.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee made an allegation about the dead body of somebody. I hope the Home Minister will take this opportunity and clarify that doubt, so that we are able to see the picture clearly. I say this because, Sir, this innocent sentiment of love for the cow has been badly exploited by the Jana Sangh and the R.S.S. and the emotions aroused have been directed for their political gains, and it is high time that their designs were exposed.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय गऊ रक्षा के प्रश्न पर देश के स्वतन्त्रता काल से ही आन्दोलन चला आया है। राजनैतिक संस्थाओं और सामाजिक व धार्मिक संस्थाओं ने इस प्रश्न को उठाया। पिछले दिनों में इस बात की आवश्यकता महसूस की गई कि ये बिखरे बिखरे प्रयत्न अंधरे पड़ते हैं इनका एक मिला-जुला प्रयत्न किया जाय और विभिन्न संगठन जो अलग अलग प्रकार से गऊ रक्षा की मांग कर रहे थे उनका एक फेडरेशन या उनकी एक फेडरटेड बाडी गठित की गई और यह जो अभियान आज देश में चल रहा है या पिछली 7 नवम्बर को जो प्रदर्शन हुआ यह उस महाभियान समिति के द्वारा आयोजित था। कोई भी यह समझ सकता है कि बिना योजना के बिना संगठन के इतना बड़ा प्रदर्शन नहीं हो सका। लेकिन मैं अपने इन भाइयों से कहना चाहूंगा, शूतुर्मुग की तरह रेत के टीले में अपनी चौंच दबाकर इस हिन्दुस्तान को देखने की कोशिश न करे। आज सारे हिन्दुस्तान में गऊ रक्षा महाभियान की समितियां बनी हुई हैं। उनके

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

विधिवत संगठन बने हुए हैं। उन्होंने कोई टेलीफोन करके रुपया इकट्ठा नहीं किया, उन्होंने पूंजीपतियों के पास जाकर अपनी सरकारी धौंस से पैसा इकट्ठा नहीं किया। हिन्दुस्तान के एक एक नागरिक ने एक-एक दो-दो रुपया मास कलेक्शन में दिया। मुझे अफसोस है, कांग्रेस के बंधुओं को वह मास कलेक्शन की पहली आदत भूल गई है, अब तो उनको उसकी जरूरत ही नहीं रही।

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : कितना जमा हुआ है ?

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : लाखों हुआ है। यहाँ इस देश में करोड़ों लोग हैं जो गऊ के प्रति आदर की भावना रखते हैं। एक शहर में नहीं, हुआ, एक गांव में नहीं हुआ हिन्दुस्तान के लाखों गांव में हुआ है और जो लोग यहाँ पर आए और प्रदर्शन के लिए वे कांग्रेस अधिवेशन की तरह स्पेशल गाड़ियों में मुफ्त बैठ कर नहीं आए। उन्होंने टिकट लिया। मुझे सरकार द्वारा स्टेशन पर स्पेशल ट्रेन्स रिविवजिशन कराये जाने की मालूमात है जिन्हमें एक एक पैसेन्जर के टिकट का किराया एडवान्स में जमा करा कर . . .

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : कितना जमा कराया ?

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : हिसाब मेरे पास नहीं है। लेकिन यहाँ फौंट का कारखाना नहीं है। लोगों ने अपना पैसा खर्च किया है। अपनी भावना को प्रकट करने के लिए यहाँ पर लाखों की संख्या में लोग आए। आप लोगों की आदत भूल गई है, प्रदर्शनों को आयोजित करने की। आप भी जब किया करते थे तब लोगों को लाते थे और लोग पैसा देते थे। लेकिन आपका वह जमाना आपके लिए बीता हुआ जमाना हो गया। अब वे बातें न आप कर सकते हैं न आप उन बातों को लेकर के आज आप लोगों के सामने

जा रहे हैं जिसमें कि लोग आपका समर्थन कर सकें। इसलिए जब ये दूसरी चीजें होती हैं तब आप को कुछ अटपटी बात लगती है। आपको वह समझ में नहीं आती कि किस मांग को लेकर लोग प्रदर्शन करने के लिए एक जगह एकत्र होते हैं। मुझे अफसोस है कि उस प्रदर्शन के अन्दर कुछ अप्रिय घटनाएं अंत में घटी। लेकिन मैं एक बात कहना चाहूंगा गृह मंत्री महोदय से भी। यह बात यहाँ हाउस की डिबेट में केवल विरोधी सदस्यों के द्वारा ही नहीं बल्कि कांग्रेस के सदस्यों के द्वारा भी हाउस के सामने आई है कि ऐसे कुछ तत्व थे जो शुरू से ही गड़बड़ करने के लिए कोशिश कर रहे थे और प्रदर्शन के साथ चल रहे थे। उन तत्वों को ठीक प्रकार से संभाला नहीं गया। मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ अपने कांग्रेस बंधुओं को कि मुझे अफसोस है लेकिन उनके भी शासन में यह गड़बड़ पैदा करने वाले लालेसनेस क्रिएट करने वाले एलीमेंट बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। ये बढ़ते अपने आप नहीं जा रहे, मुझे ऐसे उदाहरण मालूम हैं जब कांग्रेस के लोगों ने अपने चुनाव प्रचार के लिए नामी डाकू, जो जेलों में सजायें भुगत रहे थे उन को चुनाव के दौरान में पैरोल पर रिहा किया है। चुनाव के प्रचार के लिए यह दुधारू तलवार हमेशा उनके काबू में नहीं रह पाती। अफसोस इसी बात का है और आज तो यह भी एक इन्क्वायरी का विषय है कि क्या यह दुधारू तलवार का गुंडा एलिमेंट क्या उनके काबू के बाहर होकर गड़बड़ कर रहा था या वह उनके इशारे पर गड़बड़ करवा रहे थे। आखिर इस बात की जांच हम चाहते हैं क्योंकि यही तो घटनाएं सामने पेश की गई कि यह जो गुंडा तत्व काम कर रहे थे जिसको पाल पोस कर बढ़ा किया गया है जो आपके राजनैतिक उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति के लिए जेलखाने में भी हों तो छोड़ा दिये जाते हैं . . .

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : कौन छोड़ा गया ?

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : हम उदाहरण दे सकेंगे। राजस्थान में सांचों और बारमेर की कांग्रेस में। (Interruption) हिन्दुस्तान की कांग्रेस एक है सारे हिन्दुस्तान में एक ही मनोवृत्ति से काम करती है। चुनाव के दिनों में मैं उसके कामों का उदाहरण दूंगा जो एक के बाद एक लड़ी लग जायेगी। ऐसे नामी "बैड करैक्टर्स" गुण्डे, डाकू जोकि कोर्ट के द्वारा सजायाफ्ता हैं चुनाव के मौके पर पैरोल पर छोड़वाये गये। आखिर यह मनोवृत्तियां ही इस देश में बढ़ते हुए लॉसेनेस के लिए गुंडागर्दी के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं। मुझे इस बात के लिए खुशी है कि इस लॉसेनेस को रोकने के लिए लोग कोशिश करना चाहते हैं। वह रुके। हम लोग भी चाहते हैं, लॉसेनेस देश में नहीं होनी चाहिए। लेकिन मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस लॉसेनेस को अगर हम रोकना चाहते हैं और फॉसेनेस एलीमेंट पर काबू पाना चाहते हैं तो अपनी रोटी सेंकने के लिए इन लालेस एलिमेंट्स को सिर पर भी नहीं ढढ़ाना चाहिए। उनको खत्म करना चाहिए और उस मतलब के लिए उनका उपयोग नहीं करना चाहिए। मेरे पास मद्रास के ये दो अखबार हैं, एक मद्रास का अखबार है "नवशक्ति"। उस नवशक्ति ने अपने 8 तारीख के समाचार में "बैन हेडलाइन्स" में कामराज का चित्र देकर यही लिखा है कि भारतीय जनसंघ के लोगों ने कामराज के निवास पर हमला किया और उसको जला दिया। मैं गृह मंत्री महोदय से चाहूंगा कि इस समाचार पत्र में जो छपा है वह इस बात के सम्बन्ध में क्या कहता है। हमारे ऊपर आरोप लगा है। हम चाहते हैं कि इस अखबार के समाचार के आधार पर जांच होनी चाहिए। एक दूसरा अखबार है "बिडुदल"। अखबार मद्रास से निकलता है। एस० व्ही० रामस्वामी नायकर के चित्र और उन के दस्तखत इस में हैं जिस पर लिखा है कि शंकराचार्य ने, सन्यासियों और दूसरे लोगों ने जाकर कामराज के घर को आग

लगाई और उनको मारने के इरादे से ग्राग लगाई। अब यह शंकराचार्य कब तक यहां पुलिस की निगाह के सामने स्टेज पर मौजूद थे? कल श्री अटल बिहारी जी ने कहा सरकारी रिकार्ड के आधार पर कि शंकराचार्य जी तब तक स्टेज पर मौजूद थे जब तक कि यहां पर गोलियां नहीं चली थीं और उसके पहले ही श्री कामराज के मकान पर आग लगी। यह नायकर साहब ने अपने दस्तखतों से श्री शंकराचार्य पर आरोप लगाये हैं। यह चीज यों ही नहीं जानी चाहिए और इसकी जांच की आवश्यकता है। (Interruption) मुकदमा हम करेंगे लेकिन आपकी जिम्मेदारी इस संबंध में क्या है? यह तो आपका मतलब सिद्ध करता है इसलिए आप चुप बैठे रहना चाहते हैं। मेरा तो कहना यह है कि गुन्डे तत्व जब आपकी रोटी सेंकने में मदद करते हैं तब तो आप उन्हें जब में रखते हो, बढ़ाने की कोशिश करते हो, परन्तु जब वे उल्टे आप पर पड़ जाते हैं तब आंख दिखलाते हो और उन्हें दबाने का प्रयत्न करते हो।

मेरा एक ही निवेदन है कि यह जो आन्दोलन चल रहा है, गौ रक्षा के संबंध पर आज जो देश यापी आन्दोलन है, यह जो 7 तारीख का प्रदर्शन था, वह उनके आन्दोलन के रफ्तार का कोई आखिरी कार्यक्रम नहीं था कि वे यहां पर सब बातें कर के जाते। वे उसी दिन कानून बनाने के लिए हैसपिरेट नहीं थे। वे तो पापुलर ओपीनियन मोबिलाइज करने के लिए थे और इस देश की भावना प्रकट करने का वह एक तरीका था। लेकिन गुण्डा तत्व उसको डिस्टर्ब करता है और आप उसे एजिटेशनल एप्रोच करते हैं। कल कोई पब्लिक मीटिंग आर्गनाइज होगी तो उसमें ये गुन्डे गड़बड़ करेंगे और पब्लिक के सामने अपनी बात रखना यह एक एजिटेशनल एप्रोच हो जायेगा। तब तो फिर किसी भी आम सभा में कोई भी गुन्डा तत्व उठकर जूतों की माला पहिना सकता है या टिमाटर फेंकने

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भडारी]

के लिए तैयार हो सकता है क्योंकि इस तरह की बातों का कांग्रेस के नेताओं को अनुभव होता जा रहा है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप कहेंगे कि पब्लिक मीटिंग करना भी एक एजिटेशनल एप्रोच है और इसको धार्गनाइज नहीं करना चाहिए। इस लिए मेरा निवेदन यह है कि क्या इन सारी चीजों के लिए हम गुण्डों द्वारा अपनी नीतियों को निर्धारित करायेंगे या अपने विचारों को प्रकट करने के लिए जनतन्त्रीय पद्धति को पनपने का मौका देंगे ?

आने वाले 20 तारीख को इस गौरक्षा के प्रश्न पर देशव्यापी एक दिन के लिए सांकेतिक अनशन का कार्यक्रम है और नायक ने उन लोगों को छूरे से मारने का आदेश दिया है। यह बात उन्होंने अपने दस्तखत से अपने अखबार में छपवाई है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह बात क्या होम मिनिस्टर के नोटिस में नहीं आई है ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब को इस संबंध में कदम उठाना चाहिए और मैं जानना चाहूँगा कि वे क्या कदम उठाते हैं ? तथा इन प्रश्नों के संबंध में वे नीति निर्धारित करें।

आज ज्युडिशियल इन्क्वायरी की बात को सर्विसिज को डिमौरलाइज करने का एक तरीका कहा जाता है। मैं खुद नहीं चाहता हूँ कि सर्विसिज डिमौरलाइज हो जाए, लेकिन मुझे दया आती है सरकार पर, आज नौकरशाही की गुलाम बन गई है। सरकार ने आज अपना लोकतंत्रीय और जन-लोकप्रियता का आधार समाप्त कर दिया है और नौकरशाही के इंगारे पर चलने की प्रवृत्ति उसमें पैदा हो गई है। उसकी वजह से आज ना एंड आर्डर कायम करने वाली ब्यूरोक्रेसी को बेलगाम होने का मौका मिला है। मैं नहीं चाहता हूँ कि ब्यूरोक्रेसी स्काट फ्री रहे। सब प्रकार

की गलतिया होने के बाद भी पिछले दिनों जो ज्युडिशियल इन्क्वायरी हुई उनकी वजह से रिबीलिफ फैंक्ट सामने आये। कितना हाइन्डेडनेस और कितने गलत निर्णय दिये गये हैं, ये बातें उस ज्युडिशियल इन्क्वायरी से पता चली। ये बातें डिबेट करने से मालूम नहीं होती है।

यहां पर जो कुछ हुआ है इसके बारे में बहुत बातें बतलाई गई हैं। सरकार की ओर से सिर्फ त्रिनिगडन अस्पताल की लाशों के बारे में ही बतलाया गया। दिल्ली में और भी तीन अस्पताल हैं और पता नहीं उनमें कितनी लाशों की संख्या थी ? इर्विन अस्पताल के लाशों के बारे में यहां पर कुछ नहीं बतलाया गया। यह हमारा चार्ज पुलि के ऊपर है कि उसने इस तरह की सारी बातों को छिपाया है और इन सारी बातों को छिपाने के लिये केवल एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की तरफ से इन्क्वायरी करना पर्याप्त नहीं होगा। आपको इस संबंध में ज्युडिशियल इन्क्वायरी करनी पड़ेगी ताकि सब बातें जनता के सामने आ जायें। इन सब बातों के तह पर आकर जो सही बात है वह सामने लाने में आपको तकोब नहीं करना चाहिये। मैं गृह मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन कहूँ कि वे ऐसी न्यायिक जांच की मांग को स्वीकार करें और लोगों के मनो को आशंकाओं को दूर करने का प्रयत्न करें।

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पंजाब) डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिबा, टाइम थोडा है और मिनिस्टर साहब ने बोलना है, इसलिये मैं ज्यादा अर्ज करना नहीं चाहता हूँ। 7 तारीख को जो वाक्या हुआ वह आपके सामने है कि किस तरीके में, प्लान्ड तरीके से, सूझबूझ से गाड़ियों को आग लगाया गया, मकानों को आग

लगाया गया। मैं यहां पर आपके सामने एक चीज अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अभी हमारे भाई श्री भंडारी जी ने कहा कि मद्रास के अखबारों में श्री कामराज के कत्ल के सिलसिले में एक चीज आई है। अगर श्री भंडारी जी थोड़ा पीछे जाये तो इसी तरीके से जनसंघ के नेताओं ने जनसंघ के वर्कर्सों ने जब पंजाब स्टेट रिआर्गनाइजेशन का झगडा चल रहा था तो पानीपत के अन्दर तीन कांग्रेसी मेम्बरों को जिन्दा जला दिया और आज उनके खिलाफ केस चल रहा है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी . मंडम, पानीपत का केस सबज्युडिस है। लोगों पर जलाने का आरोप दिया जा रहा है और उस के का यहां पर हवाला नहीं दिया जा सकता है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't say anything about it.

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि तीन कांग्रेसमैनों को जिन्दा जला दिया गया था जिसमें जनसंघ के कार्यकर्ता इन्वाल्व थे। वे इस समय जेल में है और मुकदमा चल रहा है। मैं इससे ज्यादा नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मैंने कहा कि जिस तरीके से इन तीन आदमियों को जलाया गया उसी तरीके से जनसंघ के . . .

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह कैसे कहा जा सकता है कि किस ने जलाया मंडम, यह बात गलत है। पानीपत में किस ने लोगों को जलाया यह अभी तय होने जा रहा है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't refer to it. That case is sub judice.

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : जनसंघ के वर्कर्सों को गिरफ्तार किया गया है, यह बात तो सच है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह बात आपने ठीक कही।

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : उसी काल के सिलसिले में जनसंघ के वर्कर्सों को गिरफ्तार किया गया है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : जब तक मुकदमा तय नहीं हो जाता है तब तक यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि उन्होंने ही जलाया।

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : उनको जलाने के इल्जाम में गिरफ्तार किया गया है। इसी तरह से कामराज को भी जिन्दा जलाने की साजिश जनसंघ की थी। यही नहीं जनसंघ वालों की यह भी साजिश है कि किसी तरीके से कांग्रेस लीडरशिप के ऊपर हमला किया जाय। अभी शस्त्र पूजा का जिक्र मेरे दोस्त ने पहले किया था। लेकिन शस्त्र पूजा के बाद फारेन एम्बेसीज के साथ गुरु जी की बाने हुई जिनसे रुपया आया, जिनसे प्रोग्राम लिया गया कि किस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान में जनरल इलेक्शन के दौरान में . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Now foreign embassies are being involved. This is not a simple matter. Madam, let him name the foreign embassy. I challenge him.

SARDAR RAGHBIR SINGH PANJHAZARI: I accept the challenge and I request the Home Ministry to enquire into the matter and inform the House.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Which foreign embassy is financing this demonstration? Let him name that Embassy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You continue and please finish soon.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAEYEE: He is maligning his own Government.

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : जी हां, आप तंग पैसा लेते हैं, उसी से काम करते हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : वकवास मत करो। आप साबित करिये कि हमने किसी स पैसा लिया है।

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : करेंगे।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : क्या साबित करेंगे? श्री मोहन लाल ने, पंजाब के एक मंत्री ने आरोप लगाया था कि जनसंघ वालों ने विदेशों से पैसा लिया है और मोहन लाल ने माफी मागी। हमारी देशभक्ति को चुनौती मत दो।

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : आप साबित करिये तो हम भी माफी मांग लेंगे।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप साबित करिये।

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : आप साबित करिये कि नहीं मिला।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप साबित करिये कि हमें दिया गया है या नहीं।

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : आप साबित करिये कि रूपया आपने नहीं लया है। उससे काम चल रहा है।

मैं तो यह अर्ज करना चाहता था कि आज जनसंघ का प्रोग्राम देश में हिन्दू राज को कायम करना है। उसको कायम करने के लिये शस्त्रों की पूजा और इलाकों में प्रोपेगेंडा करते हैं और गोरक्षा के सिलसिले में लोगों को इकट्ठा करके राजधानी में गड़बड़ करने का उनका प्रोग्राम था। डिटी चेयरमैन, जो ज्यादा गड़बड़ करना चाहता है वह सच्चाई के लिये रोता है, जो गड़बड़ नहीं करता है वह नहीं कहता कि यह होना चाहिये, वह होना चाहिये। इन्होंने किया और आगे करने जा रहे हैं।

मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहूंगा। सिर्फ यही अर्ज करूंगा कि इनके साथ साथ जो हमारे लेफ्टिस्ट भाई हैं, कम्युनिस्ट भाई हैं वे भी इसका साथ देते हैं। उनका प्रोग्राम तो यही रहता है कि अकालियों का मूवमेंट हो तो उनके साथ चले जाओ, जनसंघ का हो तो उनके साथ चले जाओ और और किसी का हो तो उनके साथ चले जाओ ताकि किसी न किसी तरीके से जो इस हिन्दुस्तान की कांग्रेस सरकार है उसे नुकसान पहुंचाया जायें।

भंडारी साहब ने कहा कि लाखों रूपया गोरक्षा के सिलसिले में इकट्ठा किया गया। अगर इकट्ठा किया गया है तो बड़ी अच्छी बात है, लेकिन इस रूपये को कांग्रेस सरकार के खिलाफ एजिटेशन पर न खर्च करिये, डेस्ट्रक्टिव काम के लिये न करिये। जितना लाखों रूपया इकट्ठा किया है उसे सामने लाइये उतना ही रूपया कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट देगी गोरक्षा का प्रबंध करने के लिये, लेकिन आप यह करने वाले नहीं है। आप वह रूपया खुद खायेंगे और गड़बड़ करने के लिये खर्च करेंगे, यह हमारा विचार है। गोरक्षा के सिलसिले में कांग्रेस सरकार ने

बहुत किया। हर जगह, हर स्टेट में गोरक्षा का हमारा बिल मौजूद है, विधान में हमने गोरक्षा का आश्वासन दिया हुआ है। हर स्टेट में बैन लगा हुआ है। यू० पी० को लीजिये, राजस्थान को, मध्य प्रदेश को लीजिये, सिवाय एक-आध स्टेट के सब में यह पाबन्दी है; गोरक्षा के बारे में सिर्फ तीन महीने से उनका जोश आया है। पिछले 12 साल से जब इलेक्शन आया, उनका जोश आया। डिप्युटी चेयरमैन साहिबा, मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि यह जासंघ का इलेक्शन के लिये पोलिटिकल स्टंट है। ये गोरक्षा के सवाल को लेकर इलेक्शन जीतना चाहते हैं। मैं इनको यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे जितनी गड़बड़ करने की कौशिश करें, चाहे कोई भी स्टंट लायें, कांग्रेस सरकार आगे से भी ज्यादा थम्पिंग मेजोरिटी में आयेगी और मुझे यकीन है कि नये होम मिनिस्टर साहब गुरु साहब को मत्था टेकने के लिये या किसी और के पास नहीं जायेंगे बल्कि फर्म रहेंगे। जो हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर डेस्ट्रक्टिव काम करेगा, जो भी पोलिटिकल पार्टी हिन्दुस्तान के अमन को खराब करेगी उसको जल्दी से जल्दी बैन करके उनको जेन में भेजे।

आज यह कहा जा रहा है कि राष्ट्रीय स्वयंसेवक संघ तो बिलकुल लोगों की सेवा करता है। लोगों की सेवा नहीं करता है वह पोलिटिकल जमात है, वह चाहता है कि ताकत के जरिये, तलवार के जरिये हिन्दुस्तान की हुकुमत को पलटा जाये। इसलिये जितनी जल्दी राष्ट्रीय स्वयंसेवक संघ को बैन किया जाये और अनर्लाफुल करार दिया जाये उतना हिन्दुस्तान के लिये बेहतर होगा।

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN):

1298 RS—9.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I have heard this debate, a major part of it yesterday, and today and I have tried to understand the main purpose of this debate. I have partly succeeded and I must say, I must admit, that I have partly failed too. Some of the points which the debate raised have been very ably and authoritatively replied to by the Prime Minister herself and I hope this hon. House does not expect me to deal with those aspects or touch those subjects again, particularly about my predecessor, the hon. Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda, who is a very senior worker of my party. He was my senior colleague and he is also a very senior and devoted worker of the country. I find myself in a very embarrassing position to discuss my predecessor which I refuse to do.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: And the Prime Minister has done it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Chavan will always have to do it.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Yes; I always find myself in that embarrassing position.

Let me say at the beginning that a demand was raised at the end and sometimes in the middle of the debate for a judicial enquiry.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: May I request the hon. Minister to move a little nearer the mike?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: A demand for a judicial enquiry was raised and I think it is much better that at the outset I explain our attitude on that point. I personally feel that it is neither practicable nor desirable to have a judicial enquiry into an entire complex event that has taken place. Naturally certain violent activities have been done and those special events are being investigated and those who are found responsible will certainly face the consequences of it.

Nov. 7, 1966

[Shri Y. B. Chavan.]

But the major point that was raised was—I heard the hon. Mr. Vajpayee's speech very carefully and read the hon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's speech and naturally I heard with respect some of the speeches of hon. Members on this side as well—which party was responsible for it and which party was not responsible for it. This point was specifically raised and I do not want to go into the details of this question but, Madam, there are certain basic facts which are undeniable and those basic facts are, firstly, who applied for permission to hold the demonstration. Who was the individual who sought the permission is a different matter. There was some sort of Sarva Daliya Sangatan, which approached technically for it but the point is, who were the persons who took initiative in these matters? Who were the persons who were organising the whole thing? Who were the persons who were going round the city and talking about it? It is important. It does not happen that somebody who signs the application and puts it up before the Deputy Commissioner will be personally responsible for organising the whole thing. It was such a big demonstration; it cannot be undertaken by one person. There must have been many persons, organisations, their goodwill, their strength and their aid and it is their entire collective effort that really speaking can undertake a very huge demonstration of this type. Then out of the parties mentioned here, Jana Sangh was certainly one of the major participants in this. Madam, I was not personally present here during that event and naturally I had to go by certain statements made in this House and other documents that I could lay my hands on. And one fact that stands out is that the demonstration was going on very peacefully till 1.30 and at that point Swami Rameshwaranand got up and made a speech which I think the

hon. Mr. Vajpayee himself heard. And what did he say? One thing stands undisputed that the Swamiji said, 'why are you sitting here? I am driven out of this Parliament? Why don't you go and force this Parliament to close down? Why are you merely sitting here? Better go and surround this Parliament and see that Members and Ministers do not come out of the Parliament House' and so on. And it cannot be denied that he is a representative of the Jana Sangh in Parliament. I am only referring to the minimum facts. That was the beginning of the whole trouble.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: But he did not speak as a representative of the Jana Sangh. I spoke after him and I dissociated myself from the statement made by him.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Maybe; I am not contradicting Mr. Vajpayee. But at the same time yesterday he said that he was not allowed to speak. He merely added two or three sentences and the mike was snatched away from his hand. That also he concedes. But he did not say yesterday that he contradicted what Swamiji said. If he says it even now I am prepared to accept it. If he says so, I am prepared to accept his *bona fides*. You announced yesterday that you do not believe in non-violence . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Violence.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I mean violence. Because I am all along a believer in non-violence, that word has come from me. I certainly accept that with all seriousness. He said that if it is proved that his Party is doing violence, he will not only leave that Party but he will also go out of public life. I certainly believe in Mr. Vajpayee's statement, but on going into the facts of the event certain facts stand out and

stand out very eloquently. Now, naturally when such a thing happens, people will try to hold responsible those who led the movement, who participated in it, who organised it, who gave all support, moral, material and manpower support. Can the Jan Sangh deny that they did not do that?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
We only deny that we did not indulge in violence.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: This is where I am coming to. A very important and basic lesson we have to learn from the 7th November incident is this. People in public life have to be completely divorced from violence. I am talking of a non-controversial proposition. All of us believe that this country should make progress and this country should undertake all activities which are completely divorced from violence. Everyone can follow his own ideological proposition as he likes, but the idea is that we do so without resorting to violence. If this is our basic concept and if it is agreed, then it is the responsibility of those who are undertaking such big demonstrations to see whether they can do that. It is not enough for them to say that that was their intention. It is very well known that good intentions sometimes lead their way to hell and this is what happened in this particular case. My hon. friend is claiming that this is his philosophy. Lakhs of people were allowed to gather and then somebody said yesterday in another context that everybody wanted to participate. But when it led to certain consequences, everyone wanted to run away from the consequences or results. This, really speaking, is the basic thing that had happened here. Instead of going into the other things in this debate, I would certainly request all hon. Members to know that I am here, as a representative of this Government, as the Home

Minister, seeking the co-operation of all the political Parties and to eschew all violent acts and agitations which are likely to lead to violent results.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You ask for our co-operation, but your people are standing outside to shadow us.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: If they are performing their lawful duties . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is hypocritical.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: There is no question of anybody shadowing. Sometimes some people start suspecting their own shadows.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your men are there lively.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I am seeking that co-operation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You withdraw them, otherwise privilege will come.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Regarding the demonstration that is being organised for tomorrow, we are not against it. We are the exponents of the students' movement. I am myself a product of the student movement. I am grateful to it. My public life began as a student leader. How can we be unsympathetic to the demands of our students? They are the masters of our destiny tomorrow. Why only sympathy? It is our bounden duty to look into their demands. But then if some people are trying to utilise them and use them for their own political, what shall I say, exigencies or advantages . . .

COL. B. H. ZAIDI (Uttar Pradesh):
Design.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Well, 'design' is a better word and I am prepared to accept it. Then, it is the duty of those who are responsible for keeping the peace in the country to take serious note of it. When I am seeking the co-operation of hon. Members, I do not ask them to agree with me entirely in my economic or political thoughts or ideas. But what is the method to achieve it? We say agitational approach should be given up in a particular context and what is the context of today in the country? The context is that there is an atmosphere surcharged with violence. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the leaders of public life to see that anything that may start innocently should not ultimately develop into some sort of violence; because somebody else may take part in it. If that is done, then good causes sometimes get into trouble. That is what is likely to happen. That is what unfortunately happened in the case of the anti-cow slaughter movement. Government's attitude on this question has been very authoritatively explained by our Prime Minister and I do not want to go into the matter. I, therefore, request hon. Members, who are present here, to consider my appeal. Our country is passing through an absolutely critical stage today. We have gone through one external aggression. The danger and threat of another external aggression is there. It is a reality and in the face of external aggression I have not yet forgotten my work as Defence Minister. Therefore it is that I find today that this internal situation is a very relevant matter to be taken into consideration by everybody in this country. So, we have to prepare ourselves to face any external aggression. But if we give a picture of a divided country, a country full of violence, any foolish enemy would be tempted to undertake an unwise act. I know that our country would meet any such challenge, if it were attempted. I am sure about that. It is not a theoretical proposition.

When the agitational approach is taken away, it is said that we were taking away the right of the people. The Fundamental Rights are there. Neither this Government nor anyone else can take it away. We do not want to do that. We do have the Fundamental Rights. It is this Party which was responsible for accepting these Fundamental Rights. Really speaking our tradition is built on these Fundamental Rights. So, it is not a question of merely theoretically discussing this question of Fundamental Rights. It is a question of application of these rights to the present situation. The present situation is a very serious one and, therefore, it is the responsibility of everybody, not only of the Home Minister, to take care of law and order in the country. When you try to defeat it, I will be defeated, I am prepared to accept my defeat in that case. The main lesson that we have to learn from the 7th November incident is that we must eschew all agitations which ultimately lead to violence. That is really the basic thing that has to be taken into consideration.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Eschew all agitations?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I said those which are likely to lead to violence.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Provided the police respect our Fundamental Rights, I say we do not want violent agitations, but the police give the provocation.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: In this matter on 7th November the police did not give any provocation.

Having given this background, I would like to give certain details. Of course, I do not want to go into

all the details, because it is not necessary to do so. Particularly I was certainly very seriously concerned when I heard the hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee, yesterday making certain remarks or observations about dead bodies in the Willingdon hospital. He also gave some photostat copy of a chit which one doctor wrote. When I saw this photostat copy, my *prima facie* observation was 'this. Having worked as a criminal lawyer for some time and also having been the Home Minister of my State for six long years, I thought there was something funny about this photostat copy.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a fabricated one.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I was thinking whether it was not a fabricated one.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It is not a fabricated one. I have got the original. Why should the hon. Minister be taken in by what has been reported by his officers? I have got the original.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I would certainly like to see it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I have got the original.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I just make the request. The only point is that the doctor who made a statement says that he certainly gave a note to somebody who came to see him at such and such time.

"So, I referred them to the Sister in charge of the Mortuary, who was in the New Nursing Home"....

I am quoting from his statement;

"as she maintained a register of all the dead bodies, which are kept there. I gave them a chit on a plain paper and this is the photograph of my writing . . ."

which he accepts—

"but the upper portion of the photograph showing printed portion

'Willingdon Hospital, New Delhi, X-Ray Department (X-Ray Requisition)'.

which has been torn from the prescribed form of the hospital and pasted upon above the chit given by me."

(Interruption)

I am not now making my own allegation. I am reading from a statement of the person concerned, and therefore I wanted to see the original.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The doctor does not deny that he wrote the chit.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: That is the only thing. Even the photostat copy here just shows the upper portion; it looks like that. Anybody with his naked eye can see.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The photostat copy is not the full copy.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : मैं खुद वह टिकट, वह फोटोस्टेट, लेकर आया हूँ और यह विलिंगडन हास्पिटल के टिकट के पीछे लिखा हुआ है ।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Then the other point I am going into is this. The Sister to whom the letter was given says:

"On the morning of 8th instant, I was on duty from 7-30 A.M. to 3-30 P.M."—

That means practically the whole day—

"Nobody brought any chit from Dr. Pahwal, asking me about the

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

dead body of Jhamar Mal From the record of dead bodies kept in the hospital, which I have seen, nobody by the name of Jhamar Mal, was kept in the mortuary on 7th or 8th Nov., 1966 "

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The Sister contradicts the Doctor. The Doctor says he had given the chit

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The chit was given by the Doctor. The point is whether that chit was shown to the Sister as the chit is back to us. It seems the chit was never taken to the Sister. I am only drawing an inference. I am only drawing this from the two statements which are made. There is a statement from the medical authorities also. There is also a statement from the doctor which says that that night there were only four bodies in the Willingdon Hospital. After he made the statement I asked the necessary officers to go and make further enquiries about it. I have got a statement saying that there were only four bodies from this 7th November affair, and there were no more than four bodies there from this incident in that hospital. There is no question of 17 bodies or any more being available. I am only making this statement on authoritative statements which I am in possession of, from the doctor, the police and other persons. What else can I do? I can only give the information that I could get authoritatively.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The hon. Minister can invite the son of late Jhamar Mal who saw 17 bodies lying in the hospital, who got the chit, who went to the sister. We are interested in getting the number of those dead. But let him make an enquiry. Let him not go by what the doctor says. They might be interested in hiding facts.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I do not know because I do not want to get

myself involved in starting an enquiry of this type because it is again a question of accepting the word of one man against the other or not accepting it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Has the register been seen?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I am advised that that also has been seen.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Since a serious allegation has been made, you can yourself look into it, ask for the papers and see.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: When somebody authoritatively says something here, how can I ignore it? I will certainly look into the case. This much I can say. But I do not want to invite it and start an enquiry myself, I do not want to get into that position, that is the only point I said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr Vajpayee can talk to him and place the materials.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I have heard that his son approached the doctor that night and he was told to come next day. I have heard the hon. Member's speech very carefully. I know what statements he has made. That is why I wanted to make further enquiries about it. This is the result of the enquiries that I made so far. Certainly I will have to look into it further.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I suggest to the hon. Minister to invite Mr Vajpayee to bring the son of the person who is dead and hear him. It will solve the problem.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: It will not solve the problem. I am prepared to meet him, but I am afraid it will not solve the problem. It will possibly start another problem instead of solving it. I am not against meeting anybody.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will get more problems everyday now.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I am prepared to meet anybody that he wants me to but not with a role of starting an enquiry of that sort.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: In that case let him appoint a senior officer of his own Ministry who should be asked to go into this question.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I have asked a senior person to go into this. This is the result of the enquiry that he has made.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: He has only brought the statements of the Doctor and the Sister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Will the Home Minister kindly consider this? He may have his own way of enquiry, but here the hon. Member of the House on his personal knowledge has made certain statements. He has produced certain documents. Therefore, they should be examined.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Do not put him in that difficult position. He has not made any statement on his personal knowledge. Certainly he has made statements on the basis of statements made to him. Do not put him in a position which he is not prepared to take.

I will go to the other aspects of the problem. As I said, on the basic issue of anti-cow-slaughter business Government's position has been explained and I do not propose to repeat the same. I do not want to prolong this reply unnecessarily any more. The only specific issue that was raised in the speech of Mr. Vajpayee was about the general approach to the whole question. I have explained my attitude in this matter.

I would certainly like to make a reference only to one aspect. Somebody said that special trains were utili-

sed for this purpose I have made enquiries. Nobody asked for special trains nor special trains were provided.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Is it a fact that the Home Minister directed the Railway Ministry to cancel a Yatri train which was at Nasik on the 11th of November, and the Divisional Superintendent under instructions of the Home Ministry cancelled that train? The train consisted 400 women and not a single Sadhu, and that train has been cancelled.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: You are now referring to a separate question for which I will require notice. (*Interruption*) I was talking about any special trains that were asked for by anybody on the 7th November. I was only referring to a specific issue. Let it not be confused with any other special train in any other part of India, Nasik, Bombay, Poona or any other part. That is one thing certainly that I would like to mention because specific mention was made about this point.

Another small point to which reference was made by my hon. friend, Shri Dahyabhai Patel—I think it was a very unfortunate remark about the Chief Minister of the Maharashtra State. Sir, certainly some unfortunate incidents did take place which were undertaken by some anti-social elements, which were condemned by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra. I had my own opportunity to express my own views and condemned what has happened. There is no question of any Maharashtrians or non-Maharashtrians or anti-Maharashtrians. This country belongs to everyone and every one is rightfully doing his normal work in every part of the country. There is no question about it. I did not want to reply to him in that spirit in which he raised that question. But I thought, when a question was raised in the debate to which I am giving a reply, that I should just make a reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to put a question. Strangely enough. . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have spoken for so long. You cannot go on endlessly. Please take your seat. . . (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You allow us . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have had a full debate. . . (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Gupta, you have had sufficient . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to know about the Home Minister. On a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has referred to that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not the way. I think points of order also should not be . . . (*Interruptions*.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Remember it when the Congress Members raise it. Kindly allow us this time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will not allow you more than two minutes. You have taken a very long time. You must not take the indulgence of the Chair. . . (*Interruption*)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: * * * (*Interruptions*) I only wanted to say a non-controversial thing. You do not allow that. The only thing . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, I am calling Mr. Mani. Mr. Gupta, you have reflected on the Chair. That will not go on record. That has to be expunged.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: * * * I wanted to ask a simple thing.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM: Do we, Members, have the right to challenge you, to challenge the House and give these threats?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all. I wanted to ask a simple question.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr Mani will reply.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Madam . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing anybody. I have had enough.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I rise on a point of order. . . (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chandra Shekhar, he also rose. Please. I want Mr. Mani to give a reply. He is the mover of the motion.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): I am much obliged to all the Members who took part in the debate and made very useful suggestions about the manner in which such situations as had been created on November 7 should be handled in future. I wish the Minister of Home Affairs had been a little more detailed in answering . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, as Opposition, we feel aggrieved. Therefore, the only way in which we can lodge our protest is by walking out of the House, and let the country know that we are not allowed to say something on a matter like this. Well, if that enhances the prestige of the Chair, have it. I fell sorry, Mr. Mani, I cannot hear you because we, of the Opposition, are treated in this manner.

(*Shri Bhupesh Gupta, followed by some other Opposition Members, then left the House.*)

SHRI A. D. MANI: I think the Minister of Home Affairs should have been a little more detailed in answer-

ing the various points which were raised in the debate I wish he also mentioned about what the attitude of the Government of India is going to be in regard to demonstrations before Parliament House in future, because this is one of the points which have figured in this debate. The Prime Minister in a speech mentioned that she had spoken on devaluation at a number of places at meetings. She spoke to me about this matter personally and informally and I know that she has delivered one or two speeches, perhaps more than that, on the various aspects of devaluation. But what I pointed out to her was that the Finance Minister has not addressed one single public meeting on devaluation. He has been addressing through Press conferences.

I would like to say further that a reference has been made by my hon. friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, to a statement made by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra to which a reference was made in reply by the hon. Minister for Home Affairs. I would like to mention that the hon. Minister for Home Affairs in a public statement has completely dissociated himself from what happened at Matunga and other places in which demonstrations were staged against non-Maharashtrians. The Home Minister may recall that when he was the Chief Minister of Bombay I had spoken to him about the future of the linguistic minorities in the State of Bombay and he said at that time that Bombay would continue to be a cosmopolitan city.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: So it remains.

SHR. A. D. MANI: No. Unfortunately, various trends have developed in the State of Maharashtra and a good deal of pressure is being put on employers to see that only persons of Maharashtra origin are employed. I would like more and more Maharashtrais to get chances. But the Government

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not know what you are replying to.

SHRI A. D. MANI: . . . should issue a definite circular to the State of Maharashtra that such a policy should be actively and publicly discouraged by them.

I want to thank all the Members. I do not want to take up the time of the House, as there are a number of amendments to be put to vote. I want to thank once again all the Members for taking part in the debate and offering solutions for what happened on November 7 and what is likely to happen in future if such demonstrations are staged

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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 suitable tax on cows;

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

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that immediate steps must be taken to

[The Deputy Chairman]

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 coordination 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 a 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.”

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:—

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’”

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

4. “That at the end of the motion, the following be 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 motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-seven minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 18th November 1966.