

which may, if it thinks fit, make a representation on their behalf to the authorities concerned in accordance with the provisions of instructions governing the recognition of Associations. Such representations can be made only on matters of common interest to a class of Government servants represented by the Association, and not those concerning an individual Government servant.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am asking the hon. Minister to stop for sometime. I have no objection to keeping quiet for the rest of the Question hour. How long can I ask hon. Members, as if like school children, not to talk here like this? I will have to take more drastic action hereafter. Hon. Members who want to talk like this may kindly go out into the lobby as long as they want. It is impossible to hear anything.

**Dr. P. S. Deshmukh:** You should have a hammer by which.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am hammering myself.

**Shri Datar:** (c) and (d). A Union! Association or its members may make use of such information for the purpose of making their representations as is within their personal knowledge and can be communicated without infringement of the provision of the Government Servants Conduct Rules, or the Indian Official Secrets Act, 1923, prohibiting the unauthorised communication of official documents or information.

**Shri Punnoose:** In answer to (a), the Minister said that complaints have been received. May I know what steps have been taken to meet those complaints?

**Shri Datar:** Government are taking all steps to reduce over-work and remove under-suffing.

**Shri Punnoose:** May I know, Sir, whether disciplinary action is taken against any officer for complaint to their Union or Association with regard to over-work and under-staff?

**Shri Datar:** Sir, I have no information on that point, because it was not related to this question.

**Shri Punnoose:** Am I to understand that the only condition imposed is that no official secrets shall be revealed?

**Shri Datar:** Subject to correction, that is so.

**Shri Namdhari:** For exploiting the Government servants, will the Government consider granting the designation of 'Exploiter-General' to the hon. Communist member?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Next question.

आइनेन्स फॅक्टरी, कानपुर

\*२२१३. श्री रघुनाथ सिंह: क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित इस समाचार में कोई तथ्य है कि कानपुर की आइनेन्स फॅक्टरी से लगभग ६० हजार रुपये की लकड़ी गायब है;

(ख) क्या इस सम्बन्ध में कोई जांच अधिकारी (कॉर्ट ऑफ इन्क्वायरी) नियुक्त किया गया था; तथा

(ग) यदि हां, तो वह किस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचा?

**The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Satish Chandra):** (a) A report was received by the Director General, Ordnance Factories in March, 1953 regarding the loss of Haldy planks at Small Arms Factory, Kanpur. The value of the loss is reported to be in the neighbourhood of Rs. 53,000/-.

(b) Yes. A Board of Enquiry was ordered by the Director General, Ordnance Factories on the 25th March, 1953 when the loss became known.

(c) The report of the Board has now been received and is under examination. It is not considered desirable to disclose the findings of the Board till the Government has come to definite conclusions.

**Shri Raghunath Singh rose—**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question hour is over.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** Only one question, Sir

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No. The question hour is over. There are some short notice questions.

**Shri Chattopadhyaya:** On a point of order, Sir. There has been a sudden cutting off of water-supply both in Old Delhi and New Delhi and especially.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not allow the proceedings to be interrupted.

**Shri Chattopadhyaya:** Sir, it is a very important and urgent matter....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is wrong. Hon. Members should kindly intimate to me earlier. I cannot allow anything to interrupt the proceedings of the House. Shri U. M. Trivedi.

**Sardar Hukam Singh:** Am I authorised to put the question, Sir?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Yes.

### Short Notice Questions and Answers

#### LATHI CHARGE BY POLICE IN DELHI

**Sardar Hukam Singh** (on behalf of Shri U. M. Trivedi): Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that about 63 persons excluding satyagrahis were injured by lathi charges by the Delhi Police on the 12th May, 1953 at 7-45 P. M. near the Dewan Hall;

(b) whether it is a fact that no medical assistance was rendered to any of the injured persons;

(c) whether it is a fact that the shoppers in the area in Lajpatral Market were lathi charged and driven out by the Police;

(d) whether it is a fact that one Lekhraj a bystander was beaten till he lost consciousness on the road adjoining the Dewan Hall;

(e) whether it is a fact that a story was circulated of acid bottle and/or acid bomb and/or brickbats being thrown on the Police or the Magistrate to cover the police excesses;

(f) whether it is a fact that Dr. Satyawati, a Lady of Etawah aged 80 years was beaten by the police till she became unconscious; and

(g) whether it is a fact that Shri Amolak Singh and his younger brother the owners of the National Hotel were dragged out and beaten?

**The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju):** I feel that the House will get a clearer and more connected picture if, instead of answering each part of the question separately, I give an answer in the form of a narrative.

A public meeting was organised at the Dewan Hall at 6-30 P.M. on 12th 149 P.S.D.

May, 1953 by the Jan Sangh and allied organisations. A number of excited speeches, inciting people to break the law, was delivered at the meeting by a large number of gentlemen including several M.P.'s. It was announced by Shri V. P. Joshi that the ban on meetings and processions would be defied and that he would lead a procession to the residence of the Prime Minister for staging a demonstration. On the conclusion of the meeting the audience came out and formed into a procession equipped with black flags. The Magistrate on duty called on them to disperse and to refrain from violating the District Magistrate's prohibitory order. This was the signal for violence by the demonstrators, some of whom snatched the turbans of the Sub-Inspectors of Police while others commenced throwing brick bats. A number of bottles was also thrown. One of these hit the back of the Magistrate and then dropped to the ground and broke, whereupon its contents burst into flames. Another bottle was picked up intact. When the Magistrate found that the processionists were not prepared to disperse and were continuing their attack on the Police, he ordered a lathi charge. Some of the demonstrators ran away but the rest continued their attack on the Police. The women demonstrators took a particularly active part. They formed a cordon round Shri V. P. Joshi and grappled with the women Police who were employed to reach Shri Joshi. A woman Sub-Inspector had her hand bitten while other women demonstrators also assaulted the women constables. The number of persons arrested at the end of the lathi charge included 14 women and 46 men. Four Policemen received injuries caused by brickbats. All the injuries whether on the side of the Police or on the side of demonstrators were of a simple nature.

2. I now come to the specific points mentioned in the question. It is not possible to say how many persons in all from among the public were injured. Among the 60 persons who were arrested by the Police, 7 were found to have injuries and all of them received medical attention either from a doctor or, in two cases, at a Hospital. It can be affirmed that the lathi charge was made only on persons who were actually taking part in violent demonstrations and had refused to disperse; whether or not they were so called Satyagrahis is more than I can say.

3. It is not correct that persons who were shopping in the Lajpatral Market were lathi charged. Some of the