

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD):

We don't want to press that the Railway Minister should give his reply now itself.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us do one thing. Now, we will have our regular unlisted business upto 1 o' clock. Then, we will raise for lunch and at 2 o' clock, he will reply.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have given a notice on the misuse of National Security Guards as has also appeared in today's Newspapers that the motorcade of our "Chief Election Commissioner, Shri shashen was not given passage by a vehicle. So Shri Shashen overtook that vehicle, stopped it and asked his Guards to shoot him. But when they did not do so, Shri Sheshan Abused them. When the officers of National Security Guards came to see him they were kept waiting for more than two hours. We have given notice of impeachment motion against him which is pending with you.

It is another matter whether the remains on his post or not but the National Security Guards should be withdrawn from him. Otherwise it may happen that some times if we go to see him, he may order his guards to shoot us. Therefore, it should be taken seriously. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura): **Bring an impeachment motion against him (*Interruptions*)**

MR. SPEAKER: You are speaking against a Constitutional authority.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Please. let me formulate my views.

You are making a statement against an authority which is mentioned in the Constitution. You are making that statement on the basis of the newspaper report. I would like to ask you whether you authenticate that.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): May I make a submission, Sir?

[*Translation*]

I had given a notice about it and had said that...

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Are you going to authenticate that?

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We are ready to authenticate it since I came to know about it five to seven days earlier. Many people came to me and told me that such an incident has taken place, the Government has its report but it is not doing anything. I tried to collect the information in my own way, just then U.N.I., which is a responsible agency circulated it.

MR. SPEAKER: Please say what you want to say.

[*English*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I stand by every word that I will speak here.

[*Translation*]

It is another matter, I am not raising the issue before you to impeach the constitutional authority. Can anyone, who may have any constitutional authority, ask the police to fire at a person, who had not given passage to his car to overtake I would like to submit to the hon. Home Minister that an F.I.R. should be lodged against Mr. Sheshan at the police station. He should also be subjected to the law of the country. It should not be allowed that if one has become a reputed person, a big Minister or an officer then he will be above the law of the land. I would like to submit to the hon. Home Minister through you that the F.I.R. should be lodged since I know that he has the report with him. If he has not lodged the F.I.R. then please let us know when are you going to do so. Mr. Speaker Sir, my submission to you is that the one who does not abide by the laws enacted under the Constitution of the country, whether he is rich or poor or a big officer enjoying constitutional position should not be spared.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, You are going too far. I cannot ask anybody to file complaints with or knowing the facts.

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: They have the facts, let them say that these are wrong. My submission to you is that...

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know that.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): Let the Home Minister come with a statement that it is wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: That is a different thing.

[*Translation*]

Do not put this responsibility on me unnecessarily.

SHRIGEORGE FERNANDES: The law was passed in this House that if the Prime Minister of the country commits some crime, he will not be considered a culprit but this law was withdrawn in this House and it was said that according to the Constitution of the country everyone is equal before the law. If he is holding a responsible post then it is his responsibility to maintain the dignity of that post. But he cannot violate the laws. The constitution does not say so. My submission is that the hon. Home Minister should be summoned. Take action against him. The N.S.G. provided to him should be withdrawn and the order for the cancelation of his arm licence should be issued.

[*English*]

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (Hooghly): Mr. Speaker, Sir, your attention must have been drawn to a very serious matter which involves the honour and dignity of a large number of Members of this House as also of this august House itself. Well-known English daily published from Delhi and Calcutta in a column titled 'As I see it', the author of it has made very very derogatory remarks about a large number of Members of this House who were present on the day of the presentation of the Budget, that is, on 29 February.

The Members of this august House have been described as 'A mob of howling hooligans'. He has made some other remarks also like 'It was a disgraceful show of indiscipline and hooliganism on the part of the Communists and their allies and the illegal purposes they have been serving in the name of socialism, etc.'

I think, Sir, as many others do think, that this has caused immense damage to the

honour and dignity of a large number of Members of this House as also the House itself.

It seems, the above remarks were deliberately made with the purpose to malign the Members and show disrespect to the Members and the House. We are double shocked to see that the author is a former Member of this House and he was the Leader of the Swatantra Party we know his perceptions and his views. His consistent/rabid anti-communism and anti-people's are all known. But, Sir, such attempts to denigrate this institution and a large number of hon. Members of this House amount to attack on the rights of the Members this House to freely and conscientiously discharge their duties.

I would request you to kindly grant me leave to move my Privilege Motion and refer the same to the Committee of Privileges.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I will look into it.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (Uluberia): I have given a Privilege Notice.

MR. SPEAKER: I Shri Khanduri have received many Privilege Notices.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal): Mr. Speaker, Sir.....

SHRI RABI RAY (Kendrapada): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I accept the Contention of Shri George Fernandes that Chief Election Commissioner enjoys a constitutional position. I want that this should be made clear. Shri Arjun Singh and Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad are present in the House. Therefore, I request that Government should make a statement on it before the House rises for the day

so that Government views are known. It will dispel all the doubts and a true picture will come before the nation. It may not sound a good proposition to you.

MR. SPEAKER: There are certain constitutional posts and if any action is to be taken against the incumbents of these posts a specific procedure has to be followed. If the incumbent has done any thing in his specific unofficial capacity then he can be tried a court and there is an investigating agency to go into it. Despite this, if any member has raised any issue asseinting that whatever he has read in the newspapers is correct, I have not stopped him. It is my request that he should observers, certain restraint while raising such issue such issues. You are free to do anything. If something has been reported by the newspapers, Hon. Members can ascertaining its veracity from the Minister. But in this case it has not been done.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Whatever issue we raised it was found correct.....

MR. SPEAKER: I have not stopped you.....

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Whatever issue we raised that was found correct. Shri Arjun Singhji and Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad ji are present in the House. we want to know only this much as to whatever has been reported by the press, does that not lower credibility of the Government ?

MR. SPEAKER: I have not stopped you from speaking. You have referred to every thing. ...

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: I want to say only this much that whatever ths appeared in the press that lowers the dignity attached to the post. Therefore, we should maintain the dignity of the post. Government should come out with a statement about this incident involving Sheshan?

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, how can we function if we are described as hooligans? Do you not feel shocked? I would like to know how other hon. Members react to that (*Interruptions*)

I would like to know how the Government would like to react to this? Do you like that we should be described as hooligans. If it is permitted, then it will be used every day. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): It is a breach of privilege; it should be immediately sent to the Committee of Privileges. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): The point raised by the hon. Members is too serious. At least, it deserves your comment because whoever he may be, if he describes members of Parliament as hooligans, and a newspaper, howsoever reputed it may be, published this, does it not deserve your comment on this?

MR. SPEAKER: I Will .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: This is the most irresponsible statement could have been made by any Member in any newspaper; and if this practice goes on, I do not know how the dignity of this House can be maintained. This matter cannot be just a matter to be mentioned and ignored. Either you might refer the matter immediately to the Committee of Privileges or condemn the Writer, reprimand the paper; something should be done; it cannot be waited for time to come to take up this matter for consideration.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh): It was an article; it is not a new item it is signed article. And therefore the minimum which you should do is that you

should write to him because he is also a former member of this House. At least, you should write to him and ascertain; its authenticity.

MR. SPEAKER: I am going to say something. Shri Chandra Shekhar has asked me to comment. I will comment. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDERJIT (Darjeeling): I think it is not only a serious but very grave matter; and I do think that this House ought, in all seriousness, to go into the matter; and if there is a breach of privilege, then appropriate action ought to be taken; and I support this demand. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): I think it is clear that *The Statesman* has published that. The author of the column has deliberately, knowingly, made this remark to denigrate this House. This constitutes a contempt of the House and a breach of privilege. Therefore, it is clear case for referring the matter to the Committee of Privileges.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHURI (Serampore): This is a serious matter.

MR. SPEAKER: You take your seat.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHURI: You will recall that Mr. V.P. Singh, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee and several other Leaders have spoken with your permission before the Finance Minister, in fact, starts making his speech. These esteemed Leaders belonging to Opposition and different parties belonging to National Front and Left, they have expressed their views. Are they hooligans? The matter is too serious. What pains me most is that this is coming from one person who is an ex-Member of Parliament. He must be knowing what is a breach of privilege.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE

(Panskura): You were kind enough to nominate me in the Press Council of India. All kinds of such things are coming. We cannot really do any work because there cannot be any guidelines; nothing is taken up by anybody really of the newspaper.

Now, if this is allowed to be said about the parliamentarians and that too about some of the tallest Leaders, I do not know how the Press Council of India will ever function. Unless you take this cause up and protect the rights of the Members here first, to begin with, these newspapers will not understand that they have to obey somebody to be objective.

SHRI LAL K ADVANI (Gandhi Nagar): Two issues have been raised. In respect of the first issue, which relates to the news item, which appeared in this morning's paper, and I believe it must have been appeared in all papers, because it has been circulated by news agencies, I think that in such a situation, it is the Government's duty to ascertain the veracity of that report or not; and immediately to come out with clarification or a contradiction, if that is not true; because, after all, the person concerned, as you have said, has certain constitutional protection because of which we cannot raise the matter ordinarily in the House. And therefore, it is all the more incumbent on the Government to ascertain the facts because it relates to NSG, it relates to something which is under the control of the Government of India, the Home Ministry. It is not merely the question of the of the Chief Election Commissioner about whom, no doubt you gave the right guidance to everyone that that matter should not be raised, but in so far as a news item relating to NSG and a news item which relates to a person who cannot even defend himself is concerned, it is the Government's duty to come out with the facts. Therefore, I believe that now that this matter has been raised not merely in the

media but even in Parliament, the Government will come forth with a clarification as to what are the facts. And then, it would be up to you to decide what to do about it.

So far as the second matter is concerned, it certainly is surprising that any language which condemns Members of Parliament as whole should be used in a newspaper. But it is a matter about which if the Member concerned who has seen it, because only a small portion was read out and I do not know about it, and a reference was made to a newspaper, if a new notice of privilege has been given, I am sure that you will consider it.

I do recall that both in the Indian Parliament as well as in the House of Commons very often extreme epithets are used about members and about Parliament which Parliament has found it necessary to ignore, and thought it better to ignore. It all depends upon the precise case, in what context a certain word has been used. I can recall so many epithets that have been used about Parliament which always Parliament as a whole said, "We will ignore it".

It was in the other House, only three or four years back, when I remember that the Charimen gave a ruling that "though these words used are extremely offensive but it would contribute to the dignity of Parliament, if we ignore it altogether." It is a matter about which you have to take a decision.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: He is not a toddler. He realises the importance of the words he has used.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I do not now.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Shri Minoo Masani is not just a toddler.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Oh! Shri Minoo masani!

Then I leave it to you to take a proper decision because I have not read that article which was just quoted.

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Speaker, Sir, It is worth mentioning that the person who has used such a language had been a member of this House... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): I too have not read the article by Minoo Masani, but he had been a member of this House with me and he very well knew to abide by the rules of this House. Now he has grown old and is now no more a member of this House. Now when he assesses this House from a distance he might have written something which he should not have written. But we should just overlook it for the simple reason that it has been written by Minoo masani. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI INDERJIT: (Darjeeling): I am on a point of information. many years ago one newspaper in Bombay had used an expression 'loony' against Acharya Kriplani. An issue of privilege was raised on the word 'loony' and the Editor was summoned to the Bar of the House and reprimanded. And I do think that it is a grave matter calling a whole House as "Howling hooligans" and even if it comes from Shri Minoo Masani, I think there ought to be some kind of a reprimand, even if it is a mild reprimand.

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA (Balasore): Mr. Speaker, this is really a serious matter on that word we have discussed and we are seriously feeling that this should be treated seriously and you should give your decision whether it involves a breach of privilege. If it is breach of privilege then the

Editor should be called and asked to give an explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: he is an old man.

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA: It should be treated as a breach of privilege of the entire House. (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: I am of the view that you should throw more light on us. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this article has been written by Shri Minoo masani who was a great freedom fighter and who also contributed in the formation of this institution known as Parliament. So I agree with Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji that it should be ignored when something has been written by a great man...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: If this is repeated by somebody else will that be ignored then also? Therefore, this is a question of an attitude of mind, how the Parliament is to be treated, how the Members' interventions are to be described. If somebody has any objection, certainly he is entitled to say. On a question, the points raised by us, anybody can say that the points are irrelevant points. But to say that we are howling hooligan and Sir, the distinguished Members of Parliament say that this is just to be ignored because somebody was here is not correct. I take it much more important and much more serious because it is from a gentlemen who was a Member of the House and who has a command over the language. He knows English very well. He deliberately has used them only to malign us because of his political convictions...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I should be allowed to say something.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): This should not be ignored. He has deliberately written this... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I think, the Speaker should not speak. But the Speaker is compelled to speak in some cases.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: You protect the dignity of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Some times, I think, the Speaker should also speak to see that the feelings are assuaged and supposing if there is any misconception, it is dispelled. Well, I have received not one notice of privilege, but many notices given by many Members exactly on this point. If one reads the notice and one reads the newspaper the words are very clear and one can form any opinion. The only thing is that in such matters, we generally ask the concerned person to explain what he has to say and receive his explanation and then we take a decision. Now, the notices are with me. The hon. Members had come to me and they insisted that they will raise this issue on the floor of the House. I said, it is better that you give me some time, But they have said that they will raise it and they have raised it. I think, everybody has spoken with restraint and responsibility. Nobody has to be blamed for raising such a matter on the floor of the House. And rightly I am also asked to say something in the matter.

As we all know, the author of this article is a very respectable person. He had been a Member of the House and a knowledgeable person and a person who can use the language in a very deft manner. And yet the words have appeared in this. The only thing is that we should know whether he has

written it or whether there is some kind of mistake in reporting and all those things. This is one aspect of it.

On the one hand we respect the personality and on the other hand we expect the author to be little more kind to the younger Members of Parliament in the House and carefully use the words and things like that. When we have the elders, they some times feel that they have an authority to say a few things against others and things like that.

I know that there have been cases in the House of Commons and here also in which harsher words, harsher phrases and harsher expressions have been used... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, are you not feeling disturbed?

MR. SPEAKER: I have not completed my remarks, Mr. Somnathji. Probably you had understood what I was trying to convey. I cannot use the harsher language than what I am using today.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDER JIT: Please do so explicitly... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: That means, you are not understanding what I am saying.

Well, there are two aspects. I am saying that there were cases which were decided by the Parliament as well as the House of Commons, in which harsher expressions have not been taken note of. I am not saying that we should not take note of and I am not saying that I am not going to take note of. The only thing I am saying is that I have received the notices. I will just find out from him, what he has said and all those things. But then I would like you to keep this entire notice is the clear perspective and form a correct opinion

about this issue. To what extent it should be stretched, should be decided by all of us. I am not saying that this is wrong. The Members have done nothing wrong in bringing the notice. I am not saying that this can be easily neglected. At the same time I am also not forgetting that harsher expressions have not been taken note of. Here is a balance which I have to strike and I will try to strike the balance. I would have rather kept quiet myself.... I should have kept quiet myself and given...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not stretch this issue. Now, on the second issue I am not rejecting and I am not accepting. I am just going to examine it. I will take an appropriate decision. I will consult the Members also and ask the Members also. On the first issue, the Members have expressed their views. The Government side was here. If they have anything to say they can do it. If they do not have anything to say, I am not going to ask them to do anything.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Somnathji, I will go by your advice.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We are prepared not to pursue the on that matter provided that there is an observation from the Chair that those words are most unfortunate and should not have been used. *(Interruptions)* ...

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly. Well, I can understand that we do respect our elders. We do want to go by their guidance and sometimes they are angry also. But, even if they are angry and used such words, if the words are unfortunate, the words are unfortunate.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: They should not have been used. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, while we are in the process of tidying up and as you so admirably tidied up two contentious issues, may I for your consideration-submit that since last week an unfortunate and unhappy controversy relating to the office of the Chief of Army Staff and statements attributed to him, as reported by newspapers, has also been seizing the attention both of this House. and also of the newspapers. I do believe that a situation has arisen in the country where we have to reflect very deeply and as my senior colleague Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, while intervening in the discussion on the debate on the Motion of Thanks for the President's Address had said that when the office of the Head of the Republic is maligned by all kinds of demonstrations, when a Justice of the Supreme Court is under impeachment proceedings, when the high office of the Chief Election Commissioner is brought into controversy, it is really unfortunate that the office of the Chief of Army Staff should also become surrounded by the controversy. I am not going into the personality. I am concerned with maintaining the office of Chief of Army Staff beyond controversy. I do believe and I agree that whereas restraint is necessary in what we say inside the House about various functionaries of the Republic, equally, restraint is necessary by the functionaries themselves also. This is self-evident. This goes without saying. When that office is an office of high responsibility, restraint ought to be an integral of that responsibility. Such is the view that I have had occasion to discuss with my friend and colleague Shri George Fernandes who had raised this issue earlier. I would appeal to you-and through you to the House-that let this controversy attending on the office of the Chief of Army Staff be finished here and now in this House and no further need be said about it. That would be

my appeal to you. I am given to understand that... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: Sir, it is a serious matter. Government have said that they will come with a statement. (*Interruptions*) The House has decided and the Government have committed that the Defence Minister will make a statement. Until that is done we cannot just finish this issue here. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: The statement of Shri Krishna Kumar has come today. The hon. Member should make a statement here. We will consider it only after a statement is made by the hon. Minister (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: The Government should come and explain. Nobody wants that the matter should be finished unless and until the Government make a statement. Let the Defence Minister come and make a statement. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Somnathji, I will allow you. Let me tell you that I have received the letter from the Defence Minister.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My submission was precisely this. My friends and colleagues were a bit impatient. I did wish to say that when I was not here because we had our party function, you had directed the Government and the Government had come forward and said that they will issue a clarification, they will come to the House and clarify the situation. Let the clarification be provided and with that clarification-my appeal is this-let the matter finally be resolved. We cannot have every office of the Republic being involved in a controversy which we can avoid. That is all I wish to say.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: We will decide this, when the clarification comes after the statement (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: After the statement of the Defence Minister. We do not want to bring any person into controversy, but if a responsible person takes a stand or makes a public statement on certain important policy deviating from issues well established superiority of the civil authority in this country is well established. The Parliament in this country is our highest national forum we cannot allow such things to go unnoticed. Therefore, let the Defence Minister come and make the statement then we will decide the next step.

MR. SPEAKER: He has said, 'yes'.

SHRI INDER JIT: Sir, we on this side of the House are equally concerned and we are equally clear, Sir, that the supremacy of the civil authority must be affirmed, and I do think that we should all wait for the Defence minister's statement and then decide what is to be done.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, nobody can question the very significant role and patriotic role played by our Army. There is no question about that and we deeply appreciate the contribution always made by the Army in defending our country, in defending our integrity and our security. Unfortunately, Sir, these days the conduct of some of the high officials and some high personalities is coming into question. We do not want necessarily to bring those personalities into any dispute, but certain things are happening which should better be avoided. Certain things are being said, certain things are being done, which I am sure, on proper reflection those persons

themselves will feel, should not have been indulged in.

Sir, so far as the present matter with regard to the Chief of Army Staff is concerned, we do not want to keep it continuing, we also want to put it at rest. This is a matter, I am sure, on which that gentleman himself will reflect. I had a meeting with the Defence Minister, he had requested us to see him, and he had promised to make a statement on this. I am sure, on that we can put the matter at rest.

Sir, once more I wish to record that against the Army as such we have nothing to say, against the Chief of Army Staff *per se* we have nothing to say, but if something has been said, let the Government clarify it and I am sure the matter will be put an end to.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I agree with the hon. Members that there should be some statement from the Defence Minister. But I am inclined to agree with my friend, Shri Jaswant Singh, that this matter should not be pursued after the Statement of the Defence Minister because the Defence Minister is considered to be responsible enough to see that the supremacy of the Civil authority is maintained. I know this officer, I shall be failing in my duty if I don't say that he is a very able and conscientious officer, I do not know under what circumstances he made this statement. My only request will be that matters of this sensitive nature should not be debated in the Parliament, otherwise it will have a very bad reflection.

I agree with my friend, Shri Somnath Chatterjee, that Mr. Defence Minister should talk to him, make a statement and after that statement the matter should be considered closed.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I am very sure of the sagacity and wisdom of the hon. Members. On the one hand they raised some

important issues; on the other hand they understand that beyond a certain limit we have not to go. I have received the letter from the Defence Minister asking permission to make a statement, I have allowed him to make the statement at 3.00 p.m., and I am sure, after that it may not be necessary to have any discussion and that is not the rule also. We know that our Army officers have been doing a splendid job for the country. On the one hand we appreciate that and on the other hand we have put the things in a very correct perspective and I am sure that with this it will end. Today, we have dealt with sensitive issues in a manner which will bring appreciation.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We are not always hooligans.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BHUWAN CHANDRA KHAN-DURI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit to the hon. Minister of Communications through you that a postal-stamp should be issued in the memory of late Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna. Today is his third death anniversary.

Late Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna was a great freedom fighter, an able politician and a social worker. He was born on 25th April, 1919 in a farmers family in Garhwal district. He was sent to jail during freedom struggle while he was receiving Primary education. He actively participated in the Quit India Movement in the year 1942 and was sent to jail for years together and was subjected to various types of torture and becoming victim of many diseases yet from within the jail itself he provided leadership to various student organisations, labour organisations and unions. As an able politician he did organisational work on different posts of Centre and State Committees of Indian National Congress. He was Minister in the Central Government in the important departments like Communications, Petroleum, Finance and