

Mohalla Shaker Talab, Mohalla Amanullah Pura, weavers colony and others, the PAC broke open the doors, severely beat men, women and children, looted cash, jewellery and other articles and indulged into indiscriminate arrests of the victims themselves. While the PAC let loose a reign of terror and atrocities, the CRP sent by the Centre was never effectively deployed and it remained a mere silent spectator of all these atrocities.

We, namely, Janab Ibrahim Sulaiman Sait, Member of the Lok Sabha, Janab Khawaja Mohiuddin, Member of the Rajya Sabha and myself visited Varanasi and met a large number of these victims. The magazine 'Sunday' has also published a special report in its issue dated 27th November, 1977. At p. 28, in column 2, it refers to this police high-handedness and says:

" Was it also necessary for a police officer, Ram Kumar Lall, to shout as he entered the Muslim mohalla, "This is a Pakistani mohalla! Burn this!"

At last, the U. P. Government announced a judicial inquiry. But despite such a long delay, the Commission is yet to be constituted and is yet to start functioning. In the context of what I have narrated, it is absolutely necessary in the interest of law and order and in the interest of confidence in and the efficient working of the police itself that the inquiry be made expeditiously. The commission should also be required to submit its report within a stipulated reasonable time. Otherwise, the appointment of a commission becomes a mere show. I would, therefore, urge upon the Government of India, upon our hon. Home Minister, Shri Charan Singh, to take up the matter seriously and earnestly with the Government of U. P.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I fully support his demand.

2856 LS—10

14.17 hrs.

(iii) PUBLICATION OF BOOKS ON PANDIT NEHRU AND MAHATMA GANDHI AND ATTEMPTS AT DENIGRATING THE LEADERS.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrackpore): Sir, under rule 377, I rise to bring to the notice of the House a very serious matter.

Recently, a book on the life of Mahatma Gandhi, "Mahatma Gandhi and his Apostles" by Ved Mehta and another book called "Reminiscences of Nehru Era" by M. O. Mathai have come out in the market. They deal with the private lives of these two great leaders and bring into disrepute many of the famed women patriots of our country and denigrate these two leaders. . . .

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Truth has been brought out.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: It is a shame on you, Mr. Subramaniam Swamy.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): Don't add word "Swamy" to his name. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: It may be mentioned that Shri Ved Mehta is an Indian writer, living in the United States, and Shri M. O. Mathai is a former Special Assistant to Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and he was sacked on the basis of charges levelled on the floor of this House. It must also be mentioned that a large number of women Members of Parliament had issued a statement in which they say:

"We are constrained to say that some books have been published, and newspapers are reproducing portions thereof, regarding the personal lives of eminent public men. We are shocked that a lot of respectable Indian women have been referred to in these publications in a very disparaging manner, which is highly indecent. We are not concerned with the veracity or otherwise of these things. We

Shri Saugata Roy

however, strongly feel that such publications militate against standards of public life and are undesirable insults on our womanhood. We urge upon the Government to find ways and means to protect the reputation of women in public life."

If I may also mention, yesterday a large number of women Members of Parliament, about 20 Members of Parliament, met the Prime Minister and brought to his notice this very serious matter, this continuous character assassination, which is becoming a part of the new political culture that is being evolved in this country.

This book by Shri M. O. Mathai was serialised in a popular Calcutta magazine called *Sunday*, which has published an article on Dr. Subramaniamswamy also. This magazine had published an article and its caption was "Nehru and his Women".

People may have their differences with Jawaharlal Nehru and his views, but to denigrate the lives of such great leaders is to denigrate the cultural heritage of this country, is to denigrate the Indian nation as a whole. If I may say so, this is a part of the new character assassination that is being done of the Indian leaders, this is a new attempt to denigrate the freedom struggle by making scurrilous and sacrilegious remarks against such great people in our national life.

If I may also mention, recently one issue of *Organiser*, which is an organ of the Jan Sangh, brought out an article on Shri Krishna Menon where it is said that he is a sexomaniac. This has now become a fashion in this country. Sir, with the permission of the House, I want that this serious matter should be brought to the notice of everybody. The Ministers are present here. Shri Biju Patnaik is present here. He was a close associate of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. We expect people

from the Janata benches, who worked with Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, to come in protest against such books. That is why I demand a discussion, a thorough discussion, on this matter in this House.

Yesterday when the women Members of Parliament met the Prime Minister, he is reported to have said "what is to be done about such books? There cannot be any banning of such books." We want to say that in the name of the freedom of the press, if the whole culture is denigrated, it is not a thing that should be tolerated by this House. We should think seriously as to what steps are to be taken.

I also want that the Prime Minister, or the Education Minister, or any of the Ministers present here, should come forward and make a statement in this House against this character assassination game that is going on in this country, under the inspiration of RSS, through their organs. It is high time that a stop is put to such things, such denigration, such unjust remarks, such indecent remarks, which goes against the grain of our cultural heritage.

I want to repeat that we want a full-scale discussion in this House on this issue. I have given a Calling Attention Motion this morning. We are giving a notice of a motion for a full-scale discussion this moment. We want, and the women Members of Parliament want, that there should be a full-scale discussion of these books, and the character assassination which is being done throughout the country in the name of these books, in the name of periodicals, in the name of publications, in the name of the new freedom that the Janata Party has brought in this country.

I hope that all members will be with me in supporting this demand for a full-scale discussion on this matter... (*Interruptions*). When this matter was raised in the Rajya Sabha, Shri Mohan Dharia made a statement on the floor of the House. So many

Cabinet Ministers are present here. We want them to make a statement here also.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Sir, I rise on a point of order, which is very simple. I fully appreciate the sentiments of what the hon. Member has said. I am not at all bothered about the contents of the point of the hon. Member. My point of order is slightly different. Under rule 377 we are permitted by the Chair, by the hon. Speaker, to raise certain matters which, in the wisdom of the hon. Speaker are matters of public importance which need to be brought on the floor of the House. My point of order is a little different. I agree that the particular point which the hon. Member has brought before the House is important, it is delicate, and it is true that some portions of the two books are in bad taste, according to women Members, I say according to all Members of Parliament. But that is not my point of order. I want to know in what way the Government of India are responsible for these publications.... (Interruptions)

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Such books should be prescribed.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: If we believe in an open society, in a healthy society, we must take the risk of having such dirty books also. We must condemn them, but not through this method. That is my point.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What is the other method? You should prescribe them.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: There are many other methods. I am against prescribing. In that case, there may be many other books which would be prescribed.... (Interruptions) I feel that this problem cannot be solved in this way.

श्री द्वारिकानाथ तिवारी (गोपालगंज) :
श्री मावलंकर साहब ने कहा है कि

गवर्नमेंट रिसर्पासिबल नहीं है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट तो बहुत सी चीजों के लिए रिसर्पासिबल नहीं होती है। श्री साइकलोन आया है उसके लिए भी गवर्नमेंट रिसर्पासिबल नहीं थी। लेकिन वह बात हाउस में लाई गई और उस पर बहस हुई। जो भी चीज बहुत इम्पोर्टेंट होती है और बहुत जरूरी होती है उसको हाउस के सामने लाया जाता है। इसलिए इसमें कोई प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर की बात नहीं है।

SHRIMATI V. JEYALAKSHMI (Sivakasi): Yesterday, we, the women Members of Parliament, irrespective of party affiliations, joined together and met the Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, and placed our grievances before him. We said that the politics of character assassination should not be allowed to enter the books of history, and the Prime Minister said "these are books of history; we cannot do anything to prevent the publication of such books". Immediately, we, women Members of Parliament, pointed out that it is nothing but character assassination, which is a political game. In India, it is already very difficult for women to enter politics.

A few Members are in politics and they are being criticised like this. It is not good. Not only that, they have not even spared Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit's daughter and Padmaja Naidu. Mr. Vasant Sathe also told that Jhansi Ki Rani had also been criticised. (Interruptions) Mr. Morarji Desai told us that when he was in the States, Mr. Ved Mehta asked for an interview. He refused to give an interview. We, the Members of Parliament, say that we are thankful for that and it is the duty of the Government to protect us from all such scandals. This is my submission. (Interruption) Please do not say that is because of Congress. We know that Padmaja Naidu was also a Congress

[Smt. V. Jeyalakshmi]

woman. Mrs. Vijayalakshmi was also a Congress woman. Most of the Janata Party members' origin is the Congress Party. So, do not criticise them because they were in Congress (Interruptions).

SHRI VASANT SATHE: If we criticise Vijaya Raje Scindia, will you agree to that? You are talking in the name of freedom. (Interruptions).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): I am on a point of order about Government's responsibility. Mahatma Gandhi is the Father of the Nation. People in this country and all over the world pay great respects to him as one of the greatest men of the age. We, the Indians are proud of it. I know some Members of the Janata Party went to Raj Ghat and took an oath in front of his samadhi that they would follow Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation. (Interruptions) The whole history is connected with Jawaharlal Nehru including you, Mr. Chairman. That can only develop a national feeling of respect. I do not want to mention the names of other people. There are other leaders who are also involved, especially the Father of the Nation. In this big scandal, all nasty things have been said about the national leaders. Is it not the duty of this Government to protect us from these things? There are provisions in the IPC for obscene publications. There is a Censor Board to censor the films. It is the duty of the Government to check such publication which degrades the national leaders, especially the Father of the Nation and the first Prime Minister of this country, the freedom veteran to whom we are looking with an enthusiasm for a direction. So, I submit that it is the duty of the Government to take steps and come out with a statement on the Floor of the House. (Interruptions).

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: On a point of order. Yesterday, this matter was raised at Zero Hour in the

Rajya Sabha. After that, in the morning, I gave a notice under Rule... (Interruptions). I am answering the point of order raised by Prof. Mavalankar. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You take your seat. Let me dispose of it. (Interruptions). ...

श्री विजय कुमार मलहोत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली): मैं यह सबमिट करना चाहता हूँ कि पहले तो जायद दो, चार लोगों ने ही यह किताब पढ़ी हो। लेकिन जब से हिपोक्रैट्स ने शोर मचाया है तब से सारी दिल्ली और हिन्दुस्तान में यह किताब हजारों, लाखों की तादाद में बिकनी शुरू हो गई है ... (व्यवधान)

श्री वसन्त साठे: बदतमीजी की बात नहीं करो ... (व्यवधान)

I am on a point of order on what he has said.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him finish his point of order.

(Interruptions)

श्री विजय कुमार मलहोत्रा: मैंने यह पायंट आफ आर्डर रैज किया है कि इस हाउस को किसी पब्लिशर की किताब बिकवाने के लिए इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहिए, और इस लिए इन माननीय सदस्यों को हाउस में किसी किताब का प्रापेण्डा करने से रोका जाये। ये लोग बाहर तो नारा लगाते हैं "हमारी नेता इन्दिरा गांधी, भाड़ में जायें महात्मा गांधी" और यहां महात्मा गांधी की महानता और उनके सम्मान की दुहाई देते हैं (व्यवधान)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Under rule 377, we bring a matter to the notice of the Government. (Interruptions). Let us

not bring politics here. There was a book written by one British author about Jhansi-ki-Rani. In that book he had written similar things about her. I brought that book to the notice of the then Home Minister and the then Prime Minister, and that book was proscribed. In this case also when respected national figures are involved—particularly after taking oath in Rajghat, I think nobody here would say.... (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: My point is this Mr. Vijay Kuamar Malthora was just now pointing out that this was hypocrisy to bring it to the notice of this House because that gave publicity. My point is that it has already been published. We are not bringing it out for the first time. It has been published and serialized. If the policy of the Government is that national figures' character should be sullied by this method, tomorrow things will be said against Guru Gollwalkar. Somebody may write a book, and things may be said against anybody's mother. What are they talking? Things can be said in the worst possible manner. What will they do then? The only way it can be stopped is by bringing it to the notice of the Government, so that this book can be proscribed. Under rule 377, the object is to draw the attention of the Government....

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has already been done. Under rule 377, Government is not called upon to make a statement. They may make a statement.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You must understand the urgency of the matter.

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK): Sir, Shri Saugata Roy had mentioned my name. I do not know what was the case for excitement. It may be a case for disgust. A person called Mr. M. O. Mathai, who was the Personal Secretary or Private Secretary of the for-

mer Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and who was ultimately turned out from his establishment for whatever improper things he might have done according to the former Prime Minister, has written a book and has written, according to some friends, scurrilous reports. I have not read that book, nor have I any interest in reading what Mr. Mathai has written. I do not even know whether he is a mere writer or a chronicler or anything of that sort. If what my friend says is true, if what the hon. lady Member says is true, I personally think that we should dismiss it just by one word—'disgusting'. While my hon. friends were getting excited, I was wondering if Pandit Nehru was alive today and such a book came out, what would he have said. If I knew the man, Pandit Nehru, he would have smiled and said, 'Obviously, the man is ill-informed'.

That is all he would have said and dismissed it. Nehru's greatness or Mahatama Gandhi's greatness or other great men's greatness cannot be marred by some such publication. I would say, therefore, let us not make an issue of it. All that you are saying is: 'Proscribe the book'. The moment you proscribe a book millions would want to read it. All the pornography that is proscribed is sold by millions in the country. So I do not subscribe to the view of proscribing the book: I would say 'ignore it'. That would be the advice of the Government.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: After the book on Jhansi Ki Rani was proscribed has anybody read it? (*Interruptions*).
... ..

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister made a statement in his personal capacity, he has not made a statement on behalf of the Government.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): He said that it is the stand of the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He may be a member of the Government but he was giving this personal opinion.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Kindly refer to the record, he said that it is the stand of the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us not prolong the discussion.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: This is a vital question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It may be a very vital question, but we will have to take it up by a proper motion at the appropriate time. Under Rule 377 Members are permitted to mention a thing of public importance: that had already been decided by the Speaker and so Mr. Saugata Roy was allowed to make a statement. No further discussion is called for; nor is it allowed under the Rules. So, let us stop here. If you want to pursue this matter let us have a proper motion and then you can discuss it at the appropriate time.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN I am rising on a point of order. The procedure under Rule 377 is stipulated in the Rules of Procedure and it does not contemplate a chain discussion after a submission is made under it. But, after the statement made by Shri Saugata Roy you, in your wisdom permitted observations to be made by different Members, not by way of a point of order. The lady Member here spoke and Mr. Biju Patnaik spoke and it was not by way of a point of order. Therefore the subject came up before the House by some means, somehow. I am not asking for a complete discussion, but when a demand was made from this side for a statement from the Government, while the Parliamentary Affairs Minister Mr. Ravindra Varma shook his head, indicating his unwillingness to make a statement, Mr. Biju Patnaik offered to do so. He stood up and concluded his statement by saying that that was the stand of the Government. Emanating from that statement, I am entitled to make a state-

ment. If you remain restricted within Rule 377, I am shut out. But that was not so: the matter was handed over to the Members and the Members made their contribution. If it had stopped with the Member you could still have ordered me to keep quiet and I would have obeyed. But the Minister made a statement and said that it was the stand of the Government. From out of that a very important issue arises, which I want to raise. That important issue is this: what is to be the attitude of the nation to the memory of persons acknowledged as national Leaders by common reputation and common acknowledgement? It would be open to Pt. Nehru to say 'I don't care' but Pt. Nehru is dead and he is in his grave. Whether or not the nation owes something to him and to Mahatama Gandhi and to all the great national Leaders who preceded them, if their memory is calumniated, if scandalous and scurrilous statements are made about them, are we to say that we will react the way Pt. Nehru would have reacted. It is a question of national importance that I am raising here. The Government has taken the stand that anybody may say anything about anybody who has gone by and our attitude must be that of ignoring. Is that to be the stand of the nation with respect to scurrilous attacks of persons who led the nation and whose memory the nation cherishes? This is the basic question that I am raising. Is it to be the attitude: Ignore it or do we not owe it to their memory that we defend them in their absence and protect their reputation so that the nation's reputation may not be sullied? India cannot be remembered except in connection with Mahatama Gandhi, except in connection with Jawaharlal Nehru, except in connection with Jhansi Ki Rani, except in connection with the great leaders who led this nation and if their names are sullied, are we to say that we ignore it and smile or we react against it? This is a major national question that I raise before this House to be answered in due course under the rules.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as you very rightly pointed out, the Chair permitted Shri Saugata Roy to make a statement under Rule 377. It is not incumbent on the Government when a statement is made under Rule 377 to make any explanation or to give any answer because all that is intended under Rule 377 is to draw the attention of the Government to a certain matter. Therefore, as far as Government is concerned, Government does not want to make any statement on this reference at this time.

14.47 hrs.

PAYMENT OF BONUS (AMENDMENT BILL—contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House would now resume further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Ravindra Varma on the 5th December, 1977, namely:

“That the Bill further to amend the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, be taken into consideration”.

श्री बृज भूषण तिवारी (खलालवाद) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस सदन में जनता पार्टी की सरकार के वरिष्ठ मंत्री श्री वर्मा जी का स्वागत करूंगा और उनको धन्यवाद दूंगा कि उन्होंने यह विधेयक सदन के समक्ष रखा। मैं कल कांग्रेस के अपने साथियों की बातों को और उन के तर्कों को सुन रहा था। एक ही मिनट बोले और उन्होंने इस बात को स्वीकार किया कि जनता सरकार ने इस विधेयक को ला कर के बोनस देने की बात कही है उसमें उनकी कोई मूल बात नहीं है बल्कि कांग्रेस सरकार ने 8.33 के बोनस के सिद्धांत को स्वीकारा था। परन्तु मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहूंगा कि इमर्जेंसी के दौरान और जितनी भी ज्यादातियां हुई और काले कानून तमाम पास किए गए उस में जिस तरीके से श्रम विरोधी कानून पास करके मजदूरों को जो बोनस पाने का हक मिला

हुआ था उसको छीन लिया उसके द्वारा उस सरकार ने अपना चरित्र जनता के सामने पेश कर दिया। उसमें जो सबसे ज्यादा मजदूरों के हक या उनकी भलाई की बात करने वाले सी पी झाई के साथी हैं उन्होंने बराबर श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की तानाशाही का समर्थन किया और उन्हीं के समर्थन का नतीजा यह हुआ कि उस समय की सरकार को इतनी ताकत मिली जिसका इस्तेमाल मजदूरों के खिलाफ करके जो बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपति थे, जो बड़े बड़े कारखानेदार थे उनके हितों का समर्थन किया या उनके हितों का पोषण किया। आज उसमें से बहुत से लोग घड़ियाली घांसू बहाते हैं। कभी तो वे रेल मजदूरों के बारे में और कभी जो और सरकारी मोहकमे के लोग हैं उनके बारे में बोनस के सवाल को लेकर जनता के बीच में या मजदूरों के बीच में जाते हैं और कहते हैं कि यह सरकार बोनस नहीं दे रही है।

श्री एस० रामगोपाल रेड्डी (निजामाबाद): सब को दे दो। खजाना खाली कर दो।

श्री बृज भूषण तिवारी : पिछले 8-10 वर्षों में और खास तौर पर पिछले 18 महीनों में जिस बेरहमी से आपने खजाना लुटाया है, उसके हिसाब से तो हम इस हैसियत में नहीं थे कि बोनस देते। लेकिन उसके बावजूद भी हमने इस बोनस को देकर 140 करोड़ रुपये का बोझा अपने ऊपर लिया है। यह धन का सवाल नहीं है, पैसे का सवाल नहीं है, यह हमारी आस्था का सवाल है। सर्वहारा के प्रति, मेहनत कश लोगों के प्रति, हमारी कितनी मुहब्बत है, उन के हक़ों के लिये हम कितना लड़ते हैं—यह उसका सबूत है। उन्हीं को साथ लेकर हमने उस तानाशाही के विरुद्ध लड़ाई लड़ी और आप को उस गद्दी से उतार कर इस हैसियत में बैठा दिया। इस लिये हमारा यह कर्त्तव्य था कि हम उनकी