

shall not take up another item, the motion by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra.

We are postponing this discussion till tomorrow.

15 hrs.

**MOTION RE VIOLENT INCIDENT IN CALCUTTA IN WHICH SHRI JAYAPRAKASH NARAYANA'S CAR WAS ATTACKED AND SHRI SAMAR GUHA, M.P. SUSTAINED INJURIES.**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** We shall not take up the motion by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra.

श्री मधु लिमये बांका: इस प्रस्ताव पर संतोषजन देने के लिए हम को छुट दी जाए। टाइम को जो हमके लिए था एक्सटेंड करके तीन बजे तक किया जाए।

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** After the hon. Mover has moved his motion.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** Notice

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I do not think that there is any need to be hard and fast on this. You can give it now.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai):** Mr Deputy-Speaker, I beg to move:

"This House deplores the recent violent incident in Calcutta in which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's car was attacked and a member of the House Shri Samar Guha and his colleagues sustained injuries."

One had expected that a motion of this nature and on this subject would be brought up by the ruling party itself and more particularly by the Prime Minister who happens to be the Leader of the House. In fact it is the function of the Leader of the House to rise to such occasions and speak and act on behalf of the entire House symbolising the unity and consensus in the entire House and

certain fundamental values which underlie our democracy. But she had not done so.

Our regret at the Leader not rising to certain occasions has taken the form of a motion which we have recently tabled saying that the hon. Leader of the House is not performing her functions. Perhaps the hon. Members of this House are not aware of the fact that many leaders of the Opposition have already associated themselves with this motion which is currently awaiting approval and permission of the Chair.

One had however, thought that at least on this occasion the Prime Minister would not be found wanting in performing her duty.

If any party should have the greatest vested interest in the rule of law, it should be the ruling party but that can happen only when the ruling party happens to be of true democratic intentions and character. It is the fascist regime which wants to destroy the system which throws up that regime and it is the fascist regime which is not interested in sustaining the rule of law. So if anywhere the rule of law is found to be in jeopardy or threatened, I think, it is the duty first and foremost of the ruling party and of the Prime Minister to come forward with unreserved condemnation of such a threat. That has not happened in this case and that does not seem to be happening on any other occasion too.

Here is Mr. Jayaprakash Narain whom my hon. friends on that side in season and out of season seem to be condemning. They seem to think that the only way to keep them politically alive is to look nice in the eyes of the Prime Minister and not in the eyes of the people of this country. They seem to forget that they have their umbilical link with the people of the country. It is not enough that they please their masters here; they must not speak against

their conscience. When I say so I do not lose sight of the fact that there are some hon'ble Members even in the ruling Party who had unreservedly condemned the attack on JP. Two of them Mr. Krishna Kant and Chandrasekhar who belong to the other House had expressed their views in regard to the incident that had taken place in Calcutta. Have you got the courage to speak against that voice of conscience of Shri Krishna Kant and Shri Chandrasekhar? There was also the voice of conscience of Mr. Mohan Dharia who made the severest indictment of this Government. The indictment of Mr. Mohan Dharia had gone on unchallenged and unrebutted confirming all the allegations that the so-called irresponsible Opposition on this side had been making.

With what face are you going to meet the people of this country? To my mind in a democratic country with a peaceful heritage and traditions of India, there can hardly be any subject which could demand greater attention of this hon. House than this one. What did you find yesterday? In a very amazing spectacle in one way and very agonising in another, when one of the victims of this fascist attack. Prof. Samar Guha an hon. Member of this House, was speaking, he was subjected to constant jeering from the other side of the House. That is how you treat a subject like this.

This party has got scant regard for democratic values. Now their mask is wearing thin. This incident which I have described in my resolution, had indeed an unusual, ominous significance. It poses certain questions which have to be answered by this House. What would happen if Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan succumbed to one of these threats to which he is being subjected and to which he has been subjected during the course of the last 1½ years? Had it been an isolated incident of a freakish nature one could have ignored it. But this comes in the

wake of a series of such incidents to which he has been subjected during the course of the last 1½ years. Would this House forget for a moment that the peaceful procession led by Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan on the 5th June 1974 at Patna was subjected to a firing undertaken from the house of an MLA belonging to the ruling party? That MLA found himself lodged in jail, but have you gentlemen on the other side, asked yourselves the question whether your party has taken any action against that member and where the case stands now? The firing had resulted in injuries to 21 persons in the procession and the officials of Patna on that day were shaking in their shoes that if the results of the firing were made known to the people who have assembled there in lakhs, there could be very serious repercussions. But Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan quietened the entire crowd, although such a serious incident had taken place, and nothing untoward happened. Why was the firing resorted to on the procession? Later Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan was subjected to blows on a second occasion when he led a march on the 4th November at Patna. Ultimately the Home Minister had to express his regret about it. But it was a very reluctant Home Minister who expressed regret when the entire House wanted that there should be some explanation for the silence on the part of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister on the sad incident at Patna.

This was the second incident. The third incident has now taken place at Calcutta.

I have mentioned in my resolution that Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan's car was attacked. That is the wording, but my intention is clear and unmistakable. No one wants to attack a car. The attack is always on the occupant of the car. Nobody has got any animosity or hatred against the car, it is only against the occupant. My friend says that the car, in fact, has become a very

lovable thing after it had been adopted as the people's car by the sponsor of the Maruti Project! So the car could not have been the object of the attack. The target of the attack was clear. When the target was clear, the House should also have been unmistakably clear in its condemnation of the incident. But the other part of the House has been offering all kinds of resistance to such a discussion taking place in the House.

But how did this very House behave on the occasion when a man with a pistol wanted to force his entry into the court room at Allahabad on the 18th of March? I stood my ground, and now I have proved to be correct, that it could not be definitely stated that the Prime Minister happened to be the target of the attack on the 18th of March. It might be the presumption in the circumstances that the Prime Minister could be the target of the attack. But one could not say it for sure that the Prime Minister was the target of attack; the target of attack could be the judge or the opposition leaders too. Now, what has it turned out to be? Shri Govind Mishra, the man with the pistol, has openly declared that he had sympathies with the ruling party, and all the old files could be produced in this hon. House, if so required, to show that the paper which he was editing had been supporting the ruling party. Now that person had been absolved of all criminal intentions; that is the statement made by the police officers. So, who has been proved to be correct? But, on that day, the sheepish flock on the other side wanted to declare that the target of attack was the Prime Minister of India. Even so, the entire House rose to the occasion, and the entire House demanded greater security for the person of the Prime Minister.

But when the occasion comes, when Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is threatened, the other side of the House

callously resists any attempt at bringing up a motion on that subject. If for any legal, constitutional or political reasons, they cannot show any love for Shri Jayaprakash Narayan in this House and they would like his name to disappear, what have they to say about the security of the person of an hon. Member of this hon. House? Professor Samar Guba is a man of great self-respect and great dignity. So when he spoke in this House yesterday he did not show to the House the torn shirt with blood stains on it; but we have seen it.... (Interruptions) If you want to see the shirt.... (Interruptions) What does the torn shirt with blood stains indicate? Let the hon. Members on the other side not take it in a light manner. That indicates nothing less than tearing to shreds the democratic values of this country; the blood stains on his shirt indicate the blots on our democratic system, which is being administered by the ruling party.

What exactly do they fear from JP? He has raised his voice against a regime which commands an army of 8½ lakhs, equipped with all the lethal weapons and backed by a para-military force of the same order, say, about 8 lakhs. Then, it has got a large State police. It has also got a network of an intelligence system, the like of which probably prevails only in a Communist or a dictatorial regime.

In no other country of the world such a net-work intelligence system prevails. They are equipped with all the terroristic tools that any dictatorial or fascist regime possess. And yet they fear J.P. Why? Here is a frail person at the ripe old age of 73 going with a stick in hand throughout the country. They fear him because his message is spreading with a lightning speed throughout the length and breadth of the country. The Ganges is already on fire. After the mass rally on the

6th March, the Jamuna is also on fire now. The regime is indeed shaking in its foundation.

They have already witnessed how he conducted the most peaceful march on the 6th March. Was there a single untoward incident on the 6th? Would not my hon friend, Mr Bhagat, bear testimony to that? When he addressed a meeting at Patna on the 18th November, there was an unprecedented gathering. Never had a meeting of such proportions been ever held at Patna. But there was not a single policeman to look after the vast gathering. That is how J P has been moving about. And your Prime Minister requires the security costing about Rs 15 lakhs to Rs 20 lakhs in one meeting. Here is the people's man who does not require a single pie or a single paisa for his safety.

Now my hon friend Mrs Maya Ray is waving her hand from her seat. I know that she was not present in Calcutta on that day when the incident took place. But the very pleasing presence of a girl on the roof of the car gave us an illusion; that probably it was the hon Member Mrs Maya Ray, who happened to occupy the roof of the car of J P. I recollect she had been away to Baghdad on that day.

AN HON MEMBER Why do you get such illusions?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA She is Maya. She is bound to create illusions all the time.

I was saying that they seem to be fearing this frail figure because of the revolutionary message he has been giving to the people. What a show of elaborate police bandobast they had made on that day! What was the police there for? The police was standing as mute spectators all the time. When the car was being pelted with stones, even when window panes were being broken to pieces and the girls were climbing

the roof of the car, the police stood by silently and mately. That is the kind of police which we found on that day.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola). What would you have done if you had been there?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA My hon friend asks me, what I would have done if I were there.

AN HON MEMBER You would have swooned.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA I would have certainly swooned at their shameful behaviour.

This regime is on the point of disappearance. Where do they exist now except in this hall or in this chamber. Come forward in Gujarat—we give you a challenge. Why don't you face the election in Gujarat? Why do you go on postponing it? We ask you to hold the election here and now, but you are afraid of it.

(Interruptions)

Bihar has already solved its problem. You don't exist in a population of sixty millions. Can any Minister of yours stir out of his bungalow and address any public meeting? The Prime Minister has no courage to go to Bihar and address a public meeting. She could go only to the funeral of Shri L N Misra; she could not go to any other place. That is not because of the fact that anything could happen to her, but because she does not stand morally strong anywhere among the people of Bihar.

I know Sir how these people have been behaving on many occasions. They have been saying one thing in the Central Hall and another thing in this Chamber. So I don't attach much importance to what they say.

But, there can be absolutely no doubt that there was enough of pre-planning in this matter. This could never have happened unless there was

careful planning at the hands of the State Government there and there was also sufficient support from the Central Government. Therefore, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan was right in saying that they had the tacit support of Smt. Indira Gandhi at the Centre. Otherwise, why was the procession allowed to proceed under the leadership of a Minister? Is this fact denied by any person that the procession was led by the Minister?

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI** (Calcutta-South) I led it not the Minister

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA.** The Minister was also there and everybody had seen the Minister behaving in a most objectionable manner on that occasion. The Police stood by but they did nothing. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan had to return from the place where the meeting was to take place because he could not get out of the car.

Now, here are people who say—and my Hon'ble friend Shri. Priya Ranjan Das Munsi issued a statement the other day which is now supported by the Chief Minister of West Bengal—that Jayaprakash Narayan turned away from the meeting place of his own accord. I ask you, do you mean to suggest that a red carpet was laid out for Jayaprakash Narayan but he could not speak? The dumb people are on the other side, we have seen on many occasions how your leader has been behaving like a dumb person in the House. Jayaprakash Narayan is not a person of that kind. Do you think that, on that occasion, he lacked any theme or words to address the gathering there and so he turned back. But when he found that he was not being allowed to come out of the car and enter the place where the meeting was to take place, he did not come out. Therefore, their argument cannot cut ice with any people. The entire police force there could not help Shri Jayaprakash Narayan in escorting him to the place where the meeting was to

take place. So, he had to come away.

That, however, does not mean that meeting would not be held in Calcutta. The meeting would be held in Calcutta. We will be holding the meeting with bleeding injuries on our heads and on our faces. The meeting would be held and no power on earth either the Government here or the Government in West Bengal, can prevent it in Calcutta. Now, West Bengal would indeed be in the arena of the struggle.

All in all, it was a carefully planned affair which was meticulously executed.

Now Mr. Siddartha Shankar Ray says that, if Shri Jayaprakash Narayan comes on the 25th May, he would be able to hold his meeting. He condescends to say that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan would be able to hold the meeting. But we do not want any mercy from Mr. Siddartha Shankar Ray. It would be the people's strength which will organise the meeting whenever Shri Jayaprakash Narayan visits, and you will find what a response by that time is forthcoming from the people of West Bengal itself.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI** Provided CPM stands with you

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA.** It is not a question of CPM, it is a question of the entire Opposition rising against the fascism of the ruling party and its allies with which the country is faced at the moment.

So, one would ask, what was the use of this police arrangement made if blows could still be showered upon the car of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan.

One of my hon. friends on the other side was suggesting to me that if the motion only referred to the car being involved in the violent

incident, it could have been acceptable to them ..

AN HON Member Who said"

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA**  
I would not disclose anything that has been told to me in confidence An hon member belonging to the ruling Party told me, as if the car could have been attacked if there had been no Jayaprakash Narayan there, Is that the suggestion? (Interruptions)

These people know that they are running their whole show with the help of the money provided by the capitalists What has happened to the to the case against Mr Narang who had been regularly financing you? What has happened to the case against Mr Singhania from whom you took Rs 30 lakhs recently?

It is also very pertinent to observe that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has been subjected to a persistent vilification campaign a scurrilous campaign, by the members of the ruling Party and by no less a person than the Prime Minister himself It has been said by the Chief Minister of West Bengal that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan made some personal remarks against the Prime Minister Now, what has the hon. Prime Minister been saying against Shri Jayaprakash Narayan? Did not the Prime Minister say the other day at Bhubaneshwar that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was living in pash houses of the industrialists? Here is a man without any property

(Interruptions)

Can you come anywhere near Shri Jayaprakash Narayan? If we begin telling the truth about the way in which members of your party and particularly the members of your Government live, you will be reeling under its impact They have been speaking against Shri Jayaprakash Narayan in that strain

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** Please conclude.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
I will speak for 4 or 5 minutes more. They have also said that Jayaprakash Narayan is a foreign agent Since he is a foreign agent—tit-for-tat—you are determined to kill him! Then, say so

(Interruptions)

Now, Sir, you see the hooligans in this House itself These hooligans have no place in the public life and yet they are now having a place in this House

So, Sir, he has been accused of running his movement with the help of foreign money and being a foreign agent These are the vilifications to which he has been subjected So, constantly hatred is being spread against him, and, therefore, we fear, as Shri Jayaprakash Narayan himself has said—as you will recall, soon after the incident when the Pressmen met him—that "I would have been beaten up and killed" He feared an attempt on his life and these are the circumstances in which any reasonable and intelligent person would come to the same conclusion, i.e. that there is a definite attempt on the life of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan And all the incidents which are being cited, viz. of the attempt the supposed attempt on the life of the Prime Minister at Allahabad or on the life of Shri A N Ray here and many other cases of similar nature would not convince any one—they lack credibility

(Interruptions)

श्री शंका द्वै (बीदर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मेरा प्वाइट द्राफ्ट फाईर ह । मैं कहना चाहता हू कि जब मैं बं मेवा मध के सम्मेलन में गया था तब जे ० पी ० वहा मौजूद थे वहा मुझे पकड कर बाहर फिकवा दिया गया (ब्यवधान) मुझे मारा गया पुनः—प्राउट कर के बाहर निकाल

दिया गया। मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उस के बारे में हमारे मिश्रा साहब ने एक लफ्ज भी नहीं कहा.....  
(व्यवधान).....

श्री जनैकनाथ मिश्र (इलाहाबाद) :  
ये भूदान प्रादोलन में श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की बमचागिरी करते हैं।

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You carry on, Mr. Mishra. Please conclude now.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: My hon friend has asked me, why a particular treatment was meted out to him at Wardha where Shri Jayaprakash Narayan happened to be present. May I remind him that not only Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was present there, but Shri Vinoba Bhave was also present; and my hon. friends on the other side have been evoking the blessings of Shri Vinoba Bhave so often now. There was the distinguished presence of Shri Vinoba-Bhave himself. So, the responsibility does not devolve on Jayaprakash Narayan for what had happened to my hon friend on that occasion.

(Interruptions)

I was posing this important question, viz. whether my hon. friends ponder over the implications of such incidents and if such incidents go on disfiguring our democracy, would our democracy survive, and if these incidents are being organized under the aegis of the ruling party, would not the people come to the conclusion that they have basically no faith in the democratic system?

All these incidents that I have pointed out to you, whether it be the incident at Allahabad or the one at Delhi in broad day-light are now being interpreted by the people, because the credibility gap has so much widened between the Government and the people, in the same manner as they interpret the fire organised in Reichstag by Hitler who made it a startling

point for assuming emergency powers. They have to seriously reflection these things.

When I was mentioning about the vilification campaign against Jayaprakash Narayan, I forget to mention that no less a person than the Prime Minister made Shri Jayaprakash Narayan responsible for the murder of Sri L. N. Mishra. Now, I ask you whether any person from the Opposition has been interrogated in this case at Samastipur. None of the Members of the Opposition has been and all those who have been interrogated in that connection belong to the ruling Party. Yet, the hon Prime Minister rushed to the conclusion that Jayaprakash Narayan was responsible for the murder of Shri L. N. Mishra. But the whole thing recoiled on the head of the Prime Minister and she was compelled to say that, 'Even if I die, people would say that I have killed myself'. Shame to such a Prime Minister whom people are not able to believe, shame to such a regime which rushes to a conclusion before its investigating agency has been able to arrive at its finding.

Therefore, I would say that these incidents clearly indicate that the ruling Party is bent upon fostering conditions for the growth of fascism in this country. But, let it be quite clear in the minds of my hon. friends on the other side that whatever be their attempts, the vastness of this country, the variety of this country and the level of consciousness of the people would not allow them to plant a fascist regime in this country. If these conditions are being fostered they are because of the complexion and composition of the ruling party and the combination that it has brought about with the CPI which is now passing on to them their own tactics for overthrowing the democratic regime that we want to see strengthened in this country.

Thank you very much, Sir, for your indulgence. With these words I commend my resolution to the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. Motion moved:

"This House deplores the recent violent incident in Calcutta in which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's car was attacked and a member of the House Shri Samar Guha and his colleagues sustained injuries"

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER Now there are a number of amendments given notice of by Members I will call the names one by one

Shri Indrajit Gupta

श्री मधु लिमये उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर है। ये अमेन्डमेंट मूव नहीं कर सकते हैं।

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER Which one you are objecting to? I will listen to you (Interruption)

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE You can throw out the motion but you cannot move amendments which go against the original resolution itself इनमें कोई नोटिसमिज प्रपोज़र आइडर है। बूक एक दफा यहा गलत काम हो चुका है, इस लिये आज मैं यहा पर मौजूद हू।

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER Your point of order is with regard to which amendment?

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE Most of these amendments, which have been circulated

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न

....

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER May I know what is your point of order?

श्री कै० बी० लालबं (बेतूल) 344 के अन्तर्गत हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये जी हा 344 के अन्तर्गत हैं। इसी आप ने श्याम बाबू के सकल्प पर ऐसा गलत निर्णय करवाया था—सब जानते हैं। यह नियम इस प्रकार है—

"(1) An amendment shall be relevant to, and within the scope of, the motion to which it is proposed

(2) An amendment shall not be moved which has merely the effect of a negative vote

(3) An amendment on a question shall not be inconsistent with a previous decision on the same question"

अब उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त का मशीन देखिए। यह कहते हैं कि श्याम बाबू के प्रस्ताव का यह जो अर्थ है this house उस के बाद deplore आता है यह कहते हैं कि बीच में यह जोड़ा जाए :

"the spate of violence unleashed from Bihar by Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan's followers resulting in

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्याम बाबू का प्रस्ताव क्या है

This House deplores the recent violent incident in Calcutta in which Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan's car was attacked and a Member of the House Shri Samar Guha and his colleagues sustained injury

अब यह प्रस्ताव है श्रीर बिन्कुल उस के विपरीत इस में माननीय इन्द्रजीत गुप्त जोड़ना चाहते हैं कि बायलेस किया है जयप्रकाश नारायण के अनुयायियों ने। तो क्या माननीय प्रिय रजब दाम मुशी श्रीर उन के जो गुड उस समय मौजूद थे

(व्यवधान)



from the Members what do they want by raising certain points of order; and these points of order can be settled by disposal from the Chair. But while making his submission, you interrupt him and it becomes another matter of debate. It becomes difficult to ascertain what he wants to say.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं यह कह रहा था कि जयप्रकाश जी के ऊपर जो हथला करने वाले लोग थे वह उन के अनुयायी नहीं थे। श्रीर यह प्रस्ताव . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER Only on a point of order

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं यह कहना हुआ कि यह अमेंडमेंट नहीं हो सकता इस प्रस्ताव में।

श्री शंकर देव (बीर) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, "गुंडे" शब्द पालियामेदरी है या अनपालियामेदरी ?

श्री मधु लिमये मैं न इन को तो नहीं कह

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER. Kindly do not interrupt Mr Shankar Dev, kindly sit down Order please

May I point out to Mr Madhu Limaye that there are only three grounds on which he can object to this amendment

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE They are not allowing me I have not finished

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER I am not preventing you I will point out certain things There are only three grounds—firstly the amendment is negative in character, secondly, it is beyond the scope and thirdly a decision has already been given and, therefore, it cannot be brought back here. Do not go beyond these three grounds On these three grounds you can establish whether these amendments are admissible or not.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्राप श्री शंकर की किताब का पृष्ठ 576 दें।

An amendment which has merely the effect of a negative vote.....

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already said so

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: It says—

"An amendment which has merely the effect of a negative vote is not admissible (a) on the same principle, amendments purporting to omit a clause of a Bill are out of order and are not circulated (b), An amendment which in effect would constitute a direct negation of the original motion has been held to be out of order (c) as also one which is contradictory to the text of the motion"

Please see 'one which is contradictory to the text of the motion'

इस पर मैं अपने व्यवस्था के प्रश्न को प्रापति-प्राधारित कर रहा हूँ और माननीय इन्द्रम जीत गुप्त का जो संशोधन है यह मेरी राय में स्वामी बाबू के प्रस्ताव का जो अंग है उस के बिल्कुल विपरीत है, उस के असंगत है। इसलिए माननीय इन्द्रजीत गुप्त का जो अमेंडमेंट है उस को प्राप को नहीं स्वीकारना चाहिए।

दूसरा यह माननीय बी० बी० नाथक का है।

SHRI PHOOL MODY (Godhra). Do you want to go through all the amendments?

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please What is that they are saying? I may explain Kindly sit down Do not get excited

श्री जननाथ राव जोशी (राजापुर) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम को संशोधन ही नहीं मिले है।

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** Order please. This Motion was admitted today, and the amendments were submitted only after that I was told by the Table that many of these amendments have been cyclostyled and the copies have been kept at the seats of Members, many of them have seen them.

**SHRI K S CHAVDA (Patna)** No, Sir.

**MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER** Many members have got them and if somehow you have missed yours, copies can be given to you. Why do you get excited? There are quite a good number of hon. Members here who have got these copies. If you have not got them, copies can be supplied to you.

**SHRI K S CHAVDA** Then please allow me to raise my point of order after I go through them.

**MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER** I am on my legs I am regulating the business of the House. Mr. Madhu Limaye, I understand, it is not only this amendment that you object to but you are objecting to the other amendments.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE** When they are moved I will object. If that is not moved how can I object to that? (Interruptions)

**MR DEPUTY SPEAKER** Order please. This becomes very very difficult.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE** Mr Daga may choose not to move it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER** In that case it would become a debate on each and every amendment.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE** Sir you must first find out who wants to move the amendments.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER** Let us remember the procedure for this. When I call the Member, it means I have admitted his amendment.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
No

**MR DEPUTY SPEAKER.** That is why I am allowing him to move that. If I do not admit, I will not allow him to move that. That is the procedure (Interruptions) order please. Mr. Madhu Limaye's point is this that is on the admissibility of this amendment, which I have already admitted.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE.** Admitted for circulation.

**MR DEPUTY SPEAKER.** They have been admitted and if they are admitted they will be circulated and the Members will be allowed to move them. And as I told you, I have admitted them. That is why I have asked Mr. Indrajit Gupta to move that. It is at that point of time that Mr. Madhu Limaye rose on a point of order saying that this amendment cannot be admitted even I could have said that I have admitted it and I won't hear you any more, but on an issue like this, I don't want to be rigid especially when tempers are so high, members are so charged with emotion. All that I can do is to try to deflate and defuse the situation. And that is why I don't want to be high and mighty, saying, 'I won't hear any more.' I would request you this, in order to save the time of the House. You are in possession of the other amendments also. You may kindly make your submissions on those amendments also and then I will give my ruling. If you say, you will confine only to the amendment of Shri Indrajit Gupta then I am sorry I cannot allow you to raise your point of order any more on other amendments.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE.** If they do not move what to do?

**MR DEPUTY SPEAKER.** They have been admitted; they have been circulated.

15 hrs.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Sir, I am rising on a point of order.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We are now dealing with his point of order.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** My point of order is this. The circulation of an amendment does not mean the admission of the motion. That is my first submission. The circulation is only for the purpose of information to the Members of the House. Such an amendment is proposed to be moved in the House and it does not go anything further than that.

So, as far as many of these amendments are concerned, my submission is on the ground that they negative my motion, they are contradictory to the main motion and they are, therefore, beyond the scope of the main Motion. Therefore, all these amendments should be rejected.

Now, I am taking, as a case in point, the amendment moved by my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta. My Resolution relates to a particular incident. I lay stress on the word 'particular incident'. That incident took place at a particular spot. I am saying that it is beyond the scope of these three grounds that I have submitted already. I am not vague in the matter. I have submitted that on these three grounds, they are contradictory, they negative the main Resolution and they are beyond the scope of it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Let me here interrupt you.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (All-  
pore):** Won't you allow me to speak?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** This is my difficulty. Please understand it. I had said that it is the Speaker who admits the amendments and, after the amendments have been admitted, they are circulated. Now, you are disputing that. You say that amendments can be circulated even before

admission. Shri Madhu Limaye has now raised an objection to the admissibility of this amendment. Obviously, I have also to hear Shri Indrajit Gupta because it is his amendment, naturally. The point here is that, if more Hon. Members want to make submissions on this, then the same thing becomes a big debate by itself. How do we contain it and how do we propose to discuss? (Interruptions) I am not disputing anybody's right. I am only seeking the cooperation of the Members on how to proceed in this matter. If every amendment becomes a subject of a debate by itself, then how do we go along? This is my difficulty.

श्री मधु लिमाये मरी आप में प्रार्थना है कि पहले आप सदस्या में कुछ तीव्रता कि वीन वीन अपने एमेंडमेंट को सूब करना चाहता है और उस के बाद जो मेरे आक्षेप है उन को सुनिश्च और जा उनके आक्षेप है उन को सुनिश्च और बाद में जिन्होंने एमेंट दिया है उन को सुनिश्च और अपनी स्थिति दे कर मामले को स्पष्ट कर दीजिए।

**SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola):** Sir, I now rise on a point of order.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Now, it becomes a debate. Let me regulate this. I shall first (Interruptions).

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** If you want to avoid more troubles on yourself, I would humbly suggest that you also fix some time by which the amendments can be given.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The time limit was upto 3 P.M. I am not admitting any more.

**SHRI K. S. CHAVDA:** How many amendments are moved by the Members? How many are circulated? We have not got all the amendments before us.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Will you all kindly listen to me? Will you listen to me for at least two-three

minutes? I am not denying anybody. Now, if Members want to speak and they want the Chair to listen, but, when the Chair wants to regulate the business of the House, they have no patience to listen, then, you can go on and I will not regulate. Now, we had fixed the time 2.30 when amendments should be submitted. Then, Members made some special requests. Mr. Madhu Limaye made a special request. He said that he had some amendment, that he could not beat the time limit and therefore he should be allowed to submit the amendment. I had said that we should not be too hard and fast and I had said that up to 3 PM we can admit the amendments. That is why, Mr. Madhu Limaye's amendment has been taken. He has been allowed to table the amendment. After that, no further amendments have come to me. I am not accepting any more of them. (Interruptions) I really do not know how we proceed in this matter. I do not know.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA** (Serampore) Please do not accept any amendment which goes against the spirit of the motion. (Interruptions)

**MR DEPUTY SPEAKER** Now, will you allow me to regulate? Now, obviously, there is some confusion today. I will read out to you the relevant rule with regard to amendments. Mr. Mishra, kindly listen to me. This is Rule 83. The whole difficulty today is that everything happened today. Normally, an amendment should have been given notice of one day in advance. It should have been circulated one day in advance. After that, if the Speaker feels that any amendment is not admissible, he can call the Member to his Chamber or the Member can go to his Chamber and he can ascertain from him how it can be admitted. But, today, we are denied all this because the whole thing happened today and that is why the whole confusion is there. In view of this, I think, we will not be too rigid. We

shall listen to the points of orders. I will keep my mind open. I am prepared to be convinced by you. I would only request you that you should be brief and let us finish with this business and get on with the main thing. Now, Mr. Mishra, have you finished?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** No, Sir. I crave your indulgence for recapitulating some of the grounds on which I objected to the amendments that have been proposed by many hon. Members. As a case in point, I am taking up the amendment of my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta. Sir, my submission is that, the amendments are not admissible because of the fact that they negate the main motion, they are contradictory to the main motion and they lie outside the scope of the main motion. Now, Sir, if you go through the amendment of my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta, you will find that it refers to a different place altogether. My motion, Sir, is based on a particular incident which took place at a particular place at a particular time. There are three particularities about my motion. They clearly define the scope of my motion. The first particularity about it is that it took place at Calcutta and it took place in the university area on that day.

16 hrs

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI** (Calcutta-South): Not university area.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Near the Institute hall.

It took place on the 2nd April. That is the particular incident to which my motion refers.

Now the amendment of my hon. friend's refers to 'the spate of violence unleashed from Bihar. Now the spot of violence is sought to be shifted from Calcutta to Bihar in some way. What does my motion

seek to do? It seeks to condemn the incident on that day, while this amendment seeks to justify the incident on that day. Therefore, it is contradictory to my motion. If you were to incorporate it in my motion, you would find that the amendment seeks to provide a justification for the incident which took place at Calcutta. So I think it is clearly inadmissible.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, like you, I have been in this House for a considerable time. It is a well-established practice in this House that when amendments are tabled, they go to the office of the Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** Normally, but not today

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** They go to his office and the speaker or the Secretary-General or whoever he chooses to depute screens all these amendments to see whether they comply with the rules or not. So many times we have tabled amendments on various things. One thing particularly comes to my mind. A large number of amendments are tabled every year to the motion on the President's Address. A large number of them are not admitted because they do not comply with the rules. They are not circulated even. Only after the screening is done by the Speaker's office which considers whether they are in order, in conformity with the rules, are they admitted and circulated. I may just add that even here . . .

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** Provisionally.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** *Prima facie* it is admissible.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** If your objection is upheld by the Chair, it goes.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before you proceed, let me clarify the position. What you say is the normal procedure. That is that the rules provide that one day's notice should be there so that the Speaker would have the right to vet the amendments, screen them, examine them. But today that thing has not happened.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur):** Even after screening by the Speaker, they can be objected to in the House.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** I am not ruling out a member's right to object.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** In particular, this thing has not happened today. I must say that I am also seeing the amendments for the first time only when I am here just before the debate began. I have not had the opportunity of even reading the amendments properly—after this delete this, after this add this and so on—and connecting the whole thing so as to have a mental picture of what they mean. Even that I have not been able to do. This is the difficulty today.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Anyway. Let me come to the merit of the amendment. To get a proper view of this, let me first read out how the motion would stand with the inclusion of my amendment. Then only, I submit, you can judge whether or not it violates any of these norms laid down in the rules. It would read as follows:

"This House deposes the spate of violence unleashed from Bihar by Shri Jayaparakash Narayan's followers, resulting in the recent violent incident in Calcutta in which Shri Jayaparakash Narayan's car was attacked and a member of the House, Shri Samar Guba, and his colleagues sustained injuries".

Mr. Limaya said that the original motion was sought to be negatived.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE.** Contradicted

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA.** How it negatives I cannot understand. The first point is that rule 344(1) reads.

"An amendment shall be relevant to, and within the scope of, the motion to which it is proposed"

I humbly submit that my amendment is perfectly relevant for this simple reason

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE.** No

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA.** Mr Mishra has put forward the argument that his motion refers to a particular incident, I do not deny it, but that particular incident was a culmination. It is not something which has occurred in a vacuum, something in isolation, there is a background to it. I have not gone into the merits of the Calcutta incident at all in my amendment. All I say is that it is not something which took place in a vacuum. It is related, and therefore, relevant and perfectly within the scope of the rules.

Secondly, I have read out the motion as it will stand if my amendment is accepted, and I say that it does not have the defect mentioned in rule 344 (2) which reads

"An amendment shall not be moved which has merely the effect of a negative vote"

All it does is to put the motion of Mr Mishra in the proper context, the proper background. If you read the whole motion as I seek to amend it, it certainly does not have that merely negative effect at all.

Rule 344(3) of course does not apply.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER.** This is the difficulty in making ad hoc decisions on an important debate like this

We have no time to do our home work, no time to prepare, no time to read anything and we have to carry on.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA.** In your anxiety to defuse some tension which you perceive, please do not do anything at the cost of my amendment.

You yourself have said that it is a political issue which is causing a lot of emotions to be raised here, and therefore, it should not be seen as a narrow technical thing. It has to be discussed in its proper political context and that is the sole purpose of my amendment which does not negate the main motion at all, but puts it in its proper context and is therefore perfectly relevant and within the scope of the rules.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER.** Before we proceed further let us be clear in our minds as to what we are going. First of all I will mention there are nine Honble Members who have given notices of amendments. I will read their names: Shri Indrajit Gupta, Shri B V Naik, Shri Shri Narasingh Naram Pandey, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, Shri M C Daga, Shri Madhu Limaye, Shri Janeshwar Misra, Prof. M Dandavate and Shri N K P Salve. We are not accepting the amendments of anybody else. We are first dealing with Mr Gupta's amendment now. Let me mention this. Because of shortness of time some amendments have been circulated, some have not been circulated. In the case of amendments which have not been circulated I shall read them out. So do not get excited about that.

This is a very unfortunate situation about the admissibility of amendments to the subject of debate and I am put in this unenviable position. The whole House is seized of it and yet the House cannot decide on it, I have to decide.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE.** I hope you will rise to the occasion.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER.** I will use all the objectivity that I

have, and I expect that all Hon. Members with accept it in that spirit.

**SHRI N. K. P. SALVE:** At the outset I beg to submit that so far as this not accept the very premise of this side of the House is concerned, we do motion and therefore in that sense any amendment to it is equally good or bad. That is on principle. So far as admissibility is concerned, the only objection which Madhuji has raised is on the question of relevance. I think it is a technical ground.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** I have raised two objections, that it is negative and contradictory.

**SHRI N. K. P. SALVE:** It is not so for this simple reason. What is the pith and substance of the motion? It condemnation of certain violent incidents and as a result of this amendment you still continue to condemn the violent incidents.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** No.

**SHRI N. K. P. SALVE:** AND if that be so, any amendment which is not negative cannot be ruled out under rule 344. Both condemn certain alleged violent incidents, and that remains in tact and hence I submit with great respect that the objection of negation and contradiction is utterly untenable.

I am not moving any amendment.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I am only on the point whether this amendment of Shri Indrajit Gupta is contradictory and has at negative purpose. Although the amendment takes the wind out of the sail of the Mover, it cannot be considered negative because all that it does is to add a preface saying that this has occurred on account of such and such things.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** So it is a justification.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** No justification. It is only giving the context of the incident and it will be in fact

making the condemnation of the incident total. Without giving this background this incident will be out of context and will not be complete. Therefore, this amendment does a very useful purpose and cannot be considered contradictory at all within the rules.

**SHRI DINESH BHATTACHARYYA:** This motion by Shri Shyamanandan Mishra refers to a particular incident which happened in a particular place on a particular date. And you read what this fantastic amendment says. It shows the way the CPI is going. The attack was on Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and here Jayaprakash Narayan is condemned. How can you accept this amendment?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I am not concerned with the motives of any party or person I am concerned with the rules on the admissibility of the amendment.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur):** The original motion was circulated to us at about 12-30 Mr. Inderajit Gupta's amendment says:

"after 'deplores' insert the spate of violence unleashed from Bihar by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's followers"

It is so mild and humble. It does not even say "by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan"; it only says "Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's followers". Can Mr. Mishra or Madhu Limaye or Mr. Piloo Mody vouchsafe for all his followers that there are no goondas among them? I want to know this from Mr. Limaye who never opposes any amendment moved by any opposition member. Mr. Bhattacharya says the original motion is about Calcutta whereas the amendment refer to Bihar. Sir, from Bihar Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan had gone to Calcutta and from Calcutta he has again gone back to Bihar. So, the amendment is perfectly in order.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** The original motion says that we deplore the vio-

lawes perpetrated in Calcutta on Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and his followers. The amendment says, which has been caused by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and his followers in Bihar. It is meaningless. Look at it this way. Read together, the original motion and the amendment will mean, we deplore the violence perpetrated in Calcutta on Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and his followers, which has been caused as a result of violence unleashed by Mr. J. P. and his friends. If this is not contradictory, I do not know the language.

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE:** (Calcutta-North-East): Let us go down to the essence of the matter. As you rightly said, you are not concerned, and the Chair should not be concerned, with the merits of the proposition one way or the other or the political motivations which might or might not be there. To my mind, there is no contradiction, in so far as the technique of Parliament goes, between the original resolution and the amendment, because the essence of the matter is deploring of a certain incident. If we accept the amendment under discussion, we continue to deplore that incident but we only explain to the extent possible an amendment the perspective in which it took place. The essence of the matter being the deploring of the incident and not any kind of laudation of the J. P. movement, it is perfectly in order to suggest through an amendment that the incident did not happen in a vacuum or in complete isolation without any perspective. The amendment only puts in a very summary form the perspective in which a very unpleasant thing has taken place, and it is perfectly in order.

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी (बंगाल-बिहार): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमें श्री श्याम-नन्दन मिश्र के प्रस्ताव को उस की पृष्ठभूमि में देखना होगा। पहले यह सारा विषय एक कानून-रोको प्रस्ताव के रूप में इस सदन में चर्चा करने का प्रयत्न हुआ था कानून-रोको

प्रस्ताव एक तात्कालिक बटना को ले कर आता है। उसे इस आधार पर नहीं ठुकराया गया कि वह तात्कालिक नहीं है। उसे स्वीकृत करने का आधार यह था कि वह एक राज्य के विषय से सांबन्धित है।

इस प्रस्ताव में यह कहा गया है कि उस दिन कलकत्ता में जो कुछ हुआ, वह निन्दनीय है। मेरे मित, श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त, . . . .

श्री पी. लू. मोदी: इन्द्रजीत गुप्त।

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी: . . . . .  
उसे बिहार से जोड़ना चाहते हैं। बिहार में आन्दोलन एक वर्ष से चल रहा है। वह कोई तात्कालिक विषय नहीं है। उस को अब इस प्रस्ताव के साथ कंठे जोड़ा जा सकता है? मेरा कहना यह है कि श्री मिश्र ने श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण की कार पर हुए आक्रमण की निन्दा की है। वह आक्रमण किन्होंने किया? क्या श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण के समर्थकों ने? श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त का संगोष्ठा सारा दौर श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण के समर्थकों पर दे रहा है, बिहार को बंगाल से जोड़ रहा है, समर्थकों को विरोधियों से मिला रहा है।

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** You have to judge whether it is contradictory to the original motion or not. So, these considerations are relevant.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Let me make it very clear again that, for the purpose of the admissibility of an amendment, I am not concerned on whom the blame should or should not fall.

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी: उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माफ कीजिए, आप हिन्दी समझते नहीं हैं और अनुवाद क्या हो रहा है, वह मैं जानता नहीं हूँ?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** That is my shortcoming.

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी: मैं विरोधियों और समर्थकों की बात नहीं कह रहा



हुं। श्री श्यामनन्धन सिव अपने प्रस्ताव के द्वारा श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण की धार पर हमला करने वालों की निन्दा करना चाहते हैं। श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त अपने संशोधन के द्वारा श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण के समर्थकों की निन्दा करना चाहते हैं। क्या ये परस्पर-विरोधी बातें नहीं हैं ?

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त बिहार की पृष्ठभूमि की बात कहते हैं। मुझे ताजुब है कि उन्होंने फौज रेवोल्यूशन की पृष्ठभूमि का हवाला क्यों नहीं दिया, और कम्युनिस्ट रेवोल्यूशन की पृष्ठभूमि का हवाला क्यों नहीं दिया। (व्यवधान) इन के लिए यह रेवोल्यूशन नहीं है।

मेरा कहना है कि यह संशोधन नहीं प्रस्तावित है। अगर कांग्रेस के मेरे मित्र बिहार के आमन्दोलन की निन्दा करना चाहते हैं, तो वह ईमानदारी से हमारा प्रस्ताव लाने चाहेंगे। वे बीर दरवाजे से इस प्रस्ताव में संशोधन ला कर इस को विह्वल करने की कोशिश न करें।

श्री मधु निमवे अगर यह प्रीक्टिस चली, तो हम लोगों के द्वारा प्रस्ताव रखने का कोई मतलब ही नहीं रह जाएगा।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think the discussion is getting protracted and enough submissions have been made.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The entire issue is related to the question of the assault. An assault involves only two entities—the target and those who hit. In his amendment Shri Gupta is interchanging the position of the target and those who hit and, therefore, it is contradictory to the original resolution.

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पांडे (गोरखपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त का संशोधन अपनी जगह पर एक बहुत ही मना-सिख संशोधन है। आप जानते हैं कि इसी सदन

के सदस्य, श्री बिरजीव झा, को भी, जो सहरना से चुन कर आये हैं, नया कर के सड़कों पर घुमाया गया।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is a different question.

you ruling.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: You hear me first and then give you ruling.

यह जो वायलेन का सिनमिला शुरू हुआ है, वह बिहार से शुरू हुआ है, जहाँ पर इसी सदन के एक भाननीय सदस्य, श्री बिरजीव झा, को सड़कों पर घुमाया गया, और श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण के समर्थकों ने घुमाया। उसी तरह यह इन्डिगेंट हुआ है कि जयप्रकाश नारायण की कार को लोगों ने घेरा और बहा डिमाण्डेशन हुआ। यह जो स्थिति है, उस को पूरे परिश्रम से देखना पड़ेगा। अगर इस एमेडमेन्ट को स्वीकार नहीं किया गया, और सारे देश में इस तरह का जो एक्टिविटीज हो रहा है अगर उन को इस एमेडमेन्ट के द्वारा कन्डम नहीं किया गया, तो जो लोग और जो जिनिया देश में हिंसा की प्रवृत्तियाँ फैला रही हैं, उन को प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा, देश की स्थिति और श्री बिमडेग और पानि-गामेटरी बंभो-क्रेमी के लिए खतरा बढ़ेगा। इस लिए श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त की एमेडमेन्ट का रखने की अनु-मति देनी चाहिए।

PROF. SHER SINGH (Jhajjar): Sir, I do not want to go into the merits of the Motion. My two friends, Mr. H. N. Mukerjee and Mr. Indrajit Gupta, even though they read out the Motion as amended, did not appreciate one thing.

Here, the original Motion says

"This House deplores the recent violent incident in Calcutta..."

It means, what is deplored is the incident. But in the amendment, what is deplored is not the incident.

but the spate of violence. If you read the Motion, as amended, it says:

"This House deplores the spate of violence unleashed from Bihar..."

It means, the Motion, as amended, deplores not the incident but the spate of violence. So, the object of the amendment is negative. It negatives the original Motion. Both are contrary to each other and different in scope.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a former Minister. (Interruption).

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER. Now, if the hon Members are ready to listen to me, then let me first formulate and then give my ruling

I think, the most powerful support to the amendment tabled by Mr. Indrajit Gupta was given by Mr. N N Pandey just now. He mentioned the case of Mr Chiranjib Jha, a very unfortunate thing. We deplore a thing like that. He also said that we must condemn violent activity. Of course, we must do that. But my difficulty is exactly there

Now, I am at a loss to know what the Members want to discuss

SOME HON MEMBERS: Violence.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I agree. But if you want to discuss the space of violence, you should come with a separate or different motion. This is my difficulty

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Anyhow, you cannot prevent the discussion even though you may rule out my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is true. Here, I am concerned with the admissibility of an amendment

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: When you are discussing one violent incident, then other violent incidents also come in.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am concerned with a very limited question, whether this amendment of Mr. Indrajit Gupta is admissible or not admissible. That is the main point. I am not shutting out the discussion. I thoroughly endorse and support what you say.

Let us read Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra's motion as admitted by the Speaker. It reads:

"This House deplores the recent violent incident in Calcutta in which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's car was attacked and a member of the House, Shri Samar Guha and his colleagues sustained injuries"

What is the crux of the motion? The motion is that it condemns the recent violent incident in Calcutta.

It particularises the incident ...

SHRI SHANKAR DEV (Bihar):... which originated from Bihar.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let us understand the motion. It is on that particular incident only. He is concerned with the "world government". How can he be concerned with small little things here?

Now, let us read Shri Indrajit by the Speaker

Now, let us read Shri Indrajit Gupta's amendment—

"This, House deplores the spate of violence unleashed from Bihar by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's followers resulting in the recent violent incident in Calcutta in which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's car was attacked"

The main motion as admitted by the Speaker is to condemn a particular incident while the motion of Shri Indrajit Gupta is to condemn the spate of violence all over the country of which this is only an example.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** I am trying to bring it within the competence of the Centre.

(Interruptions).

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I am concerned with this limited question. I would request Hon'ble Members who are all knowledgeable and intelligent to kindly understand The first motion deplores a particular incident and the second says 'the spate of violence all over the country of which this is only an example' The relevant point here is the scope. Now, the first motion's scope is only a particular incident and the second motion's scope is violence all over the country of which this is only an example Now, I would fully agree that there is violence not only in Calcutta but all over India and all over the world. There is more violence in Viet Nam and Cambodia and if you want to talk about the whole world you can do so.

I therefore rule that while I fully appreciate that it would have been a more meaningful debate in this House if we discuss the spate of violence all over the country—I fully agree—but for the purpose of an amendment I think Shri Indrajit Gupta's amendment has too big a scope and it cannot be put within the scope of the motion by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra

श्री मधु लिमये अब मैं बाकी घमें-मेंट्स के बारे में ही प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि जो घमें मेंट्स बाउट माइए दि स्कॉप है उनको स्कॉप बाउट कर दीजिए।

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER.** If all Members agree and if all those who have given notices of amendments don't want to move them and if they waive their right, then we can proceed with the discussion now.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** I want to move it.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** Now I would call Shri H. K. L. Bhagat.

**SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT** (East Delhi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, let us consider whether the conclusions drawn by Prof. Shyamnandan Mishra and the allegations made by him in his speech are justified by his own facts irrespective of the facts being different. I am making a very respectful submission on the facts enunciated by Prof. Shyamnandan Mishra himself. What has Mr. Mishra told us— He has said that there was a very serious conspiracy, there were very serious preparations, to attack Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, there was an attempt to liquidate him, that an attack on the car was an attack on Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, the police were the mute spectators the demonstrators were very aggressive These are the facts which Mr. Mishra himself has given. I want to ask him whether, from his own facts, his conclusions and allegations are justified According to him, thousand of demonstrators, as a pre-planned conspiracy to attack Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan were there, the police was playing a mute role; the conspiracy was there to liquidate Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan But Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan continued to sit in his car I am rather surprised How is it that, with all his assertion of these facts, no harm whatsoever was caused to the person of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan? How could it be said that the police did not have him? Our friend, Prof. Samar Guha says that he has received a few abrasions in the melee that took place there Are we to believe that the thousands of aggressive people, holding demonstrations out to attack Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, the police being the mute spectators, allow Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan to sit quietly in his car and cause no damage, whatsoever, to his person? I want to ask this of Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra Whom is he trying to fool? This House or the people of India? I can only tell him with utmost respect that he is only trying to fool himself. I can say this with respect

to him that he is very grossly exaggerating and is trying to distort the facts to stick political mud on the ruling party, on the Government and on the Prime Minister. It is obvious. I do not have to go into any other facts to come to this conclusion. His conclusions and allegations are not at all justified by his own facts. How could Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan continue to sit in his car without any damage to his person whatsoever? He had finished one meeting earlier very peacefully. There was no disturbance. I have been told that there was another meeting which he had addressed and there was no disturbance at all. It is obvious that no attempt was made to harm the person of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan whatsoever. Nobody has alleged. Even Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has not alleged that anybody tried to open the car or tried to drag him out of the car or do any physical violence to Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. Nobody has made these allegations. In the fact of these things, even presuming that the facts given by Mr. Mishra are correct, it is clear that Mr. Mishra is fabricating his allegations and conclusions only with a political motive, understanding full well what he does.

6.39 hrs

(Dr. Henry. Austin in the Chair)

The Chief Minister of West Bengal has said that he is sorry that Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan could not address that meeting, that he had failed to address that meeting. This thing has happened that Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan failed to address that meeting, may be for whatever reason may be, there was some trouble between two groups of people. Let us keep that aside for the time being. Now the conclusion is that he failed to address the meeting, and the Chief Minister of West Bengal has very rightly regretted that he could not address that meeting. But the whole point is this. Who is responsible for this cult of disturbance in the meetings in this country? Let us see that precisely. I want all of us to consider it dispassionately. Is it the only

instance where somebody has failed to address a meeting? Is it the only instance in this country where there was an alleged demonstration at a time when a meeting was being held? I want to tell you that, recently, when the Prime Minister addressed a meeting in Delhi in connection with the Centenary of Chhatrapati Shivaji, a group of women from Maharashtra had been sent to this meeting to disturb the meeting.

These women got up in the meeting and tried; and these friends stood up in defence of those woman and said that they had a right to go and stand in the meeting and protest. They justified it on the floor of the House. I want to remind you about Mr. Barooah's meeting at Baroda. Who tried to disturb it? Was it not attempted to be disturbed? Were not stones flung? I am not justifying this. I am against all kinds of disturbances in the meetings. Some people tried to disturb Mr. Barooah's meeting. Stones were flung in the meeting. Sir, even at Lucknow during the U.P. elections, when the Congress President, Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma was addressing a meeting—I am a witness to it; I was present. There in the meeting.

Similar attempts were made to disturb the meeting. During the UP elections, even their leader had said that the Congress jeeps will not be allowed to proceed and Congress meetings will not be allowed to be held. What was done in Patna in several meetings? Sir, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has a right to address a meeting; certainly he has a right, but the legislator has the right to attend the Assembly. He cannot be prevented. Who pleaded for the intimidation: who had said that legislators should be slapped? He withdrew it and said that it was said jocularly. I say that the Vidhan Sabha has a right to sit. I say that the student who wanted to appear in the examination had a right to go to the examination—but he was shot at. He was shot at. Did this friend bring in a resolution to condemn it, Sir? Disturbing a meeting is bad, thoroughly bad and it should not be encourag-

ed; but even if, in a meeting, some kind of a disturbance takes place or somebody fails to attend a meeting, should it become a subject matter of a resolution or a motion in this House? That is a question for us to see. Who is responsible, who has given a call? With respect, I appeal to my hon. friends I do not know; the appeals were never responded to. I appeal to them to consider as to who is taking the politics to the streets. Who has given the call to the people to take recourse to extra-constitutional means and extra parliamentary means? (Interruptions) Mr. Vajpayee himself once remarked that extra-parliamentary means are justified; what are those extra-parliamentary means? You remember, Sir, that originally Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan had said that ten lakhs of people would gherao the Parliament. That was the language used. I quote; nobody can contradict me; and later on he changed the language and said that it would not be a gherao; it would be a march. Even the Parliament was threatened to be gheraoed. Parliament has a right to meet, collectors and district administrators have a right to govern. And you say that you are forming parallel governments. Sir, it looks ridiculous. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: MR. Mishra: you may say this when your turn comes, Mr. Bhagat may continue.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT: I am speaking, on behalf of my friends, to plead for democracy, constitution and the rule of law Mr. Mishra had discovered. In Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan a god. The same god has said that he will hold elections in the country; and you are preaching to us. Please, now, keep quit, Prof. Mishra. forget your intolerance. Learn to have parliamentary conduct at least in this House.

(Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, Order. Mr. Mishra, you will have an opportunity to say.

SHRI H. L. BHAGAT: Is not a fact that an MLA from Navsari in

Gujarat, the poor fellow, was caught by the so-called revolutionaries, his face was blackened and he was paraded on a donkey? Did they come out with a condemnation of that incident? No. Because it suited them. As a matter of fact, if you permit me to say so and if I am.... excused, this motion itself is an attempt to project the cult of violence side and then to stick mud on the ruling party. Sir, we believe in democracy and in defence of democracy, we would not kill but we would rather be killed, many more of us would be killed to defend democracy, but we will not kill. That is our way.

L. N. Mishra has been killed. My friends are talking of a democratic spirit. The other day I quoted a newspaper article which said that Indira Gandhi is conducting a very oppressive and tyrannical regime in this country and the people have a right to kill the tyrannical rulers. That is what is stated in that article. I brought it to the notice of this great House but my friends simply indulged in jibes and jeered at me. When certain things are written, when incitement to murder and violence is done in written words, then our friends ridicule it. These very friends took it lightly. Now, the very day this incident relating to the Chief Justice happened. Then, the next day without finding out any fact, newspapers and leaders came out with a statement that the incident was planted. L. N. Mishra is killed and they say that Government has done it. I want to ask whether this is a democratic conduct, whether this is a democratic way. Everything the Government has done? ... (Interruptions) Intolerance has become a trait of my friends over there.

My friends were just now talking of elections. The question of dissolution of the Gujarat Assembly was raised. Who was responsible for it? Who led the agitation? Mr. Morarji Desai. I would say Mr. Morarji Desai went on a fast to get a democratic Assembly dissolved and it is his

sin and it is 'he sin of these people by which the Assembly was dissolved and the people were deprived of their representation. Then it was said that Mr. Chiman Bhai was bad and 'we want dissolution' Now, they are working in partnership with the same Chiman Bhai Sir, would there be a greater instance of duplicity, hypocrisy and double mindedness of this Opposition?

Now, therefore, I say this and I warn them. Somebody was threatening us, 'Look, we can do this, we can do that' Look We do not wish to be provoked We would not like to be provoked Whatever provocation you may give us, we would not like to indulge in street politics Don't threaten us You know you are not stronger than us among the people Do not do it I tell you

Now, it is surprising and, I am very happy as it shows the great confidence of the people of India in the methods of democratic behaviour and conduct What has not been done in this country? Now anything and everything has been done—character assassination, false allegations and what not. Somebody said the Prime Minister is attacking Jayaprakash Narayan Prime Minister's criticism, if you see, whenever it is there is a political criticism

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA**  
No, it is personal

**SHRI H K L BHAGAT** Mr Mishra, please learn to be tolerant You are a senior member I have come to learn from you not to teach you. But I am sorry I have to teach a professor like you

What I am submitting is that the Police and the Military are incited to revolt. Everything is being done Mr. friends said, the Ganga is on fire, the Yamuna is on fire To-day, I must say honestly after listening to Mr. Mishra that I did not find that he was even inspired by his mentor.

Sir, it is surprising, it is a very pleasant surprise for me that millions of people in India have so far very rightly, because they believe in democracy, not reacted in any unconstitutional manner against the most unconstitutional, undemocratic, violent and leading to anarchy and chaos movement of Jayaprakash Narayan.

I have my grievance against this Government I have repeatedly said and they said that they would consider my suggestion, for issuing a White Paper on what has been done during the last one year, what has been said, what has been written during this one year to propagate unconstitutional means and recourse to violence I hope the Government would issue the White Paper soon and that will establish the truth

Therefore, my suggestion is an incident has taken place Siddhartha Shankar has very rightly made his comments on it Now, to exaggerate that incident out of all proportions and distort facts and fabricate allegations is the usual and theatrical way of the Opposition But if they think that they can in this way befool the people of India, they are sadly mistaken They will be only fooling themselves

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA** (Serampore) Sir, I fully agree with the motion moved by Shri Shyamnandar Mishra in which he has very rightly given the true picture as to where this ruling party is leading the country As soon as it was announced that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan would address a meeting in Calcutta, day in and day out there was propaganda by the Congress, Youth Congress, Chhatra Parishad and their allies CPI that they would not allow Shri Jayaprakash Narayan to hold any meeting in Calcutta They started propagating that at the time Mr Jaya Prakash Narayan comes to the University they will see that all the lights would be put off You just go through their propaganda leaflets and their people propagating in the streets

and you will be convinced about pre-planned attack on JP. All the newspapers in India in all languages except Patriot in Delhi have brought the facts in its true form True picture has been depicted in The Statesman, and other newspaper of De'hi and Calcutta Can you imagine a minister leading the hooligans and gangsters to attack Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan and his supporters Has it taken place anywhere in a democratic country

We tried our best to convince you and our friends in the opposition as a what is the state of affairs in West Bengal and how the people are being ruled over there and what sort of terror regime was prevailing We could not convince you but in an incident of half-an-hour the whole world came to know what is the rule that the people are having not only in West Bengal but throughout India Some West Bengal papers and some feature writers while describing all these things said that CPIM friends should have sent earthen potsfull of rasputia to the student leaders Subroto Mukherji and Priya Ranjan Das Munsai and their allies CPI

In West Bengal semi-fascist forces are there and these people killed thousands of young men of our party And now they have started killing their own men, because of their in-fighting. The hon Member who spoke before me said about democratic norms, decency and all that Here is a gentleman sitting in the front benches, whose name is Mr Priya Ranjan Das Munsai He will agree that everyday one would find that the roads there are being blocked because of their in-fighting resulting in murder of their own cadre Mr Siddhartha Shankar Ray was willy willy forced to come forward with a statement that road blocking must be stopped But still everyday you will find this method of forcibly blocking of road by Congress storm troopers still continuing. In respect of attack on J P, Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray has come forward with a statement. He has expressed his regret for the incident but he has not condemned the

persons responsible for it. He said that Jayaprakash Narayan did not come out of the car on his own. I say it is completely wrong and distortion of facts There were two meetings One was in the students' hall. The teachers were there JP addressed the meeting The meeting being hardly concluded there was some big shouting by the Chhatra Parishad and Yuv Congress people there just outside the gate of that students' hall and even JP was not allowed to come out of the hall and get into the car He was prevented This is what happened Mr Samir Guha and others were there, and they helped him to come and get into the car with great difficulty And the next meeting was to be held only 100 yards away You will be surprised that the hooligans prevented him to reach that gate Some youth congress people went there shouting and a girl jumped upon the bonnet of the car and began dancing In the meantime brickbats were thrown Two bricks were thrown aimed at Mr Jayaprakash Narayan I will read out here what Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has stated in a Calcutta meeting This is from Statesman It states

Mr Narayan recalled the ugly incidents that had occurred at Calcutta on April 2 and said 'what happened there and of which I myself was a victim was naked hooliganism and gangsterism in the presence of a West Bengal Minister, a West Bengal MP and a posse of police officers and the police force'

This is Mr Jayaprakash Narayan's own statement, Shri

17 hrs

Again, I would say that the attempt was there to throw stones, brick-bats and coconut shells towards the car where J P. was sitting Still they say and Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray will say that there was no attempt or no attack on Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. I say, the same old story they are repeating since the year 1970-71. From that day onwards they started

317

the violence on the Opposition, particularly, in West Bengal. Some Members might remember that Shri Sidhartha Shankar Ray was chosen by Shrimati Indira Gandhi as a stalwart in West Bengal; when he was the Education Minister here, he was sent there when there was President's rule to prepare the ground for the election which was a mere show. I will say, and it was totally a rigged election and no fair or free election was there. When we came to power in 1971, at that time, (Interruptions)..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now you please try to conclude. Your time is already over. You were given seven minutes. You have spoken for ten minutes. Please conclude now. Congress Members are given ten to fifteen minutes. You have been given 7 minutes.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: I shall finish within ten minutes. Please excuse me for taking a little more time. You please read your own Congress Papers like the Jugantar, Statesman, Hindustan Standard, Ananda Bazar Patrika and all the English dailies in the capital. Read even Basumati which is run by the Congress in West Bengal. They all came forward and depicted the incident as the most ugly one. They proved by one action that there is no democracy, no freedom of speech. Sir, you will be astonished to hear that during the jute strike when our C.P.I. (M) leader was going to address a meeting in Kamarguli suddenly the Congress hooligans appeared there and said that they would hold a meeting; the police then and there clamped Sec. 144 there and this tactic has been adopted by Shri Rai's Government apart from straightway breaking the meeting of opposition by Congress hooligans under the direct protection of police. Here is Shri Tridib Chowdhry who had been to Dum Dum for holding a meeting. But, that veteran leader was not allowed to hold the meeting. He was told that if he would hold a meeting, he would not go from this place alive. This was the naked

way of attack on the minimum democratic right of the people. In Malda same method was adopted to disrupt and break a meeting organised by opposition parties. (Interruptions)

Mr. Darbara Singh will not be able to appreciate what I am saying because he could not understand how in spite of presence of police, how so-called Youth Congress and Chhatra Parishad storm troopers of Congress could venture attacking public and indoor meetings addressed by prominent left party leaders. Why were these people not pushed out of the place? The people who were there to attend the meeting of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, first of all, were locked up inside the university institute and those who were outside, were not allowed to come near Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. They were beaten up and many of them received injuries. These hooligans with the help of those so-called Yuva Congress and Chatra Parishad leaders, with the help of police and with the connivance of the administration attacked J. P.'s car. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was sitting in it. He was amazed. He could not believe that these things could have happened in Calcutta a metropolitan city. The left parties specially our party C.P.I.(M) were trying to convince him and the people of other states that the minimum democratic rights were not there, parliamentary democracy was subverted, no trade union right, no freedom of speech, no security of life, a semi-fascist terror Raj was prevailing.

Shri J. P. was convinced and the next day he said that he had understood the reality and he stressed that in Bengal democracy was in peril and terror Raj was prevailing. J. P. took up the challenge and said that he would come again and address the people. Congress Party has become panicky and so J.P. is being threatened by Shri Ray. If you read Shri Ray's statement, you will find that he has been threatening that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan should not say anything against Shrimati Indira Gandhi.



Who is this Ray to tell Shri Jayaprakash Narayan that he should say this and he should not say this. I say this sort of thing is going on in West Bengal and the people of India will not tolerate this.

Now, what is happening in West Bengal and other places? It is obvious, Sir, that they are building up capitalism. Prices are going up everywhere. Wages have been frozen. Land distribution is not there. Real land reforms are not taking place. Everywhere, they are facing crisis. The workers and the ordinary people are rising up against this ruling class. But, they want to crush them and they want to finish them by terror and by other repressive measures. They are terrorising the people.

The previous speaker said that we are now demanding the dissolution of the Bihar Assembly. What did she (Shrimati Indira Gandhi) do in 1959? She was the Congress President. She made her father to throw away the Communist Government. Is it not a fact? We know what happened in Kerala at that time. The Kerala Government was thrown out because her father was in the Centre. With the assistance of Shri Padmanabhan, they formed a Vimochan Samithi.

MR CHAIRMAN All these things are not relevant. The most relevant point now is, you are exceeding your time. There are other Members. Please cooperate and conclude.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Sir, whatever our friends of the ruling party here may say, we are now heading towards a situation where the top leaders of the Congress want that there should be only one party and only one leader. They want dictatorship. This is the situation they are leading the country to. That is why, while condemning the gangsters and violent attack on J.P. on 2nd April, I would appeal, through you, to the people and specially the toiling masses of our country to stand up and unite against this sort of gangsterism and

hooligans against the ruling party who are bent upon crushing our democratic rights and subverting our Parliamentary democracy. c

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Maya Ray Please try to confine your remarks to ten minutes. From the Congress Party alone, there are as many as 18 speakers.

SHRI S M BANERJEE (Kanpur): This International Women's Year.

MR CHAIRMAN I will give all the consideration to her on that score.

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY (Raiganj): Mr Chairman Sir, I assure you that I will not take longer time than is absolutely necessary.

I oppose this Motion. First of all, it relates to a State matter which, I understand cannot be discussed in this House. So either we have to make up our minds to delete that rule from our rule-book or we should not allow such a matter to be discussed here and stick to the Rules. This is my first ground of opposition to this motion.

Secondly, the hon Mover of the Motion deplores the recent violent incidents in Calcutta. Did he deplore them when we were at the receiving end of such violence from the period of 1967 to 1971? Or has Shyam Babu just woken up when such an incident has taken place now in Calcutta?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I condemn both.

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY. Did he deplore the violent incidents perpetrated by the Party of the hon speaker who has just preceded me? These were in 1971 (Interruptions).

Now this venerable gentleman, this hallowed 'has been', Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, has issued a clarion call for a 'total revolution'. He is

inciting mutiny in the forces and mutiny in every walk of life. But he whines when there is a reaction to his positive action of inciting others to break the law in every walk of life and to use unconstitutional methods.

His cry is that of total revolution. What are the trends of that revolution? It is naked assassination, one of which has already taken place. One victim has already been claimed and two attempts at murder have been made, one on the Leader of this House and the other on the head of the judiciary

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE Nonsense.

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY. Our concept of revolution is totally different. It is that of a peaceful transition, an economic, social and cultural revolution, and that is where the basic difference lies between our ideology and the ideology of the Opposition. Not a single constructive programme has been put before our people in explaining the totality of the "total revolution" by responsible members opposite including Shri Janeshwar Mishra. They have entered into a programme of appointing agents provocateurs to spark off incidence, such that a small, minor incident escalates into a holocaust

I do not remember having heard any voice of protest being raised when members from our party were stripped and humiliated publicly by followers of Opposition recently—I think it took place in Bihar. I do not remember any adjournment motion being moved when the Congress President was attacked in Baroda, when Shri Shanker Dayal Singh was attacked in Bihar or when Shri K. D. Malaviya was obstructed in another part of India

Therefore, as far as principles are concerned, these do not concern the hon. members of the Opposition. It is merely a question of personalities and personalities alone.

329 L.S.—11

Our stand is quite clear.

We condemn violence of any kind; we have always done so and that has been the principle of our party. We stand by that even today. But even Gandhi said that violence was justified under certain circumstances and it may be that such a circumstance has come about today. Our stand is quite clear. We do condemn violence and we are not concerned with personalities, not even with you, Mr. Madhu Limaye. We are concerned with principles while Members of the Opposition are concerned with x, y or z (Interruptions). When two professors are sitting side by side, Sir, it becomes a very dangerous combination. He is one, Prof. Dandavate. Samar Guha is another and so the entire party is in a terrible mess. We do not indulge in vilification or character assassination and scurrilous attacks on persons as do the Members of the CP(M) party

There is another side to it, Sir. Prof. Samar Guha is very agitated because the Professor was approached by a girl on the hood of car. I must apologise on behalf of my clan; I am really amazed at such a bad taste.. (Interruptions) I would have thought that Prof. Guha being a gentleman and a bachelor would have approved of his experience of having provoked a woman to climb of car. (Interruption)

AN HON MEMBER He is not a bachelor he is prepared to be considered a bachelor

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY Then I pity his wife. (Interruption) Anyway a woman climbed a car; he should have considered it an achievement to provoke her into doing so and not raise such a hue and cry in this House over that

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, the Bengali woman is highly emotional and Prof. Guha must have realised this. But so is the Professor, judging by his histrionic performances in this House, so much so, that Professor

Samar Guha's injuries, I think, were more mental than physical. Because, he is here and he looks really quite fit on the whole. Maybe if he uses more temperate language in the future, he will not open himself up to such humiliating situations of being chased by a girl

For us in Bengal the most crucial factor is that after a period of violence and turbulence which had retarded Bengal by about fifteen years in its developmental programme, our boys and girls have brought about an atmosphere of peace and tranquillity in order that we may progress and we intend preserving that atmosphere (Interruptions) Time and history takes no notice of people like you or me but we do intend to preserve this atmosphere of peace so that the millions of our people who live below the poverty line and who are entitled to a decent living can have our developmental programmes implemented so that they can have atleast the minimum needs that we promised them and we intend to see that they live in an environment of peace and safety. We will not tolerate fascist strong arm methods to disrupt our aspirations and achievements at the behest of international forces disturb that peace that we have brought about. It makes me sick, hearing the Marxist Members speak here adopting the holier than thou attitude. It is they who unblashed a reign of terror in West Bengal thank goodness they could not do so in any other part of the country. Nobody could produce those conditions of violence. Shri Limaye and the hangers on of Mr J P or any other P J P made a mistake. He had come and gone from Calcutta many times. The memories of those boys and girls are not as short as the memories of the Members of the Marxist Party. They had not forgotten what they had undergone during the times of the Marxist rule. Therefore when Mr J P. joined forces with the Marxists, it incensed them and had aroused them. I am not apologising on their behalf; I do not apologise for what they had done; it

will be done again if he comes to Bengal with such forces, including subversive international forces...

(Interruptions)

**PROF MADHU DANDAVATE:** While the Chief Minister has expressed his regrets, she says that the boys and girls had done the right thing

**MR CHAIRMAN** Mr Ray has expressed his views as Chief Minister. She has her own views.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** We only want the country to know what she is saying

**SHRIMATI MAYA RAY** Mr Chairman, Sir, no development can take place without peaceful conditions and therein lies the provocation so far as the Members of the Opposition are concerned. They are not in the least concerned with, or worried about the welfare of the average man. They are only concerned with singing hallalujahs to a septuagenarian leader who is trying to make a dramatic come back after his days of Sarvodaya, and having entered the fray screeches every time the wear and tear of that process scratches him.

The saddest part is that there is a huge poverty-stricken world outside these parties and this House, waiting in the wings to go forward and attain a minimum standard of a decent level of living. That is what we should be discussing here and not what happened to J P or the girl on the hood of a car or whether Samar Guha had suffered scratches what is this in comparison to what millions of people outside this House are suffering and waiting for

**SHRI PILOO MODY** Why are we not discussing it?

**SHRIMATI MAYA RAY** We are trying to but you bring in such motions and waste the time of the House

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** All the time is Government's time; why do you not discuss it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let her finish her speech.... (Interruptions).

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY: They have unleashed the forces of reaction in all its strength. They CPM is lurking behind the skirts of the Jana Sangh and BLD and other reactionary parties and are attempting a "come back"... (Interruption) through the back door....

As I said, we can forgive them for, Sir, "they know not what they do," but we cannot forget. We in Bengal have had our share of this revolution and a bloody one at that, Sir, literally, when the CPM took over and ruled Bengal for 22 months where was Mr Jayaprakash Narayan and Professor Guha when one after one of my Chattra Parishad boys were brutally murdered and liquidated? Sir, there is not a single burning ghat in the districts of Bengal that I have not visited during that period, where one or other of my boys was cremated, after being killed in the most barbaric manner

I do not recollect Mr Jayaprakash Narayan emerging from his Sarvodaya retreat to join in in condemning such acts at that time I do not remember hearing his cry of protest against such dastardly acts. Not a single voice of protest was raised by our venerable Professor Guha or the mover of this Resolution. No he only deploras recent events in Calcutta, not the old ones I will remind Prof Guha of the incident at Ethora in Bengal where a Communist Party Marxist girl called Taraidar stabbed and murdered a Chattra Parishad boy I know because I visited that place where a teacher also was speared to death through the bars of a window in a locked room, by the very very good boys of the Communist Party (Marxist) loyal card-holders (Interruptions) Does Prof Guha remember? Whereas some Bengali women know only how to pound the hood of a car, others are taught by

some parties to kill? You have joined hands with them, remember that I am serious about it, (Interruptions)

Shri Samar Guha (Contai):\*\*\*

MR CHAIRMAN Mr Samar Guha's observation will not be recorded

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior). Just now you have said that the remarks made by Professor Samar Guha will not go on record. May I know the reason? One may or may not agree with the remarks made by Professor Guha but they were not unparliamentary.

SHRI C M STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha) When a member speaks, if the member does not yield and still another member makes some remarks, those remarks will not go into the records

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: My hon friend, Shri Stephen, contends that since the hon lady Member had not yielded, therefore, the remarks made by the hon Member, Professor Guha, would not go on record. May I remind him that when one makes an interruption even while sitting those interruptions go on record?

MR CHAIRMAN They are indicated as interruptions

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Then, you would be pleased to recall that the hon Member was specifically referring to Professor Samar Guha all the time and was directing her attack against him. Do you want him to bear all the attack?

SHRI C M STEPHEN: He is the subject matter of the resolution. So, he must be amendable to criticism (Interruptions).

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Professor Samar Guha has been mentioned in the resolution as had been assaulted. Does that constitute a crime? Professor Guha has not yet made his submission in the course of the debate. Since he has sustained injury, is that considered to be a crime for her to make some remarks against him? Is that the point?

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** There are two things which I want to emphasize. The question is whether your direction that his remarks must not go on record is correct or not. The hon. lady Member was having the floor and she was continuing to speak. She was holding the floor and she was continuing her speech. Simultaneously, Professor Samar Guha was carrying on a parallel speech. An occasional interruption is one thing. But continuing a speech when another hon. Member is speaking is a different thing. Both cannot go on record together. Therefore, when the hon. lady member has not yielded but was addressing the House, any other speech made on the floor of the House must certainly remain off the record and, so, your ruling is absolutely correct.

Secondly, Shri Mishra says that the hon. Member made an attack on Professor Guha two or three times. The only point for discussion today is whether the alleged attack on J. P. and the allegedly inflicted injury on Professor Guha deserve to be deplored by the Parliament of India. When we discuss that question, whether the attack on this member is of such a special character as to deserve deploring by Parliament is absolutely relevant, and the person who has canvassed in a part of the resolution to draw the attention of the House must be prepared to receive the attack, right and left, and left and right, and he will be receiving that attack.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not concerned with the quality of the remarks that have been exchanged, or the quality of the

speech which was being made. But I am concerned about this too frequent interjection on behalf of the Chair to say "this would not go on record", or "that would not go on record". The whole purpose of a record is that it is recorded. It is not recorded at the discretion of anybody else.

Your direction is quite explicit that you may only ask those words to be expunged which are unparliamentary. For your information and for the information of these people here, there is actually a dictionary of unparliamentary expressions. I have seen that very often, not knowing enough of the language, many words are sought to be expunged which should never have been expunged. The whole procedure of expunction is to be used only in that case. Anything they can be heard by the Reporters..

**SHRI VASANT SATHE.** That nothing to do with expunction. This is something said without the permission of the Chair. That is why it is not going on record.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Expunction is not a disciplinary instrument.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** I am glad that Mr. Sathe intervened because it gives me a further opportunity to clarify the situation. The Chair is not a deciding authority as to what is said with his permission or not. The Chair merely regulates the procedure. It does not decide what should be said by whom and when. If a Member chooses to say something, if it is at all possible to record it, it should be recorded. Only history will be the judge whether that was a just or an unjust thing that was said. Therefore, I plead with you not to use this injunction of "Nothing will be recorded". It is only done by weak Speakers who cannot control the House and who resort to this cheap method of practice to control the House.

**DR. KAILAS (Bombay South):** Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra said that interruptions are recorded. But here

the case is different. There was a parallel speech made by Mr. Samar Guha when the hon. lady Member was speaking. Hence, when an hon. Member makes a parallel speech without the permission of the Chair, the Chair is right in saying that it will not go on record. Because he was speaking without the permission of the Chair and making a parallel speech, it should not go on record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee, raised a point of order. I thought I should examine the validity of his argument. So, I allowed the hon. Members to make their submissions. I am thankful to them for expressing their views on various aspects of it.

As the hon. Members have noted, when interruptions were being made, I was taking a lenient attitude. I know this is a matter on which there is a considerable interest evinced. These interruptions were allowed. Some hon. Members wanted to say something and they sought my permission tacitly or I gave the consent.

In this case, I requested Shrimati Maya Ray, to conclude her speech. But the Congress Members and the Chief Whip indicated that they were prepared to give more time to her. So, I was giving her some more time. She was holding the floor in her own right. If anybody wanted to intervene and make any observation, naturally, it should be with my consent, with the consent of the Chair or only when she yields. Here, what happened was, knowing as I do Shri Samar Guha's nature, I was tolerant and I allowed him. But again, he wanted to intervene. I said, no. I requested him not to do it repeatedly. Again, he persisted and, therefore, I had to take a firmer attitude, in tune with the spirit of the House and in conformity with the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of this House. I hope every hon. member will agree with me that, in this great and esteemed organ of our

State apparatus, in this august House, proceedings cannot be conducted unless we conform to the injunctions of this House. It is in this context that I said that, without the permission of the Chairman, nobody could interrupt. I hope Shri Vajpayee will agree with me. I did allow the first one or two interruptions, but when he persisted, I said that it would not form of the proceedings.

Shrimati Maya Ray.

SHRIMATI MARA RAY: What is happening today are merely trends. If you allow such an atmosphere to prevail and escalate, this country will be plunged into such conditions of anarchy and chaos that will sweep away Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan and Mr. Samar Guha in its wake, and all the progress and development which we need so desperately, will be retarded by decades.

The positive action of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Shri Samar Guha was to use vulgar and scurrilous language in attacking our Prime Minister.

The reaction of our youth in Bengal was to protest. The public of Bengal has given a fitting reply to his movement and will continue to do under such circumstances. Do not trifle with Bengal or Bengalis. You do not know them. It is our youth and our youth alone, along with the West Bengal masses, who will resist this conspiracy launched by the Right Reactionaries and their hangers on like the CMP and other international agencies. It is they who had driven out gondaism out of Bengal between 1967 and 1971 and they will still do so again today, for, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has joined hands with those very same forces and we will not allow those forces to return through the back-door, with J. P. or any other person.

There cannot be a one-sided fray. If you have your say, we shall have ours also. Bengal is not pusillanimous or afraid. We have been thr-

ough our trials of fire and are prepared to go through the same again to preserve what we have attained. Nothing can stop us, not Mr Jayaprakash Narayan or any one else. We do have our loyalties and we shall stick to them. Our loyalties are to our national leaders and to the Leader of this House, in particular. We are not apologetic for having our loyalties or for being members of a democratic society. We do not prescribe to the fascist strong-arm methods of the members opposite.

With these words, I conclude, and I thank you for your indulgence, Sir, as well as the indulgence of my fellow members on this side.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA** (Alipore) Mr Chairman, as far as the incident in Calcutta is concerned, which forms the subject-matter of Mr Mishra's motion, I am afraid no amount of debate in this House will bring about agreement on what actually happened there. We can argue till we are blue in the face and even the statements which may be made by those few people here who happened to be present on the scene will be different. Most of us were not present, neither Mr Dinan Bhattacharyya was present, now was I present, nor was Mrs Maya Roy present. Mr Priya Ranjan Das Muni was present and so was Mr Samar Guha, but they will give diametrically opposite versions of what happened. We can only rely on newspaper reports and photographs. It was precisely for this reason that I wanted to widen the scope of the debate. Otherwise, it is quite futile. I am grateful to the Deputy-Speaker that, though he ruled out my amendment, he did make the observation that it would have been a more meaningful debate if my amendment could have been accepted, but it could not be, unfortunately, according to the rules.

Now, what are the few facts which are not disputed by either side about the Calcutta incident? One is the fact that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was prevented from addressing a

meeting at the University Institute Hall. This is accepted. Secondly, it is also accepted that shortly before he went to the Institute hall he had addressed a meeting only a hundred yards away, at another hall called the Students Hall. All of us are familiar with those places. It is hardly a hundred yards away. It is a small hall. About 200 people can perhaps sit. That is accepted. (Interruptions) The third thing which is accepted, because the photograph proves it is that a girl or a woman—I do not know, her age cannot be decided from the photograph she belongs to the feminine sex, she has a long pig-tail, the pig-tail is very much visible—was, according to the photograph, sitting on the top of the hood or roof of Mr Jayaprakash Narayan's car. It is also agreed that Jayaprakash Narayan did not suffer any injury. What was in somebody's mind, we do not know. He did not suffer any injury. My hon friend, Mr Samar Guha first claimed that he suffered some injuries and that he is having internal haemorrhage and what not. I am sorry for that if it had happened, but my contention is that on the basis of these 3 or 4 facts which are undisputed and which are not a matter for controversy, can one come to the conclusion that there was a deliberate attempt to murder Shri Jayaprakash Narayan? There should be some limit to these things. I do not approve of this business of physically preventing people from holding meetings, whoever it is, though it may sound a goody-goody thing because nobody observes it in this country; but to say that because he was prevented from attending the meeting at the Institute—though he had held another meeting perfectly all right earlier, half an hour earlier, hundred yards away—and to say that because a girl had gone to the roof of his car, therefore, there was a diabolical plot to murder him—that is more than I am prepared to swallow. (Interruptions) That is not in the motion. It is difficult to put it in the motion; but that is what is

being tried to be proved here on the floor of the House. Therefore, as far as this Calcutta incident goes, I want to say that facing hostile demonstrators, I am afraid, is part of the occupational hazards of politics. All of us have faced it some time or the other.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA**  
Now you dont, we are glad you are safe now.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA** I will tell you what I mean. If one has to run the risk of a hostile demonstration now and then one does not complain and generally one does not cry if one gets one or two bruises. You have to get used to that. I do not know whether Mr. Pilo Mody has got that experience. I read in the newspapers that Mr. S. dhartha Shankar Ray has expressed his regret, because, as he has said, some of the boys got over-excited. This is what he has stated in his statement. That means that he has expressed his regret for the fact as I understood it, that some boys had got excited and surrounded his car and all these things took place. There were no weapons. (Interruptions)

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA**  
Iron bars, of course.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA** There were no lethal weapons alleged by anybody. You can now talk about iron bars and machine guns and every thing. They are not established anywhere.

**SHRI SHYAMANDAN MISHRA**  
Jayaprakash Narayan has seen the iron bars in the hands of many of the hooligans. (Interruptions)

**MR CHAIRMAN** Let us hear him.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA** My point is, whether one approves or disapproves of all these things I do not approve of them but how was it, that if, as it is alleged, the crowd

had gone there to attack and kill Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, the meeting in the students' hall a hundred yards away was held perfectly peacefully and orderly? (Interruptions) Secondly, if the people of Calcutta in large numbers had really wanted to hear Jayaprakash Narayan, could anybody have stopped it? (Interruptions) They should know that Bihar is not West Bengal. They should know that (Interruptions) Mr. Dinen Bhattacharyya please don't provoke me into saying something, because Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan is, now, convinced he said that by his experience that day, he is convinced that the CMP's allegations about terror during elections earlier are now confirmed. (Interruptions) Today they are completely confirmed. When I contested this Lok Sabha election in 1971—let them know; can they deny it? I was fighting against their candidate—in the constituency, in four of the Assembly constituencies within my area, viz. Behala West, Behala East, Jadavpur and Maheshtala I and my workers were not able physically to go anywhere even to hold any meeting. (Interruptions) I say that it does not lie in the mouth of these people. (Interruptions) I #

**MR CHAIRMAN** Kindly sit down.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA** The Secretary of the branch unit of my party in an area called Bansdrona. (Interruptions)

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : फिर भी जीन गये ।

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त जीन गये, शही शर्म नूम का हनी चाहिये । यह बान रहा नहीं मग्न गे, कलत्ता मग्न त, नुम्हे ममज्ञायेगे ।

श्री पीलू मोदी : शर्म कहते थे कल-कलत्ता देखा नहीं है, रंग कास्टेयूएन्सिज मे जा नहीं गये शर्म कहते हैं कि कलत्ता



याचो, तब विवाह वः क्या विवाहोने,  
क्या इतिहास याचो का हाथ पकड़ कर  
दिखावोने ?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Indrajit Gupta, please continue. We have had enough interruptions, I suppose. Please, no more interruptions.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** There must be some limit to buffoonery also.

**MR CHAIRMAN:** Let us be serious about it.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** During the election, the secretary of the unit of my party in a place called Baledoni, which is in the Jadavpur constituency, Comrade Netaji Mukherjee, was murdered during the election campaign. The case is still going on. He was not murdered by Congressmen. We know who he was murdered by. We do not want to say it here. And only 3 days ago, every newspaper here also carried a report of the conviction of the 3 people of the CPM who had murdered one of our eldest and most respected leaders, Suren Dhar Chaudhary. They have been convicted—it is in the newspapers—after a prolonged trial.

**SHRIMATI MAYA RAY:** Ask Dinen Babu what he has to say now

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:** How many of our people you have killed?

(Interruptions)

**MR CHAIRMAN:** Please let us get out of this insensible murder business.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** All I want to say is that it is not somebody who is threatening Jayaprakash Narayan as to what will happen if he comes to Calcutta. I think it is very indiscreet, I should say and very unwise of JP himself to have

issued a threat before he left Calcutta, saying, I will come back..

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Yes.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** ..and I will show you.'

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** I will come back—is it a threat?

(Interruptions)

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** My hon. friend from the CPM was not there to welcome him that day. Not a single CPM leader was there to welcome him or to protect him that day. Where were you? You are championing him now. Why were you not in the College Square on that day?

(Interruptions)

At least Mr Samar Guha had the courage of his convictions to be on the spot, but these gentlemen were not to be found anywhere. Now, they are talking here.

(Interruptions)

**MR CHAIRMAN:** I can understand the feelings of the Members of this side, but you should not go on to the extent of interrupting a speech.

(Interruptions)

Order, order. Please sit down. I on my legs. Please co-operate.

**SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER** (Ausgram).

**SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI** (Patna):\*

**MR CHAIRMAN:** Nothing will go on record.

I would appeal to the hon. Members to keep up at least the elementary norms of a normal debate. I can understand the strong feelings one might feel when party confrontations take place but you will have to bear it and when members of the other party are speaking, they can point out—Please do not interrupt. (Interruptions)...

Now please conclude.

\*Not recorded.

28 hrs.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** The purpose of my amendment which was unfortunately rejected or ruled out was to show that there was an original sin which was responsible for all this chain of things that were taking place. It is absolutely a native and a non-political way to consider this problem without reading it in that context. Is it something suddenly happening out of the blue in the vacuum? I do not say that if you slap me, Mr. Mishra, that I would be justified....

(Interruptions)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I know he is interrupting, but you address the Chair. Mr. Mishra will also cooperate

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** The original sin is October revolution

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** When Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan first launched his movement in Bihar on the 18th of March, 1974, his chatra sangharsha samiti indulged in rampant kinds of arson, etc.

It was *Everyman's Weekly*, which is whose Paper you know very well, that *Everyman's* paper had to write at that time—

"loot and arson do not make a revolution" and that "if they want to make a revolution, they must do it with the people rather than against the people" because "what they did in Patna, however, has turned the entire people of this city hostile to them except for the goondas and those who are blindly partisan"

This was given by *Everyman's* paper on 30th March, 1975

(Interruptions)

The appeal issued for the 18th March demonstration openly called upon the students to march to Patna in order to have "a hell of blood and revolution with the establishment." *Everyman's* paper on the 6th of April wrote—

"Gujarat students' demands for cleansing the system breathes righteous anger. That of Bihar abandon and licentiousness".

You can check it up. These are *Everyman's* paper's words and not my words.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** What was Indira doing at that time?

(Interruptions)

**PROP MADHU DANDAVATE:** I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. member that what he has quoted is correct. But everything happened before Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan's tour and after he took up leadership, all this..(Interruptions)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** He is capable of defending himself. He is himself a leader. That would be a better way of defence.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** On the 6th of October last, after his famous three day Bihar Bandh there was a public rally. He said this and I will ask everybody to consider this,—whether this is incitement to violence or not. He said—

"Sometimes I also think that when these men are so shameless ..."

He is referring to the MLAs and Ministers—

".. what is left for the people to do but to go to their houses and bring them out and tell them that they have to go..."

That means, go to their houses, get them out forcibly, force them to resign. JP had given a call for the students to boycott their examinations. May I tell you something in this connection? In Nalanda district, a student by name Brinda Prasad did not choose to follow this call of his and he went to the examination hall. He was killed on the way. So, we have to know these things. I ask: In which country—especially one which is charged by you with having fascist or

semi-fascist regime—are politicians permitted to go up and down the country, addressing public meetings, in which they appeal to the army and the police to revolt against the Government? There is an interesting book written by Mr. S. S. Khera. I can quote that if you like. As early as in 1967, Mr. Khera wrote this. This is what he said:

'Even a person like Jayaprakash Narayan was reported quite recently (Indian Express, 3 May, 1967) as 'toying with the idea of a military dictatorship in India' and suggesting that in the 'political instability' created by the results of the general elections of February, 1967, the nation should 'summon the service of the army to fill the vacuum and set right the instability'.

In the 1967 general election, in a number of States, the Congress was defeated for the first time. But at that time JP said, there is a political vacuum...

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contd):** I rise on a point of order. My point of order is this. When a political statement attributed to a leader like Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is made saying that he said, Military should take over, and all that, should we not know from which source the quotation is made, when he made that statement, and the place where he made that statement and in which book or publication this was mentioned, and in the absence of that, would you allow such a serious observation to go on record? He mentioned the name of one gentleman Mr. Khera. It may be his own personal observation. There is no indication that JP made such a statement. I request you to kindly understand the mood of the House. I request you to seriousness of the observations and the accusations made by a Member.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** I am willing to supply all the quotations

to Shri Samar Guha. There is no difficulty.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** There is a serious point of order. (Interruptions).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Please sit down. I think you do not have any doubt about the seriousness of your arguments. The point here is this.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Before you give your ruling, I want my points also to be covered, namely, whether, in this House, anything can be quoted or not.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** Anything can be quoted and nothing can be deleted. (Interruptions)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, order. Now, Shri Gupta was only quoting from a certain authority who has written a certain public book on current topics. So, in our debate, it is now open to other hon. Members to put forth their view points. Prof. Guha himself is to speak. He wrote to me just now that he is an eyewitness to the alleged incident and that he is also a victim according to him. And so, he can also quote to substantiate his view points. The precedence in this House is to allow the hon. Members to quote from any recognised authority. So, I disallow his point of order and I would request Shri Gupta to resume his speech.

**SHRI PILOO MODY:** I am glad that you gave a correct ruling.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** I have already quoted from this book. He can verify it from that. The quotations are from the *Indian Express* of the 8th May, 1967. There is nothing mysterious about it. It is also incidentally mentioned there that the C.P.M. leaders, Shri A. K. Gopalan and Shri Basava Punniiah mentioned that Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan's remarks amounted to:

"Patronising flattery of our armed forces and utter contempt of the people and their democratic and patriotic aspirations."

Now I would like to conclude that the seeds of violence were sown through these activities and statements which have been going on since the JP's movement was launched I again repeat that I do not consider that because of these, any counteraction of this type is justified. But, on the other hand, we are living in a realistic world, we are not fooling ourselves. JP's movement avowedly has the support of such organisation pledged, to peaceful means as the Naxalites, as the Ananda Margis and as the R S S. These are all veterans of peace and non-violence. They are avowedly in the movement. Secondly, I shall just remind you that on the 11th of November when the C P I. held a demonstration in Patna, every newspaper—all the newspapers, which my friends are quoting—had the banner headlines describing how the trains were stopped on the way by the JP's supporters and how they were forcibly dragged out of their compartments. They were all poor people, landless and agricultural labourers. Women were beaten up and they were stripped. One Mr. Loke Nath Azad—I am not discriminating in the status of the people; they are all Members of the Legislature—a Member of the Legislature was so severely beaten that he was hospitalised. He was a Harijan M L.A. All these things went on. This is not denied by anybody. It was published through the country in the press. Not only there was not a word of condemnation, but, I have a very sore grievance that when we tried repeatedly in this House to raise this matter, it was not permitted. It was permitted. But, one incident in the university institute hall there is magnified into such a huge thing because he is a big leader. These were only poor agricultural labourers. What does it matter, if they were beaten up? Nobody bothers.

Finally, Sir, I would say this. I do not know if there is any means by which all these things can be brought to a stop. But, those who saw the wind have to reap the whirlwind. It will be better if we come to some sort of an understanding. It is no good seeing things in isolation and saying that we condemn this or we support this. Something is happening. Finally, Sir, I would bring to the notice of the Home Minister that in a lengthy statement made by the West Bengal Chief Minister, which is published in the papers today, he has made one allegation, the truth or otherwise of which I do not know. But, I think it is the job of the Home Minister to take notice of it and hold an enquiry, investigation. The Chief Minister has said that the flat in Calcutta in which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was put up and which he was using during his stay there in Moira Street, where he had had on fabrications with his other political friends and allies is the office of an organisation called 'Awakening of Life' which is a branch according to the Chief Minister, of an organisation known as the Neo San'yas International, which, he says, functions in the USA also and is reported to have links with the CIA. I do not know whether it is correct or not. But, it is the job and it is the responsibility of the Home Minister to find out the truth, to pursue this matter and see whether there is any concrete evidence available. Much has been said about how many and resources are used and so on. It is an unfortunate fact in our country. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is no exception. He went to Calcutta in a chartered plane, specially chartered, which cost some Rs. 14,000 or something was paid as chartered fee. Is this the way the leaders of the common and poor people are supposed to go about? They also do it and your leaders also do it. It is no use saying that this is right and that is wrong. If we are serious about it, if we want to stop this business of forcibly stopping people from holding meetings and demonstrations and so on, then, let us get together and

see whether it can be done. If it cannot be done, whatever consequences are there will follow, which will not be good for the country, I am afraid.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola):** Sir, there are two main points that arise for consideration from this motion. One is, in relation to Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and the other person involved is Shri Samar Guha, Sir, I will first take up the point relating to Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. Let us dispassionately consider the facts of the case, that are known. I just saw some photographs. From these photographs and from all the descriptions that have been given up till now, what is seen is that and what is reported, even in the speeches, to have happened is that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was to have addressed meetings in two places in the university area. One was in the students' hall and the other was in the Calcutta University institute. In regard to the meeting which he addressed in the students hall, it is nobody's case that there was any disturbance.

**DR. SARADISH ROY (Bolpur):** Inside the hall, stones were thrown.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Nobody has said that. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and even Shri Samar Guha has not said that. What actually we know is that the meeting took place and about 100-200 yards away, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan came in the car.

The allegation in the case made out by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, and the gravity with which he put it, is that there was a danger to the life of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan; actually there was a pre-planned attack, a plan to murder Jayaprakash Narayan. That is the way he put it. Now kindly see the circumstances of what happened. In these photographs you see the car surrounded by hundreds of students who were demonstrating. It is alleged that the police were just bystanders and did not intervene; in fact, they were sympathetic to, and a party

more or less to this demonstration. It is said that the window-pane of the car was broken. I would like to ask this. Here was a car in which Jayaprakash Narayanji, a weak, old, frail man, as he is described, was sitting. There were no security guards, no persons to protect him.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:** There was security.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** At least, it was not effective, according to you. According to you, Shri Samar Guha was the only person present to protect him, and but for him he does not know what would have happened to Jayaprakash Narayan. That was the state of affairs. Is it difficult in such a situation for these students and young men to pull out this old, frail man from the car? The easiest thing would have been to pull him out. I would like you to consider this when you make this allegation unless you blow hot and cold in the same breath unless you say that that could not be done because there was protection. Then you will have to give credit to the police that they protected him; or if the police did not protect, you will have to give credit to the boys themselves that they did not have any such intention. You cannot have it both ways. This is the simple logic of the situation.

Then Jayaprakashji waited in the car. The boys were demonstrating. One girl is shown to have climbed the car in the photo. Shri Samar Guha is standing nearby in the car with specs on. It is alleged that he was man-handled. Then the first thing that would have happened was that the specs would have fallen. It is alleged that this girl climbed the top of the car and slapped Shri Samar Guha.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** That girl did not slap me.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** She did not. When Shyambabu was speaking, I thought he said that.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
I did not say that.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I had noted  
you say that.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
That the girl slapped him? No. They  
climbed the roof of the car.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** The whole  
question is if these girls had any  
such intention. I have not heard  
Shyambabu speak in this House with-  
out heart as he did today. Normally  
he speaks out of conviction, but today  
it appeared as if he was enjoying and  
speaking in a manner as if he was  
feeling jealous of Shri Samar Guha  
when he referred to those girls.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
That is how they have been enjoying  
the whole thing.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I am sorry  
for Shyambabu

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
I am sorry for your degradation, being  
reduced to mere sycophants. My  
speech is not to be judged by third-  
rate persons.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Even this  
remark cannot be considered first rate.  
See the logic of your resolution. A res-  
ponsible person like Shyamnandan  
Mishra comes in this House and wants  
this country to believe that there was  
a murderous attack on JP! He must  
have some sense of responsibility.  
These are the circumstances that we  
had been told—a person sitting in the  
car, surrounded by hundreds of young  
men with the intention to manhandle  
him or hurt him? Is this what hap-  
pened there? Thereafter he refused to  
come out of the car. His car is allow-  
ed to go peacefully. Is this the exam-  
ple of the youth wanting to hurt JP?  
And this is what they are saying. This  
is what you want the country to be-  
lieve. The meeting in that hall was  
held in spite of JP having gone away  
and was continuing till 8 p.m. These  
are facts. Does this show that there  
was any intention on the part of the

youth and students to have any vio-  
lence there? There was no clash.  
There were two groups. One was a  
Morcha. Some people were on the  
side of JP; they supported him. Nor-  
mally when there are two groups, one  
would expect a clash.

Shri Dinan Bhattacharyya said that  
brickbats were thrown and he started  
quoting from the Statesman. There  
was not a word about brickbats. Why  
do you want to tell lies?

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**  
You go and enquire; so many brickbats  
were thrown.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** You wanted  
to corroborate your statement from  
quotations from Statesman and there  
was not a word about brickbats. ...  
(Interruptions).

**MR CHAIRMAN:** Let him have his  
interpretation.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** They are  
trying to make a mountain out of a  
molehill.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
He is saying that he is telling lies.  
Would you allow that to go on record?

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I say that  
he was not telling the truth, he was  
misleading. Therefore, let us calmly  
consider the circumstances.

I uphold the right of not only JP  
but also of any other person in this  
country, any citizen to express any-  
where his views freely. There was a  
ridiculous resolution brought in some  
days back by Shri Shyamnandan  
Mishra that fascism was growing what  
greater proof do you need to refute  
that, than the fact that persons like  
JP are allowed to go on making spee-  
ches inciting the army and the police  
to rebel? Can there be any greater  
proof of freedom of expression and  
democracy? JP would be welcome any  
day in Calcutta to speak but he must  
also give the same privilege to others.  
In those days when ugly things were

happening in Gujarat. When Vice-chancellors and MLAs were being gheraoed, MLAs were shaved and paraded in the streets, when buses and public property were burnt, he did not utter one word of condemnation against the students of the Nava Nirman Samiti or whatever it is

In Bihar even today MLAs have been gheraoed. Shyambabu has just now said that the Prime Minister dare not go to Bihar. (*Interruptions*). MLAs and the Ministers cannot speak there. Why cannot they go and speak there?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
Because they have no faith

**SHRI VASANT SATHE.** And two things are possible. Firstly if somebody goes there and speaks, nobody will come to listen him. That can be understood. Secondly no one can go and speak there because there is a fear that people will be violent with the leader.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
Nothing

**SHRI VASANT SATHE.** Now, what is happening in Bihar? What is this 'gherao' that is taking place? What is the physical force that was used in Bihar? Therefore, you cannot have double standards. I would submit that as far as Jayaprakashji is concerned, these are the facts.

Now, I come to our hon. Member, Shri Samar Guha. Even today Shri Samar Guha— it is now six days past— is under shock. He has himself said so. Now, Sir that shock obviously is due to the fact that he is an emotional person. We know that and we have seen him here. This shock must be due to his being emotional, because the photograph does not show that he was being manhandled. He says that his shirt was torn, he says that his nose was bleeding, his spectacles fell down and he had internal haemorrhage. When nose starts bleeding, it is a serious thing. If more blood comes out, it is likely to damage the brain. It could lead to paralysis. Thank

God, we have Shri Samar Guha here hale and hearty. Therefore, Sir, no girls were violent but the allegation was that the girls attacked him.

**SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI:**  
Not at this age

**SHRI VASANT SATHE.** So, Sir, as far as Shri Samar Guha is concerned nothing has happened apart from the internal mental injury that was caused. It is a serious thing, I agree, and it should not have happened in the International Women's Year. Even apart from that, nobody has the right to hurt Shri Samar Guha. But why don't you compare this incident with the one that took place in Pavnar Ashram? In the Pavnar Ashram Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was holding his meeting with the Sarvodaya workers. At that time the poor fellow Shri Shankar Dev, was trying to say that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was not telling the truth when he was making the allegation against Shrimati Indira Gandhi and he was circulating the pamphlets. For this act, what did the Sarvodaya workers do? They lifted him bodily and threw him out. Therefore, Sir, if we put ourselves strictly within the purview of today's motion—this motion which has been moved by Shyamnandan Babu—has absolutely no logic, no truth even. Therefore, it cannot be taken seriously, and this resolution deserves to be rejected by this House. This resolution itself should be condemned, and you should be condemned for bringing such a resolution.

I could have understood if you were really sorry about the whole cult of violence occurring in the country. We are willing to join you. Let us seriously consider this tendency. It is no use blaming each other. Let us see even now how to put a halt to it so that the democratic system, the parliamentary system survives and the right of each individual and party for freedom of expression, freedom of speech and freedom of association are preserved, protected and maintained. Let us apply our minds to this. If

you were to bring such a resolution, there can be no two opinions in this House and we would gladly join you, but if you bring a tendentious, false exaggerated and perverted story about a particular incident, nobody can support you.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai):** Seeing the mood of my Congress friends, I actually feel ashamed that this resolution should have been moved at all by our friends from the Opposition. At least I thought that this resolution would be discussed and adopted unanimously by expressing the same sense of concern and anxiety and with the same spirit of dignity and patriotism that was shown in this House when a report came about a person who was arrested with a pistol when the Prime Minister appeared before the Allahabad Court. This House unanimously condemned that incident. At least I thought that some of the Members would not behave like Lilliputians trying to measuring how tall Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is

18 42 hrs.

[SHRI VASANT SATHE in the Chair]

My name is included in the resolution incidentally I am just a grain in the dust of my motherland. Because I happen to be a Member of this House it has been the privilege given to me to include my name in this resolution. I would have been happy if my name was not there.

I do not want to utter a single word about what happened to me because there are other friends who received grievous injuries. Shri Swaraj Bandhu Bhattacharyya had two teeth broken. Prof Dilip Chakravarty, the undisputed leader of the College and University Teachers' Organisation received blows after blows. Another young Ph.D. scholar, son of Shri D. L. Sengupta, Member of the Rajya Sabha, had four stitches on the head and several stitches on the face. A number of other friends are not privileged like me to be mentioned in this House in this resolution.

Another reason is that something was mentioned about assault on me which evoked derisive laughter from the friends on the other side. I do not know whether the feelings of a Member whether this side or that side in a humanitarian sense, in sense of camaraderie in a parliamentary institution have come to such a level that if a friend is injured, it only evokes laughter from the other because our sense of compassion and human dignity have come to that level. I would only add thousand times shame to myself and my sense of dignity if I utter a single word today in this debate as to what happened to me. Sir, I was simply astounded when Mrs. Maya Ray boldly said that they would not apologise, rather they would support what had been done. It has been very rightly said. Exactly it is the echo of what all the Congressmen in the West Bengal Legislature as also of the President of the West Bengal Congress Shri Maitra said in support of anti-J. P. demonstration.

"Aya Pratibad suspasta Ebong Balishta"

This protest is clear and courageous. They have done just what their leaders said. Sidhartha Babu did not utter a single word of regret then and there. He mentioned it casually in a meeting at Durgapur after six days. Neither the Congress President nor the Prime Minister did have a word of regret to what happened not for me -- I am just a grain of dust—but again I say for what happened to the tallest among the Indians today, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** I question that.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** He may put this question to the people of India and not to me.

Sir, Mrs. Maya Ray said that this Motion was nothing but waste of time of the House and she was thunderously cheered by the Congress Members. That shows the psychosis of powerism, political arro-



gance and sense of human degradation that have been brought upon them. They say that it is a futile debate and this debate should not have been allowed. It has added injury to the wound of not Jayaprakash Narayan but to the conscience of the Indian people and the feeling of the Indian people. These people sitting in this House may have designs for certain pleasure to give expression to their views but how will it reflect on the millions of their countrymen? I do not know whether they have thought over that. Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit is not here; Shri Brahmananda Reddy is there at least. I thought the older men in the Congress who had the privilege to work with Jayaprakashji and who know him at least should have some concern and restraint over the speeches and the expression of derisiveness and the slanderous remarks which they were making about Jayaprakashji. I repeat that I am sorry and ashamed that this resolution has been mooted before this House. Its purpose was completely different. I thought it could have been finished within an hour, as it was done in the case of the resolution adopted in regard to the Prime Minister.

There is no necessity for me to describe what actually happened. All the papers in West Bengal have given detailed coverage about the ugly incident. This is *Amrita Bazar Patrika* owned by Mr. Tarun Kanti Ghosh, the Minister of Industries, who is very powerful, next only to Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray. This paper says:

"Demonstrators force JP to abandon meeting—Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan was prevented from addressing a meeting of students and youths in Calcutta on Wednesday, by anti-JP demonstrators from the Youth Congress and Chhatra Parishad... In the melee stones and chappals were thrown and Mr. Narayan's car was damaged and its windscreen broken. Some demonstrators climbed atop the car and

danced shouting slogans like "neofascist JP, go back".... At one stage, a Youth Congress leader, who is also a Minister of the West Bengal Government, was seen moving with the demonstrators and addressing them through a police microphone standing on the rails of the Institute's gate. The policemen posted there were seen not interfering."

Here is another paper *Basumati*, now completely financed by the Government and controlled by the Congress Party, by one wing of the Chhatra Parishad. It gives the picture of the Minister addressing, exciting the mob. This is what it says in Bengali—I will translate it:

"Before the Institute, the demonstrators damaged and tried to crush the car of JP. For 15 minutes, they performed a devilish dance on JP's car. Some of them got over the car of JP and were dancing there. One girl was also there. From 6 to 7 p.m. there were demonstrations, as a result of which 38 were injured. The attack on 6 of them was very serious. Samar Guha was one of the wounded. From his face and nose blood was oozing out."

This is another paper *Ananda Bazar Patrika* which has written several vitriolic editorials criticising the JP movement. I will translate into English what it says in Bengali in its headline:

"Demonstrations after demonstrations like *Daksha Yajna* spoiled the meeting of JP".

Here I have got *The Statesman*. It says: "Violent demonstrations against JP; Several injured; Institute Meeting abandoned". This is *Jugantor*. Again the same story is given here. Sir, I will place all these papers\* on the Table of the House. These are few photographs\*. Here the Minister is exciting; this is the car and a girl is dancing over it.

\*The speaker not having subsequently accorded the necessary permission the documents were not treated as laid on the Table.

Now I will give you the whole background, what actually happened. On the earlier day, when JP arrived at Dum Dum airport, there was a very good police arrangement. There were demonstrations with black flags and other pro-J.P. demonstrations also. The police made such a nice arrangement that nothing untoward happened. Then next morning when JP was addressing batches after batches of representatives of political parties and Nava Nirwan Samiti elaborate arrangement was made by police. Black flag demonstrators were there, but nothing untoward happened. After that when J.P. came and entered into Students' hall in the evening and addressed the University professors and teachers, there was not much trouble although some trouble started. He entered Student Hall peacefully. But when he was almost concluding his speech, stones, brickbats etc., started being thrown into the Hall. On one side of the road was my young friend, Priya—I did not see him there, his name was heard there—I saw Subroto Mukerjee on the other side. I am sorry to mention about them. I have a lot of affection for them for two reasons. One, after all they are brilliant youngmen; they may belong to any party. I have grown in age and if I find a youngman in any party coming up, I feel proud. There is another reason. Every year on 21st October and 23rd January, Subroto Mukerjee very sincerely and with a sense of dignity decorates the statue of Netaji. I have congratulated him several times. This year Priya has brought out a brilliant brochure on Netaji's birthday. I have my softness for them, but I have to mention about them as a matter of fact because they were to lead the anti-J.P. demonstration there. Perhaps they will think over the whole situation now as to what happened and what they did.

Then what happened. There is one police officer, Sri Kalyan Dutt, Deputy Police Commissioner, who

was in charge of the whole thing. When J. P. was to come out, already there was some kind of disorder. On one side of Bankim Chatterjee Road, where Subroto Mukerjee was there, there was a cordon of the police. On the other side, there was also a cordon of the police. Suddenly, some 200 or 300 people, not more than that, with lathis—not exactly lathis, but with flags fitted in *dandas* were running from North to South. I asked Dutt what this was and why police were allowing them to run inside threatening. He said, "Do not worry, Samar Babu, everything will be all right, JP will go there." When J. P. came out, immediately, a few hundred boys, from the north side of the cordon came. About two hundred to three hundred people suddenly came and gheraoed JP's car. We had allowed the pro-J.P. students and youth with identity cards to enter the Institute Hall. They were all inside. We did not allow anybody without identity card to enter the meeting Hall. We were not prepared for this kind of a rowdyism. There was another reason. On 30th, the Socialist Party had its annual conference at Panihati, a small town near Calcutta. When I went to address that meeting, I was astonished to see that before me and after me there were several police vans and in the meeting ground 300 armed police were posted. The Additional Superintendent of Police of Barrackpore was also there. About 15 to 20 police vans were there. I asked, what the matter was, and why this arrangement was there. They said that there were some reports of likely disturbances.

Naturally, we thought that in the case of JP also such precautionary measure will be taken. When JP came, when the trouble started, when the melee started, when some trouble and rowdyism was going on, I tried to pacify them. I asked Subroto Mukerjee "what are you doing? This is the end of democracy. Don't do this". The role of the police I will

narrate afterwards. Then they started throwing stones and brick-bats. JP was there inside the car with another security guard by his side. There was stone-throwing, and chappals were also being thrown. With the flag dandas they were beating JP's car and the window glass was broken. One stick was enough to kill J.P. I was standing by the window of J.P.'s car to protect him when blows after blows were coming on me.

I will not mention many things—what happened about me; I will mention only one thing. They were trying to snatch Netaji's badge from me. What vulgar words were they using about Netaji. I do not believe they were Congressmen. I have myself published the 15th edition of the book on Chemistry and at least 20 lakhs of students have read my book. I do not believe any young man in Bengal can speak derogatively about the emblem of Netaji. They tried to snatch it away from me. They were raining blows after blows on me. I kept quiet. I do not believe in Gandhian ethics. When I was a boy. I was trained differently; my cult was different. But that would have been self-defeating if we tried to retaliate. They were trying to snatch Netaji's badge. I think they were hirelings, not real congressmen. I do not think they belong to the Congress. I refuse to believe they were Congressmen. When they tried to snatch Netaji's emblem, I tried to push them away. I said that only at the cost of my life they can snatch away the badge of Netaji. Then Shri Kalyan Datta came and I said "what has happened to the police? Why don't you ask the police to give protection?" He replied "yes, you are injured, but I don't know who hit you." But nothing was done. I will come to that story afterwards.

About 2,000 pro-J.P. youngmen were inside the meeting Hall. If

they were asked to come out of the University Institute Hall, there would have been blood-shed. I said "don't open the door; don't allow them to come out". Then JP was allowed almost to get down. Immediately I went to the right side of the car to escort him to the meeting hall. I saw hundreds of demonstrators and hirelings who tried to obstruct J.P. getting down. I hesitate to use the word "gangsters" or "hooligans". They are our boys and we have made them what they are. If there is gangsterism or goondaism among them we are responsible for it. Just as a beggar-waster uses the lepers for his own professional purposes, similarly, we the politicians are using these unemployed young men, utilising them for gangsterism, for hooliganism, for our political purposes. Therefore, I do not call them hooligans or goondas. Somehow they are like misled young men.

When I went there and saw the sight I was terrified because in front were hundreds of anti-J.P. demonstrators. Before J.P. could get down, his car was forcibly whisked away by police and the anti-J.P. demonstrators to northern direction, where thousands of demonstrators were raising anti J.P. Slogans. I immediately rushed and telephoned to the Police Commissioner, Shri Sunil Chaudhari, and asked him immediately "Where is JP?" I told him "If he is not safe, what would happen you cannot understand". Then, immediately, within half a minute, he telephoned me that J.P. is being escorted to 6. Short Street with two police cars in front and two police cars in the rear. Then I telephoned to J.P. at 6. Short Street when Shivnath Babu J.P.'s brother-in-law said "JP is sitting like a statue; nobody dare approach him now." After ten minutes JP telephoned me and asked me to see him immediately. Because, pro-J.P. students who were there wanted to take some other action. But JP said: "No, you cannot do like this.

you have to reply in a different way by mobilising public opinion such hooliganism." Then immediately I had a lightning trunk call connection with Shri Brahmananda Reddy. I had long talk with him. It costs me a few hundred rupees. He promised, "I will find out the whole matter and let you know afterwards."

19 hrs.

Till 10.30 at night, we held our meeting at the gate of the Institute Hall, but we did not allow J.P. to come, though he was eager to come again to address the students. After 10.30 p.m. when I found that all the boys went away safely, then I along with Shri P C Sen visited the hospital and saw some wounded persons and the son of Shri D L Sen Gupta, M P. Then at 11.30 p.m. I had sent this telegram to the Prime Minister. It reads as follows:

"Protesting against naked fascist attack on Jayaprakash Narayan, myself and others by Congress hooligans in presence of a Minister inciting the mob. Police helped hooligans instead of preventing them. Myself injured while trying to save J.P. Unless police acted on advice from Delhi and West Bengal Governments the officer-in-charge must be suspended immediately. Shri Brahmananda Reddy informed by me telephonically urging him to communicate to you the incident of attempt to kill J.P. and butchery of democratic right of dissent."

Sir, the role of the police was baffling. We could manage ourselves and deal with the situation. It was not so difficult to face those few hundred young men demonstrating against J.P. Shri Sunil Choudhary, Deputy Commissioner was there. I would not blame the police. They were very eager; they were very much concerned to save J.P. and others. But not a single police man raised his baton. Every Press has

said that the police remained completely inactive. Therefore, nothing was done to stop hooliganism against J.P. All Press reported this fact. The whole situation could have been controlled very easily by the police. I told Shri Kalyan Dutt, "what you are doing, gentleman." He did not say anything. Therefore, this creates a suspicion in my mind that he deceived us. He said earlier, "Do not worry; everything will be all right." This had led to a doubt and a suspicion in my mind that it was done in collusion with the Government. Their whole intention was not to allow Shri Jayaprakash Narayan to enter into the University Institute Hall and address the meeting. Otherwise, why should the police remain absolutely passive, inactive, doing nothing, although ordinary police men were too eager to take action. It was the officer who was wholly responsible. How can an officer do it without having any instructions from the Government? This is the whole thing which has happened and intrigued us.

Now, I want to ask a few basic questions involved in it.

SHRI C M STEPHEN: Now that you have completed, I wish to seek a clarification. The Chief Minister made a statement before the Legislative Assembly saying that during the incident, Mr Samar Guha mounted on the bonnet of the car and made a speech which was highly inflammatory and instigating and that provoked the incident. I want to know whether you mounted on the car and made a speech

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This is a fact. I once mounted and tried to pacify the crowd. But who would believe what the Chief Minister said. They can draw their own conclusions. All the papers of West Bengal did not mention a word that I did any thing to instigate violence. On the contrary, every paper mentioned about the Minister and others—how they made inflammatory speeches

They mentioned that Mr. Samar Guha tried like that This is totally false and fabricated

I again say that I am not an ethical believer of non-violence I belong to Netaji's cult Even according to the situation on that day, there were enough students to counteract the anti-J.P. demonstration

At last, I say, 20 lakh students have read my book Half a dozen students at least would have given their lives to save Samar Guha But that would have been absolutely self defeating

What was my slogan? It was

मरणे मारने नहीं । मरणे तुमका मारने नहीं ।

There was another one in Bengali

मारबो मारब ना प्राण दबा प्र ण नेबा ॥

These were the two slogans We will give our lives but we will not take life We will die but we will not kill anyone "

Now, there are a few basic questions that are involved in it I think, every organisation has a right to stage a black-flag demonstration against anybody provided it is peaceful, provided it does not obstruct, provided it does not deprive any person or any organisation of his fundamental rights

Secondly, I say about this vulgarity—the Opposition parties are also victims of such vulgarity—debasement, demeaning—of burning the effigies of important men either of this side or that side J.P.'s effigy was burnt I do not object to that J.P.'s effigy was burnt and some crackers were put inside the effigy They showed black flags About the burning of effigies it is vulgarity, debasing demeaning, we are all equally victims of such political perversities; it is the perversity of the present state of Indian politics.

There are three basic questions. I know they will not agree. This is what Mr. Subrato Mukherjee said in his speech, "Why is J.P. angry? J.P. approached the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to make him the Deputy Prime Minister and, as she refused to oblige him, he got angry and he started all these agitations " It is all written in the papers It has come out in the press. If you want I can read it out It is on record

You, Sir, were then the follower of J.P. Now you are criticising him . . . (Interruptions).

MR CHAIRMAN I do not want to say anything from this Chair

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE If you were not in the Chair, I would have said, "You are a J.P. defector "

MR CHAIRMAN I do not want to say anything from here

SHRI SAMAR GUHA It is known to everybody that in 1953, the Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, invited J.P. to become the Deputy Prime Minister It was written in innumerable biographies of Indian leaders—"Who after Nehru" Almost everybody universally said, "J.P. after Nehru" You also know that everybody said, not Giri but J.P. should be the President You know that Giri was the Opposition candidate They forget it conveniently J.P. could have been the candidate for Presidents' Office But he is a man with a sense of different values and our sense of political values has undergone such change to such an extent that we do not understand him He is a person with a sense of commitment to certain basic values—J.P. is the emblem of the basic values of morality of politics, which it is now beyond the comprehension of many of us, perhaps including myself.

Therefore, if such a man is attacked, if an attempt is made to attack

him, if an attempt is made to assail him, what will be the reaction in the country? If such a thing can happen in the case of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, it can happen in the case of the Prime Minister, it can happen in the case of many Ministers, it can happen in the case of the Congress President. There are scores of determined people who hold Shri Jayaprakash Narayan in affection and consider him as the emblem of the highest values that we possess in India today in our political life. They are determined people having the spirit of sacrifice and dedication, and nothing can stop them. Therefore, you have to ponder over this if these things are allowed to happen, what will be the consequences?

Secondly, I want to say that our Constitution guarantees certain Fundamental Rights. They may call J.P. a reactionary, they may call him a henchman of the Americans, they may call him a CIA agent. J. P. may be, according to them, a dalal of the industrialists. They have every right to say so. I do not contest their right. They have every right to accuse him and try to convince the people that J.P. is nothing but a reactionary, nothing but a CIA agent, nothing but a dalal of industrialists, that J.P., in his old age, has gone mad. This is the democratic right of anti J.P. groups. I do not say anything about their right to say so. But I want to ask whether anybody has any right to prevent a person from exercising his Fundamental Right of addressing an assembly or a meeting or from exercising his freedom of expression. A lurking fear is there in the minds of the people, seeing the way in which they have stopped J.P. that this is perhaps the way for imposing an authoritarian rule in the country. I warn the country to beware of it. I warn them that it will recoil on them too. That is the apprehension of J.P. J.P. never wanted the army or the police to revolt. He says: "be loyal to the Constitution, be loyal to the national flag, be loyal

to the people, and if here is any attempt from the ruling party to impose a totalitarian rule in this country, scuttling the democratic values, then revolt against them." J.P. has not done anything wrong. He is playing the role of a great saviour of Indian democracy. These pignies and Lilliputs may attack Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, but the millions of the Indian people consider him as the emblem of the people's power, as the Lok Nayak of the Indian people.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): I just want to ask him one question. He has said just now that he belongs to the Netaji cult which does not believe in non-violence. Now my question is this. What did Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, after the Tripuri Session, say and write about your present hero, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan? Please answer me

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: J.P. wrote from Hazaribagh jail a long letter to Netaji saying that he made the greatest mistake in life in Tripuri by opposing him. He wrote a long letter to Netaji expressing his regret to Netaji from Hazaribagh jail.

This young man perhaps does not know. J.P. in his historic second letter during the Quit India Movement said that Indians should co-operate with Subhas Bose—he was not known as Netaji at that time. He admitted the mistake. In that letter he asked Indians to join hands with Subhas Chandra Bose I can tell you even the names of messengers through whom he sent the letter to Netaji. One of them is Mr. Abyankar. They were sent to contact Netaji and deliver the letter. And lastly it was Netaji who gave the call of "All power to the Indian people" at Ramgarh Anti-compromise Conference and J.P. is now fulfilling that ideal by building people's power.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: History is recorded and you cannot rewrite it now.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI** (Calcutta South): Prof. Samar Guha in his usual style.....

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** Not his usual style. He did not get excited even for once.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** Yes. He tried to explain the incidents that happened and took place in Calcutta on the 2nd of April when J.P. visited Calcutta. Prof. Guha's name is included in the motion and he was one of the witnesses in that gathering and he claimed to be a victim of the situation. Incidentally, I was present on that day and I....

**SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI.**  
.....incited.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSHI** ... take all responsibility in this House that I led the demonstration from the Calcutta University lawn and I had issued a statement after the incidents took place there

Before I come to explain all the matters as expressed by Prof. Guha and the mover of the motion, I would like to place before you some facts. The mover of the motion, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, Prof. Guha and one hon. friend from the CPM Group tried to explain that democracy is at stake in Bengal and that efforts were made not to attack, but to kill Jayaprakash Narayan on that day

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA**  
That would have killed him

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** I would like to submit to you one thing J.P.'s visit to Bengal after the Patna agitation started from 23rd April 1974. His first visit was on 23rd April 1974. He did not organise any meeting. He straightaway went and came back. His second visit was on 31st May and then also he did not organise any meeting. He straightaway consulted some friends and came back. ..

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN** (Wandiwash): You were in Calcutta?

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** Yes. His third visit was on 3rd April. He reached Howrah Station and received people there and addressed a meeting in Mahajati Sadan. Prof. Guha will agree with me as also the members of the Opposition that Mahajati Sadan is the headquarters of the West Bengal Chhatra Parishad, the students' wing of the Congress Party and Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan addressed the first meeting in the Mahajati Sadan near the headquarters of 'the Chhatra' Parishad when not even a single protest was made. His fourth visit was on 30th September and he addressed the first public meeting in a maidan called the Shaheed Minar Maidan. It was presided over by Shri P.C. Sen, the President of Cong (O) unit there and presently, President of Nav Nirman Samiti .

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
He is not the President

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** I am not sure in that meeting there was no demonstration. Nobody threw stones and there was not even any black flag showing. His fifth visit was on 20th March 1975 when also he consulted some people and came back. His sixth visit was on 2nd April 1975 and on that day a demonstration took place

**SHRI G VISWANATHAN:** Why

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** Naturally. It is very interesting to know why our students and the youth have chosen the date of 2nd April, without disturbing and demonstrating during the fifth visit, to demonstrate their strength and protest against J.P. on his 2nd April visit. I would like to make it very clear to you that the tradition of not only the youth of my Party or the youth of other parties but the tradition of Bengal youth in general is not

to regard the personality but to worship the ideology, and the context in which it takes the direction of the country. We watched carefully—J.P.'s movement as it happened in Gujarat, in Bihar and its consequential developments—aligning with the political parties and its constant switching to non-violence in the method of violence and appealing to the Army, Police and asking students/youth to boycott the examinations, etc.

Maturity of Bengal and the youth of Bengal is well known and when Bengal re-acts, it reacts at the proper time and it never reacts at the immature time or stage.

On 2nd April Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan organised a public meeting at the venue chosen by him. On that day one venue was one "student hall", the capacity as 50. The other Institute is Calcutta Institute. The capacity is 450 (interruptions) make it 600. I left Delhi on 31st March in the night and on 1st April I was at Calcutta. I heard from the State Unit that they were organising demonstration. Incidentally, I regret the word 'incidentally' my aunt and uncle were badly ill at Aljoudwar. I was supposed to go there. I could not go. I reached Calcutta by plane. They expired on 4th morning. I could not go. When I heard the news that the State Wing of Youth Congress and Chhatra Parishad is going to organise demonstration and that they took the decision that there will be students strike on 2nd April and black out in Calcutta city. I incidentally told them that 2nd April was Higher Secondary Examination day you cannot hold strike. There will be a problem for them. Secondly, if there is a black out in the entire city, so many people including the office goers and the examiners will face serious problems. It does not look nice. We should demonstrate very peacefully as a political party.

I listened to the news that Youth Congress will show black flags. Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan—the symbol

of youth which they claim—tried to banter the sentiment of youth by saying "Oh! they will show me black flag. That is my flag. Whenever I see that flag I get inspiration. When I started my movement, I started with the black flag." To inspire him more it was the task of the youth—which symbol is claimed by Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan. The youth of Calcutta city did not make any mistake in that regard and they did it very carefully and very intelligently to give more inspiration to Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan, having thousands and thousands of black flags.

Secondly the area chosen by Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan to hold the meeting was not the Calcutta University. Do not misunderstand, it was not Calcutta University. It is not within the Calcutta University compound in the University compound, not 100, 200, 300 or 400, but there were 15,000 boys and girls. It was Calcutta city demonstration in spite of the examination of Higher Secondary; otherwise the number would have been 50,000. I went there and I addressed after three years in the university lawn and what I spoke in the meeting appeared in all the newspapers. I do not want to mention that. The speech is tape recorded.

Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan held a meeting of the non-party teachers in which former Education Minister of C.F.M. Mr. S. Roy was there. I give it a "non party" shape. Teachers from different political parties were there.

Our procession should not go to the venue of the meeting of Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan that was our attempt. We made it a point that our procession should straightway go towards Sealdah so that the boys may catch the bus to leave that area. I did exactly so. The newspaper which Mr. Samar Guha is quoting also said so.

I led the demonstration. When I was crossing along with the demonstration, Bankim Chandra Street of



Mirzapur Junction one police sergeant in the North Calcutta Mr. Anil Bannerjee came and told me, before you started ~~the meeting~~ in the University areas, a few young men assembled near the Mirzapur Junction and Coffee House. Will you come and see who is there? I got panicky. Government is run by our party, if there is any stake in law and order it will come to our shoulders; as responsible member of our party and of Parliament I should see that nothing is done to disturb this. I immediately instructed my colleague and lieutenant. I have my regards for him and he is a person who cannot defend himself in this house because he is Minister of my State Mr. Subrato Mukerjee. I said: You go the spot. Police is there, it will be more useful if you go there. Our friends have quoted only one portion of the paper. I can quote the whole lot of it. In one portion it has been stated, he is blowing his own boys right and left. Counter-slogans were coming from Nav Nirman Samiti faction. JP was conducting this meeting and there was students and teachers. For the teachers I have tremendous respect and some of them are my teachers also. They gave slogans which I don't like to mention. These came in newspapers also They are: 'Agents of Soviet Imperialism, hands af; Stooges of Indira Gandhi hands-of. I don't deny the fact that no youth leader, no sensible political leader, if he is provoked will keep quiet. I know how they will react. Here what happened? 15,000 militant progressive boys and girls were there. JP concluded his meeting with teachers in the student hall. He came out of the students hall. This was reported in the papers. Slogans and counter-slogans were going on. Those who have not seen the college square there cannot explain the position there. The college square is surrounded by some railings. It is a spectrum where the youth used to assemble, publishers, shopkeepers, etc. There was a big crowd. The area was covered by hawkers' stalls and it was a strategic spot. Slogans and counter-slo-

gans were going on. JP said 'Now I will not go; I will go inside.' He went inside and sat in a chair quietly. In the Calcutta University Institute area what happened was this. There were some personalities of Congress (O) who had no guts to move in the streets, with their own children. Even their own children say that. I say this because if they do that, boys will spit at their faces. They went to receive Shri Jayaprakash Narayan at the airport. *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
Can you say honestly whether any person is more respected than Shri P. C. Sen? *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** I have not said anything. I am only talking of Shri Nirmalanand Dey. Last time, Prof Guha, it is in the record of the House, admitted that these people are dead people and so their names should be cancelled from the list. This Nirmalanand Dey's Group and his followers started not only provoking but they were throwing chappals from the window of the University. They were showing their fists and so the entire boys there became angry Mr. P. C Sen was not present at the meeting. I am telling you the truth. You do not know it. You will be happy that Shri Nirmalanand had no objection to do so .... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
You have no culture.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** You do not teach me that. Why are you angry? When your followers started shouting, there were counter slogans and then J.P. was squatted by the police and by some people—I do not know—maybe they are organisers of the meeting—in the car. Let me explain the incident one after another. He was in the car. Shri Sushil Dara, President of the B. L. D. Unit of Bengal and Shri Biswa Ranjan Sarkar, Vice-President of the Bengal Youth

Congress immediately went to J. P. and requested him to come down from the Car. But, he said—I wan't be wrong because it is not reported in the press—in Hindi, I do not know what exactly he said because I can not speak Hindi:—

प्रदानो कहो हैं जहां नै भाषण करूंगा।

He was thoroughly unhappy because (Interruptions) .. Let me finish with this and then you may clarify; if I am wrong—I am telling the truth—Prof. Guha is at liberty to refute it. What happened afterwards was this. The car was taken away and then Shri Ausit Mitra, the General Secretary of the Chhatra Parishad—I still say he is an honest boy because he has sacrificed his all—and he is well-known to the people of Howrah District. He rescued not one gentleman's life but thousands of lives from the violence of Naxalites and C.P.M.; in the entire Howrah area he is a known fellow and is liked by all political parties including Shri Haripata Bharti, President of the Jan Sangh. He himself said 'Please get away from here'. Shri Guha stood at one end of the car. He also said what he used to say to the boys, to control or to provoke I don't know. The boys got provoked I am told. Afterwards the police in civilian dress, A.C. Central Calcutta was scuffling with the boys and the Minister Shri Subroto Mukerjee's face is known to everyone but the face of A. C. was not known. There were exchanges of blows among themselves and he got injured. There were slogans and counter slogans. It usually happens in all political meetings and somebody gets injured. I do not deny this fact; I make a statement here that what happened is shameful. There was not a single word about it. I do not like to suppress the truth. If something is wrong, I may be hauled up. If a great leader tells a lie, he is not exposed by the people but if I tell a lie, I am sure, I shall be exposed by the people because I am young. I may tell you that but for me and Shri Subro-

to Mukerjee, on that day, the massacre would have taken place because demonstrators were provoked badly. It was disastrous. (Interruptions) Why is the massacre occurring? I tell this in the face of Shri Dinen Bhattacharyya that there was a planned meeting in Alimudin Street by the C.P.Ms. on the 2nd morning. But, that day no CPM went to the meeting and still they sent some infiltrators to create such things which will demolish the entire arrangement. Shri Jyoti Bosu was all along present in JPs room in the meeting. He organised a meeting in Alimuding Street. I have my information and I may show you from the photograph as to how many of them were there (Interruptions). You will please keep silent. I know it. You do not try to tell me about the youth of West Bengal (Interruptions). You tell Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. Why Jyoti Bosu was about? Why you were sent? (Interruptions). You are trying to teach me. Have I not known the facts? I know the kind of provocation given to the boys on that day and I know about the utterances if Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. Prof Guha may like him. I do not mind. I say, Sir, that JP is not at all a symbol of revolutionary youth. He is a symbol of reaction. He is exploiting the youth in the name of fighting corruption, uniting all the corrupt people in this country like Maharani Gayatri Devi and Biju Patnaik and other people. If he comes forward and tells us that he will leave these corrupt people and he will lead a revolution, I will be the first to join him. Sir, JP has addressed a meeting of the teachers. He is trying to incite the teachers and the students of Vishwa Bharati. He did not quote that statement. This has also appeared in the papers. Amrita Bazar Patrika:

"Shanti Niketan had set an alternative programme for education, but, today, it has very little difference with other institutions. He could not understand why the Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi should

be the Chancellor of Vishwa Bharati."

JP has said this. He has asked, how can a senior Cambridge lady be the Chancellor of Shanti Niketan. He has been telling like this every day. He is a reactionary. He is a symbol of fascism. He is a symbol of all corrupt forces. Simply because he is an elderly man, simply because he fought for freedom, simply because he is a weak man, he cannot be touched, and therefore, he will do everything and the youth will keep quite? No. I do not mind. We must demonstrate and oppose in Calcutta and everywhere. I will demonstrate in all parts of India. Even if I am put into trouble by Anand Margis and RSS, I will do it. I will fight the reactionary forces. Today, should the youth be taught by Shri Shyamandan Mishra, a man who did not have the guts to support the economic programme of the Congress in 1971? Should the youth be taught by Shri Morarji Desai, a man who always indulges in stunts and who is exploiting the precious weapon of Mahatma Gandhi, of fasting? Should the youth be taught by a person like Shri Jayaprakash Narayan? Where was he when there was violence in West Bengal for four years? Prof. Guha, please help me. I agree that you are opposed to CPI(M) in West Bengal. Where was your great leader Shri Jayaprakash Narayan at that time? Sir, in the University Institute, where he went to address a meeting, portraits of Mahatma Gandhi and Vidya Sagar Statue were burnt. (Interruptions). Where was Shri Jayaprakash Narayan? I would like Shri Guha to help me. Where was he? Sir, nails of six inches thickness were pushed into the head of the leader in the Dum Dum by CPI (M). (Interruptions). Where was JP when the Vice Chancellor, Shri Gopal Sen, was murdered in the Jadavpur University campus? You are talking of JP. He has come to West Bengal at a time when we are restoring peace after four years of violence. I agree that still there is

violence and youth are indulging in violent activities. I do agree. But, the reasons are very simple. One is the economic backwardness of the State and the second is very clear. The atmosphere of violence which has been built up by the CPI (M) for four years has poisoned the youth of my State. I agree that our boys became unruly on many occasions. I condemned them and I expelled them. It is my State. Should Shri Jayaprakash Narayan teach Shri Ray the lesson of corruption? It was not JP, but it was the Youth Congress in my State which demanded an enquiry against the Ministers and then the Wanchoo Commission was set up. It was the Youth Congress which said that Ministers give permits which are sold in the black market, and therefore, they should be removed. I have personally sent 80 people of my party to jail under MISA. Can they deny? This is my duty. When, we have done anything to restore order, when we are trying to restore the confidence of the people, when we are trying to restore faith among the people, he is asking the Army and the Police to agitate. He is being supported by people like Shri Biju Patnaik and Shri H. K. Mahtab. (Interruptions). Jayaprakash Narayan will come Nobody prevents him. I know his capacity and power. Jayaprakash Narayan was always a follower of violence. In the 1942 movement when the great leader Mahatma Gandhi condemned violence, when the Working Committee of the Party had condemned violence, it was JP who encouraged violence and spread the cult of violence in many States. Can anybody deny it? This is recorded in the history of India.

Sometimes JP is a peacemaker. Sometimes he is asking boys to slap MLAs. Sometimes he is saying I am the Supreme Commander of the revolution. If JP is the Supreme Commander of the revolution uniting Biju Patnaik, Gayatri Devi, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Pilloo Mody and inter-

national reaction, then I say the progressive youth of the country would be the Field Marshal to stop that counter revolution. Yes, I do say that. What do you think of us?

In the State of Bihar, MLAs are unsafe. Shyamnandan Babu was laughing and telling that Ministers cannot go and address meetings. I was in Ahmedabad on the day the students started forcing MLAs to resign. He said in this House that that was the spontaneity of the expression of the people. This is also a spontaneous demonstration—nothing more. You are talking of spontaneity. Here is spontaneity.

You are saying that Mrs. Gandhi cannot go and address meetings. You are happy at that. Mrs. Gandhi may not go because there are security and other reasons for it. But it is Mrs. Gandhi who stood by the people in the dark days in 1971. You are saying there is no democracy in our State. In 1971 when our Government was in a minority carrying on like a coalition, we carried out the Bangladesh operation, we managed the refugee movement. The entire thing was done by our Government, by the youth whom JP accuses of goondaism.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**  
What about the blanket scandal?

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** You betrayed Bangladesh. You fought Mujibur Rehman. Promode Das Gupta sided with the Razakars. Do not forget that.

The net result is not this photograph which you are showing. I am sorry for that. The net result is this photograph—of JP and Jyoti Bose, the great philosopher of proletarian revolution and the great philosopher of party less democracy.

Our slogans have nothing personal against JP. Not a single one of them is provocative. There was no plan or preaching of attempts on JP's life. The slogans were very simple. These are in Bengali. I will give them and also the English translation. They are:

**HITLERER TIN DOST JP  
PRAFULLA JYOTI BOSE**

'Hitler has got three friends, JP,  
PC Sen and Jyoti Bosu';

**JYOTI PRAFULLA SUSHIL  
DHARA EBAR HABE  
BANGLA CHHARA;**

'JP' Prafulla and Sushil Dhara  
will be turned out from  
Bengal';

**CPM SYNDICATE SAMAJ-  
BADER BARRIC DE;**

(CPM and syndicate is the  
barricade of socialism);

**DALHIN GANTANTRA FASCI-  
BADER SHARAJANIBA;**

(Partyless democracy is the  
conspiracy of fascism);

**CHILE THEKE SIKSHA NAO  
CHAATRA YUBA TAIREE**

'Take the lesson from Chile; let  
the country's youth be united';

**KAMODIA THEKE SIKSHA  
NAO JP TUMI FIRE JAO**

'Take the lesson from Cambodia,  
Prince Sihanouk, JP please  
quit';

**BIJU KI DURNTIHEEN JP  
JABAB DIN**

'Is Biju corruptionless; JP  
answer'.

**GAYATRIKI DURNITI HIN JP  
JABAB DIN**

'Is Gayatri Devi less corrupt?  
Answer JP'

These were the slogans. There was nothing personal against him. There was no attack on him, no intention to do so.

I would like to establish three things. First, there was no intention to attack JP. You may blame Bengal youth, but they are not so foolish that they will hit a man at the age of 80 years who is only serving a narrow selfish interest uniting all the reactionaries in the country. Our enemy is not JP; our enemy is the arrangement of the reactionaries. We have fought it, we are fighting it and

we will continue to fight it in all directions. There is no doubt about it.

I would like to say three or four things.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** With that good sentence, you should have concluded.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** There was no attempt; there was no plan by the party against him. Secondly, during JP's previous visits the youth never planned any demonstration. They could not assess the situation earlier. They never understood that. JP was not a danger to Bihar. We never say that. JP is not a danger to Mrs. Gandhi herself. JP is a danger to the very establishment of democracy in our country. We considered it. In newspapers it came "that JP said in Calcutta during the days of Gokhale and earlier it was said of Bengal that what Bengal does today, India does tomorrow. what Bengal thinks today, India thinks tomorrow but today I am surprised that Bengal is not doing anything and how will India do tomorrow? He said it in public. I do not know." JP is sorry for the behaviour of Bengal. I say this for your understanding, the very next day after the incident the Youth Congress office of Bombay was ransacked; the President was in trouble; the Youth Congress office in Saharsa was attacked. I know. I do not bother. He does not care for the violence of Naxalites and others; he does not care for the violence of RSS and Anandamarg. Prof. Guha may be a witness. After 1972 elections, when JP said that he would like to come to Bengal and see what kind of rigging went there. I was general Secretary of the PCC and I wrote him a letter: You are welcome to come and meet the people and see what the fault was there. But he did not turn up. I make clean offer. I am told that JP is coming again and will address meetings and he will organise a revolutionary army or whatever it is with all those people. I am told that JP will send a parliamentary

delegation for enquiry. It is welcome; we will not object. I think Dinan Bhattacharyya will accept this proposal. Let JP come and enquire into all the incidents from the P. C. Sen Government's firing down to happenings of the Ray Government. Let JP give independent hearing to all incidents and tell who is responsible. If I cannot prove .... (Interruptions). You are spoiling yourself by siding with JP; you do not know the sentiments of the people. Many of your followers have left you and are begging membership from me; I will not give them just now; I will wait. Your followers in Calcutta will resign and you will be in a great soup. JP will not be able to help you. If you require a seat please follow JP and join Morarji and have a seat in Gujarat; do not fight here in Bengal.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:** Don't tell cock and bull stories here.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** Stories are inside the House you know and in your area you do not make any stories. Siddhartha Sankar Ray expressed his regret. I am glad. It is the test of my Government. Whether it is a meeting conducted by JP or anybody else, if in the slightest way something is done, something is wrong, it should not be there. We must see how it has happened. But I can tell you categorically and clearly that the Youth Congress, the Chhatra Parishad did not make any plan; they never had any idea of attacking or assaulting anybody. JP unfortunately depended on CPM to mobilise people but they betrayed him. People saw Prof. Guha. Guha. I admire his courage. It is a fact that in all cases of violence in my State, he comes forward. It is his habit. Some of the boys appreciated his conduct. He also knows that they did not turn up. They will not turn out. The CPM is in great danger. Even P. C. Sen did not go to the meeting because he also knew that the meeting would be a great flop. They depended on CPM

and they betrayed them at the last hour of meeting. Shri Indrajit Gupta referred to Jyoti Bosu and others meeting at flat 31. This should be enquired by the Home Minister's Intelligence Department, 3, Moira Street, that flat has witnessed so many riots in Calcutta city. Gulzarilal visited Calcutta in 1965 during riot at Calcutta. 3, Moira street flat has witnessed many conspiracies. I know it. There is movement, international Krishna Consciousness. Great hippies, dozens of Americans come and take charas etc. morning and night I do not know what sort of conversation took place between JP and others Without casting aspersions on JP, I should like to say: please make enquiries of International Krishna Consciousness and No. 3 flat in Moira Street. It is nothing but a branch of the American Consulate at Calcutta which is indulging in all mischiefs against the nation and our national integrity all the time. J. P. might also be trying to change their minds and habits. I do not know how far he will be successful. There is a book written by Shri Bharat Chandra Roy, a poet of Bengal In that you will find a story about 'Annapurna' It says that somebody was the disciple of 'Annapurna' and whenever he touched a thing—even a bamboo stick—it became gold. Here J P is also considered like that. If he touches Gayatri Devi, she becomes honest, if he touches Shri Biju Patnaik, he becomes honest, when he touches Goenka, he becomes honest and he touches this thing and that thing and everything becomes pure. He is trying to make everybody honest and purified except his purpose. Let him first purify his purpose, let him purify his intentions and let him purify his desire. But don't try to denigrate the Prime Minister and spoil the democracy Their charge is that we are becoming communists and Communists in this country as hob-nobbed.

Sir, West Bengal is the headquarters of the Communist Party—

CPI(M), C.P.I., CPI(ML), RCPI, RCPI-dissident, Bolshevik Party, SSP(I) and R.S.P. Out of all these parties only CPI took the stand against J. P. But others like Prof. Guha and Shri Piloo Mody are unhappy. A majority of the so called Communists CPM have told that they are Communists or Marxists. I do not know why. But they say that they do not believe in Marxism because Marx is dead, Lenin is in the Museum and that too in USSR. We have no faith in that because Lenin is no more living and there is no Leninism. Therefore, they say that they would better follow J. P. because once he was a Communist and once he tried to follow Communism.

Sir, I have no personal charge against Prof Guha, nothing against his party, but I only want to establish that demonstration was spontaneous. Shri Jyoti Bosu made a statement the very next day of the incident because some journalist wrote in Ananda Bazar Patrika about this incident. Sir, the role of Ananda Bazar Patrika is well known and this Patrika, for the last one week, has been publishing leading articles on these matters. When Pakistan was getting arms from the United States, when J P. was asking the army to revolt against the democratic rule, at that time Ananda Bazar Patrika gave a large coverage of J. P. movement. Sometime back a news item was published in that Patrika which stated that Mujibur Rehman was a communal man, Bangladesh was a State of Communalism and secularism was destroyed there This kind of news item was published for some days in the front page of that Patrika. I am giving this for your information. In that Patrika they praised the Members of the CPM and Shri Jyoti Bosu's statement that "let S. S Rav withdraw the police; we do not believe in police, we have our own police" was published. Shri Jyoti Bosu used to say if the police were withdrawn from the State, how the Congress Party could rule the State.

Let him choose any kind of action, but we do not like violence. I tell you very seriously that your hands stained with blood of women and children will not be spared. Let Jyoti Bosu do whatever he wants. Let him give a challenge J P also gave a challenge. He is coming to mobilise a meeting. We welcome it, but we also say at the same time that if any mischievous effort is made to disrupt integrity there, Calcutta will simply demonstrate with black flags. It was only 15,000 last time, now it will be 15 lakhs. You are waiting for that. Most welcome.

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी (शाजापुर)  
मम पनि महोदय, श्याम बाबू ने जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रखा है वास्तव में उसकी पृष्ठ भूमि को समझकर मैं यह मानता था कि यहाँ पर उसके बारे में कुछ उच्च स्तर की बहस होगी, क्योंकि आमता पर हम लोग इस बात को स्वीकार करते हैं कि जब हमने लोकतंत्र को अपनाया है (व्यवधान)। मैंने बैठे बैठे बहुत कुछ सुना है। किन्तु यह जो लाकनव है, वह केवल बोलने में नहीं होना है, बल्कि उमने पीछे एक स्वस्थ परम्परा का खड़ा करना होना है।

श्री श्री प्रिय रजन राम मुणी का भाषण सुना। वह बारबा सी० पी० ए० के बारे में बोल रहे थे। लेकिन वह बीच में एकदम बोल पड़े कि आनन्द मार्ग एण्ड थार० एम० एम० वड किल मी। मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि जो मगठन पिछले 50 साल में इस देश में काम चलाय है, उस सवठन के बारे में एक छोटा सा गुदा खड़ा होकर ऐसी बात कहें, जिसका न आगा है और न पीछा है। हमें इसलिए बचना पड़ा कि अगर आ किमी के तर में झूठी बात कहने जाये, तो आखिर उसकी भी महान करने की मर्यादा टूट जाती है। आप यह समझकर चलिए कि आज 1948 नहीं है, अब 1975 है। हम मार खाकर,

जलाकर, टांग लूटवाकर आगे आ है। मेरे दायें, बायें जो बैठे हैं सब को मैंने देखा है।

मैंने 1930 से कांग्रेस को देखा है। मैं आज का नहीं हूँ। आगे साहब जिन दिनोंगाधी जी को एण्ड थार एम० एम० के बारे में लिखते हैं, तब से मैं उनको जानता हूँ। मैंने कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी में स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री से कहा था कि थार० एम० एम० के बारे में कोई निष्पक्ष जांच बैठे। और उनकी जो भी सिफारिश आगयी हम स्वीकार करेंगे। किन्तु कोई प्रिय रजन राम मुणी खड़े हो कर, कोई इदजॉत गान खड़ा हो कर बोलने जाए बोलत जाए श्री हम सिर्फ सुनते रहे, सुनते रहे। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह लाकनव है यह भूले नहीं। आज आपकी स्थिति अच्छी नहीं है बिन्दु अच्छ नहीं है, इसलिए कि आप न लोग ही आपको मानने पर उत्तर है। हम नहीं है। जब कांग्रेस टूट गई तो निर्जालगप्पा का हाथ हमने नहीं लगाया। नुम्हारे शशि भषण न लगाया। कांग्रेस आफिस पर कब्जा नुम्हारे चन्द्रजीत यादव ने किया। मोगरजी भाई के घर के सामने पुलिस खड़ी थी। वह ननाव किम ने पैदा किया? आप दोनों समझते हैं न? मैं इर्मा ए बना रहा हूँ आर्इडयोलॉजिकल बात होनी तो मोगरजी भाई के घर के सामने पुलिस खड़ी करने की जरूरत नहीं थी, किमी का कुर्ता फाड़ने की जरूरत नहीं थी और आप हम का सुनाने हो? शिमला समझौते का विरोध हमने किया। हमको ले कर जनसभ के कार्यालय पर हमला किया गया। कलकत्ते में हुमा, दिल्ली में हुमा। क्या शिमला समझौते का विरोध करने का अधिकार हमें नहीं है? आपको आलोचना बरदाश्त नहीं है। जब आप दबी आवाज से कहने हो पाकिस्तान फिर हथियार ले रहा है, पाकिस्तान यह कर रहा है तो आपके शिमला समझौते का क्या हुमा? कोई क्या उसका विरोध नहीं कर सकता?

30 hrs.

श्री एम० राम गोपालन रंढडी (निजामा-  
बाद) : क्या यह रेनेवेंट है ?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : रेनेवेंट इसलिए है कि जयप्रकाश बाबू पर आप लोगों ने जो हमला किया यह पहली बार नहीं है । जब तक वह आपके साथ थे अच्छे थे । जब से उन्होंने आपको विरोध करना शुरू किया तब से खराब हो गए । उन्होंने कहा जय-प्रकाश बाबू जिन के बारे में कह दे कुरूप्ट है बिठाओ जाच, कोई भी हो, डरते क्यों हैं ? जहाँ-जहाँ अफ़्टाचार है बिठाओ जाच ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : डरना क्यों है ?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : आप डर रहे हो । आज स्वयं मैमूर का काग्रेस का अध्यक्ष कहना है कि मर्याद मंत्री अफ़्टे है । आपके ही लोग कह रहे हैं ।

श्री नरेश कुमार साहू मेरी स्टेट में आपकी मविद सरकार रह चुकी है और उसके जमाने में जन मध और आर० एम० एम० ने जितनी बेईमानी की और जितना पैसा कमाया उसकी जाच करवाने के लिए आप तैयार हैं ?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी बिन्कुल । साहू जी मैं आपको भी जानता हूँ । कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कि जो मैं नहीं जानता लेकिन मैं बोलना नहीं चाहता किमी के बारे में । (अवधान) फिर आपने शुरू किया जय-प्रकाश जी के बारे में और कहा कि वह दलाल है...

सभापति महोदय : यह प्रश्नाव मध्य प्रदेश के बारे में नहीं है । यह बलकले में जो घटना हुई उस के बारे में है । इसलिए उसी पर आप बोलें तो ज़रूर हो जायेगा ।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : यह वायलेंस का वातावरण जो पैदा हो रहा है, आप ने कहा कि यह जयप्रकाश बाबू ने पैदा किया ।

सभापति महोदय उसी बात पर तो प्रश्नाव नहीं होना दिया । इस को उसी घटना तक सीमित रखना जाय यह रिप्टी स्पीकर साहब ने कहा । तो आप अपने को उसी पर सीमित रखिए ।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : प्रियरंजन दाम मुर्शी ने जो कहा कि हम चुप मचन नहीं करेंगे तो हमारे चुप मचन करेंगे क्या ? खून आप में ही केवल बहना है और दूसरे में पानी बहता है ? 1948 में मैं यह गाली सुनता था रहा हूँ । 1967 में मैं पार्लियामेंट में बैठा हूँ । बार बार मैंने प्रधान मंत्री में पूछा, हॉम मिनिस्टर में पूछा, कोई जबाब नहीं देना है । फिर भी हम चुप बैठे हैं और यह कहने है कि हम चुप नहीं बैठेंगे । इसलिए मैंने कहा कि वातावरण में एक स्वस्थ परम्परा पैदा करनी होती है । आज आप की स्थिति अच्छी नहीं है । इसलिए मैं यह बार बार बताना रहा हूँ । आप ने ममम्नोपुर का कांड हमारे ऊपर डालने की कोशिश की । पैट्रियट ने लिखा कि उस में आर० एम० एस० का हाथ है । मैं कहता हूँ ब्रह्मानन्द रेड्डु आज कहा है : शर्म नहीं आती आप लोगों को, इनकी बड़ी हुकूमत लिए बैठे हैं और आज तब कानिल का पना नहीं लगा पाए ? यह राज करने का तरीका है ? गेट आउट ।

सभापति महोदय आप हम रहे हैं ? जब आप ने हमारे ऊपर यह लाठन लगाया कि विरोधी दल जिम्मेदार है.....

श्री डाकू दयाल सिंह (चतरा) यह अपेजी में गाली दे रहे हैं । ... (अवधान).....



और जयप्रकाश राव जोशी हिन्दी भाषा इतनी प्यारी है कि गाली देकर उस को मरुद्ध करना मैं नहीं चाहता ।

यह मैं इसलिए कह रहा हू कि यह जातावरण इसलिए आप पैदा कर रहे हैं, आप ने पहले जयप्रकाश बाबू को बदनाम करने की कोशिश की, कोई हत्या हा गई उस का पता लगाए बगैर उस को आरोप उन के ऊपर डालने की कोशिश की, फिर जब आप ने देखा कि उन से कुछ होना नहीं है, जयप्रकाश बाबू का व्यक्तित्व बड़ा है, तो आप ने यह सोचा कि जयप्रकाश बाबू के पीछे जा जा लोग है उन को गाली दे दो, जयप्रकाश बाबू अच्छे होने लेकिन उन के पीछे कौन है ? जन सच है थार० एम० एम० है। उन के पीछे कौन है ? सी०पी०एम० है फसा है । इस का मतलब क्या है ? जयप्रकाश बाबू कौन मा उसूल ले कर खड़े हैं, महंगाई है, बेकारी है एनेक्टोर्गन रिफार्म है, उस की चर्चा नहीं करना चाहते । मबाल यह है कि उन्होंने जो बाने सामने रखी हैं, आप काउन्टर रिबोल्यूशन भी चलाना चाहते हैं, मैं मान नेता हू । आफोसिव भी चलाना चाहते हैं, मैं मान नेता हू, किन्तु मीट हिब धार्मिस्ट्स । हेट दि सिन, मैं यह मानने वाला हू, नाट दि भिनर । जो भी गडबड करे, जहा भी हो लोकतन्त्र मे हिंसा और अत आचर के लिए, स्थान नहीं है । यह निश्चित है । इमनिंग हम यहा बहस कर रहे हैं (व्यवधान) ..

साल्वे जी, किसी भी बात के लिए हम बहस करने के लिए तैयार हैं । आप ऐसा मत समझिए कि हम छिपाने के लिए तैयार है । किसी भी बात के लिए हम तैयार है । किन्तु एक बार निश्चित तथ्य सामने आने दीजिए, बात समझ मे आ जायगी । किन्तु जब पता चला कि इस से भी कुछ नहीं होता तो आप इस हू पर पहुंच गए कि अब हम आप को बोलने नहीं देंगे । मेरा जो विरोध है वह कोई जयप्रकाश बाबू के लिए ही नहीं है । किन्तु किसी का या हम बोलने न दें, यो

ही इदिरा गांधी हों, कोई भी हो..... (व्यवधान) . . . आप पूछ रहे हैं, मैं बताता हू, मैं स्वयं गुजरात न ग था, मैंने कहा कि पहले विधायकों को चुन कर देना और बाद में उन के बिंदु निकालना यह गलत है । यह लोकतन्त्र में बैठता नहीं है । आप को नहीं चाहिए तो मत चुनिए । इतना ही नहीं महाराष्ट्र की बात बताता हू । सयुक्त महाराष्ट्र समिति के दिनों मे एन०बी० गार्डसिल को बोलने नहीं दिया गया । उस के बाद मैं बहा गया था उन दिनों मे । मैंने कहा यह गलत है । आप को उन को बात सुननी नहीं है, मत जानो । जैसे महमदाबाद मे हुआ था, जनता कर्फ्यू, मोरारजी भाई का भाषण लोग सुनना नहीं चाहते थे । गए नहीं । मैंने कहा कि सुनना नहीं है, मत जानो । किन्तु यहा हर एक को बोलने का अधिकार है । एन०बी० गार्डसिल हो, कोई भी हो । आप भले ही संबुक्त महाराष्ट्र के पक्ष मे ह, इसका मतलब यह नहीं कि उस के खिलाफ कोई बोल ही नहीं सकता । इसलिए मैंने स्वयं गुजरात में कहा है और अपने हर भाषण मे कहा है कि यह तरीका गलत है, किसी को कोयर्स करना गलत है ।

पहले चुनकर देते हो और फिर बाद में उन को बिंदु निकालते हो, उन की बेइज्जती करने हा यह बात गलत है । शुरू से मैंने यह कहा है कि हेट दि सिन बट नाट दि सिनर । कोई भी हो । जब हम ने लोकतन्त्र को अग्रिकार किया है (व्यवधान) . . मैंने उस दिन कहा, फिर बताता हू, उस दिन हमारे ना मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि विदेशी से पैसा किन को भिजना है वह रिपोर्ट आई है, पार्लिामेंट मे पेश की है । ना मिनिस्टर को यह पता नहीं है कि वह पार्लिामेंट में पेश नहीं हुई है । पार्लिामेंट को पता नहीं है । मैंने बार-बार पूछा है कि वह कौन है, जिन को पैसा मिलता है बताओ । अगर नहीं बताते । इसलिए ऐसे आरोप करना और विशयतः पत्रान मंत्री जैसे लोगों के द्वारा

कि इन के पीछे कारेल पावर है, और आप राज करते हो, बनाओ कौन सी कारेल पावर है, कहा की है ? नियो-सन्ध्यासी है, पूरा सन्ध्यासी है, काहे का सन्ध्यासी है, पीछे कौन है, पैसा कहा से आता है, कैसे चलता है, खोज के साथो। आप के पास अधिकार है, ताकत है, आप के पास शक्ति है, खोज कर जाओ, सामने ग्वां यह हो नो बात में मान लेता हूं। किन्तु 1967 में अमानात पूछने के बाद भी न बनाने हुए इस प्रकार आरोप लगाना, इस का क्या अर्थ है ? एक बार इन्होंने आरोप लगाया प्रिय रजन दाम मुशी ने कि भार० एम० एम० को सी० आई० ए० से पैसा मिलता है। सी० आई० ए० इतना बेबकूफ नहीं है। वह देगा तो आप को देगा क्यों कि कर्त्ताघर्त्ता आप है। कुछ करेंगे तो आप करेंगे। वह मुफ्त में नहीं बाटता, कोई भी मुफ्त में नहीं बाटता। इसलिए सी० आई० ए० का दमाल है, फसा है, डमराना है यह जो सारे आरोप हैं बेबनियाद और गनत, ऐसे आरोप लगाने से वानावर्ण प्रसन्न होता है। आप को जो विरोध है वह आप बताइए, हम को जो विरोध है हम बताएंगे। शिमला कान्फरेस अच्छी है आप बताइए, शिमला कान्फरेस से हम को विरोध है हम बताएंगे। इसलिए मैंने कहा था कि शिमला सम्झाने का विरोध अकेले हम ने किया था यहा तक कि यहा मधु हण्डवते जी बैठे है इन्होंने बीच में खड़े हो कर कहा था—

Let it go on record that except Jansangh all have supported the Simla agreement.

यह मैं इसलिए कर्त्ता हू कि हम अकेले थे फिर भी हमे वहाँ टेलीविजन पर बुलाया नहीं गया, रेडियो पर बुलाया नहीं गया—

What is the other point of view—  
dinning a particular thing into the ears of the people day in and day out—

कैबोकेसी का मतलब यह नहीं होता है

This is not democracy.

यदि हम अनग विचार रखते है

एक माननीय सदस्य उस की रेन्नी-वेम क्या है ?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी रेन्नीवेम अभी याद आई ? प्रिय रजन दाम मुशी जब सी० पी० एम० की बात बोल रहे थे तब रेन्नीवेम की याद नहीं आई आप को किस-किम को मारा, क्या-क्या किया सब किस्सा बता रहे थे तब याद नहीं आई ? मैं पूछता हूँ आर० एम० एम० ने किम को मारा बंगाल में ? प्रिय रजन दाम मुशी को मारा ? उन्होंने कहा कि I am not afraid even if RSS or Anand Marg wills me.

यानी आर० एम० एम० ने बंगाल में किस को मारा है बनाओ तो मरी।

श्री प्रियरंजन दाम मुशी उधर है ही नहीं।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : न होते हुए जो गाली देता है, वह या तो रिपोक्रेट है या महा मूर्ख है। उस के लिए तीमरा कोई आन्टि-नेटिव नहीं है। जानबूझ गलत इल्जाम लगाना कहा तक ठीक है। मैं ऐसा इसलिए बोल रहा हूँ—मैं यहा 1967 में बैठा हूँ प्रिय रजन दाम मुशी जी यहा आप मे पहले से बैठा हूँ और सब को देख-ना आया हूँ सब को सुनना आया हूँ जब ये सारे एक थे तब भी इन को देखा और जब झगडा कर के इधर आये तब भी देखा, एक दूसरे के साथ कितना प्यार था और कितना झगडे थे—यह सब मैंने देखा है। इसलिए यहा खडे हा कर इस तरह में कह देना ठीक नहीं है।

जब इलाहाबाद के सारे में यहा बहस हुई—हम ने युनेनिमस कन्डेमनेशन किया है और हम ने उस समय कहा था—

unreserved condemnation, no doubt about it.

किन्तु कुछ यह है कि इतने दिन होने के बाद भी यह पता न चल सका कि यह गोविन्द मिश्र वहाँ क्यों गया था, कैसे गया था, वह कैसे अन्दर पहुँचा, बिदाउट-आइडेंटिटी कैसे अन्दर पहुँच गया—was it all stage-managed?

समस्तीपुर के मामले का साथ तक पता नहीं चला, श्री राय के साथ जो हुआ, उस के बारे में भी आज तक पता नहीं चला। जिस बम का सेफ्टी पिन निकाल दिया जाए और वहाँ फेंका जाए—उस फेंकने वाले का आज तक पता न चला—यह सब क्या हो रहा है।

ऐसी स्थिति में जब कि देश के अन्दर हिंसा का वातावरण तैयार हो रहा है तो ऐसा लगता है—  
—People are not going to believe in these things. You have lost your creditability.

हम चाहते हैं कि ऐसा न हो। शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से हर मामला चले, लोकतन्त्रात्मक ढंग से हर मामला चले, हर मामले पर बहस हो, लेकिन एक दूसरे पर इलजाम लगा कर नहीं, वैज्ञानिक ढंग से बात हो। मोहन धारिया जी ने आप का विरोध किया, कैसे किया? विरोध का मतलब था कि वह आपसे डिफर करते थे, लेकिन उन को फौरन निकाल कर बाहर फेंक दिया गया, यानी छालोचना आप को सहन नहीं होती है ...

श्री प्रियरंजन दास मुश, आप ने बलराज मधोक को निकाल दिया। मौधी को निकाल दिया।

श्री जयन्नाथ राव जोशी: यदि आप कम्युनिस्टों के साथ रहें तो कुछ उनके प्रच्छेदों से सीजिए। They indulge in self criticism.

मोहन धारिया कुछ कहना चाहते थे—लेकिन उन को फेंक दिया। यहाँ तक कि पूना-बागों ने कहा कि आपने बम कर पूना का संघ

मोहन धारिया के लिए बंद।  
this is naked facism. वे आप के मंत्री रहे हैं। अगर कोई अलग विचार रखता है तो आप कहते हैं कि क्यों अलग विचार रखता है, उस को आप इजाजत नहीं देते कि अपने विचार प्रकट कर सकें। तो इस तरह से यह यह कैसी डेमोक्रेसी है।

इस लिए मैं आप से यह कह रहा था कि सब मिल कर कन्डेमनेशन करें। यह सबाल जब-प्रकाश जी का नहीं है, यह सबाल अमर बाबू का नहीं है, ऐसी घटना कही भी न हो। वह चाहे कलकत्ता में हो, पटना में हो, दिल्ली में हो कही भी हो—नहीं होनी चाहिए। दिल्ली में 6 मार्च को प्रदर्शन हुआ—हमारे ऊपर जिम्मेदारी थी, सब से बड़ा दल होने के नाते कि कोई घटना न हो और आप ने देखा कि कोई घटना नहीं हुई।

मैं प्रिय रंजन दास मुशी से कहना चाहता हूँ—सब में पहले घेगव शब्द का विरोध मैंने किया था—इसी पार्लियामेन्ट में और यह शब्द इन्हीं कम्युनिस्टों ने निकाला था। बाद में नक्सलाइट आये। नक्सलाइट के नाम पर बंगाल में कितनी हत्याएँ हुईं—उम समय कांग्रेसियों और हम ने मिल कर उन का विरोध किया किन्तु ये दोनों—सी०पी०आई०(एम) और सी०पी०आई० उन का विरोध नहीं करते थे, ये कहते थे—वे प्रिमनेर है। हत्या कही भी हो, किसी की हों, ठीक नहीं है। कभी-कभी ये आप के साथ रहते हैं, कभी विरोध में रहते हैं, कभी इन के साथ चलते हैं और कभी उन के साथ चलते हैं और हम को बेबकूफ बनाने की कोशिश करते हैं.....

श्री कुण्डलचन्द्र पांडे (अभीलाबाद): आप को जयप्रकाश जी के अलावा कोई नहीं बना सकता।

श्री नरेंद्र कुमार शर्मा: प्रच्छेद खाते अन्नक हो रहा है.....

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : सार्वे जी, मैं आप को छोड़ूंगा नहीं आप ने यहाँ चेलेन्ज दिया है।

श्री बरेंद्र कुमार सार्वे : जोशी जी, मैं प्रेसेन्सिबिल बाल नहीं करता हूँ। अगर आप एम्बेयरी के लिए तैयार हैं तो आज्ञाइये, उन लोगों की एम्बेयरी हो जाए जिन लोगों ने संविद में मिनिस्टर बनने के बाद 18 महीनों में उतनी बेल्थ एम्बेस कर ली जिनकी 180 सालों में भी नहीं हो सकती थी।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : सार्वे जी, आप सप्रीम कर्ट के लायर हैं मैं लायर नहीं हूँ। मैंने जो चेलेन्ज दिया था वह आर० एस० एस० की एक्टीविटीज के बारे में था। संविद शासन के बारे में मैं नहीं बोला था आर० एस० एस० के बारे में बोला था। इस लिए आप को सब का मामला करना जरा मुश्किल होता है।

महापति जी, ये ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ—मैं यही कहना हूँ कि आज हम को डिप्लोर करना है और उसी तरह से करना है जैसे उस दिन सब ने मिलकर किया था। मैं ऐसा इस लिए कहता हूँ कि आज वाहर हवा में तनाव है, हवा में अराजकता है हवा में हिंसा का वातावरण है और हम किसी भी दृष्टि से उस को उन्मोजित देने की कोशिश करते तो उस का अमर यच्छ नहीं हाग इस लिए हम कहते हैं कि हम उस गिन को पकड़े, the sin is a sin, let us find it out. इस लिए मैंने कहा कि ऐसी घटना चाहे कलकत्ता में हो या कहीं भी हो without even going into the merits of the case उसका अनरिजर्ब्ड इमनशन करें। इसके बारे में डिप्लोर शब्द कहा गया है, इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि सब मिल कर इस घटना को डिप्लोर करें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का संचर्चन करता हूँ।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this Resolution and to plead with the entire House, including the opposition, that we must reject this Resolution unanimously. In my judgement

today is one of the saddest days in the history of this Parliament, because I feel we are discussing a motion which, under the Constitution, this House has no jurisdiction to discuss; rather, it will not be proper for us to discuss; such a motion. The matter we discuss is an allegation of an incident of violence, a matter concerning law and order in a State in India. This comes squarely under the jurisdiction of the State Government, and not of this Parliament or the Central Government. Therefore, I feel we are doing an improper thing in submitting to the demand that this motion be discussed.

Sir, I am also pained that yesterday when the demand was made to move an adjournment motion and when it was rejected by the Speaker, the opposition held out a threat of dharna in this House. They are speaking about violence. What exactly do we mean by violence, I do not understand. Does it mean violence only if you beat somebody on his face? Would it not amount to violence if the Parliament of India is not permitted to function in the proper manner, by the collective action of obstruction by the Members of Parliament? After having entered Parliament by the right of election, in violation of the oath they have taken on the floor of the House, if some members collectively say that they will obstruct the proceedings of the House, is it by any measure less violent than the violence we are attempting to deplore? I feel this House, at least the members of this House belonging to my party, have submitted themselves to a moment of weakness in agreeing that to avoid a particular situation, we may discuss a motion which we have no jurisdiction to discuss. That is why I said this is a sad day.

Now the State Government, which must have a direct interest in this matter, is not before the House, and we are hearing JP stories. Let alone that, forgetting JP for a moment, let us focus our attention on that particular incident. Let us ask ourselves

this question whether there is anything particularly special in this incident. In an election year, when demonstrations and meetings are taking place, is there anything particularly extraordinary? Are we not conversant or acquainted with incidents, demonstrations which are taking place and some violence breaking? Some spontaneous outburst is coming out. Hundreds of these incidents are taking place in this country. As politicians, we know that we are in for series of incidents where the election tempo will be in full swing. When the tension between the political fights is going on, these will be daily incidents.

Let us look to Mr. Borooah, President of the Indian National Congress. He was attacked with chappal and stones in Baroda and Patna. Nobody raised a hullabaloo about the incident involved in it. Mr. Shankar Dayal Singh, a Member of Parliament was also attacked only last week in his constituency. Nobody was bothered about that. A series of incidents are taking place. Nobody is bothered about them.

Here, we have heard Mr. Munshi and Mr. Samar Guha. I would take my position on the basis of the statement Mr. Samar Guha had made. What is the position? A meeting is addressed in the university hall. No incident takes place there. A series of meetings. JP addressed in the morning. No incident takes place there. A massive demonstration took place under the auspices of Chhatra Parishad. They made a march on, and the paper which Mr. Samar Guha quoted here reports that Mr. Subrato Mukherjee and Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munshi made an appeal to the demonstrators to disperse and they dispersed. Mr. Samar Guha told us that about 200 people infiltrated into that scene of incident. This is not what I am quoting from the paper; this is what Mr. Samar Guha was just now pointing out that about 200 people came away to that parti-

cular place and Shri Subrato Mukherjee made a speech to those people pacifying them. These slogans and counter-slogans are taking place. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan came away to that particular place. There thousands of people made a march. All them were going to the railway station and the leader of Chhatra Parishad succeeded in sending them to the railway station. Going by the statement of Mr. Samar Guha means that only 200 people were remaining at the place of incident. Then Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan came there and slogans and counter-slogans were raised with the result that an inflammatory situation developed there. That is what is happening. The important point I am emphasising here is this. If it is a premeditated move, is this the method in which Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan was supposed to be glorified? Everyone of those who were present, who did not participate should have led into that place. In spite of its leader, about 200 people gathered there; some others were also there. Therefore, this is the story which is there. Therefore nothing was premeditated there. A development has taken place as a result of slogans and people get infuriated and then some incident takes place. Mr. Samar Guha admitted that he mounted on the bonnet of the car and made a speech. The allegation is that the speech was inflammatory. I put a question to him. He did not deny that. He admitted that he did mount on the bonnet of the car and made a speech. We know Mr. Samar Guha how will he speak and react in a particular situation. We can more or less judge and his voice gets infuriated and then something happens.

What I am emphasising is this. Forgetting for a moment that Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan was involved in this particular small incident of a series of demonstrations and counter-demonstrations going on and ultimately a small incident of some chappal being thrown and somebody being prevented. Is this incident deserving of consideration by the

Parliament of India? This is a question I am putting to you. If such incidents deserve consideration at the Bar of the Parliament of India, then I feel that the Parliament of India will have no other business to do except to discuss this, because these may be daily occurrences.

What is important about it? Because JP is involved in it. A mischievous attempt was made to equate this incident with the Allahabad incident. The Opposition was saying as if it was an act of generosity on their part in agreeing to pass a resolution unanimously condemning the Allahabad incident. Are we such duds as not to understand a distinction between the two? Is there any comparison between the two? The Prime Minister goes to a court to give evidence; somebody goes into the court with a revolver and that particular person is caught. The Prime Minister of India goes not to a public meeting, not for performing a political function, not for that sort of a purpose, but to give evidence in the court.

Now, for example, in 1967, the Prime Minister went to Bhuvaneshwar to address a public meeting. She was attacked and she was hit on the nose. Nobody came forward with a motion in Parliament to deplore or to condemn it. But the case of Allahabad was different. There was a deliberate attempt made. Somebody went to the court with a revolver. Here, it is not a deliberate attempt made. A deliberate attempt was made there. They equate it with that. As a citizen of this country, I raise my voice of protest against equating the Prime Minister of India, not Shrimati Indira Gandhi, with J.P.

I do not find anything in J.P. to deserve that sort of a position. Is there any comparison between an elected leader of the country, the Prime Minister of India, the Leader of this House, and J.P. I do not agree that there is any comparison between the two. (*Interruptions*) Don't add insult to the holy name of Mahatma Gandhi by equating J.P. with Mahatma Gandhi. I know J.P.

Did Mahatma Gandhi ever go to any place in a chartered plane? This is what J.P. went to Calcutta at 10.0' Clock on that day by a chartered plane of Kalinga. I happened to see the IAC Schedule. There is every day a flight from Bhuvaneshwar to Calcutta, landing there at 1.30. He could go by that flight. But the great poor people's leader had to go there by a chartered plane. Chartered by whom? By Mr. Biju Patnaik.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY (Kendrapara): He is telling a lie— (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can refute it when you speak.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: This is what was stated on the floor of the Assembly of West Bengal. It is not my statement.

Next day, the functions were held in the evening. He could have come the next day by the plane. But he came by a chartered plane. Where did he stay and with whom? I need not say all that. All I say is, for heaven's sake, don't speak about Mahatma Gandhi in comparison with J.P. Let his soul rest in peace. Let us not offend and shame the sacred memory of the Father of the Nation.

This gentleman in place and out of place takes the name of Mahatma Gandhi. What right has he? What is his following? He talks of partyless democracy. It is all nonsense. No politician of any recognition will accept it. Who will accept it? Will Congress (O) accept it? Will CPI(M) accept it? Will Socialist Party accept it? He is calling it a revolution. What does he know about revolution? He has no idea about revolution. He speaks about partyless democracy, I ask you, "If he wants partyless democracy, if he does not want any of you, why is he calling all of you". Why is he discussing matters with you? What is his following consisting of? Is it his following or the following supplied by you?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Let him go outside and make this type of speech.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** I am now speaking for the people to hear. I am making a public speech here. May I ask you, what is his following? Is it or is it not a following supplied by you? If you say that the following that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is supposed to have is his own, then you are conceding that you, Parties, have no following of your own. If, on the other hand, you say that the following that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is supposed to have is the following that you are supplying him, then J.P. is a non-entity on the political scene of this country. This is nothing better or nothing less than the Grand Alliance we knew of. The Grand Alliance wanted a mask and this gentleman who had been going about trying to find an opportunity has lent his own name to it.

A simple, small, insignificant incident is sought to be brought up before the House of Parliament, importance is sought to be attached to it, because J.P. is the tallest man; may be, physically; I do not know, but about the other tallness, I am prepared to agree

Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan made certain speeches in Calcutta. Every public man who goes out and makes speeches must be prepared to take the reaction of all those speeches. If he makes a speech attacking the Prime Minister—I am not against attacking the Prime Minister—but if he calls the Prime Minister an illiterate woman, a person who has no right to be the Chancellor of a University and if he makes that speech in the University campus and expects that he can get away with laurels and flowers, then either he does not know the reality of the situation or he is exaggerating it. Every political leader must have mutual respect. And here is a gentleman, who speaks about democracy, going about and asking the people to enter into a knock-out campaign, calling upon the students to give up their studies for all time to come and calling upon the military and the

police to revolt and giving instigation for violence openly; he cannot be the champion of democracy. How the people have reacted to this incident is to be judged by what followed the next day. On the 4th, a call was given for a strike by the students in protest against this incident. What happened, may I ask? If the students were angered about it, then certainly they would have struck work for one day, but no school struck work; the University did not strike work; everything went on perfectly well. Then a call was given for a bandh on the 6th. What happened? Nothing happened. That means, in the Calcutta city, this was an insignificant incident, and people felt that this was manipulated and stage-managed for a political purpose.

My only sorrow, as I submitted at the beginning, is that, for this sort of thing, for this sort of farcical comedy, the Parliament's time was taken; something was forced on this House in the most improper manner; we have taken up a subject which we have no jurisdiction to take up and discuss. That is why, I say that it is a sad thing. For this reason, it is in the fitness of things that this Resolution be thrown out, thrown out not merely by the vote of the Congress Party, but, if we have any sense of propriety, by the entire Opposition also. Let us not accept this Resolution and let us throw it out unanimously.

**SHRI V. MAYAVAN** (Chidambaram): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the way in which Prof. Samar Guha had narrated the incident that had taken place in Calcutta on 2nd April, has moved me to say a few words in support of the motion moved by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra. Enough has been spoken. The entire things have been narrated. About the text of the motion, there are two things to be considered here. And we will have to deal with this only on humanitarian considerations and not on the political plane at all.

The motion is:

"This House deploras the recent violent incident in Calcutta in which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's car was attacked and a member of the House Shri Samar Guha and his colleagues sustained injuries."

Now, the question is: was there a violent incident that took place on 2nd April in Calcutta? Secondly, are we condemning such occurrences?

Sir, what happened in Calcutta on the 2nd April is an indelible stigma on the largest democracy of the world. The Minister of Information of the State of West Bengal led the procession against Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. The procession was instigated to violence by no other person than Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsi, a member of this House, who only the other day piloted a Private Members' Bill seeking to declare that only politicians should become Members of Parliament and no other professional representatives should aspire for membership of this House. He was criticised virulently by his own colleagues in the Congress Party for having brought such a worthless Bill. Shri Munshi feigned sickness and was not here in the House to hear the abuses made by his own colleagues. But he was engaged in Calcutta preparing the ground for finishing off an eminent and the only surviving politician of the Independent era who did not seek any office as a reward for his services and sacrifices to the nation. Mr. Munsi himself had accepted while he spoke that had he not been there, a massacre would have taken place. That is what he has stated in his speech. Such a felony was perpetrated on the person of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Shri Samar Guha, a Member of this House and the Chief Minister of West Bengal, Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray has tendered his apology...

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** No apology.

**SHRI V. MAYAVAN:** All right. He has regretted, if not apologised, for

this premeditated attack by putting forth the excuse that the audience was annoyed at certain remarks of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan against Mrs. Indira Gandhi. It has been reported in the Press.

I am sure the hon. Home Minister, Shri Brahamananda Reddy who is fond of using the phrase 'our beloved leader' will no doubt refer to this qualified apology or regret of the Chief Minister. In our country, there is only one leader and that is Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Yet we call ourselves a democracy. Dissent is the life-force of a democracy. If this life-force is stifled, then we cannot foster democracy in the country. What has JP done to invite the wrath of the hooligans in Calcutta? He might have referred to the rampant corruption in the Government led by Shrimati Gandhi... (Interruptions). We have appointed a Judge. Is it democratically unwise to plead for the amelioration of the miseries of the masses? The widespread corruption does not affect those in authority. It affects the common people whose very survival hangs in the balance. Yet, the Congress Party who swears by the people does not hesitate to throttle the voice of dissent against the anti-people's policy of the Government.

I would like to point out that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has started this movement, not depending upon his physical stamina but depending upon his spiritual and moral strength. The hon. Member opposite said that he is no respecter of personality but is a respecter of ideology. What ideology have they been respecting is not known at all. He is advanced in age, with serious ailments. Any faint blow on his physique will finish him off for ever.

20.40 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI in the Chair.]

Every third man is not a security man in the audience as you find in the



gatherings addressed by the Ministers. Does he derive strength by addressing the people of the country in the sweltering heat? What he is doing is just to strengthen the sinews of democracy in the country. He has got in his heart not only the interests of the people but also the future of the country. As we see the political developments in the country, a microcosmic minority political party, the C.P.I. is extending its full support to the microcosmic Congress Party in the coming elections. It looks as though the CPI has become an incarnation of munificence in the country. It has nothing but the interests of the people in supporting the Congress Party. Yet, Shri J. P. who is acclaimed as a great Socialist all over the world has suddenly become a reactionary in the eyes of the Congress Party. As Trotsky was murdered by those then in authority in Soviet Russia, now U.P. has become the largest for the Congress-CPI alliance.

I would like to warn the Government that if anything happens to J. P., the country will rise in revolt and those in authority will have to run like the refugees of South Viet Nam now.

In this House, all the hon. Members, whether they belong to the ruling party or the opposition party, whether one Member is a Prime Minister and the other is a leader of an opposition group, have a place of honour in the democratic structure. The other day, when a man with a gun was caught in the vicinity of Allahabad High Court, where the Prime Minister was tendering evidence, there was a spontaneous exhibition of sentiments on the floor of this House from all sides. Yet, when the physical attack on Shri Samar Guha was referred here on the floor of this House yesterday, it is really abominable that the ruling party members should ridicule the issue, as if Samar Guha was a non-entity in the politics of our country. Democracy should breed tolerance towards differing viewpoints. But the ruling party members jump in jitters the moment the P.M.'s autocratic policies

are criticised by the opposition. I personally feel that the ruling party members have identified the Congress Party with its leader. I have to say that this is not conducive for the healthy growth of democracy in the country.

If I say that the country is ruled by 8 Kashmiri Brahmins, am I doing anything wrong to the cause of democracy? What I wish to stress is that the intelligence is not confined to Kashmir and it can be located in other regions also for running efficiently the Central administration. If J. P. refers to this, or if Samar Guha says this, should there be violent annoyance and anger on the part of the ruling party?

I condemn the attack on Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Shri Samar Guha. By attacking them the ruling party has cut the roots of democracy in the country.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara) Mr. Chairman, at this late hour, I do not want to extend this exercise in futility nor do I want to tax your patience or the patience of the House. But you would forgive me if I make some brief remarks about the arguments and inferences that have been placed before us and also about the admissibility of this motion to which Mr. C. M. Stephen referred earlier.

I have not been able to understand this extraordinary preposterous motion. During the last four years and a few months in this House, even earlier when I used to cover this House, or when I used to read, never have I seen such an extraordinary motion being admitted almost on the point of 'dharna' or on the point of a bayonet! I would like to pose this question before you whether it is exactly a democratic method of arriving at decision? Because, as somebody claimed, they are concerned about democratic values. The whole exercise was to paint us Members of this side and our party as hooligans.

That is the name which hon. Member, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra used,—hooligans, perpetrators of rape, arson, loot and what not, whereas they are the angles and paragons of virtue, defenders of democracy etc. But the whole debate has been an exercise in futility and it has ended in a fiasco just like the Calcutta meeting which was still-born. While I have every sympathy for the physical injuries suffered by my distinguished colleague Prof. Samar Guha, I am thankful to him that he had spared us of an exhibition in this House of his alleged physical injuries! I am thankful to him that he did not do that; he was on a very low key today but for occasional gesticulations. I would like to tell him and request him that this House is not to be converted into a stage or circus arena. Those friends who have moved this motion should not try to convert this House into a circus arena or stage and if they are bent on doing that, we are ready to play the game and many more things can come out like Goenka, Gayatri Devi, Maharanis and about their CPM leaders, their new friends, and all that. Is it proper to have this debate at all? If he had grievance he could have come here with a privilege motion. That he did not choose to do so is significant. And he clubbed this with an attack on JP's car—not person, mind you, but the car used by JP. He was not attacked but the car was attacked. All this shows how politically motivated Mr. Mishra's motion is, where an occasion is trying to be utilised, like the farce of a fast which is going on in Delhi by another gentleman, who is competing with the so-called "mahant". I call Jayaprakash Narayan 'mahant' and this is not my word. This word was used about Jayaprakash Narayan by my former leader and also his leader Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. Mahant was the title given to him by Lohia who was life-long comrade of his. I do not want to go into those things. Even in Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra's speech there was not the usual thrust and it was on a dull-note, of course there were the usual inuendoes about the

Prime Minister. The basic question now is this. About Calcutta nobody is more competent to talk than my friend Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Muni who comes from that place. He represents Calcutta. He is representing Btngal here. He is more competent to speak about it than anybody else, and to describe what went on in Calcutta. This is not the first time that there has been violence in Calcutta. Calcutta has not only been the home of revolutionaries but also been a home of terrorists in Bengal Politics. Even Shri Dinen Bhattacharyya and his friend Shri Jyoti Basu once said that the police had to be removed so that they could speak in public I am quoting from the Times of India as to what Shri Jyoti Basu says:

"To-day I challenge the Congress Party in the State to withdraw the police for forty-eight hours so that I can speak in public"

Whereas Shri Subroto Mukerjee and Nurul Islam represent the revolutionary traditions of Bengal politics, Shri Dinen Bhattacharyya and his hoodlums represent the terrorist trends which we are determined to crush at all costs in Calcutta, Kerala or anywhere else

This is a "sangam" between Shri Dinen Bhattacharyya's hoodlum strains of Indian politics and Shyam Babus! There is another Sangam between Shri E. M. S. Namboodripad and J.P. and between Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu and Morarji Desai. I was amused to see from this morning Times of India a picture where a man bereft of that great Gandhi cap and another competing Gandhi, Shri Morarji Desai who squatted on the floor. Who was behind him—Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu. Here is another picture. I am told that some of the Student's federation leaders said that it is shameful. In Calcutta Jayaprakashji was there. Who was behind him—Shri Jyoti Basu. We are determined to defeat and crush this "sangam". I can speak about my State since Muni has already spoken about West Bengal—that we are determined to crush this "Sangam" once

for all. I agree with Shri Indrajit Gupta who spoke before me that it would have been worthwhile to widen the scope of this debate because there is violence not only in Calcutta and West Bengal but also in Kerala. There is violence going on everywhere. There was violence in Gujarat; there was violence in Orissa; there was violence in U. P.; there was violence in Bihar. Who was responsible for this? May I ask who condemned the violence and who ended the violence once for all in West Bengal? The credit for ending the violence there goes to my friend, Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsî and Shri Subroto Mukerjee and countless thousands of young men who sacrificed everything so that the democracy might survive. Where was this concern then? Where was this concern when our workers in Kerala were attacked. A number of persons were attacked there. There was loot, arson and rape that went on in the name of socialism in Kerala. Where were the C.P.M. and socialist leaders and their hangers on? Where was Shri Bhattacharyya then? They were not to be seen anywhere. It goes to the lasting credit of my friends who have added a new chapter to the history of Bengal for finishing off this scare of violence of C.P.M.

So, Sir, as I said earlier, this motivated motion bereft of any content deserves to be thrown in the dust bin. Before I conclude, I would like to say what is the genesis of this violence. I would have agreed with Shri Indrajit Gupta if there was a debate wider in scope and we could have gone into greater details of it. It is again another "Sangam" to which also he referred. I shall not name it because I do not know whether Shri Bhattacharyya will object to the name. The person who calls J. P. as a C.I.A. agent was none other than the distinguished leader of Marxist Party's leader and a great leader of my State, Shri A. K. Gopalan. That was a few years ago.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:** No, No. I totally disagree with this.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN:** Well, I shall bring the cutting. We did not

say that. It is you who said it, that JP was a CIA agent. Mr. Indrajit Gupta read out from hero's book JP's statement and A. K. Gopalan's rejoinder.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:** Kaira was a capitalist.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN:** He has quoted datewise from the *Indian Express*. Don't talk about that. Now, what I would like to say is, here is the Colossus with feet of clay who is being paraded around in the international press, in the American Press, with the help of agencies like CIA, with the help of Indian monopoly press presided over by Shri R. N. Goenka and with the help of this motley crowd who were rejected by the electorate and who were thrown into the dust bin of history in 1971 and 1972. It is this combination, it is this "Sangam", with which we are concerned because we want democracy to survive, we want democratic value to survive and we want parliamentary institutions to survive. If Subroto and Priya have done whatever they have done, in organising a demonstration, a black flag demonstration, a hundred times I would say, cheers to Priya and cheers to Subroto. I can also say that the same fate awaits this Colossus Mahant, if he comes to Kerala. I am telling you today, in advance. We are determined everywhere to oppose and annihilate this trend in Indian politics so that democracy can survive and parliamentary institutions can survive.

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY** (Kendrapara): Mr. Chairman, Sir, every dark cloud has its silver linings. The Calcutta incident, however, deplorable and vulgar it may be, has at least one welcome aspect. It has unmasked the fascist face of the Congress regime, which we want to condemn and destroy through the motion moved by my hon. friend Shri Shyannandan Mishra. The attack on JP in Calcutta led by Congress hooligans and abetted by a Congress Minister and a sitting MP

of this House, who in a most unabashed manner has justified his action, is really unparalleled in the political history not only of India but of the world Sir, I would ask those who talk of the preservation of the system of parliamentary democracy, how was it open to a Minister and to an elected representative of this House to lead this kind of demonstration, vulgar demonstration? This is worse than vulgarity.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** Please define vulgarity.

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:** I am coming to that. With you sitting, I need not define.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** You symbolise that. How can you define?

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:** I have every regard and affection for the youth of West Bengal. But, my only regret is that they are represented in this House through a person like Mr Priya Ranjan Das Munsi, whose cultural level today has gone even below the level of urchins. In an unabashed manner....

**SHRI N.K.P. SALVE:** Sir, is it fair?

21 hrs.

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:** I am not yielding. Some of the speakers of the treasury benches have exceeded the urchins in their abuses and aspersions. We many differ from Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. We may differ from Mrs Indira Ganhi, but that does not give us the liberty to liberal abuses at her. Those who want to cherish the values of democracy and respect the opposition, should not have indulged in this kind of vulgar outbursts this evening. If according to Shri Das Munsi, the demonstration was justified and if it was spontaneous, I ask him as an honest man why the Chief Minister, Shri Siddhartha Senkar Ray, had to express regret at Durgapur over the incident?

Here I have the Hindustan Standard of 7th, Manday. The report is of its Staff Correspondent datelined; Durgapur, April 6:

"The Chief Minister of West Bengal, Mr. S. S. Ray, today expressed his regret over the recent incident of an attack on Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan's car in Calcutta".

He was worried at the action of the Chhatra Congress Youth in Calcutta.

"Mr. Ray, however, claimed that students and youth got excited over certain remarks on Mrs. Gandhi made by Mr. Narayan after his arrival in West Bengal."

This is exactly what we are opposing today. Mrs. Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, cannot claim the divine right of kingship that she will be beyond any criticism.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** If you abuse women in filthy language, you will be taught a lesson.

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:** I am not yielding. That a person, a Minister, who has not even completed Senior Cambridge, who has not even passed Senior Cambridge, should be the Chancellor of Viswa Bharati is fantastic....

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** On a point of order.

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:** I am not yielding.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** He is on a point of order.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** I would make an appeal to Shri Mohanty. I have great regard for his ability and eloquence. I myself have passed just Senior Cambridge. Anyone who has attained the age of 25 and who is not insane can become a member of this House. May I ask him if this is the criterion to be adopted? May I ask,

why does he respect Tagore who was not even a matriculate? Is this the standard? If a person has not passed a particular examination, does he not have knowledge? This is shameful.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: What is the point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us use moderate language.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: It is alleged that Jayaprakash Narayan made a statement in Calcutta on his arrival that the Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was not fit to be Chancellor of Viswa Bharati University and that this enraged the youth of Bengal. Is this not a fascist tendency that you claim the divine right of kingship which was washed away in blood in the 16th century in England? That the Prime Minister should claim the divine right of kingship and she should be beyond all criticism of the Opposition and the Opposition should swallow whatever be her protestations shows a fascist trend, a fascist tendency, which we are condemning today (Interruptions) because Mr. S. S. RAY said that JP made certain remarks about Mrs. Gandhi which had enraged the youth of Bengal (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: It is the statement of Mr. S. S. Ray.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: You are more loyal than the king. You will never be able to understand this because this is not a Supreme Court brief. I could not adduce perhaps better evidence to the vulgarity that was permitted on 2nd April than to quote the statement of Mr. S. S. Ray which I have quoted. My challenge is still open. If the demonstration was that innocuous and that justified, why should S. S. Ray the Chief Minister of West Bengal come with that?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Where was democracy in Utkal University when the Minister and Governor were not allowed?

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: Instead of affording protection to the critics of the powers that be the Government is today employing strong arm tactics and methods and is using Government machinery to bludgeon the critics to silence. Before JP came to Calcutta he had visited Orissa and we were grateful to him for that. From Jarasaguda to Dhenkanal the constituency of the Chief Minister Shrimati Nandini Satpathy such kind of vulgar attempts were also made. Here we are not so much bothered about the personal safety of JP. Every man is mortal and men like JP and Gandhiji always die a martyr's death they do not die of protracting ailments. Krishna was killed by Jarasa, Christ was crucified. Gandhiji was killed by Godse. The violent death of such great men always gives tragic dimension to their lives. Martyrs' blood does not go in vain. So, we are not bothered about JP or Samar Guha; we are concerned with values.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You are determined to make a martyr of him to make political capital out of it.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: As I was saying drunkards, and hooligans were employed by the Congress under the garb of youth Congress and students.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: Whisky bottles were found in Biju Patnaik's house, your leader's house.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: If he is interested in learning about Biju Patnaik he may better address his enquires to Mr. S. S. Ray who was his paid retainer for a number of years and who was handling his taxation matters. Naturally he would be able to have much better information.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You have now shifted the retainership to JP?

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:**  
In Orissa in Dhenkanal 300 drunkards and hooligans under the garb of students and outh congress started pelting stones at 10 O'clock on JP, meeting on 30th March, 1974 but unfortunately they hit the armed policemen who were there to maintain law and order. I congratulate the District Magistrate of Dhenkanal who gave order for a lathi charge and in the mele hooligans were hurt. They are therefore today clamouring for a judicial inquiry into it and the District Magistrate and the S. P. are being victimised because their "crime" was that they had only maintained law and order. It is for the information of Shri Brahmananda Reddi. Since you are asking me to conclude, let me tell you that this is synchronising with the death knell of democracy in this country. We can sit till the early hours of the morning here as we are discussing a very vital issue which goes to the very root of our democratic existence. These are fascist trends. I know the communists want to make Shrimati Indira Gandhi a Keransky.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Your pronouncement is very bad.

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:**  
Sir, God save Shrimati Indira Gandhi and the Congress Party from the hands of our friends, the Communist Party of India. Whatever it may be this is a very serious matter. Now, what we are concerned about is not the safety of J. P. It is not the safety of Samar Guha or of any individuals but with certain fundamental values. My only regret is that the Members on the Treasury benches have degraded such a momentous issue to personal level and with these words, I fully associate myself with the motion moved by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra and I hope our message will be carried across the people and even at the last moment hon. Members on the other side will analyse their hearts and associate themselves also with this motion which has been moved by Shri Shyamnandan Mishra

and deplore the violence, whatever its colour, whatever its origin might have been and in whatever sphere it might have occurred.

**श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह ( चतरा ) :**  
सभापति महोदय, मैंने बहुत ध्यान से श्याम बाबू का प्रस्ताव पढ़ा है और मेरी बहुत इच्छा हो रही है कि अगर थोड़ा सा संशोधन श्याम बाबू उसमें कर दें तो उसको स्वीकार कर लिया जाय और इस संशोधन को स्वीकार करने में श्याम बाबू को कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये या जो हमारे विरोधी दल के माननीय सदस्य हैं, उनको कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये। संशोधन वही है, कोई लिखित नहीं है। लिखित तो सबने विदड़ा कर लिया है। मेरा संशोधन यह है :

“अगर उस घटना के समय सुब्रत मुखर्जी और प्रिय रंजन दास मुन्शी नहीं होते तो वह घटना दुर्घटना में बदल जाती, इसलिये वह सदन श्री सुब्रत मुखर्जी और श्री प्रिय रंजन दास मुन्शी के प्रति कृतज्ञता व्यक्त करता है जिन्होंने वहां उपस्थित होकर कोई दुर्घटना होने से बचाया।

अब यह तो बहुत ही निर्दोष संशोधन मैं आपको दे रहा हूं। आपको कृतज्ञता व्यक्त करनी चाहिये दास मुन्शी के प्रति और सुब्रत मुखर्जी के प्रति जिन्होंने वहां उपस्थित होकर किसी तरह की दुर्घटना नहीं होने दी। देश में इस समय हिंसा का एक वातावरण जागृत हो गया है। सभापति महोदय, आपने स्वयं अपने भाषण में बहुत ही अच्छे-अच्छे शब्दों के द्वारा उसका वर्णन किया है। मैं जब आपको देख रहा हूं तो अभी भी वह झलक आपकी आंखों में दिख रही है। आप वहां से उठ कर जब सामने की कुर्सी पर गये हैं और आप जब मेरी ओर ठीक सामने देख रहे हैं तो आपकी नजरों से भी यह बात साफ जाहिर हो रही है कि हिंसा के वातावरण को बनाने में सबसे बड़ा हाथ

हमारे इन मित्रों का है। यह ठीक है कि प्रायः जब वहाँ बोल रहे थे तो प्रायः का कुछ कहना था, लेकिन वहाँ से जब प्रायः देखेंगे तो बिल्कुल साफ-पाफ पीजे दिखायी देंगी कि हमारे जो मित्र उधर बैठे हुये हैं हिंसा को जानूत करने में उनका बहुत बड़ा हाथ है और मुझे बड़ी खुशी हो रही है - सभापति महोदय, कि प्रायः ऐसे-ऐसे अपना सिर हिला कर हमारा अनु-मोदन कर रहे हैं।

इस सदन में हमने कई दुःख घटनाओं की चर्चा की है। बर्ब के प्रारम्भ में ही केन्द्रीय रेल मंत्री और देश के एक आदर्शपूर्ण नेता श्री ललितनारायण मिश्र की हत्या की चर्चा हम लोगों ने की। उसके बाद इसाहाबाद हाई कोर्ट में जहाँ से श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र चुन कर आये हैं वहाँ के एक गोविन्द मिश्र नाम के सज्जन . . . (ध्यानवान) . . . गोपाल या गोविन्द में नहीं जानता हूँ मैं मिश्र जानता हूँ कि दोनों मिश्र हैं और हो सकता है कि कोई मिश्र ही, मैं नहीं कहता कि इस सम्बन्ध में, लेकिन वह एक दुःख घटना हमारे सामने आई जिसकी चर्चा हमने इस सदन में की। उसके कुछ ही मग बाद जब कि अखबारों की काली पगड़ी नहीं खूबी होगी कि उच्चतम न्यायालय के मुख्य न्यायाधीश पर जो बम प्रहार किया गया उसकी भी चर्चा हम लोगों ने इस सदन में की। उसके बाद कलकत्ता में बग हुआ, क्या नहीं हुआ, यह तो मैं नहीं जानता, मैं नहीं ब, लेकिन 3 अप्रैल को मेरे ऊपर भी कुछ इसी तरह की घटना हाँ-होते बच गई। मैं अपनी कास्टीट्यूटरी जमगी तलैया से चला जा रहा था गाड़ी में और एक ब एक 15-20 व्यक्तियों ने नारा लवाना शुरू किया। झुमरी तलैया का नाम सभी लोग जानते हैं इसलिये कि विविध भारतीय पर फर्माइशी गानों के लिये सबने जवाब फरमाइश झुमरी तलैया से होती है। जब मैं उस जनह से जा रहा था तो 20-25 लड़के—वह छात्र नहीं थे, लफंगे थे, मैं मुन्का अजब प्रयोग नहीं करता हूँ, कुछ लफंगे एक ब एक नारा लवाने लगे कि बंगाल का

बंगला बिहार में लेंगे। मैंने तो अखबार भी नहीं देखा था, तब तक एक बड़ा सा पीड़ा चला जिसने मेरी गाड़ी के शीशे को तो बिल्कुल धागे से निकाब कर दिया, दूसरा चला उसने दाहिने तरफ के शीशे को तोड़ दिया। वह तो खुर्गाकस्मती कहिये, प्रायः लोगों की शुभ कामना मेरे ऊपर है कि मैं सही सलामत प्रायः लोगों के सामने हाथिरे हूँ नहीं तो वो तारीख को कलकत्ते में हमारे, तो मित्रों ने बचाया दुर्घटना होने से लेकिन दूसरी ओर विरोधी दल के लोगों ने जिस बातावरण की सृष्टि की है उसके कारण सारा देश आज हिंसा के कगार पर खड़ा है और इसके लिये आज या कल धागे वाला इतिहास इनकी निन्दा करेगा कि पकने वाला उनेवा कि उनकी इसमें भूमिका क्या है? जनतंत्र में विरोधी दलों की बहुत बड़ी भूमिका है, बहुत बड़ा कर्तव्य है। लेकिन मैं वह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या विरोधी दलों का एक ही काम है कि प्रायः में भी या काम करे?

कई बातों की चर्चा होती है माननीय सदस्य विरजीव अ की चर्चा हुई। गंवर देव जी के साथ यहाँ में पवनार आश्रम में जो घटना हुई थी, उसकी भी मैंने चर्चा की थी। मुझे विरोधी लोगों की भी चिन्ता रहती है। जब मैं नीय सदस्य पोलू मोदी के ऊपर किमी ने चापल फेंकी थी तब भी मैंने दुःख व्यक्त किया था और प्रायः भी किमी के ऊपर जूते चप्पल का प्रहार होगा तो मैं दुःख व्यक्त करूँगा। लेकिन जाके रीर न फरे बवार्द, तो क्या जाने पीर पराई, थोड़ी सी बात क्या हुई क्या नहीं हुई, उसको लेकर इतना बतगड बनाया जा रहा है, तो मैं तो केवल एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम साथ भी भरते हैं तो हो जाते हैं बदनम, वह कल भी करते हैं तो चर्चा नहीं होगी।

हमारे पूर्व बचताओं ने बहुत कुछ कहा है। मैं नहीं चाहता कि इस सदन का बहुमत समय में बरबाद करे। एक ही बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि भी समर भूहा भी के प्रति हम

सबको बहुत आदर है। मैंने जब अखबारों में बोड़ी की बात इनके बारे में पढ़ी तो मुझे बड़ी चिन्ता हुई और मैंने सोचा कि अगर समर वा की कुछ भी हुआ होगा, अस्पताल में गये होंगे तो केरे बन्ध का घुप मिले या न मिले अपना खून मैं उनके लिये दे दूंगा। इतना मैं इनके लिये आदर करता हूँ और ये हैं श्री आदर के काबिल। लेकिन जब वे यहां आये तो इनकी बुलन्दी इनकी सेहत, इनकी आवाज में कोई भी कमी न देख कर, मुझे लगता है कि वहाँ के जीववानों से उनका इतना अधिक स्वागत किया कि उससे इनका व्यक्तित्व इतना अधिक आगे बढ़ा। इसके लिये समर वा को बगाल के जीववानों के प्रति धन्यवाद ज्ञापन करना चाहिये।

अन्त में एक बात कह कर अपने भाषण को समाप्त करूंगा और वह यह कि देश के सामने जो परिस्थितियाँ हैं, वे चिन्ता की हैं। हिंसा के पाव बढ रहे हैं, जनतन्त्र पर उनका बढ़ रहा है और हम लोग जो इस सदन में बैठे हैं, भारत की 60 करोड़ जनता के प्रति-निधि के रूप में—हमको बहुत गम्भीरता से इन बातों का तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिये। यह ठीक है कि हम लोग एक दूसरे पर लाठान लगा दे, एक दूसरे पर कीचड़ उछाल दें एक दूसरे के सम्बन्ध में तरह-तरह की बाने कह दें, लेकिन जनतन्त्र का पोषा जिस दिन सुधला जायेगा उस दिन हम छान की मीनारें नहीं रहेंगे। इसलिए हम लोगों का कर्तव्य है कि देश में जो वातावरण इस तरह वा बनता चला जा रहा है—प्रतिहिंसा का—इसको रोकने की अगर 12 घाने जवाबदेही हम लोगों की है तो 4 घाने जवाबदेही आप लोगों की भी है। इसलिये कि यहां जो कुल मख्या है उस में चार घान भर जाती 25 प्रतिशत आप लोग हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि यह 25 प्रतिशत आपके चुनाव में भी कायम रहे, हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि इधर बिल्कुल सफाचट हो जाये—हम लोगों को इसकी चिन्ता भी रहती है। इसीलिये आप लोग जो बोलते हैं—सब बोलें वा झूठ बोलें—उस को सुनते हैं, बहुत

आदरपूर्वक सुनते हैं और जनता भी सुन लेती है, लेकिन हम कान में सुन कर उस कान से निकाल देती है क्योंकि भागन की जनता जानती है कि देश के लिये कौन क्या कर रहा है। भागन की जनता जानती है कि आज इदिरा गांधी के मिवाय न कोई हमारा नेता है और न भत्रिय में कोई भागन के जनतन्त्र की रक्षा कर सकता है। इनलिये, सभापति जी, अचछा हुआ कि मेरे भाषण के समय आप इस कुर्सी पर बिगजमान हैं, इसलिए मैं आपको साक्षी रख कर इन भाइयों से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ—जयप्रकाशजी को छाना बना कर टुककी न लें। बगाल में क्या ऐसा हुआ ? जयप्रकाशजी अकेले जाते तो उनका स्वागत मत्कार भी होता, लेकिन—अगल बगल वालों को देखकर जनता बैसे ही भडकती है जैसे लाल रंग को देख कर माट भडकता है। अगर एक तरफ उनके बाँजू पटनायक रङ्गे को जनता पटक पटकी करेगी या नहीं ? उनका नाम ही पटनाय है। दूसरी तरफ अतुल्य घोष को रख ले तीमरी तरफ पाटि न माहब को रख ले और चौथी तरफ जनमध के हमारे जो भाई लोग यहां पर हैं—मैं चिन्ता का नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ उनसे मैं आप को छुडरर किसी का रख ले—तो जनत, पर उन का क्या असर पड़ेगा ? हम चाहते हैं कि इस वातावरण को समाप्त किया जाय और हम सब दल के लोग, जितने विरोधी दल के लोग हैं, वे आज मकल्प करें कि देश के जनतन्त्र के पोषे को मरदाने नहीं देंगे और उसकी रक्षा के लिये बटे में बड, बलिदान देने के ये एक साथ मिलकर तैयार रहेंगे।

सभापति महोदय श्री जी० त्रिभुवायन ।

श्री एस० एम० बनजा सभापति जी, हम लोग तब तक बैठेंगे ?

सभापति महोदय, त्रिभुवायन जी, भावलकरजी और सान्ने जी पांच-पांच मिनट से लें तो हो सकता है।



श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : मुझे खतरा है—साझे नौ राज चुके हैं, अब अगर रेडियो से किसी का नाम नहीं बोलेंगे तो कल प्रविलेज मोशन प्रा जायगा। इसलिये इन बहस को अब खत्म कर दूँ जिसमें आज इंडिया रेडियो पर लोगों का बाषण प्रा जाय।

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN** (Wandiwash): Sir, the resolution moved by Shri S. N. Mishra seeks to deplore the incident in Calcutta where Prof. Samar Guha was assaulted. All of us feel very sorry about it. But I would have been happy if Shri Mishra in his resolution has condemned the cult of violence which is very much on the increase throughout the country now. Recently we heard that when Mr. Piloo Mody went to address a meeting at Allahabad, a chappal was thrown at him. Mr. Shankar Dev was unfortunately assaulted by Sarvodaya workers and thrown out bodily from the venue of the conference. I am glad our DMK member has expressed the view that the opposition should be allowed to express their views freely. But I ask him, is this addressed to Delhi along or to Madras also?

**SHRI V. MAYAVAN:** What is the relevance?

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN:** We are talking about violence and that is the relevance. Very recently one of the members of the Legislative Council, Mr. Venga was assaulted and stabbed in open day-light in the MLA's hostel and the irresponsible Government of Madras took no action at all.

If the cult of violence is on the increase, all of us should be held responsible for it. The politicians of the country have been egging it on and it is recoiling on us. Whether it is J. P. or Mr. Piloo Mody or Mr. Guha, politicians receive bouquets as well as brickbats. But in a democracy, there must be two criteria: People must be able to express their view without

fear and also change the Government without violence. If you go on encouraging violence, whether it is Bihar or Bengal or any other State, it will naturally recoil on us. The proverb in the Bible says, he who takes the sword shall perish by the sword. If you sow the wind in Bihar, you will reap the whirlwind in Calcutta. Curbing violence is the responsibility of all of us, particularly the ruling parties.

[**SHRI VASANT SATHE** in the Chair]

21.31 hrs.

I have great respect for J. P. who has started this movement against corruption. But I do not know whether it is restricted only to Patna or Calcutta. I want to know from him whether it will extend to Madras or not. I want J. P. to have the same yardstick for all the States.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Has anybody applied for agency from Madras?

**SHRI G. VISWANATHAN:** So far J. P. and his colleagues have kept mum about the Tamil Nadu Government which is the most corrupt ministry in this country. I am glad I have come out of it. The problem is, how to change the Governments. Is the dissolution of the Bihar Assembly the panacea for all the ills of the country? I want some concrete answer from J. P. or Mr. Mishra. We have to change the Government by the ballot, not by bullets.

If the fate of a Government is going to be decided in the streets by mob, it will not be democracy, but it will be mobocracy. We must find out a solution. There is no provision for recall in the Constitution, it has to be amended. If somebody says that the people are against the Government how to find this out? There is no provision for referendum now in the Constitution you have to amend it. Let us sit together and

find out a solution. Let us not convert democracy into mobocracy. Violence is not going to solve any problem. Our leader, late Shri Anna, used to say that violence would complicate problems and create more problems than solving the problems. Are we going to create such a precedent for the future?

Suppose, in a State, the Government is forced to dissolve the Assembly, what happens after the election? If somebody takes into his mind and collects ten thousand people and daily goes on creating trouble in the capital, what happens to the next Government? Is it going to be dissolved again? Where is the end to this? Ultimately, it will be some sort of mobocracy, or whatever we may call it. We have, therefore, to find out a solution. I will request the Prime Minister, the leader of the country to sit together with the opposition, as well as J.P. and find out a solution.

I am very unhappy that one of our esteemed members of this House and former Dy. Prime Minister, Shri Morari Desai, has gone on fast. He insists that unless the Prime Minister announces, and the Government announces, elections in Gujarat, he would not end his fast. It is unfortunate that he has taken this extreme step. I think he has to re-consider it. All of us have to sit and find out a solution. I will request all the senior leaders of Congress (O) that they should not sacrifice such an eminent leader.

Already, the cult of violence is on the increase and people go on inciting violence. Whether it is the tallest man or the shortest man, I want that whosoever instigates violence, should be dealt with by the law of the land. If somebody instigates the military and the police that they should defy the Government, I am very sorry to say that it is neither democratic nor patriotic.

Former American President Woodrow Wilson, once said that the world must be made safe for democracy. Let

us not worry about the world, at least this country must be made safe for democracy. Let us curb and eradicate violence in this country and the politicians of this country should take up the responsibility.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul):  
Mr. Chairman, Sir, a debate on a Motion such as the one which is being discussed by the House should have taken the entire discussion to the dizzy heights of sublime dignity in fact but if it had descended to the disgraceful low depths of ridicule, I am afraid, the supporters of the Motion have to thank themselves for the gross mishandling of the entire matter. I think, greatest harm has been done to J.P. by bringing him to ridicule in this House by those who have sought to defend him. If he has friends like them, who have defended the Motion, J.P. need no enemies.

Sir, in a way, this debate has been exceedingly helpful, for a smoke screen had been created about this incident in the country and every sane-thinking person including Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray regretted the incident. Everyone regrets an incident in which it becomes necessary to throw chappals and throw brick-bats. No one is happy. We love devoutly democratic traditions and we hate situations and we hate contingencies where the people have to resort to extra-Constitutional and extra-legal means in any manner whatsoever. And therefore, we are sorry for the incident. As I was listening to Shri Priv. Rangan Das Munsal very carefully and very cautiously—I listened to the facts as he narrated them with absolute calm, clarity and lucidity—I felt and I say now, that far from blaming the Chhatra Parishad and far from blaming the Youth Congress, my hearty congratulations to the young people in these two organisations for their extreme restraint and exemplary behaviour. If there is any one to be blamed in this connection, if there is any one to be blamed for the episode, it is those who indulged in reckless and irresponsible criticism.

The hon. Member from Orissa was asking why anybody should arrogate to himself the divine right and the divine authority. That is precisely, with great respect, my submission. Is it correct, and has anyone any business to say, that the Prime Minister has soiled the land of Bengal and the good name of Rabindranath Tagore by becoming the Vice-Chancellor of a University? Is it not a personal invective? You may have difference of opinion and you may think that somebody else is more suitable, others have their own opinion, but casting a personal aspersion, to what extent is it in conformity with good taste? And how do you expect people to be silent spectators to this sort of smear campaign going on against a leader whom they revere and love? How does it behove a person, who is considered an embodiment of gentleness, to cast aspersions on the Prime Minister? How does it behove him to say that the Prime Minister is not educated to be entitled to lead the country? If these allegations, if these utterly irresponsible, reckless abuses and invectives are not going to arouse the youth of the country then, I am afraid, the youth is not worth the name. In the midst of such grave provocation how they have behaved, how they have managed the affairs, how Shri Subroto Mukherjee went and tried to pacify the mob is a great tribute to the restraint and exemplary behaviour of young Mukherjee, Priya Ranjan Das Munsai and so on. And if Priya Ranjan Das Munsai has been accused of being an urchin, then all of us join that member in being urchins, because those members are trying to preserve the norms of democracy in spite of grave provocations.

There is one more thing that I want to refer to. Why is it that there is no creditability when you are speaking about your concern to curb violence? Have you realised this that people are not taking you seriously at all when you are showing your concern to curb violence? Because, violence and parliamentary democracy

can never go together; they are not on the same road. It is because the history is entirely against you.

Who is responsible for burning Gujarat? Who is responsible for inciting violence in Gujarat? Who has humiliated and paraded the MLAs? Who has stripped out the cloth of the MP and paraded him on the roads? Who has killed a student for the only offence of going to attend the examination? Who has talked of gherao of Parliament with a million people? Who has talked of slapping the MLAs? Who has behaved like the worst goondas in the Wardah Ashram in front of Vinoba Bhave? Who has recommended extra-constitutional means to overthrow the lawful Government? Last but not the least, who wanted the police and the army to revolt? Under the laws of the United States of America and United Kingdom any call to the army and police to revolt against the government is considered high treason against the country. It is only in our country that we tolerate that.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY

Arrest him

SHRI N K P SALVE: If we do not arrest him it is because

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY

You cannot arrest him

SHRI N K P SALVE: Mr. so and so, we do need to arrest him, as long as you people are there to support him. He is a damogogue. (Interruptions) I am not yielding. Sir this gentleman who supports the party is led by a party I may be educated by that. But, unfortunately, I do not belong to that class which has committed all sorts of crimes. I still continue to be economically on the same level as my friend Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munsai, and I am very proud of it.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY

You are a middle man between crime and justice

SHRI N K P SALVE: I am the middle man between the crime and the criminals, and that is why I know the criminals very well.

(Interruptions) Sir, I do not mean him. I mean all those affluent sections of the society who show high-brow snobbery after committing all sorts of economic offences. Professionally, I am certainly connected with it. There is no doubt about it.

There is one more important reason why there will never be a creditability to JP. So far as the question of condemning violence and so far as his avowed profession to profess democracy is concerned, it is this set of people who have gathered around him. As very rightly pointed out by Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munsri, has he not willy-nilly acquired the role of an election agent of all these people, of this motley crowd in the opposition, who have been thrown lock stock and barrel, not once, but in five consecutive elections. The unfortunate part is do they want us to believe very seriously that Anand Margis, who are the champion killer have certainly become apostles of non-violence. Do they want us to believe that RSS has taken to the cult of non-violence and have started believing in parliamentary democracy? When the chief of the RSS is to be nominated by the existing chief, how RSS works. Sir, you are from Nagpur. I am also from Nagpur. The less it is said, the better it is. Otherwise, Shri Jagannathrao Joshi will again get into the fit of hysteria. (Interruptions) He has got into it

Last but not the least, there is my friend, Shri Dinen Bhattacharyya; their hands are soiled with human blood and the entire water of Ganges will not be able to wash that blood of their hands. How are they talking of parliamentary democracy? How are they talking of condemning violence? It does not lie in their mouth either to talk of non-violence or of parliamentary democracy. As long as spirit of Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsri and Shri Subrato Mukherjee survive in this country, parliamentary democracy shall go from strength

to strength. We shall fight and fight to the end.

Shri P. G. MAVALANKAR: (Ahmedabad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is nearly seven hours now.

MR CHAIRMAN. Now, he is the last speaker on that side. After this..

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is nearly seven hours that we have been discussing and debating an issue which is apparently very small, of one incident on one day in one metropolitan city of our country. But the hope was and is that taking advantage, I use the word 'advantage' advised by, of the very serious thing that has happened at least, this House, would now consider in all earnestness and fairness, the various implications, and thereby, if possible, give to the country some kind of a comforting message that this Parliament is not going to tolerate any increase in the atmosphere and cult of violence. But, Sir, when I sat through, almost continuously, these seven and odd hours of the debate, I must confess that I am not able to say that this has been necessarily a fruitful debate. Of course, it is not also a completely futile debate perhaps, this debate has been partly futile, partly fruitful! It has undoubtedly produced some thinking points. But I wonder whether people who will read the debate of today in months and years to come will readily agree that we as Members of this House were really in a serious mood and they would ask whether we were at all earnest about locating the guilt, as to where it really existed and whether we were doing so without bothering about who was at fault and instead of trying to see what was wrong in our politics and policy

Significantly enough, all speakers who have preceded me have been Members of this or that political par-

ty. It is natural. After all, in a parliamentary democracy, it is only the political parties, by and large, which are reflected and which are represented in various Houses. Even in the developed democracies, like the United Kingdom, for the information of Dr. Kailas, if it pleases him, I may tell him that Independents have practically gone for good. However, I do not know whether in parliamentary democracy, although it becomes workable through party system, party institution and party membership, we should consider all matters necessarily from any partisan angles. Is there no national angle? Is there no objective angle? Is there no dispassionate attitude towards all these matters?

I would have gladly sat down if my hon friend, Mr Satpal Kapur and others felt that I am the only person responsible for prolonging the debate. I am not interested in making a very long speech. But the point is: Look at the attacks that have been taking place on both the sides of the House, these attacks and counter-attacks, for instance, on J.P. and Mrs Indira Gandhi. What have they produced? If Congressmen are to be charged with their heroine worship, I am afraid, I must say that many Opposition parties must also be charged with their hero worship! If you go on attacking Mrs Indira Gandhi all the time, then I am one of those who will say, Congressmen will go on attacking J.P. all the time. But these attacks on the Prime Minister and on J.P. and other individuals do not lead us anywhere. It may give a vicarious satisfaction to some of us that we have taken the liberty of using the parliamentary forum and thereby publicly criticised or condemning or abusing this or that the individual or leader in sometimes the most filthy language which can ever be used.

Hearing the entire debate, barring a few exceptions—I am sorry if I am brutally front in this expression of my feeling. I am not only distressed but am also disgusted at the way in

which the debate has developed rather degenerated....

**SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAMMA:** (Khammam): He has used the word "heroine" worship. I think, he should change it to "hero" worship. The Prime Minister is masculine.

**SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR:** The entire debate included all kinds of verbal exchange, and gesticulations. Today, the House has seen and witnessed a strange spectacle of some political parties, pitted against each other, washing their dirty linen in Parliament so that the entire nation can watch and see the dirty damn things.

What was the purpose of the debate? It was about the Calcutta incident. Now, it is not a stray incident. It is the culmination of the cult of violence that is fast spreading in the country. There was the Allahabad incident. When the Allahabad incident took place, we did not even wait for the press reports to come in. We immediately, instantaneously, unanimously condemned it which we thought, at that time, was an attack on the Prime Minister. It is on record what I said, that any attack on the Prime Minister is, ultimately, an attack on democracy. And we will not tolerate it. It is not a question of this or that party being in power. It is a question of the Prime Minister who belongs to the whole country. Similarly, when a grenade was thrown at the highest man in the judiciary, the Chief Justice of India, this House expressed its deep concern. I would have, therefore, thought that, when this Calcutta incident took place, we should have pinpointed the alarming fact that the VIPs, whether they belong to the establishment or to the Opposition, very important persons who are held in high respect and esteem by millions of people, whether it is Mrs. Indira Gandhi or Mr. Jayaprakash Narain—it is foolish to say that the country condemns Mrs. Indira Gandhi and not Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan or vice versa; millions of people

admire both these individuals as national leaders—, the VIPs are being made targets and that the politics of assassination is replacing the politics of persuasion. That is the point which we should have highlighted in this debate, because if this alarming climate is not stopped and the equally explosive conditions of repression are not averted, then I feel that no amount of debate, heat and argument in this House will really clear the air from the polluted atmosphere

Today the situation is that authoritarianism and totalitarianism are increasing on the one hand; and on the other hand, civil liberties are getting eroded, on the third hand, the politicians and political parties are becoming more and more intolerant of one another. It is on account of these facts that all this acrimony, bitterness, hatred, intimidation and in the end physical violence are being injected into the political atmosphere.

How has violence been spreading? Can any one of us, with our hands on our heart and conscience, say in all sincerity that we are not guilty of using the youths of this country for our political and narrow purposes, for our party purposes? Can we say that we are not exploiting the emotions and sentiments of the people concerned? We have the atmosphere of threats, intimidations and personal attacks. As my friend, Mr Salve, has said, uncharitable criticisms are levelled against one another. Physical assaults, violence, use of force, fascist techniques and even murders are happening. Did they happen only recently? Have we forgotten who started the gherao and where was it started? Where was it started—the idea of having the politicians of the opposite parties almost taken to ransom, closing them in their offices for hours together? This had happened in more than one State, and over a period of five or six or seven years, all this has developed in such a way that we find today that there is almost nobody—no party or no individual—who is free from it.

Several friends, including my friend, Shri L'raya Ranjan Das Munsri, Mr. Saave and others, have referred to incidents in Gujarat. I would like this to go on record. The Gujarat movement started on January 10, 1974. Normally I would not have spoken on this because I consider it below the taste to refer to my own participation in that particular phenomenon. On January 10, 1974, I flew back cutting short my stay in Madras where I had gone as a member of a Select Committee, of which you Mr. Chairman, were also a member, because Ahmedabad was in flames and being my constituency, it was my duty and obligation to go back to Ahmedabad. For five days, from 10th to 15th January, I tried to have a direct, intimate, honest and frank dialogue with my young friends and students. I have been in the education field for 25 years and more and I claim to know the youths and students fairly well. The Navnirman Samiti was formed in my presence; the name was christened by me. For five days I pleaded with the students. They made me their leader. They wanted me to be the Chairman of the Samiti, but I said I could not be the Chairman; at best I could be their friend and adviser if they chose me to be so. But after five days, on the 15th January 1974 when I discovered in the evening that these youngsters and students were out for a programme involving some kind of fascist techniques and violence and intimidation, at once I resigned publicly and I said that I could not be the leader of a movement where the followers wanted me to be led by them rather than to lead them. Therefore, let them not unnecessarily chide against some of us and say that Gujarat was full of violence. Of course, we condemn the phenomenon of MLAs, and Congress MLAs particularly, being taken out in all kinds of shameful demonstrations. I am one of those who feel eternally ashamed of these things because they do not lead us anywhere. Even if it means a chieiving the dissolution of the Assembly, it does not mean restoration of democratic and decent standards in our public life. Therefore, my point is:

whether it is Gujarat or Bihar or the rest of the country, almost all Parties are doing things in collusion which they say others are doing, but they conveniently forget that they themselves are also doing the same things or even more! Therefore, I want to conclude by saying only this, that we must take an overall view, an objective view and a dispassionate view of the whole matter, and decide coolly but earnestly and urgently whether we all want this cult of violence to go on in a galloping way and let it soon let us up all, while we go on simply and helplessly looking at its destroying all of us in that process, or we want to take sincere, bold and prompt steps to put an end to this violence, intolerance, bitterness and hatred! All of us have to ensure continuously that people can attend and hold meetings peacefully. The other day I was told by my friends that in Bihar those who are opposed to JP movement cannot hold meetings, and then people who are opposed to the Congress cannot hold meetings in Bengal, Haryana or other places. This is not good for the health of democracy.

Therefore, I am concluding by saying that this is the real challenge and if we cannot see it and if we dare not face it, then no one will help us, not even God! If democracy means civilised behaviour, persuasion, tolerance and understanding each other's point of view, then I should say that the "Demon of Violence" must be driven away from our political and public life for all times to come, or, else, we must be prepared to perish for all times! Hypocrisy and dishonesty will not rescue us. Only sincere and honest efforts and bold attempts in the right direction will rescue us and this country from this increasing cult of violence.

जब अंदर देख (बीबर) मैं फिर इतना ही बड़ा बन, चाहता हूँ कि इस मोमन को मैंने बंद देखा तो मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ।

हमारे मित्रा जी ने यह कहा है 'The House deploras', मैं यह समझ रहा था कि डेप्योर की जगह अगर वे 'The House appreciates'.

कहते तो बहुत अच्छा होता क्योंकि जे० पी० साहब विचारियों को इंडिस्टिपलिन दिखाते हैं। इंडिस्टिपलिन को बंद करो, यह उन्होंने विचारियों को सिखाया और यह उन्होंने सीखा लिया और वही उन्होंने वहाँ पर डिमोन्स्ट्रेट किया। फिर उस के बाद पुलिस को यह कह दिया कि सर्वनेमेट के घाईस को नहीं मानना। और वहाँ पर जो कुछ हो गया था, उसी तरह से पुलिस वहाँ पर देखती रही। इस तरह से मैं यह समझना कि जे० पी० साहब जिस मूवमेंट को चलाना चाहते थे, जिस मिशन को वे चलाना चाह रहे थे, वह सब सफल होना हीच रहा है और वह खुद उन्होंने अपनी छात्रों से था। तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि हमारे मित्रा जी कि तरह से कह रहे हैं कि जे० पी० साहब के साथ जो कुछ हुआ, उस को डेप्योर करे और यह करें और यह करें। उस के बाद मैंने देखा कि समर मुहा जी के साथ भी कुछ हुआ। तो एक चीज मैं यहाँ पर कह देना चाहता हूँ और भी मकर बयान सिंह जी ने भी इस को रिकर किया है और यह यह है कि सर्वोदय संबंधी संघ की प्राइमरि कान्फ्रेंस विनोबा जी की उपस्थिति में होती है और ऐसी जगह पर जे० पी० साहब पहुंचते हैं। जे० पी० साहब वहाँ पर रहने हैं और उन के सामने वे बैठे हैं। विनोबा जी वहाँ पर बीच के धन्दर से बीच इधर जे० पी० साहब सामने बैठे हैं कमरे के धन्दर और तमाम उन के कानोअर्स बैठे हैं। मैं वहाँ पर पहुंचता हूँ, तो वे क्या करते हैं। जब मैं पेन्स (ट) ले जा रहा था स्टेज पर देने के लिए और वहाँ पर मेरे दोस्त देवा मातव प्रीजा (8) कर रहे थे, तो मैं ने कहा कि इन वेम्पकान को डिस्ट्रीब्यूट करवा दीजिए, तो उसी वकत बीच में कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि क्या बीच है, इन देखते हैं। कुछ बंध लोगों को दो बार दिखे और बीच में ही उन्होंने देखा कि

यह तो इंदिरा गांधी से सम्बन्धित है और उनमें  
लिखा था।

'Look to Mrs. Indira Gandhi in the  
totality'.

जब उन्होंने यह देखा कि यह तो इंदिरा  
गांधी का भावनी है, मकरदेव तो इंदिरा गांधी  
का एजेंट है और वहाँ पर बैठा हुआ मन्त्र  
विनोबा सरकारी मन्त्र है, तो इस तरह का  
स्वंगन लगाते हुए मयाम लोगों ने मेरा चेराव  
किया और उसके बाद मुझे उठाकर वहाँ से  
बाहर फेंक दिया गया। और यह सब हुआ  
जब कि जे०पी० वहाँ पर उपस्थित थे।

फिर मैं जे०पी० के पास गया क्योंकि जे०पी०  
के लिये मेरे मन में बहुत बड़ा घावर रहा है।  
मैंने उन से कहा कि आपके होते हुए इस तरह से  
आपके लोगों ने किया है, आपको इस बारे  
में कुछ इन्द्रबन्धन देनी चाहियें, तो वह कहने  
लगे कि मैं इसके लिये क्या कर सकता हूँ।  
और जो कुछ हो रहा है वह आप देख रहे  
हैं।

मेरा कहने का मतलब इतना ही है कि जे०  
पी० जिस विमन को बना रहे हैं उसमें  
उनके सम्बन्ध मिल रही है।

22 hrs.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AF-  
FAIRS (SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA  
REDDY): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is now  
over seven hours since the discussion  
started in this House, and naturally  
all of you, including me, must, have  
been feeling very tired and jaded,  
and, therefore, I shall try to be very  
brief.

Sir, after listening to the speeches  
of hon. Members, and particularly the  
Mover of the Motion Shri Shyam-  
nandan Babu, I wonder why this  
motion has been brought before this  
House at all. I agree with what my  
friends Mr. Unnikrishnan, Mr. Salve  
and some others have said. I cannot  
call this a futile discussion com-  
pletely, but all the same, it is a discus-  
sion, which, if it had been challenged

in a different direction, would have  
been helpful to the country.

After all, Shyamnandan Babu, na-  
turally as he was not there, spoke  
anything except the incident, though  
the Hon. Speaker had confined him  
to the particular incident at Calcutta  
on April 2nd. Now, even after listen-  
ing to the very unusually calm speech  
of Prof. Samar Guha and the very well  
delivered speech of my good friend  
Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munsai, you will  
observe, the House will observe, and  
wonder why a simple demonstration  
should have come to the floor of this  
House for a discussion.

It may be, Sir, that Shyamnandan  
Babu thought that it will serve a  
political purpose if he brings it on the  
floor of the House to give it a na-  
tional focus. That may be so, but  
even there, I am afraid, Shyamnandan  
Babu, you have not succeeded.

Now, I am not questioning the ruling  
of the Hon. Deputy-Speaker when he  
disallowed the amendment of Shri  
Indrajit Gupta; whether it was allow-  
ed or not, if the debate had been di-  
rected towards, as you had rightly  
said, Sir, while you were speaking,  
against the cult of violence, the at-  
mosphere of violence, the cult of  
hatred and what we have been seeing  
in recent months in this country, if  
this House had unanimously condem-  
ned this attitude, probably that would  
have had a sobering effect not only on  
the entire population of this country  
but especially on the impressionable  
young men and women of India. I will  
not go into the details just now be-  
cause all of them have been published  
in the papers. Let me start by say-  
ing about the Bihar movement. Bihar  
movement is for the dissolution of the  
Assembly, seeking to secure it by in-  
timidation, coercion, threat etc. Is  
it to be called a peaceful movement?  
Is it to be called a non-violent move-  
ment? People who disagree with you,  
who do not want to resign, are para-  
ded on the streets with shoes and all  
that round their necks. Is this not  
an ugly intimidation or coercion?  
Many other things are there. Even



on 2nd April when the Chhatra people and Yuv Congress people were holding a meeting something had been said against the Prime Minister which Mr. Balve has put just now before the House. Is it not intemperate to make speeches like that about high personages, especially against persons who are respected by a large number of people in this country, by millions of people in this country? I do not know Mr. Mohanty's qualifications, but to call Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munsi, an honourable Member of this House....

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:** I am not a mofussil lawyer.

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:** I am glad you are a barrister. I am glad if you are very much satisfied of your qualifications; I have no objection. But your taste has been just now displayed here by calling a co-member as an urchin..

**SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY:** I did not call him an urchin. I said he had exceeded the bounds of an urchin.

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:** Never mind, if you have not called him like that I am happy. That I want to submit is this. There are several things that have been happening not only here in the House but outside. I want to ask this. You call students to boycott schools and colleges not only for one year but for two years, to waste their education, to come on the streets. Is it patriotism. I ask. Everyone must have noticed this that wherever Jayaprakash Narayan goes, the first thing he does is to touch the students and youth wings, to start this sangh or that samithi.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** It is because students are on the verge of starvation, 25 lakhs of educated youths are unemployed in West Bengal alone.

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:** If you really felt like that, then, the

remedy is different. The remedy is to discuss the matter. The remedy is to go into the question and find out a solution and not to call them to the roads and ask them to indulge in all kinds of violence, to ask them to waste their educational career, resulting in huge loss to their parents. Is this patriotism? Is it nationalism? I want to ask this.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** His grievance is that they have read two lakhs of his books.

**DR. KAILAS (Bombay South):** 20 lakhs and not 2 lakhs.

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:** Today it is reported not once but twice that JP himself has been indulging in some speeches which cause not only disaffection and disloyalty in the armed and police forces.

Is it quite a reasonable activity? That is a different matter whether you arrest or you do not arrest him. I want to submit to you....

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** Has he ever asked the army to revolt against Government? He only said that if any attempt is made to subvert the constitution, only then, they could revolt?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Is it the right of the army to revolt?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Who is to decide that?

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:** If you take the roots of the matter or the genesis of the matter and go into it and then condemn all sorts of violence, intimidation, coercion, etc. in the public life in this country, as I said earlier, it would certainly create a great impact on all of us.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** The opponents of the Resolution are changing their colours.

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
My submission is this. On April 2, it is in the words of Prof. Guha himself, that everything went off peacefully. He addressed a meeting at the students' hall and in the areas of Shri Das Mitra, J. P. went to Calcutta not once but five or six times. This was the sixth time that he went to Calcutta. Not only there. But, during the last so many months or about a year and nine months or so, he must have gone to 7 to 9 States addressing about hundred meetings.

**SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER:** Is there any restriction to go to Calcutta?

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN:**  
Nobody said that

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
I am narrating the fact to be sure about what Mr Syam Babu said. He said that there was a preplanned attack on the car of J. P. to murder him or kill him and things like that. You said that there was a pre-meditated or preplanned attack.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
A very carefully planned and executed act.

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
You must have seen that government has been spending some lakhs of rupees as protection whenever he goes to any place of the State in the country. Therefore, to say that the police are keeping quiet is not correct. Do you want the police to interfere for anything? Is there any demonstration which has not affected the public life in the country? Is it such a thing for a person like Shri Mishra to bring that on the floor of the House? I must submit one thing about Shri Shankar Deo. He is our respected leader. He went to Gujarat, Baroda and other places. There was stone throwing; there was brick-batting and there was almost all kinds of things. Therefore, it is unfortunate that Shri Shankar Deo should be insulted by the Sarvodaya people. Therefore, my

submission would be this. If you can indulge in inflammable language, you can offend the people—highly respected people and highly respected leaders of the States, leaders of the nation and then simply get away with it, without any reaction, without any countering by forces, that is to expect too much. It is not as if I am encouraging anybody to hold demonstrations. The fact is, we must take it as a stance in the political life of any country and more so, in this country. All of us have been in public life for decades. We have seen instances where in a political atmosphere, in a political heat, sometimes, when temperate language is used, when unnecessary language is used, when vocabulary is wasted on high dignitaries, certainly emotions run high and if some young people indulge in some demonstration, surrounding a car, what does it matter? Is it a big thing? I would like to submit, let us not take an unrealistic view of things. You say that Indira Gandhi becomes the Chancellor of the Vishwa Bharati University. You try to offend her by saying. In the words of Mr Salve, he has sullied the name of this University. What type of speeches? Does it lend maturity and stature to the gentleman who uses it? Does it not create an emotion in the minds of young men? It does create emotion in the minds of our people including the Opposition friends. Supposing, some other man talks disparagingly, denigrating JP and using filthiest language would it not offend you? Would it not affect your emotions? If you get passing, is it something unreasonable or inhuman? Therefore, Sir, we should not think that I am clean and others are wrong, that you are not indulging in violence and others are indulging in violence and so on. If I associate myself with Indira Gandhi, I am a bad man. If Jayaprakash Narayan associates himself with Biju Patnaik, he is a paragon of virtue. Let us not do that. We know the people of India. The people will be watching and are watching, who is associating himself with whom, about whom what the great leaders are speaking,

and therefore, they are able to arrive at their own conclusions. We are not worried on that account. But, the point would be....

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**  
Don't encourage this thing.

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
Certainly not. I would only say that it is not that because a certain gentleman associates himself with a certain gentleman, a bad man becomes a good man. Therefore, let us not presume that people are not watching us. You and I are in the eyes of millions of people of this country. By using an intemperate and an inflammable language, you may feel temporarily gratified. Just for an hour, you may feel satisfied. But, you should know that the Indian citizen is such a shrewd man. Even though he is illiterate, he is shrewd enough to understand who is humble who is wrong, what language a person is using and therefore let us be very careful. Therefore, I would submit to the House, for the consideration of the entire House, that all of us must have restraint in the exercise of our fundamental rights, either of speech or association and so on. If we observe restraint, if we do not use intemperate language, if we do not use coercion, if we do not use intimidation, if we do not accuse others if we do not denigrate high personages in power with all kinds of allegations and accusations, and if we do not denigrate our democratic institutions which we cherish, certainly, you will have a better India in future. Let us all work towards that.

I felt very sorry also. Many times, when I see that certain friends are being paraded and certain friends are being insulted, I feel very sorry. This is not the way at all. Even to achieve an objective and even to bring down a Government, this is not the proper way I agree with Mr. Shyamandan Mishra when he said that this country is a peaceful country. This is our tradition and this is our heritage. Let us maintain that and see that,

from year to year, as we go on, from end on in education, people grow more mature. After all, it is not a question of the personalities. It is a question of the national prestige. It is a question of the national stability. It is a question of the national progress. It is a question of tens of millions of our people who are going without food and who should get a better deal tomorrow. These are all wide questions. To indulge in small things does not benefit anyone of us.

Now to put the record straight, I just want to waste the time of the House for a few minutes so that I could read the information I got from the State Government, because several friends have said something...

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** In that case, why do you say 'waste the time of the House'?

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** Did you have any talk with the Chief Minister when he visited Delhi on this matter? I requested you about this over the telephone on that very day, within a few minutes of it. Did you have any talk with him?

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
With whom?

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** With Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray.

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
He did not meet me.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** He did not meet you.

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
You will permit me to read it

"Shri Jayaprakash Narayan arrived at Dum Dum airport from Bhubaneswar by a plane chartered by Kalinga Airlines at about 2200 hours on 1st April 1975. The leaders of the Nab Nirman Samiti, Congress (O), Socialist Party etc. who wanted to receive him were allowed to go into the VIP Bay where the plane of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan landed. A small group of Yuba Congress followers staged an anti-JP demonstration at the airport by shouting slogans.

"There was no obstruction to Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's car and no clash during his journey from the airport to Calcutta.

"On 2nd April, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan held a number of meetings at 6/C, Short Street, where he was putting up with a relation of his and at a ground floor flat of a multi-storied building at 3 Moira Street. There was no disturbance during these meetings. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was to address two meetings in the afternoon—one at the students' hall and the other at the Calcutta University Institute. Both the places are in the university area situated on Bankim Chatterjee Street at a distance of about 200 yards of each other. The former meeting was organised by some teachers including those owing allegiance to the CPI(M) and the latter by the Nava Nirman Samiti. The Chhatra Parishad and the Yuba Congress had organised a mass rally of students and youth at the university campus to protest against Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's activities. From time to time, prior to the scheduled meeting, processions of youth Congress and Chhatra Parishad paraded in the locality where the meetings of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan were to be held, shouting slogans and waving black flags. At about 1635 hrs. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan arrived at the students' hall escorted by the police. Elaborate police arrangements had been made for maintenance of peace in the area. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was welcomed and received at the gate of the hall by the organisers of the meeting. The meeting was being held peacefully.

\* Meanwhile, Chhatra Parishad and Yuba Congress meeting at the University campus terminated at about 1615 hrs. and a big procession of Youth Congress and Chhatra Pari-

shad led by Shri P. R. Das Munsal, MP, Shri Subroto Mukherji, Minister of State. Shri Sudeep Bandyopadhyay and many other leaders was taken out. A section of the procession about 100 strong went towards the University Institute followed by Shri Subrata Mukherji and a few other leaders. Reaching the gate of the University Institute which by this time was closed by the organisers of the Nava Nirman Samiti, they began demonstrating and faced counter-demonstration. Tension was mounting. Seeing this Shri Subrata Mukherjee climbed on top of one of the gate pillars of the Institute and addressed the crowd persuading them to disperse. His voice had already cracked and he had to take the help of a power mike used by the police. Some went away, but some remained and Shri Mukherjee left the place.

Owing to the intervention of Shri Mukherjee tension subsided. Tension however increased subsequently due to counter demonstration by the followers of the Nava Nirman Samiti and the speeches given by Shri Samar Guha, M.P....

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA\*\***

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
".....The atmosphere was surcharged owing to the nature of the speeches made at the meeting. Shri J. P. came out of the students hall after the meeting...."

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA\*\***

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
In fact I will be anxious not to disbelieve you but the fact seems to be otherwise; I am helpless.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**  
Who had sent you this report?

**SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:**  
Not you.

"...Shri Samar Guha M. P. made the following remarks:

\*\*Not recorded.

"Goondalism is going on under the direction of Indira Gandhi; Indira Gandhi and her favourite Chief Minister are leaders of Goonda gangs..." (Interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA:\*\*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please resume your seat.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA:\*\*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not a word of what Prof. Samar Guha says will go on record.

(Interruptions)

He is reading a report, Mr. Samar Guha. Now what do you want him to do? Allow him to read. It is not his speech. He is reading the report. Do you understand this much? You must agree that the report he is reading is the report that he has received from West Bengal. You have already suffered from haemorrhage. Some-time back you were very cool. Don't get excited. Please sit down.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY:

The atmosphere was however surcharged owing to the nature of the speeches made at this meeting. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan came out of the student's hall after the meeting had concluded peacefully and boarded his car to go to the next venue. The police threw a cordon all around the car and took to the University Institute slowly through demonstrators. No sooner had the car of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan reached the gate of the University Institute then it was surrounded by the demonstrators, some of whom pounded and thumped the car. The police pushed them back with great difficulty. Tension ran high at this stage when the supporters of the Nava Nirman Samity raised counter-slogans and made many disparaging remarks about the Chief Minister and the Prime Minister. A few pieces of brickbats and one or

two chappals were thrown in the direction of the University Institute. One lady demonstrator climbed on the bonnet of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's car and started pounding it. She was followed by a couple of other demonstrators. They were immediately brought down by the police. Shri Samar Guha, M.P., then climbed on the bonnet of the car and began castigating the Congress, the Chhatra Parishad and the Yuva Congress. Irritated by his utterances, some of the demonstrators surged towards the car and in the melee, Shri Guha's spectacles fell on the ground and his punjabi was torn. His spectacles were immediately picked up by a police officer and handed over to him. The members of the Nava Nirman Samity requested Shri Jayaprakash Narayan to come down and attend the meeting, but Shri Narayan did not get down from the car and asked the driver to move away. The car inched along and its path was cleared by the police by removing the demonstrators. It finally left the place escorted by the police. A case was registered at Amherst Street police station. The State Government have observed that there was no fighting or clash in the course of the entire incident and that the meeting of the Nava Nirman Samity was held at the University Institute Hall till about 8 p.m. At the meeting the followers of the Nava Nirman Samity took a decision to squat on the road but they were dissuaded by the police.

These are the facts as enumerated by the information given to us by the West Bengal Government.

I would like to say this. We deplore any violence.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I had the courtesy to telephone to you immediately.\*\*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't you even need to take my permission? Because

\*\*Not recorded.

\*\*\*Not recorded.

you have not taken my permission, nothing will go on record. This is the only thing I can do.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: What portion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everything that you said, will tell you why. Because repeatedly I am asking you to at least take the permission of the Chair to speak. This is elementary. And without my permission you go on speaking for give five minutes. What is this?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Do not remove from the record. Are you sticking to your decision that nothing will go on record? I humbly request you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt. Let him go on.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I humbly request this should go on record. Today it is affecting something of my inner feelings

MR CHAIRMAN: I am not expunging I am saying nothing will go on record if you speak without taking my permission. You ask for permission now I will allow you.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I seek your permission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, what do you want to say?

SHRIMATI T LAKSHMIKANTHAMMA: On a point of order. Everybody in this House is an hon. Member. If something is quoted here and the Member contradicts it, are we not supposed to believe what the Member says now is true and correct? What should we do? Here is a statement given by the Home Minister and here is an hon. Member saying that he has not said it. What should we do? What the Member says should be taken as true

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY: Prof. Samar Guha was mentioning about the telephonic talk. It is true that he mentioned that there was demonstration and the Police did not intervene and then I told him that I would certainly look into the matter (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI T LAKSHMIKANTHAMMA: Rose (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: She is in search of truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can bring gentlemen to order but I can't bring a lady to order if she behaves in a disorderly manner. (*Interruptions*) Hereafter, if you do not behave properly I will have to pull you up also (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K BRAHMANANDA REDDY: Now Shrimati Lakishmikanthamma and Mrs Maya Ray are sitting in different places, there won't be any trouble (*Interruptions*)

We deplore violence in public life in the country. It is our endeavour and it will be our endeavour in future to give all reasonable protection to any public man or any other in every lawful exercise of fundamental rights. There is no gain-saying this fact. But what I have submitted before is that we have to see that we do not create a climate, we do not do anything to contribute to the creation of atmosphere of violence and we do not indulge in speeches which are inflammable, etc

In the end, I would say, as has been said by Shri Stephen and several other friends, looking into the matter and looking at what has happened—that the demonstration took place, even 100 or 200 persons surrounded the car and even if Shri Samar Guha or some lady got on the bonnet of the car—it is not a matter which should claim the attention of the House. It is purely a State subject. I am glad that Shri Sidhartha

Shankar Ray, Chief Minister, because certain things have happened in his own State, felt about it and it was gentlemanly of him to have expressed regret. I am happy about it. If Mr. Guha says he has also received any injury unfortunately, I say, I am sorry. But he has not said so and therefore, there is no occasion for me to express regret.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**

Let me say at the beginning that no debate has succeeded better than this debate in serving the purpose for which it was intended (*Interruptions*)

**MR CHAIRMAN** May I appeal to you all not to say a word till he has finished?

**AN HON MEMBER.** How long will he take?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA.**

I cannot say, I will take a reasonable time

**SHRI S M BANERJEE** I agree he should be allowed to reply to the debate to the best of his ability, but he says, there should be no time limit. It has never happened even in the House of Commons. If we start the discussion on the 8th and end on the 9th, what will happen? Let him say he will take 1 hour or 2 hours.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** He is in the spirit of indefiniteness that is prevailing all round

**SHRI S M. BANERJEE:** The debate must end at 12 o'clock.

**SHRI C M STEPHEN:** On a point of order, Sir. As a member of this House, I have a right to know how long I am to sit in this House. It is already 11.0'clock and I should not be held to ransom by any member. This is a motion under rule 184 Under rule 192, the Speaker has the right to prescribe a time limit for the speeches. Under this rule, I am making a request to the Chair to prescribe a time limit for his reply. No

member has the right to say "I will speak as long as I choose". You have a perfect right under rule 192 to say this is the time-limit for a speech. I submit that you kindly prescribe the time. It is 11 O'Clock now. We are human beings. We have not taken our food. We are feeling sleepy. We want you to give your ruling. I protest against this attitude "I will speak as long as I choose".

**MR CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Mishra, can you show me any provision which gives a right to the member who is replying to speak for any length of time that he wants? If you can show me some rules, then I have nothing to say

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** I have told you that I must be given enough time

**MR CHAIRMAN** There is no right to reply for an unlimited time

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA**

You can pull me up if there is repetition

**MR CHAIRMAN.** It is not a question of repetition

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**

I have my right to reply.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:**

The member has categorically stated that he wants reasonable time

**SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN (Kangra).** Under rule 178 no speech shall be for a duration of more than 15 minutes

**SHR SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**

Why don't you trust my reasonableness? As I was submitting, the motion has eminently succeeded.

**SHRI C. M STEPHEN:** Sir, I submit I am entitled to know how long we are to sit here? I am appealing to you to prescribe the time. Otherwise, I am moving a closure motion. We cannot just continue to sit like this.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You leave it to my discretion.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** My submission is that it is wrong to hold, as the hon. Home Minister has tried to do, or convey an impression to the House, that the debate had been futile. The debate had been exceedingly meaningful, and it had eminently succeeded in serving its purpose. It has revealed the face of the ruling party, it has revealed the forces which had master-minded, engineered and inspired the incident at Calcutta.

It is clear that my hon. friends on the other side have been extremely unhappy because of two reasons, which have not originated from me. They have, in fact, originated from the Chair. One is that they did not like, and put up all kinds of resistance to the admission of a motion of this kind. It, ultimately the motion was admitted, and they have been smarting under the permission the chair has given for a discussion on this subject. It is also very clear that they have been smarting under the rejection of an amendment for which they rallied all their support. And you know what type of amendment it was?

My hon. friend, Shri Brahmananda Reddy, the Home Minister, said that if the scope of the discussion were enlarged, it would have been better. I am not prepared to learn any lesson from a person like Shri Brahmananda Reddy. If there is a specific incident the whole attention of the House has to be concentrated on that incident. When that incident took place at Allahabad, we did not ask for the enlargement of the debate. When the incident took place in this gallery, did we ask for a general discussion on the question of violence in the country? No, we wanted to deliberate on that particular issue in order to put it in proper focus and effectively draw the attention of the country to it.

This is an incident which requires the specific attention of the House, and if these people have been trying to run away from it, that shows the

utter irresponsibility which characterises their attitude. So, let them not get away by saying this that they wanted the larger subject to be discussed. We want the larger subject to be discussed and if they wanted to discuss the subject of violence, there was an ideal opportunity which the hon. Prime Minister lost. After the murder of Shri L. N. Mishra at Samastipur, who prevented the Prime Minister from calling a meeting of the leaders of the opposition to consider that? But the Prime Minister and her party have been avoiding a discussion with the opposition. They do not have the courage to call a meeting of the leaders of the opposition. If she thought it necessary, she should have invited leaders like JP also to that meeting. It was JP who first converted a political meeting into a condolence meeting. Let the hon'ble Home Minister Shri Brahmananda Reddy hold his face to the mirror and ask what the hon. Prime Minister did when a condolence meeting was held at Vithal-bhai Patel House? She turned it into a political meeting. But what did JP do? He converted a public meeting, a political meeting, into a condolence meeting. That is the contrast in quality, Mr. Brahmananda Reddy, from which you suffer.

Today what has made me a sad person is the quality of the speeches made by some members in the name of Congress. This is the crisis of quality, a deterioration we have been witnessing. I will never call it Congress, if this is the kind of values which saturates their speeches and their attitude.

The rejection of amendment also is a triumph for the opposition just as the motion is a triumph for the opposition. These people have been smarting under all this.

Now the impression created on one's mind by the speeches from the other side is that JP is an undesirable person—he happens to be a CIA agent, he happens to be an undesirable person, and what not. Even then,



my hon. friend Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi was making a clean gesture when he talked of appointing JP as a trusted tribune in West Bengal to go into all the incidents since the days of the B.C. Roy Ministry. If he is that undesirable, why entrust that responsibility to JP? And yet that is what they sought to do.

My hon. friend, Shri Brahmananda Reddy wanted to chastise my hon. friend, Shri Mohanty, for using some expressions. But, has he ever cared to ponder over what kind of expressions the Prime Minister has been using against JP? Let the country not lose sight of the fact that there is not a single speech of the hon. Prime Minister which is free from vituperative attack on JP.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Sir, I rise on a point of order.

**SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER:** Sir, Shri Raghuramaiah and the Home Minister are instructing the members to go out so that there will be no quorum in the House

23 hrs.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** I raise the question of quorum. There is no quorum in the House. Normally, I would go by the convention.

(Interruptions)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The quorum bell may be rung... Now, there is quorum. The hon. Member may continue his speech.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** So, I was submitting that the hon. Home Minister was stating to us something which was obnoxious only on the basis of certain remarks made by the hon. Member, Shri Mohanty. But he has never cared to ponder over what kind of remarks the hon. Prime Minister had been making against Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, whenever she opened her mouth. She has always insinuated that he had been getting monetary help from outside. But JP has contradicted these things in his own way. He had said: If JP turned a foreign stooge, there would be no patriot left in the country. If

it sounds vain, I cannot help it. That is what JP has said. We treat such things with the utmost contempt. Again, the Prime Minister says that he has been keeping company with the corrupt people. If we started telling the truth about the Prime Minister's company and the way in which her whole lot has been behaving, she would be unhappy about this. But I don't want to abuse them; I don't want to pay them back in kind coins. I represent the values of the Congress and I propose to remain committed to them. I don't want to undergo the cultural revolution that they have undergone.

So, their contention was that JP is an undesirable person, and what he received in Calcutta, he richly deserved. Is it not the impression created by the obvious speeches that have been made from that side? It has been said that he is reaping the consequences of his own action. In fact, what we find is that there are three slices of the mirror which have been presented to this House. One hon. Member went to the length of saying that the word "deplore" should be substituted by the word "appreciate". It means that we should appreciate the violent action in Calcutta. Did it not come from the mouth of one of the hon. Members on that side? Then the other hon. Member, Shri Shanker Dayal Singh, has said that if Mr. Mishra includes in his motion another clause—"we appreciate the efforts made by the hon. Member, Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi and Shri Subrato Mukherjee"—then the motion would be acceptable to them. So, they want us to appreciate their efforts in this direction.

Now, there is an hon. Member in this House called Shri Vasant Sathe. I like him very much. I would also like to agree with him when he says that there was no deliberate attempt on the life of J. P. But my predicament is, whether to believe him, the hon. Member, Mr. Sathe, a very lovable person, a charming person, a likeable person...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I would not like you to know because you are now sitting in the Chair which is much higher than any person's here. He said that there was no deliberate attempt on the life of J. P. Now, who will be more pleased than myself if am assured that there was no deliberate attempt on the life of J.P.? But my predicament is, whether to believe my hon. friend Mr. Sathe, who sits in that corner or to believe the hon'ble Member Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munsai whose seat I do not know but who generally occupies a front seat. According to his own admission, the hon'ble Member, Mr. Munsai happened to lead the procession that went there. And what did he say? He said that a massacre had been prevented because of the efforts made by him and Mr. Subrato Mukherjee. This has gone on record. So, had these honourable gentlemen not been present, a massacre would have taken place. What greater testimony do you want to prove the contention that there was a deliberate attempt on the life of J. P.?

I ask you: Should I believe the hon'ble Member Mr. Vasant Sathe or should I believe for that matter the hon Minister, Mr. Brahmananda Reddy, who was arguing on the same lines? The hon. Minister was also trying to argue how there could not be a deliberate attempt on the life of J. P. But he is contradicted by his own party Member, Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munsai, who said that there was an attempt at a massacre which was prevented. (Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSAI: Don't try to make politics out of it. I know how many criminals you have protected. (Interruptions) But for the criminals, you are surviving. (Interruptions) In Begusarai, you were seen surrounded by criminals. (Interruptions) I know you

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: My hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta who does not happen to be present

just now also seemed to hold the same view that there could not be any conclusion that there was an attempt on the life of J. P. But here is what J. P. himself has said. He said, "I would have been beaten and killed." He himself has said it. I have to go by that.

What are the evidence available? If the blows fell on J. P. and not on the car, what would have happened to J. P.? I ask you that. Were they only after the body of the car? He was physically prevented from going out of the car. I do not believe in the deliberately concocted report which the Home Minister read out to the House. I never care to ask for such reports. I know the depth of degradation to which this lot has gone, and they cannot be trusted with preparing any accurate and honest report. Therefore, I never care to ask for them.

Shri Jayaprakash Narayan had told me that he had been prevented from going out of the car. If he had not been physically prevented from going out of the car by the security men and others, then what would have happened? I ask the hon'ble Member, Mr. Gupta, to contemplate the consequences, what would have happened.

Would they also forget what kind of slogans were raised on that occasion? The slogans were (spoke in Bengali) "We will murder; we will murder."

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSAI: No, no. Do not say these things, Mr. Mishra. Do not behave like a Begusarai man. Behave like a Member of Parliament. This sort of slogans were never raised. Do you think that you can say whatever you like and we will accept it? (Interruptions).

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Let them say whatever they like. When Mr. Brahmananda Reddy was reading out the report, I kept completely silent although I did not believe a word of it. My hon. friend

can say that what Shyamnandan Mishra is saying is not correct. But it is not necessary for him to use all sorts of abuses.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** Sir, I rise on a point of order. Two hon. members of this House were present at the scene of incident, of which Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsai is one. Mr. Das Munsai categorically repudiates that this slogan was ever raised at all. Mr. Mishra makes a statement that the slogan was raised. Papers have been laid on the Table of the House by Mr. Samar Guha, and none of the papers says that this slogan was ever raised . . .

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** I am quoting from a paper.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** Any paper of West Bengal? I challenge.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** Let him place that paper on the Table of the House. Let him produce that paper. He just cannot speak through the hat in repudiation of a statement made by Mr. Das Munsai who was present on the spot.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** I am quoting from a paper.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** Where is the paper? Place it on the Table of the House.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** What is he saying? Such a slogan was never raised. Behave like a responsible Member of Parliament. You have no standing in your Party. Even your own Party does not trust you. (Interruptions).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Stephen has raised a point of order. Mr. Mishra, if you are making a specific allegation and are relying for that on a particular newspaper, then you must produce that paper, you must show me what that newspaper is.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** I wish to draw your attention to one fact. When the hon. Home Minister was making a statement, when he was reading out from a written statement that Shri Samar Guha had alleged Shrimati Indira Gandhi of encouraging goondaism, he was immediately on his feet and he said that he never said that. To that you said that there are methods by which it could be raised. Therefore, we have given notice under rule 115 and we will raise this issue of a wrong statement. Similarly, if he wants to raise it, he can follow the same procedure. It is an identical case.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That is a different thing. He was reading the report of the Government of West Bengal. If there is anything wrong or misleading, according to you, under Direction 115 you will be perfectly free to raise it. But that is not out of order. Here, when he says, 'I am quoting a particular slogan which was raised and I am quoting from the newspaper', and once he says, 'I am quoting', he must produce the document on which he is relying.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** Let him say which paper it is.

(Interruptions)

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** He is a responsible Member. Let him say which is the paper.

(Interruptions)

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** I accept your contention, but, on this point I want to bring to your notice that sometime back in this very House Shri Janeshwar Misra made reference. Those utterances were challenged. They were also related to the Prime Minister. He said, 'I am quoting them from the newspaper.' The Speaker said, 'Though you are not able to produce the paper to-day, tomorrow you must try to bring to

me the newspaper from which you are quoting." Next day, Mr. Mishra brought the paper. Similarly, you can direct the hon. members if they quote from newspapers that they can bring the newspaper and point out the quotation to you. It is not obligatory that the Member should immediately produce it. This has happened. You can check the record.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** Let him name the paper at least. He can produce it tomorrow. This is a serious charge which I cannot accept.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hon. Member should not get excited. Mr. Mishra, as long as you say that you are quoting from the paper, do you have the newspaper?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** I will show it to you tomorrow.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** There is a precedent.

(Interruptions.)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Unnikrishnan, please sit down. I have allowed this to be said, subject to the condition: (1) that if it is not produced tomorrow, then the Chair again has the right to expunge it. That is the position as it stands now. It will be expunged if he does not produce it and it will not form part of the record.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN:** He can produce it tomorrow, but let him at least name the newspaper.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes, I am asking him to produce the paper and the newspaper cutting tomorrow.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN:** But the name of the newspaper should be given to-day.

(Interruptions.)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Actually, the rule is that before you quote from a document, you must inform the

Chair that you want to make a quotation from that document and then produce the document. That is the rule. You cannot just offhand quote and say, 'I will produce it later on.' That is the rule.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Many Members quote.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** We read so many papers.

**SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAMMA:** It is not that a Member has said this or not said that. Sir, we take what the Member says whether from this side or from that side.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I am not able to follow what the hon. lady Member is saying.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** He did not say that Mr. Munsî gave the slogan.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** I read so many newspapers. I will show it to you tomorrow.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If it is not there, it will be expunged. Now, kindly do not prolong it further.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Then the slogan was raised—I am again quoting from the newspapers which I will show to you tomorrow—'Yeh Bihar Nai, Yeh Paschim Bangla.'

Sir, I was referring to certain remarks of the hon. member Shri Gupta. He had not a word of sympathy, Mr. Brahmananda Reddy had not a word of sympathy, for the 21 persons who had been injured by a firing from the house of an MLA, Mr. Phulana Rai, a Member of the Ruling Party, on the 5th of June 1974—Now, I ask my hon. friend of the Communist Party whether you should not have spoken a word about them? And then my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta . . .

(Interruptions.)

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Shri Indrajit Gupta said that he does not support this.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Did he not support that indirectly? Whether J. P. would not have been killed on that date—5th of June, 1974 when firing was resorted to—that is my question?

(Interruptions)

Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to another point which was raised by the hon member Shri Indrajit Gupta. He quoted Shri Khera in a particular context. But may I remind this hon House that Mr Indrajit Gupta himself had made serious allegations against Shri Khera during the course of a Commission of Enquiry when investigations were being made by a Commission. On the one hand he would quote Mr Khera and on the other hand he would make serious allegations against him.

(Interruptions)

Today Shri Indrajit Gupta was donning the mantle of a Buddhist. He was not only non-violent but had turned a completely Buddhist. May I ask him whether it is not a fact that in all the processions organised by his party there are persons equipped with lethal weapons? Whether it happens to be the case in the processions of Congress(O), D M K or Jan Sangh or C P M? I say that their processions are full of persons who carry lethal weapons and yet now they are bringing to us the message of non-violence. Why do you carry lethal weapons in the processions?

(Interruptions)

Mr Chairman Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi has told that many a time J P has returned from Calcutta without addressing a meeting. What does he want to convey saying so? He then wanted to tell the House

that the halls where he had addressed meetings had meagre capacity. Probably, he slipped into saying that there was also a meeting at the Maidan near Shahid Minar.

We were told by Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi that we will continue to face all this; that was also the threat given by hon. Lady Member Mrs Maya Ray. But I am also told that Mr S S Ray had already expressed regret, so why I make a fuss about it. But regret of what kind Mr Ray says that Jaya Prakash Narayan had used certain remarks against the Prime Minister thereby he wanted to suggest that it was natural. And yet it had been considered a grace gesture on the part of the Chief Minister. Even if the regret was with obvious reluctance on his part his other half was unabashed, when she said that the incidents would continue to occur.

Then again, Mr Chairman what had Mr Priya Ranjan Das Munshi said—"you will face field marshals". Now his party consists of

(Interruptions)

My hon'ble friend Shri Pande could not invite me to a dinner though he promised daksahna too which I would not like to tell the opposition members! Consider also what the President of Ruling Party in West Bengal has said about the incident. This again I will quote. 'He has been paid in his own coin'. This is what he has said. And these are considered to be examples of regret!

**SHRI C M STEPHEN:** How long are we to go? He has taken 40 minutes for reply.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** You will be pleased to hear about the mark made by a uniquely significant person. I say, a uniquely significant person. He says: 'Anti-JP demonstration was inspired and perhaps organised by covert pro-JP elements

within the State Congress! And who is this peculiarly significant person? Mr. Yeshpal Kapoor.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** When did he say, evening or night.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA.** That is a very appropriate question. He knows what time of the day or night one could be treated more balanced than on some other occasions.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** How long are we to go on like this? There must be a time limit.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I now fix time-limit. This must be over at 11-40. Then I will adjourn the House.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA** Let me say what Mr. Krishnakant has said.

'It was hoped that the authors of the Resolution of the Working Committee on the Cult of Violence would have shown at least some concern about the events in Calcutta where Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was obstructed from addressing the students the other day.'

My hon'ble friend, Shri H. K. L. Bhagat, wanted to meet my point that the police did not stand as mute spectators. But what have we seen in this very city of Delhi when the raid was carried out at No. 7 Jantar Mantar Road? It could be said that the police stood as mute spectators when the inmates were driven out of the premises. And, in the State of Bengal itself, our office was raided by the ruling party with 300 to 400 policemen; our Dum Dum Congress Committee Office was bombed by their men. Our office was sought to be occupied at Midnapore where Miss Aba Maity stood like a valiant fighter and they treated her in a very shameful way.

So, Sir, the basic question is: whether any party would keep a

private army fully equipped to attack its opponents. There is a hostel called 'Hardinge Hostel' which is equipped with arsenal and distillery. This is how a political party keeps a private army and maintains it.

The basic question is: if the leaders of the stature of Shri Jayaprakash Narain and of the standing of Mr. Guha are prevented from exercising their rights to freely express their views, what would happen to smaller men? These are the issues which I wanted to highlight through this Motion and this, I hope, has been effectively done.

If they try to defend this incident in an unabashed and aggressive manner, that will not help democracy or even them. They cannot hold up their face against the mirror. Let the country realise this. I know that they are going to oppose this Resolution. We welcome their opposition because therein lies the success of the Motion in a way. This will clearly unmask that they stand in the way of such a Resolution being passed even though it only wants to condemn a violent incident. I ask them: is this a crime of the Opposition that it asks for the condemnation of this violent incident? In fact, while this Motion has sought to condemn this incident here the Mover is sought to be condemned and all those persons associated with this Motion are also sought to be condemned.

Therefore, Sir, I was not surprised when the hon. Home Minister, Shri Reddy, said that this was a 'simple demonstration' and what has been done is not 'unhuman.' What he wanted to suggest was that it was human. On that day, or probably, the next day, one important person who led the demonstration said that it was a perfectly peaceful and legitimate demonstration! So we have got an ideal Home Minister who says that it was a simple demonstration! Our ideal Home Minister further says that it was not an unhuman incident. He might even suggest that there was an

element in that incident which might be said to be overbrimming with the milk of human kindness. That was the kind of impression that he gave.

Therefore, this is an occasion when the country has come to realise the nature of the party which is ruling this country and which is driving this country to Fascism. Now, most of the allegations that had been made by my hon. friends from the C.P.M. about the rigging of elections, about the political murder etc., would stand confirmed. It was because of their actions (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** Shri P. C. Sen was the only Congress (O) Candidate who won election.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA** Finally, if conditions for Fascism are created in this country, it would be the autobiography of the Ruling Party, it would be because of the kind of elements which have come into the • Ruling Party. It was remarked by a

very eminent writer that Italian Fascism was the autobiography of Italy. In this country, the growing conditions for Fascism I repeat, are an autobiography of the Ruling Party. We were not surprised when Shri Munshi and Shri Subroto Mukherjee got cheers from Shri Salve. Probably, he would get something in return for a lawyer does not do anything without a consideration.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Now, the question is:

"This House deplores the recent violent incident in Calcutta in which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's car was attacked and a member of the House Shri Samar Guha and his colleagues sustained injuries.

*The motion was negatived.*

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, April 9, 1975/Chaitra 19, 1897 (Saka)*