

17.00 hrs.

**MOTION RE : STATEMENT MADE BY
THE HOME MINISTER REGARDING
THE REPORTED STATEMENT BY
THE AGRICULTURE MINISTER
OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AGAINST HARIJANS**

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : I beg to move :

"That the statement made by the Minister of Home Affairs on the 6th May, 1968, regarding the reported statement by the Agriculture Minister of Andhra Pradesh against Harijans, be taken into consideration."

I have gone through the bunch of correspondences and statements supplied to us by the Home Minister with due care and caution. These papers pin-point a very relevant thing. These papers say that the correspondent of the PATRIOT who is responsible for the alleged statement in the news item in the paper which says that 'Harijans deserve to be kicked' was not present at the press conference given by the Andhra Minister, Mr. Thimma Reddy, on 22nd April. This fact has been made very clear in this correspondence.

Secondly, it has also been made very clear in this correspondence that the correspondent of the PATRIOT depended for his news item on hearsay and this hearsay has not been corroborated by the statements made by the different journalists who attended the Press Conference of Mr. Thimma Reddy on 22nd April.

These papers also pin-point, if you go through them carefully, one basic thing that this correspondent of the PATRIOT tried to play up that thing which is likely to damage harmonious relations between the different communities of this country. There is no doubt about it. Whatever that might be, I know the PATRIOT is a paper manned by persons of high integrity, character and progressive ideas. and whatever.....

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : Have you got a barometer ?

SHRI HEM BARUA : It is common-

sense. That is the barometer of experience of constant reading of the PATRIOT.

Whatever that might be, what action the PATRIOT took and what does it purport to say in this particular matter of playing up this news item ? It is for them to decide. Parliament is not in a position to suggest means because if we suggest means that will be an encroachment on the freedom of Press. But this paper pin-points another very relevant thing. This Press Conference took place on 22nd April and the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh did not inquire into the matter till 2nd May although there was a furore created in Parliament and there was widespread repercussion all over the country over this news item in the PATRIOT. This shows that the Andhra Pradesh Government was, I am sorry to say, rather looking at the matter in a very casual and a cavalier manner. There is no doubt about it. Judging from the correspondence or judging from the interest taken by the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, this becomes clear.

Now what about the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh ? The Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh has forwarded only the statements made by the different press representatives who attended Mr. Thimma Reddy's press interview. When the Chief Minister has not given out his mind or his conclusion, he has not said anything about this correspondence, then the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh must have a blank mind—I hope you will kindly excuse me, you come from the same State—he seems to have a blank mind because he has not drawn any conclusions and he has not forwarded any conclusions for the benefit of Mr. Chavan who is over-worked, Sir and if he has rather sent his conclusions, that would have helped the Home Minister. Instead he has sent the statements of the different Press Correspondents. Now the question is : who took the interview of the Press Correspondents for replies. Was it the Chief Minister or was it his Private Secretary who took the interview ? We know the only thing, that the Chief Minister attended a dance recital given by the daughter of his Private Secretary. So, was it the Private Secretary who took down these statements or was it the Chief Minister himself ? Or surely there may be a third possibility which is this. Possibly

the Chief Minister issued a question naire to the journalists to be filled up by them. And, if that is so, and judging from the similarity of language and facts narrated in the statements, it becomes crystal clear that possibly the Chief Minister did not take the responsibility of interviewing and finding out directly from the Press correspondents whether the statement alleged to have been made by Shri Thimma Reddy is correct or not. He possibly issued a questionnaire. Now, Sir, if you scan the statement of the Andhra Pradesh Minister and also the statement made by the press correspondents one thing becomes crystal clear. The Andhra Pradesh Minister might not have said that the Harijans deserve to be kicked. He made some disparaging remarks about the Harijans; there is no doubt about that. From the statement it is very clear. He said certain disparaging remarks which is apparent from the statement made by the Chief Reporter of *The Hindu* which says that the Minister mentioned the recent incidents in which Harijans were involved. The Minister had the Harijans in his mind. And it is this Minister, you know, who said, and that is corroborated by the statement of the Journalists that Journalists should be kicked. A man who can say that journalists should be kicked can also say that Harijans should also be kicked and all that. Whatever that might be Sir, there is a statement made by the correspondent of the *Blitz* which says: Generally Harijans who are poor indulge in these thefts in villages. Now, Sir, that is what this Minister said and this is what is corroborated by the statement of the correspondent of the *Blitz*. Now, Sir, at this statement I was taken aback, one Mr. Thimma Reddy said "Do you want Harijans to be kissed?" Naturally enough, I don't want Mr. Thimma Reddy to kiss the Harijans because that would muddy his lips. He need not kiss them. Sir, kicking and kissing are the opposite side of the same coin. There is no doubt about it. Mr. Chavan is smiling. Possibly he knows both.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about you?

SHRI HEM BARUA: One side only, not both.

Now, Sir, I have read the letter of the

Andhra Pradesh Minister, Mr. Thimma Reddy addressed to Chief Minister, that was on the 3rd of May. The incident took place on the 22nd of April. And if you scan the letter, you will find that the last three paragraphs of the letter are full of 'I-isms' and igoisms. He says about what he did when he was young for Harijans, what he has done now etc. All these are only 'I-isms' and a man who can indulge in 'I-isms' is a man who very surely has distorted views and visions.

Now, Sir, we have to examine the entire matter in a wider perspective. Mr. Chavan would agree with me if I say that Harijans are the most oppressed and suppressed sections of the Indian community. There is no doubt about it, Sir. Even this Andhra Pradesh Minister has said that when the thieves are caught the people in the villages take the law into their hands and then they beat them; often they are burnt also. This is a sad commentary on the State administrative machinery. What for do you have the Police, if the people are allowed to beat, to burn and kill human beings like this? The Andhra Pradesh Minister has said that water pumps are being taken away from the gardens of the rich people there living in the villages. Sir, do you think that water pumps are more valuable than human lives?

Therefore, I say, Sir, that Harijans are the most oppressed and suppressed sections of the Indian community and during these twenty years of freedom, their condition has not improved in spite of the fact that there is a constitutional provision. In spite of the Untouchability (Offences) Act which has been adopted in 1955, all these evils are continuing. All these legislations are in cold storage. The legislations remain only on paper.

The condition of the Harijans is bad. When the condition of the Harijans is so bad, what moral right do we Indians have to criticise the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King? The conditions of the two crores of Negroes living in the USA are no less inferior to the conditions of six crores of Harijans living in this country. When we treat our own people like this, what moral right have we got to criticise other people?

You know of that incident that occurred in the village in Andhra Pradesh on the

[Shri Hem Barua]

24th February ; if you read the details you will find that a boy of 19 was so much roasted that he ran from pillar to post for relief and he was refused relief even by the doctor who owned a private clinic because the doctor belonged to the so-called upper caste Hindus or the upper caste echelons of society. This is the type of mentality that we have. This is the sort of perverted psychology that we suffer from in this country.

Now, there is a tendency to say that we have a Harijan Minister and all that. We might have Harijan Ministers, but Minister-ship does not solve the problems of the common man. Does it solve? It does not solve it. It is only a slogan for the so-called caste-Hindus to use whenever it is profitable for them to use these slogans.

Now, a new class known as the neo-rich is evolving in this country. They have a sort of built-in superiority and they suffer from a sort of perverted psychology.

I know this because we were sitting at the Bombay Airport. And there was a girl. And we saw the example of a neo-rich young man coming there with a camera tucked on his arms with two transistor sets in his hands, and a pretty woman. He came to the place where we were sitting...

AN HON. MEMBER : That is okay.

SHRI HEM BARUA : That was okay. The man came with a camera and two transistor sets. He was a symbol of the neo-rich. He came there and wanted a reservation in a particular flight. He banged the table. He did not have any business to bang the table in that fashion. Shri Nath Pai was present there and he told me about this man. Immediately I thought that he seemed to be the representative of the neo-rich class in India. This neo-rich class in India is suffering from a sort of built-in superiority complex, and these are the people who are responsible for all sorts of things.

Even in this village in Andhra Pradesh, there was actually a tug of war tension between the rich and the poor. What is happening in this country? There is a revivalism of the odd features of Hinduism under the cover of nationalism. Anything

that a Hindu does passes off for a national thing. That is what happens in this country. Hinduism teaches universal compassion. Are these examples and are these treatments meted out to the poorer and weaker sections of our community evidences of universal compassion? They are not and they cannot be.

In this country, sectional interests of caste, community and religion are challenging the basic foundation of our democracy. There is no doubt about it and they are emerging as a force in this country. But I am unhappy to say that instead of relying on the statement of the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh—I hear he is a good man ; and I have also been told that Shri Thimma Reddy is also a good man who tries to imitate Shri Morarji Desai in his outspokenness ; this is what I have been told about Shri Thimma Reddy ; judging from the statement, I find him a salubrious type of man who is temperamental, who is very loose in his tongue, who does not have any mental discipline, virtues that Shri Morarji Desai possibly lacks ; this is what I find from the statement of this gentleman—instead of depending on the statement of the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh...

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : The hon. Member was saying that Shri Morarji Desai was lacking in something or that something was wrong with Shri Morarji Desai ?

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : (Gonda) : He said that those virtues Shri Morarji Desai lacked. Which virtues did he mean ?

SHRI HEM BARUA : I was very clear.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : That was a very wrong assessment.

SHRI HEM BARUA : This Mr. Thimma Reddy, somebody has told me, is known as Mr. Morarji Desai of Andhra Pradesh. But I find, judging from the statement that Mr. Thimma Reddy is a man who is loose in his words, who does not have any mental discipline.

These are virtues which Shri Morarji Desai lacks...(*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : You are losing your time now.

SHRI HEM BARUA : I am not here to draw a line of distinction between virtues and vices. It is for the hon. lady Member to do it.

Whatever that might be, I would say that instead of depending on the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh to report about this incident and instead of depending on the letter of Shri Thimma Reddy to the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, which is an illuminating document on egoism, why is it that the Home Ministry did not try to inquire into the matter directly through its own agencies ?

When the unfortunate language riots took place in Assam in 1960, a parliamentary delegation was sent to Assam to inquire in the matter. In the same manner, a parliamentary delegation can be sent to Andhra Pradesh to inquire not only into this incident but also into the conditions of Harijans in general.

I am very sorry to that Shri Jagjiwan Ram, the most outstanding leader of the Harijans...

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon) : Of the country.

SHRI HEM BARUA :...Of the Harijans also. So I would very much appreciate if in protest at what has transpired so far, Shri Jagjiwan Ram resigns(*Interruptions*). That would be a very fine gesture. I can tell Shri Jagjiwan Ram that if he resigns his Ministership, I will resign my Membership of Parliament. If he resigns his Ministership, he still continues to be a Member of Parliament. But if I resign my membership of Parliament and go away, I become unemployed as I have no other source of income.

Whatever that may be, we have gone through these papers.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : He is reducing the whole thing to a farce.

SHRI HEM BARUA : No, no (*Interruptions*).

When I make a reference to Shri Jagjiwan Ram, it is no use some members getting angry, because I have read in the papers that he is the mouthpiece of certain sections of the Indian people, and when there are reports in the newspapers that Shri Jagjiwan Ram is interested only in his office, not in the welfare of his people, naturally enough my demand that he should resign in protest is, I think, in all fairness.

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM) : I only wish he could read newspapers.

SHRI HEM BARUA : I read papers. That is the only thing I do very carefully—reading newspapers and journals. I can show him the journals. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI A. S. SAIGAL (Bilaspur) : He only wants that it should be published in the papers—that Shri Barua said like this.

MR. SPEAKER : We are losing time. Please conclude.

SHRI HEM BARUA : Here is a suggestion coming from Shri Amar Singh Saigal !

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (Guna) : Incidents of oppression of Harijans recently appearing in the papers have not only distressed us but have caused a great deal of indignation which all members of the House of all sections have expressed. Not only have they expressed their indignation ; they have demanded that such incidents should not take place and should be curbed in every possible way.

No doubt, these incidents do occur here and there and the reason may be laxity on the part of the administration. It is also true that it is not possible for any administration to have a police force in every village. Therefore, when in a remote village incidents occur, it is possible that by the time the police come on the scene some unfortunate incidents may have taken place and the preventive measures that have to be taken are not taken in time.

It is also possible that Government is

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

desirous of implementing a policy whereby Harijans should be given full protection but officers at the lower rank are indifferent and they do not implement the policy as whole heartedly and sincerely as they should do. It is not enough to blame the Government; we should blame ourselves...*(Interruptions)*. Government may pass laws and create conditions. No Government can possibly get a policy fully implemented unless the people give whole-hearted support.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : They should also punish the offenders when things brought to their notice...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : One member of the Government himself talks this.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : I started by saying that it may be due to the laxity on the part of the Administration or negligence or indifference on the part of the lower ranks if they are not whole-heartedly and sincerely implementing the policy. I say with all the emphasis at my command that any social reform cannot be carried on unless there is an effective and sizable public opinion willing to support and help the Government. When that poor boy was beaten, what were the people doing? If the Government is to blame, the people are to blame too. What is their moral justification?

SHRI PILOO MODY : What about the Ministers?

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : If some animal is treated cruelly, we go and report to the SPCA. It is our social conscience which has to be stirred and made alert. It should also be active and organised and ready to take some trouble for the protection of the Harijans. What do we do today? If we see any accident happening, we take no steps as we do not want to get involved in police cases. We do not want to be bothered; we do not want to trouble ourselves. It is our indifference which is to a great extent responsible for the social deterioration. I do not want to exonerate anybody. Government should be responsible; Government is responsible...*(Interruptions)* and it must

check and control. But what are we doing to check this indifference? When an incident like this did occur, we took it up in the Parliament. That was right. The Assembly should also take it up; the social institutions should take it up. We should put pressure on the Government and see that such things do not occur and punishment is meted out to the offenders. If you say that only the Government can look after the interests of Harijans, I do not believe it.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : यह चिन्मा रेड्डी को हटाने का सवाल है, सुचेता जी ।

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : I say that it is not enough for the representatives of the political parties to come here and shout. Shouting will not help the Harijans. All of us are supposed to be broad-based political parties and all political parties have got their members in the villages...*(Interruptions)*.

श्री रामचरण (खुर्जा) : लेकिन यह तो काँग्रेस ने किया है, आप क्या बात करती हैं ।

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : This kind of impatience will not help. I am too old a hand in this game. I have done work for the Harijans, Labour and for the peasant in the villages. I have done more work than you. It is the responsibility of the Government and also of each one of us. If such incidents happen it is a mark of shame for each one of us and all of us should hang our heads in shame...*(Interruptions)*.

I do not wish to deny that the main responsibility to give protection to the Harijans is of the Government. The Government must implement the policy accepted by us with vigour and sincerity. If officers show indifference they should be punished to set an example but at the same time I will say that all social reform measure needs strong public opinion behind it. We cannot, therefore, absolve ourselves of the responsibility for such unfortunate incidents. We must build up a vigorous public opinion and work for the cause of the upliftment of the Harijans.

Now, I come to this particular incident of Thimma Reddy. One particular newspaper which is noted for its slant—*Patriot*—reported that Mr. Thimma Reddy had said that “Harijans should be kicked”. Such a bland and outrageous statement for a seasoned politician to make is very difficult to believe.

SHRI PILOO MODY : What about the human being ?

The content of the human being is at stake.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : Please be patient. Now, this matter was referred to Shri Brahmananda Reddy ; Shri Brahmananda Reddy met the Home Minister and told the Home Minister, “I am going to tour the drought-affected areas and as soon as I come back I shall look into this matter.” As soon as he came back, within the specified date, he sent the report to him.

Some hon. members criticised the Chief Minister for not sending his own assessment of the incident. I am afraid that if he had given his own assessment he would have again been criticised for sending report prejudiced in favour of Shri Thimma Reddy who is a member of his Cabinet. Therefore what did he do ? He perhaps thought that he should not get involved in this and should leave it to the judgment of the Parliament. He has, therefore, forwarded to us the evidence that he collected ; the reports from the press people. He met the pressmen. There were seven of them. We have read all these reports. Each one of the pressmen have said that the Minister did not say the words “Harijans should be kicked.” Shri Thimma Reddy in his letter has said that he deplored the playing up of caste and communal feelings and highlighting of caste and community in describing such incidents. He also said that it was dangerous to do so and the journalists responsible for rousing caste and communal feelings should not be spared. It is true that he used immoderate language against the press. He should not have used such language but he did not say that “Harijans should be kicked.” (Interruption)

Now my friend has objected to the letter of Shri Thimma Reddy and he says that the letter is full of ‘I-isms’. Many of

us do not know this gentleman and have no knowledge about his background. It is therefore, natural that he in his letter has given us details of his past association in Harijan work. He has said, “All my life I was pledged to the upliftment of the Harijans”. (Interruption) Wait a minute.

Apart from the letter of Shri Thimma Reddy we have received a letter—it was not addressed to me but to Acharya Kripalani—a letter addressed by a Harijan ex-Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad—and an ex-M.P., Shri Shankar Dev. He has been a leader of the Harijans and has worked for the Kisans and labourers for a long time. He has said “I am ashamed that such a propoganda is going on against Thimma Reddy who has devoted his life for the welfare of the Harijans”. He has also said that previously when he was a Minister “we used to go to him and if we had any difficulties with respect to Harijans he was most sympathetic to their cause and always tried to help them.” I am therefore inclined to believe the letter of Shri Shankar Dev as well as the statement made by Shri Thimma Reddy (Interruption).

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Please sit down, Mr. Sheo Narain.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : Apart from that, let us remember that the *Patriot* representative was not present there. He got the information from the report of the UNI. He built up his story from it. Even the UNI story, as given by Mr. K. Parthasarathy, did not say that the Minister said that the “Harijans should be kicked”. He has not said that. You please go through it. (Interruption) Then, let us see what the PTI representative has stated. When the PTI representative was asked, “When you saw the report in the *Patriot* and later in the proceedings of Parliament about that report, what did you feel ?”, he said, “I felt it was incorrect and misleading.”

Then, let us see what the *Times of India* correspondent has said. He replied to a question that “My impression was that the report conveyed a wrong and distorted impression of what the Minister had actually said and I attributed it to the correspondent’s reporting on hearsay as he was not present at the interview.” It is

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

the statement of the *Times of India* reporter who was present there.

Then, Mr. Sitaram, the *Patrol* representative, first of all, was not present at the interview. He did not also have the courtesy of checking up with Mr. Thimma Reddy as to what he had actually said. (Interruption) If you read carefully the letter of Mr. Thimma Reddy, you will find—

MR. SPEAKER : Please finish.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : I am finishing. But I have been disturbed.

MR. SPEAKER : But that is because you are addressing them ?

SHRI PILOO MODY : We have read all those fabrications.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : It does not matter. When the truth is unravelled, it becomes unpalatable to the hon. Member (Interruption)

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Please resume your seats.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : Now, it is interesting to note what Mr. Thimma Reddy has said in his letter to the Chief Minister ? I want you to hear it carefully. He has said :

"I do not propose to say in this statement about the associations and activities of Mr. Sitaram (*Patrol* correspondent) or his known antipathy towards me."

This is said by Mr. Thimma Reddy.

Mr. Sitaram corroborates it in his report by saying "Mr. Thimma Reddy had shown violent reaction to some of my writings." So, both had already enmity against each other. Mr. Sitaram was waiting for an opportunity to highlight something against Mr. Thimma Reddy. Somebody asked him, "Don't you think this is very important ?" He realised that this was going to be a very sensational news. What the press people call a scoop—he wanted to do that and strike the headlines. That is why he did it. Before I

read all these reports I was of the opinion that there should be an enquiry by a parliamentary committee. But after having read these reports, I am convinced that the whole thing is a concocted affair of the press. Because Mr. Sitaram had some enmity against Mr. Thimma Reddy, he wanted to highlight something against him. There may be politics or something else also behind it, but I do not think it is right to condemn this minister in the manner we have done. But as far as the incidents against the Harijans are concerned they are serious and deplorable and I would request the Home Minister to ask Shri Brahmananda Reddy to have thorough enquiry made and take stringent action against these officers through whose laxity it has been possible for such incidents to occur.

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : It is only a two-hour discussion, not a two-day discussion. Only a few people can speak, not all the 500. I appeal to members to confine their remarks to 10 minutes.

SHRI HEM BARUA : But you said that day that the discussion can go up to 9 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER : If the House wants it, I have no objection. Mr. Hem Barua can occupy the Chair—he is in the panel—and it can go on.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I request you to give me a few minutes. I hope you do not want me to jump up like a jack-in-the-box and say, "Sir, Sir..."

MR. SPEAKER : Not immediately after Suchetaji. There should be some time lag.

SHRI P. R. THAKUR (Nabadwip) : You should allow the scheduled castes people to express their feelings. You are only calling the caste Hindus.

MR. SPEAKER : Whichever names are given by the parties, I call them.

You have raised it two times ; do not raise it again. When the parties give

certain names, I call them. I do not ask to which community they belong—Brahmin or scheduled caste. Mr. Vishwanatham.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Vishakhapatnam) : Sir, when first this news appeared that Mr. Thimma Reddy made such a statement, we were all shocked. Then we did not know all the facts. Unfortunately, that day there was no other paper to check up. I come from Andhra and none feels more sore than myself with regard to the difficulties and disabilities suffered by Harijans. Even now, in spite of our 20 years' efforts, they have not been reduced. I am one of those who believe that we must make some special effort in gearing up our machinery and creating a special machinery to remove these disabilities to see that within the shortest possible time the difference between Harijans and other people in this country is completely wiped out and every Harijan feels as good as the highest man feels in this country.

This incident came close after the Kanchikacherla incident. When the Kanchikacherla incident came, all of us here were very much perturbed and, speaking for myself, coming from Andhra Pradesh, my eyes were wet when I heard that such a thing should happen there, in a State which gave the first Harijan Chief Minister, in a State which gave the first Harijan President of the Indian National Congress. It was almost impossible for me to think that this thing could have happened.

Now, as soon as I rose, Shri Nambiar was saying "Now he will speak the truth". At the time of this incident, I was here. I was not present at the interview. If I were present there, I could have given the truth as I heard and as I saw. Unfortunately, I was here at that time. But one thing I would like to submit. This is a case which should not be viewed with emotion. This is a case which we should bring into the arena of cold reasoning, for the Parliament is a generous body. Only this morning we witnessed the spectacle and of the Parliament taking a very generous view ; of one State invading another State, as it were with police; with the slightest of protest, the question was

passed over. Similarly, when we are discussing this matter, I would only submit, we should apply not emotion but mere reason. Neither should my personal knowledge of the person concerned come into play. I have got relationship with so many friends here also and if I should discuss a statement made by a member of this House, using my personal knowledge of the private life of that gentleman, I should be doing a great injustice to myself, to the other person and even to Parliament.

Shri Hem Barua said he was not clear whether Shri Brahmananda Reddy made the enquiry himself. Yesterday I happened to be in Hyderabad in connection with another function and I was told that he personally conducted this enquiry. I could also see that the questions put to the various witness were not similar or in the same order. According to the witness and the nature of the talks separate questions were asked.

The other point that was raised was that he did not give his assessment. I think it was right that he did not give his assessment. Firstly, it would not have been possible. A Chief Minister depends upon other Ministers for his position ; we all know it. If he had supported Shri Thimma Reddy in his assessment of the position, it would have been easy for us to say "What else could you expect from a Chief Minister who depends upon other Ministers for his continuance in office". On the other hand, if he is to give an adverse inference or report, he should support it completely by the evidence which he has recorded. But the evidence which he has recorded here was against the view that Shri Thimma Reddy said what was attributed to him. That is also a fact which was brought out by the previous speaker.

Now, all hon. Members have in their possession the report of the Chief Minister with its enclosures. All the correspondents, whose evidence is recorded in that report, are very experienced correspondents, excepting Shri Parthasarathi, the correspondent and Assistant Reporter of UNI, who was taken into service only 7 months ago. The other witnesses were of *The Hindu* with 20 years of experience, the PTI with 16 years of experience, the

Times of India with 15 years of experience, *Andhra Patrika* with 30 years of experience, Shri G. Krishna of the *Indian Express* with 20 years of experience and the correspondent of *Blitz*, whose experience is not given here. But he is also a very experienced man because I remember to have seen him from the days when the Andhra Government was in Kurnool. He is also a fairly old man.

Among these, the representative of the *Hindu*, the representative of the PTI, the representative of the *Express*, besides Shri Parthasarathi, were in the interview from the beginning. The question put to the representative of the *Hindu* was: "Did the Minister say that Harijans are thieves and they should be kicked?" It is a straight question; it is not an involved question. The answer by him was straight: "No". The *Hindu* did not report it.

Shri Shyam Rao of the PTI did not carry it in his report and Shri Kurve of the *Times of India* did not carry it. *Andhra Patrika* man also did not report it. Shri Parthasarathi gives us the clue to all this. Shri Parthasarathi, on whose report the correspondent of the *Patriot* based his news-item, says, "Then all of us laughed it over." It was a free discussion; everyone was perhaps saying what he wanted and that and they laughed it over.

SHRI NAMBIAR : So, it was said.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM : No person thought of reporting this portion of the interview. No other paper reported it there the next day. Therefore it is quite clear so far as the specific sentence that Harijans are thieves and they should be kicked, is concerned that he did not say it.

SHRI PILOO MODI : What did they laugh over ?

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM : That was the journalists affair. I need not go into the details because it is not a court of law.

As to the other things, as Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani said, his reference to the journalists, no doubt, was somewhat bad. It was certainly loose talk. But that should not be carried to interpret the other thing.

What really angered us all was the alleged sentence against the Harijans and raising communal quarrels. At a time when we are straining our every nerve to integrate this country and to have an emotional, psychological and every kind of integration in this country, such a sentiment should have been given expression to was the thing which angered us. Now we find from the evidence of those very persons who were present there that that was not uttered by him. Therefore there is no use trying to put Shri Thimma Reddy on the cross for that. But the reference to the journalists was certainly not good.

I am not going into the other activities of Shri Thimma Reddy or anything else. I only say that these things are really unfortunate, that even scope should have been given. Even if it was one reporter who misunderstood him, still it was bad enough, that much can I say. But to say that the report of the *Patriot* was right is not right. The other reporters were shown by the Chief Minister the *Patriot* report and they say that it did not represent what Shri Thimma Reddy had said. On that I am quite clear. On the rest I agree with those who say that Shri Thimma Reddy should not have been so loose in his language.

SHRI NANJA GOWDER (Nilgiris) : Mr. Speaker, there is a couplet in Tamil :—

*Ya kaavarainum Na kaakka kaavaakkal
So kappar sollizhukku pattu.*

That is to say, guard your tongue; it does not matter if you do not guard anything else; otherwise, you will get into trouble for the slip of the tongue.

17.44 hrs.

[MR. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair].

It all happened because after 20 years of independence and the Government having increased financial allocation for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes from Rs. 39 crores in the First Plan to Rs. 180 crores in the Fourth Plan, and passing a spate of legislation against untouchability, the lot of Harijans has not in any way been bettered. They continue to suffer and be oppressed as they were by the Caste Hindus and others before independence.

The Government apathy is responsible for this. The laws are passed and they are not enforced properly. Even well-intentioned efforts become nugatory because all our efforts do not take into account the human problem involved in this. Untouchability continues in practice. Government work smacks of condescension when they deal with Harijans. Government deals with them not in the spirit that they have a right to demand special attention but as if this is bonus of Government kindness. Economic backwardness is another important factor of their not being in a position to develop a sense of belonging. They continue to be alienated and outside the mainstream.

The Government has to change its outlook. Words like uplift and welfare should not be used as they are indicative as if Harijans suffer from some inherent defects. The *Hindustan Times* wrote in its leading article on 18th August 1966 as follows:

"Caste is a product of social moves and to change customs and usages requires not just some do-gooders spreading sweetness and understanding but a dynamic movement that will give to the members of these communities self-respect and strength."

Sir, the Chief Minister of Andhra has absolved Mr. Thimma Reddy of the charge of contemptuous words used against Harijans. Many of the Press Correspondents who were present at the Press Conference where Mr. Reddy said that Harijans deserve to be kicked might have denied it because of the official pressure. But all facts point out that the Minister did make such a statement.

Such statements are made day in and day out by caste Hindus. That may not be very serious when such statements are made by persons occupying responsible positions. Instead of setting up an example for the people, they themselves start indulging in such things. What a type of leadership we have? Their daily behaviour indicates of what the Minister said is their general attitude towards 25 per cent population of our country.

Five Satnamis Harijans were murdered by caste Hindus in Madhya Pradesh on 13th March. We observe silence in Parliament over execution of five Rhodesians by Ian Smith racial Government. But this inci-

dent was passed off as a routine matter. Racialism outside India is more important for us than racialism of the worst kind inside our own country.

A Harijan youth was roasted alive in Madhya Pradesh on a charge of theft. In Krishna district of Andhra, a Harijan boy was burnt alive and another beaten to death in a theft case in Monikonda village. In Kanpur 2 Harijan children, 7 and 3 years of age, were hurled into a well and killed because they played near the cot of a Thakur. A Harijan woman was paraded naked in Andhra Pradesh. In Patan Taluk, Satara constituency of the Home Minister, a Harijan boy was killed and four others seriously injured. These are repeated incidents of atrocities on Harijans during the past six months. A Harijan boy was shot down in Panaji on 17-12-67 for growing moustache upward. In a village in Madras, Harijans are not allowed to ride cycles. In Agra College, there is separate mess for Harijans. The Minister of State, Shri V. C. Shukla, admitted as recently as February this year about the gruesome atrocities being committed to Harijans by the caste Hindus in the Gwalior region of Madhya Pradesh which he toured. Harijans there are subjected to forced labour without any remuneration.

As for the police, instead of taking stern measures against such reports, they are a party to these incidents. They treat Harijans without contempt, use vulgar and insulting words and even beat them publicly.

There was discrimination even in regard to giving earthquake relief. In Rajasthan it was recently alleged by the Swatantra Leader, Lakshman Singhji, that Government was running separate hostels for Harijans which amounted to Government practising apartheid and segregationist policies.

It is a deplorable fact that the helpless, oppressed, poor, downtrodden and exploited people, for whom Mahatma Gandhi lived and served most, are not only being neglected but are also ill-treated. The Government promised last year itself that a Committee would be constituted to look into all aspects of the problem, but nothing has materialised so far. I, therefore, submit that a high-power committee should be constituted immediately for solving this human problem.

SHRI R. D. REDDY (Kavali) : The main question that this House is now engaged in discussing is whether the statement that has been attributed to Shri Thimma Reddy has, in fact, been made by him. If it is so, if it is proved that such a statement has been made, we all realise that it is a very serious allegation against a particular community and the person being in a high office, such a statement coming from him certainly deserves to be condemned. The question, therefore, is whether such a statement has been made or not.

The matter came up before the House on three occasions. On the first occasion, the Home Minister was not in a position to state anything; he said that he had contacted the Chief Minister and he had asked the Chief Minister to make his own enquiries and send the report to him because, as he had said, that was the channel through which he had to make the enquiry. Unfortunately, the Chief Minister was here when the discussion in the House came up on the first occasion and then he had to tour certain districts; they were all backward districts—Kurnool, Chittoor, Cud-dapah, etc.—and drought-affected districts and, therefore, he could not cancel that programme. The Chief Minister reached Hyderabad on the 3rd and on the 3rd itself he took action. He reached Hyderabad at about 3 P.M. and immediately he contacted the Press people and he examined them from 3 P.M. to 8 or 9 P.M. on that day and took their statements also in the next morning.

Instead of giving his own version of what they have said, he has put them questions and he has taken their answers. It is not as if the questions were prepared by him and they were not allowed to state what they wanted. As a matter of fact, Mr. Rama Rao, who was examined, in the last portion of his statement has volunteered and said what he wanted to say, namely, about a prior statement made by Shri Thimma Reddy against the correspondent who has reported the matter to *Patriot*. Therefore, there was full freedom given to the Press correspondents. Seven of them were present on that occasion and all of them have given their statements. It cannot be said that these people crossed floor; it is not as if these people have been won over; no such allegation can be made con-

sidering the status and standing of the correspondents.

Therefore, it is a case where an honest attempt has been made, at the instance of this House, by the Home Minister to contact the Chief Minister and to get through him the truth.

After the evidence was recorded, it was quite open to the Chief Minister to have made his own assessment of the evidence and make a report. It would have been improper if he had made an assessment of the evidence and submitted a report; in that case, a section of the people here would have criticised it and said that it was not correct. Therefore, what he did was that he examined all these persons; took their statements giving them full liberty to say what they wanted to say and to speak truly and justly of what exactly transpired on that occasion, and then made a verbatim report of it to this House. In addition to that, he has also asked Mr. Thimma Reddy, who had previously denied the statement to give his statement also. No doubt, Mr. Thimma Reddy would have done well if he had made a full statement earlier, but, I think, he was not in a position to know what was the allegation against him. Therefore, immediately when it was brought to his notice, he denied it categorically saying that this was not the statement that he made. A man in his position, a man of his experience and status, would never make such a statement.

This was his denial but what transpired on 22nd was not stated in detail. Therefore, it has become absolutely necessary to examine the correspondents and get the facts from them, and also to take a fresh statement from Thimma Reddy and those facts have also been reported.

Normally, in a case like this, it would not have been necessary to go into the antecedents of Shri Thimma Reddy, what his political life has been, what his past history has been and so on. But when we want to know what exactly is the man's temperament or attitude towards a particular community, it also becomes relevant and therefore, it has become necessary for him to state these facts since this statement could not be given by anybody else, it has become absolutely necessary for him to explain what exactly his life has been, how

he has been associated with the Harijan movement, Harijan uplift, Harijans hostels and in his statement he referred to them.

Therefore, the matter to be considered is whether on the evidence before the House, on the statements that have been recorded by the Chief Minister and reported to us, the statement that has been attributed to Shri Thimma Reddy is true. I would humbly submit that it cannot be true on the very evidence of the very persons who had been physically present there and who have given their statements. A copy of the matter reported by Parthasarathy had also been asked for by the Chief Minister and it was promised to be supplied, but it was not supplied by the person that reported to *Patriot*.

Therefore, this very clearly establishes that the words that have been attributed to Shri Thimma Reddy are not true. They were torn out of their context and something has been reported removed from the entire context and therefore it gives a very bad picture of the entire situation.

I would, therefore, humbly submit that this is not a matter which the House should further discuss any longer.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, Shri Hardayal Devgun. He should finish in five minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER : 10 minutes may be given.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No, that is not possible. I shall have to call seven parties. Is the House prepared to sit till 9 p. m. ? I think it will be very difficult. So, he should confine himself to five minutes.

श्री हरदयाल देवगुण (पूर्व दिल्ली) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आंध्र प्रदेश के कृषि मन्त्री के वक्तव्य पर गृह मन्त्री ने जो कागज हमें उपलब्ध किये हैं उन को पढ़ने के बाद इस घटना के बारे में कुछ जानकारी हमें प्राप्त हुई है। वास्तव में जब यह समाचार प्रकाशित हुआ तो उस से इस सदन में भी और सारे देश में व्यापक रोष व्याप्त हो गया था, और वह स्वाभाविक था, क्योंकि पिछले कुछ वर्षों से ऐसी घट-

नायें हो रही हैं जिन से यह प्रतीत होता है कि हमारे नेताओं में और पिछले कई शताब्दियों में राजनीतिक, सामाजिक और धार्मिक सुधारकों ने झुग्रा झूत को समाप्त करने के लिये जो प्रयत्न किये तथा जिन को हमारे संविधान में भी स्थान दिया गया, वह अभी फलीभूत नहीं हो रहे हैं। जिस झुग्रा झूत को समाप्त करने के लिये गुरु नानकदेव, स्वामी दयानन्द वीर सावरकर, महात्मा गांधी इत्यादि नेताओं ने महान् प्रयत्न किये, तथा अपने संविधान में जिसको स्थान उपलब्ध हुआ, आजादी के बीस वर्षों बाद भी ऐसी घटनायें देश में हों यह देश के लिये लज्जा की बात है।

यह घटनायें पिछले कई वर्षों से देश के अनेक भागों में हो रही थीं और उन के समाचार अखबारों में छप रहे थे, लेकिन उन सब पर इस वक्तव्य ने जख्म पर नमक छिड़कने का काम किया और इस से एक रोष व्याप्त हुआ। अब इस में जो बातें सामने आई हैं, उन से यह कहना मुश्किल है कि जो बातें मन्त्री के साथ सम्बन्ध की गई हैं वह उन्होंने बिल्कुल नहीं कहीं। मैं उन को बहुत गम्भीरता से पढ़ने के बाद इस परिणाम पर पहुँचा हूँ। "पेट्रियाट" के सम्बाद्धाता पर भी अन्ध विश्वास करने के लिये मैं तैयार नहीं हूँ और बाकी पत्रकारों ने जो वक्तव्य दिये हैं उन के लिये भी मैं यह कहने के लिये तैयार नहीं कि उन्होंने किसी दवाब में आकर वक्तव्य लिखे हैं, यह जितने सम्बाद्धाता हैं वह बड़े पुराने और अनुभवी पत्रकार हैं और पत्रकारों की प्रतिष्ठा के बड़े प्रश्न प्रहरी हैं इस लिये उन पर किसी मुख्य मन्त्री या किसी गृह मन्त्री या मन्त्री का दवाब पड़ सकता है इस को मानने के लिये मैं तैयार नहीं हूँ।

लेकिन उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा है, उस से दो बातें बहुत स्पष्ट होती हैं। एक तो यह है कि आंध्र प्रदेश में ऐसी घटनायें व्यापक रूप से हो रही थीं, जिनमें हरिजनों के साथ दुर्व्यवहार होता था और उसके बारे में जहाँ पर चर्चा हुई। मन्त्री

[श्री हरदयाल देवगुण]

महोदय ने उन घटनाओं को न्यायोचित बताने के लिए कहा कि ये जो घटनायें होती हैं, उन में आपको कास्ट या जाती का वर्णन नहीं करना चाहिए। इससे जाहिर है कि वहां पर ये घटनायें हरिजनों के साथ हो रही थीं और मन्त्री महोदय ने इस बात को छिपाने का प्रयत्न किया।

18.00 hrs.

उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि हरिजनों के साथ जो व्यवहार होता है, उसके बारे में यह न कहा जाये कि चूंकि वे हरिजन हैं, इसी लिये उनके साथ वह व्यवहार हो रहा है, इसके और कारण भी हो सकते हैं। देहात में जो कुछ भी घटनायें हुईं, उन को उन्होंने बिल्कुल साधारण घटनायें बताने की कोशिश की। उन घटनाओं के बारे में कोई चिन्ता या उस व्यवहार के कारण हरिजनों के प्रति कोई सहनुभूति उन्होंने प्रकट नहीं की।

यह बात बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है कि उन्होंने लूस टाक की, ऐसी बातें कहीं, जो हरिजनों के लिए अपमान जनक थीं। हरिजनों के साथ जो व्यवहार होता है, वह एक साधारण बात है, वह कोई चिन्ता का विषय नहीं है, ये बातें उन्होंने अवश्य कहीं। पत्रकारों के बारे में उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा, उस से भी यह बात स्पष्ट हो जाती है। जो कुछ एविट्रेस हमारे सामने आया है, उस से मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ कि मन्त्री महोदय ने हरिजनों के बारे में अपमानजनक शब्द नहीं कहे या हरिजनों के साथ जो व्यवहार हो रहा है, उस के बारे में उन्होंने कोई चिन्ता व्यक्त की। बल्कि इस से यह जाहिर होता है कि व्यापक रूप से हरिजनों के साथ जो बद-सलूकी होती है, उस को उन्होंने एक साधारण घटना बताया। दूसरे, हरिजनों का वर्णन करते हुए उन्होंने उन के बारे में अपमानजनक शब्द कहे। एक मन्त्री के लिए ऐसा करना बहुत अनुचित है जो मंत्री

संविधान की रक्षा करने के लिए नियुक्त हुए हैं, यदि वे ऐसी बातें कहें, तो उनके लिए गवर्नमेंट में कोई स्थान नहीं होना चाहिए।

इस के साथ ही मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो पत्र जान-बूझ कर छोटी बातों को बड़ा चढ़ा कर छापते हैं, जिन की प्रेरणा के स्रोत इस देश से बाहर हैं, जिनका उद्देश्य केवल यह है कि इस देश में जातियों में वैमनस्य पैदा किया जाये, जातियों को आपस में लड़ाया जाये और ऐसी दुर्भावनायें पैदा करके देश में इन्तग्रा और फूट की भावनायें पैदा की जायें, उन के विरुद्ध भी जनमत तैयार किया जाना चाहिए और उनकी भी उतनी ही निन्दा करनी चाहिए, जितनी उन लोगों की, जो हरिजनों को अपेक्षणीय समझ कर उन का अपमान करते हैं।

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobbili): We have heard many hon. Members closely narrating the episode and also closely scrutinising the evidence that has been supplied to us. From the various speeches, it is absolutely clear that nobody had categorically come to the conclusion that what had appeared in the newspaper was a correct report. Since that has been accepted as beyond the bone of contention, much of the edge in the discussion is taken away.

In retrospect, I humbly submit that much of the criticisms made was misplaced, after the issue having been clearly stated about the various inferences drawn about the factual position, particularly by Shrimati Kripalani and Shri Viswanatham. I do not wish to go into greater details. None-the-less, I have to refer to certain matters, particularly those concerning the personal attack which Shri Barua made and also the constant attempt made to bring Andhra Pradesh into disrepute which I resent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI RABI RAY : Thimma Reddy is not Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : If hon. Members say that no reflection on the

Andhra people is intended, I have nothing to say. But it is on record, and an impression is sought to be created that the Andhra people are some sort of barbarous people—all on the basis of certain reports whose veracity is not established. So far as social transformation is concerned, we the Andhras have moved forward faster than the rest of India. I can throw this challenge (*Interruptions*).

श्री रवि राय : आन्ध्र और गैर-आन्ध्र का कोई सवाल नहीं है। माननीय सदस्य को ठीक ढंग से बात करनी चाहिए और सदन के सामने जो विषय है, उस पर बोलना चाहिए।

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : As Mr. Viswanatham pointed out we are proud of offering the first Chief Minister in India from the Harijan community ; we are also proud to offer to the nation the first Harijan Congress President... (*Interruptions*). I throw a challenge to them : come to Andhra with me and visit our rural areas and see the contrast with your areas and see the vast and tremendous social transformation that has taken place in Andhra Pradesh. Let us not add tension and hinder the smooth transition that is taking place. As Mrs. Kripalani has correctly pointed out, it is not this party or that party. If party considerations matter, I am proud to announce that in this particular matter, Harijan uplift, it is the Congress Party that had taken the lead.

SHRI RABI RAY : Ask your Harijan Members.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : It is a social problem and society has this responsibility ; it cuts across party considerations. Let us not bring in party considerations.

श्री मोल्लू प्रसाद (बांसगांव) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। अगर यह पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, तो क्या वह मामला श्री बिनोबा भावे को सौंपने के लिए तैयार हैं ? अगर यह पार्टी का और राजनैतिक मामला नहीं है, तो इस को सर्वोदय की दृष्टि से देखा जाये।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There is no point of order. The hon. Member is perfectly within his rights to appeal to the House to consider this as a non-party matter.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : In conclusion, I request you not to allow any disparaging or loose remarks against Mr. Thimma Reddi personally as he is not here to defend himself.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) : Sir, the last speaker referred to this discussion as a reflection on Andhras. First of all, I deny that suggestion. This discussion is not directed against Andhras. Just because Thimma Reddi happens to be an Andhra, they should not take it that the remarks against him are meant to be against all Andhras. Mr. Narayana Rao for instance is a good man and there is no reflection on him.

This discussion is the result of the report published in a newspaper, "*Patriot*", that the Agriculture Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Mr. Thimma Reddi reportedly said to a group of journalists that Harijans deserved to be kicked and thrashed. When we read this report, naturally we became indignant. It is not only an insult to the Harijans, it is an insult to every Indian and all those who live in India if we allow this state of affairs to continue.

Now, Mr. Thimma Reddi has come out with a statement that he had not said this and the Andhra Chief Minister had produced a sheaf of papers, evidence and statements from the Press reporters. I do not want to go into the question whether it is true or not. I shall confine myself to the evidence before me. My fear is that much more and far worse things had been said in that news conference. It is only a bodily injury, if he had said that Harijans deserved to be kicked. But a deeper injury has been inflicted. I refer to the evidence of Mr. Rama Rao—I do not know how many years of experience he has as a journalist, 15, or 20 or 30 years ; all these reporters have years of experience in this field, I am told.

Instead of saying A is equal to C, you can say A is equal to B and B is equal to C and by logic A is equal to C ! The reporter quotes Mr. Thimma Reddi as

[Shri Sehiyan]

saying "In villages thefts are a common occurrence and thrashing those thieves caught red-handed are common occurrences." This is the first syllogism. Then, what is said further by the Minister? "Generally, Harijans who are very poor indulge in those thefts and the villagers immediately catch and thrash them". What does it mean? The first one says, "those who indulge in thefts are caught and thrashed" and this is commonly done in the villages. Then, it says that the Harijans who are generally poor indulge in thefts, so the villagers catch and thrash them.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO *rose—*
(Interruptions)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose—*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Will you pleased sit down? Will you resume your seat? Please resume your seat. Do not disturb the proceedings. The hon. Member is quoting from a document. It is perfectly within his right to draw his inferences.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: These press reports have come in the wake of a very dastardly incident of a Harijan boy having been burnt. There is no indignation; there is no condemnation against that as such. Almost everything the Minister has said seems to justify the beating of the Harijan like that. Now, after the sentences I have quoted, the Minister says "the landlords generally invest a lot of money for their gardens; how can they keep quiet if thefts occur of the pump sets and other machinery and fruits? Would not thieves be taken to task? Do you want them to be kissed"?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh): What is happening in respect of the lands in Tanjore? (Interruption)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose—*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The documents have been circulated, and he is drawing his own inferences for the benefit of the House. He is within his right. Do not waste the time of the House.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai): Why is she pricked when landlord is mentioned?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Where I come from, I accept. I am not hiding like that.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO (Kakinada): Is not Namboodiripad a Jenmi Brahman owning a large amount of land?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is absolutely out of the context.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose—*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. I will have to warn the Members. If unnecessarily such points are raised and all this sort of disturbance is created, it would be difficult. If he has said anything which is irrelevant or not to the point, I am here to watch it.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Sir, this is the evidence, and I am not going beyond the four corners of this evidence. It says that not only untouchables have come in for this thrashing but even the poor journalists have been treated in the same way.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: There has been so much disturbance and so much time has been lost.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You cannot say that. I am regulating the proceedings.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I will obey you.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur): Do not be angry when a good case is being made.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not a question of a good or a bad case.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Now a question was asked, "What was the reference to journalists?" The answer was, "He said that why do you mention about the caste

of the culprits and why do you play up too much about the common occurrences? You journalists who play us or highlight the 'caste' should be kicked." Because the journalists highlighted about the burning of the Harijan, this remark has come from the Minister.

The warning to the journalist comes at the end of the paper. It has been stated here :

"Sri Ramarao also says that three years ago when Shri Thimma Reddy was President, PCC, he told him that Shri Sitarama has written something against him criticising him in *Andhra Reporter* and that he should advise Shri Sitarama not to write like that and if he persists, the same fate which happened to Lakshmikantham of Madras would happen to him."

SHRI UMANATH : Thimma Reddy is a murderer. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Lakshmikantham was a journalist in Madras of a low type of yellow journalism and he was done to death in open daylight more than 15 years back. So, that threat has been held out to journalists.

While mentioning Mr. Thimma Reddy I am not viewing it from the point of view of an individual. This is a general case. I do not want Parliament to sit in judgment over what a State Minister has said. I do not want the Central Government to do that. I leave the entire question to the conscience of the Chief Minister, to the conscience of not only Andhra people but the entire people of India, to the conscience of the State Legislature and to the conscience of the Congress members, some of whom at least, I think, even now are followers of Gandhiji.

श्री शिवनारायण (वस्ती) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, होम मिनिस्टर साहब और श्री ब्रह्मानन्द रेड्डी के बीच में जो मुलाकात हुई, उस के बाद रेड्डी साहब को इतना भवसर नहीं मिला कि वह इस चीज को टेक-अप कर सकें, उन का दौरा बड़ा इम्पॉर्टेंट था। हरिजन समाज के साथ आज जो कुछ बीत रही है, उस का सम्भालना इस कांग्रेस के मस्तक पर

एक किस्म की जिम्मेदारी है। गांधी जी ने भंगी कालोनी में बैठ कर ही हरिजन उत्थान का नारा दिया था, इस लिये, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी भी इतनी जिम्मेदारी नहीं है, जितनी ब्रह्मानन्द रेड्डी की है, जितनी चव्हाण साहब की है, जितनी इन्दिरा गांधी जी की है, जितनी हमारे इन बड़े लोगों की है। यह कलंक देश पर है, लेकिन मुझे दुःख है कि श्री ब्रह्मानन्द रेड्डी ने, जिनकी बुद्धिमत्ता पर मुझे कोई शक नहीं है, उन्होंने इस रिपोर्ट को बना कर भेजा दिया, लेकिन चीफ मिनिस्टर के नाते उन्होंने अपनी जिम्मेदारी को महसूस नहीं किया, कम से कम उन को अपनी ओपीनियन तो लिखकर भेजनी चाहिये थी। इस में उस कारस्पोंडेन्ट का स्टेटमेन्ट नहीं है, जिसने उन को रिपोर्ट किया था, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने उस को एक्जामिन क्यों नहीं किया।

मैं, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, होम मिनिस्टर साहब से डिमाण्ड करता हूँ कि आप एक जूडिसियल एन्क्वायरी करायें। उन्होंने, हम हरिजनों को तो छोड़ दीजिये, हम को तो रोख ही कहा जाता है, लेकिन इन सात अस्-बारबालों को भी कह दिया कि इन को लात मारना चाहिये। इस लिये आप इस की जूडिसियल एन्क्वायरी करायें, केवल तिम्मारेड्डी के लिये नहीं, बल्कि यह एक केस आपके सामने आया है, प्रत्यक्ष आया है और अप्रत्यक्ष आया है, लेकिन यह नकशा आपके सामने आया है, इस लिये एक जज को मुर्कारर कर के आप इस की जूडिसियल एन्क्वायरी करायें। मैं इस में विश्वास नहीं करता हूँ कि यह रिपोर्ट सही है, हम यहां पर किसी चीफ मिनिस्टर या मिनिस्टर को प्रोटेक्शन देने के लिये नहीं बैठे हैं, हम चाहते हैं कि जांच हो और दूध का दूध सामने आये और पानी का पानी सामने आये।... (व्यवधान)...

हम समझते हैं कि किंग लूथर की तरह से बहुत से लोगों को इस मुल्क में भी कुरबान होना पड़ेगा। जब बाहर के मुल्कों में ऐसे

[श्री शिव नारायण]

लोगों को मारा जाता है तो हम यहां पर क्रोकोडाइल टीयर्स बताते हैं, जब अपने मुल्क में मारे जाते हैं तो कोई ावाज भी नहीं उठाता। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सवाल बड़ा गम्भीर है। मैं विदेशों में हो कर आया हूँ, वहां हमारी इज्जत ज्यादा थी, जितनी यहां पर नहीं है। हम शुरू से फोर्थ क्लास के आदमी रहे हैं—मैं यहां पर गुरु द्रोणचार्य को कोट करना चाहता हूँ जो देश महाभारत का रचयिता रहा है—उस में भी एकलव्य ने अपना अंगूठा काटा था, हम उस दिन से बर-दास्त करते चले आ रहे हैं। तो इस देश में बहुत थिम्मा रेड्डी हैं। अगर इस देश को, कांग्रेस गवर्नमेन्ट को और सभी को कामन सेन्स आ जाये तभी इस देश का कल्याण हो सकता है। हमने जनसंघ का भी नमूना देखा है। उनकी बड़ी लच्छेदार स्पीचेज होती हैं। मुझे यह भी याद है कि जब सिग्नेचर करा रहे थे तो हमारे एक मित्र जो डी० एम० के० के हैं, उनके एक सदस्य ने कैम्प में हाथ खींच लिये थे।... (व्यवधान)... जब यहां पर आप बोलने नहीं देते हो तो फिर गावों में क्या हालत होगी? दुखिया की गति दुखिया जाने, और न जाने कोय। हम जानते हैं संविधान में प्रोटेक्शन मिला हुआ है लेकिन इस सवाल को कांग्रेस वालों ने ही उठाया था, विरोधी दल वालों ने नहीं उठाया था। हम अपनी पूरी जिम्मेदारी समझते हैं। हम आज भी होम मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहते हैं कि हम निराश नहीं हैं, हम अपने बाहुबल पर खड़े हैं। जो गुंडाइज्म हो रही है उसको हम लोग बोल्टली फेस करेंगे। हम दस करोड़ की संख्या में यहां हैं, आप अपने कागज में चाहे कुछ भी लिखते रहिये। चिराग तले अंधेरा नहीं होना चाहिये। आज यू० पी० में हरिजनों के साथ क्या हो रहा है? आपकी भी वहां पर दस महीने सरकार बनी लेकिन हरिजनों के साथ क्या व्यवहार हुआ? जो पैसा कांग्रेस

सरकार देती थी उसको भी आप लोगों ने बन्द कर दिया और हमारा गला काटा। हम जानते हैं कि कांग्रेस के लोग सचेत हैं, हमारे लीडर्स भी सचेत हैं लेकिन मेरी दर्खास्त है प्राइम मिनिस्टर से कि एक कांग्रेस लीडर वे स्वयं इसकी जांच करें। एग्जाम्पल के तौर पर अगर कोई हमारा आदमी भी गलती करता है तो उसको भी हम ठीक करेंगे। जिस समय भी चेतना आ जाये, अच्छा होता है। थिम्मा रेड्डी और ब्रह्मानन्द रेड्डी को अब भी ज्ञान हो जाये तो अच्छा है। देश में बहुत बदनामी हो चुकी है।... (व्यवधान)... आदमी वहीं पर जलाया गया है, बदनामी वहीं से शुरू हुई है। साथ ही साथ हीयर-से एविडेन्स पर भी हमको विचार करना होगा। पैट्रियाट अखबार भी त्वायल नहीं है। मेरी पत्रकार बंधुओं से प्रार्थना है कि वे रीयल पिक्चर दिया करें। अन्त में मेरी इस पूरे हाउस से अपील है कि सभी मिलकर हरिजनोत्थान में मदद करें। इस तरह की घटनाओं से हमारे देश की नाक कटती है। मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है होम मिनिस्टर साहब इस पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करेंगे।

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा (जयनगर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आशा करता था कि इस सवाल को दल के रूप में नहीं लिया जायेगा लेकिन शिव नारायण जी के पहले जो सदस्य और सदस्यार्ये बोले हैं, कांग्रेस की तरफ से, वह बड़ी ही निराशा की बातें रही हैं। मैं यह भी नहीं कहता कि श्री जगजीवन राम जी को इस्तीफा देना चाहिये क्योंकि हमारे लिये वह और भी ज्यादा कलंक की बात होगी। अगर इस्तीफे की बात हो तो थिम्मा रेड्डी इस्तीफा दें, चन्हाण साहब इस्तीफा दें। लेकिन वह हमारे लिये कलंक की बात होगी। यहां पर जो तर्क दिये गये हैं, मैं उनको दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ लेकिन आज सभी राज्यों में जो स्थिति है उसको फ़्यान में रखते हुये मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि गृह

मन्त्री जी हिम्मत करेंगे, कांग्रेस के सदस्य हिम्मत करेंगे ताकि इस समस्या का निराकरण हो सके। 50 से अधिक संसद् सदस्यों ने एक साथ लिखकर इनको भेजा कि बिहार में, संविद सरकार के अन्दर, एक हरिजन का खून हुआ, उसकी हत्या कर दी गई। वहाँ की सरकार में सभी पार्टियाँ थी, संयुक्त समाजवादी, कम्युनिस्ट, जनसंघ सभी थे और अब भी हैं और सभी दलों के 50 सांसदों ने गृह मंत्री को इस खून के बारे में लिखा है। 4 दिसम्बर को हत्या हुई। 20 नवम्बर को सरपंच ने रिपोर्ट दी थी कि खून-खराबी का खतरा है लेकिन 23 नवम्बर को एस० डी० ओ० ने आर्डर कर दिया कि किसी कार्यवाही की जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन 4 दिसम्बर को सिद्ध पासवान की हत्या हो गई। थाने में रिपोर्ट के लिये जाते हैं तो दारोगा पकड़ कर जेल भेज देता है। एक और व्यक्ति को भेजा गया तो उनको भी पकड़ कर जेल भेज दिया गया। 4 दिसम्बर को खून हुआ था लेकिन आज तक उसमें कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई है। कचहरी के अन्दर 516 गवाहों ने धारा 164 में गवाहियाँ दी हैं लेकिन अभी तक एक भी मुद्दा-अले गिरफ्तार नहीं हुआ और न कोई वारन्ट ही जारी हुआ है। इस प्रकार से संविधान की हत्या की जा रही है। मैंने इस बात का जिक्र किया, चव्हाण साहब भी यहाँ पर आ गये हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि 50 एम० पीज लिखकर दे चुके हैं! आज हम सरकार में हैं तब भी खून हुआ और पहले भी हुये हैं। थिम्मा रेड्डी ने कहा है कि इसका कारण आर्थिक है। वृत्ति यह सबसे अधिक शोषित तबका है जोकि सबका अन्नदाता भी है क्योंकि सभी को अन्न पैदा करके देता है लेकिन साथ ही साथ अछूत भी है, दीन-हीन भी है। श्रीमती सुचेता कृपलानी इसमें कोई अन्तर नहीं समझती हैं। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि इसमें दोनों को खतरा है। मैं ने अभी जिक्र किया कि सात महीने हो गये हैं, नाम लेकर कचहरी में गवाहियाँ दी जा चुकी

हैं लेकिन पुलिस अफसर अड़े हुये हैं। मुख्य मन्त्री श्री भोला पासवान का आदेश आता है लेकिन एक भी मुद्दा-अले का अभी तक वारन्ट भी नहीं हुआ है, गिरफ्तारी की बात तो छोड़ दीजिये। यह आज की हकीकत है।

अब मैं एक दूसरी बात कहता हूँ क्या खून का बदला लेने का हक होगा या नहीं? थिम्मा रेड्डी बयान देते हैं कि ऐसा ही होना है। मैं कहता हूँ कि अधिकांश जमींदार चोरी करते हैं, सूदखोरी करते हैं, महाजनी के कानून तोड़ते हैं लेकिन उनको कौन पीटेगा? उनको पकड़ने की हिम्मत नहीं हो सकती है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि थिम्मा रेड्डी आखिर किस पृष्ठभूमि में बोल रहे थे? आकाश में और हवा में तो नहीं बोल रहे थे। तब वह कहते हैं कि यह आम बात है, ऐसा ही होगा। ये 15, 20 और 30 वर्ष के अनुभव के संवाददाताओं ने जो बयान दिये हैं उनको भी धमकाया गया। सभी संवाददाता एकमत हैं कि थिम्मा रेड्डी ने कहा कि ऐसे संवाद देने वालों को पीटना चाहिए। संवाददाताओं ने जो बयान दिया है उसको सुनिये :

"He said that when culprits are caught, to whichever caste they belong will be dealt with harshly generally and we can't say what will happen when there is mob frenzy."

आप बराबरी का झंडा बुलन्द करते हैं लेकिन थिम्मा रेड्डी ने बैकवर्डनेस का नारा दिया है। आखिर उन्होंने किस पृष्ठभूमि में कहा। यहाँ पर कांग्रेस के लोग समझते हैं कि हम दल विरोध की भावना से यह कह रहे हैं। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि बिहार के बारे में जो 50 संसत्सदस्यों ने लिखकर दिया है, जिसके सारे सबूत मौजूद हैं और दूसरा मामला जो आंध्र प्रदेश का है, इन दोनों मामलों के लिये न्यायिक जांच का आदेश केन्द्रीय सरकार करे। इसके साथ ही थिम्मा रेड्डी को इस्तीफा देना चाहिए, अगर वह इस्तीफा न दें तो उनको निकालकर बाहर कर दिया जाये।

श्रीमती सुशीला रोहतगी (बिल्हीर) : मान्यवर, आज इस सदन में जो रोष और असंतोष व्यक्त किया जा रहा है, वह स्वाभाविक है। यदि इस प्रकार का एक गैर-जिम्मेदार बयान कोई जिम्मेदार व्यक्ति देता है, तो वास्तव में जबकि अभी लोगों के मन को चोट लगी थी, बर्बरता के दृश्य लोगों के सामने आये थे, लोगों के स्वाभिमान को चोट लगी है। देश के कोने-कोने में जो असंतोष का व्यापक सहर है वह स्वाभाविक ही है।

मान्यवर, कुछ मौलिक प्रश्न हमारे सामने आ रहे हैं। सबसे पहला प्रश्न तो यह है कि एक तरफ देश के अच्छे-अच्छे पत्रकार 15, 20, 30 वर्ष के अनुभव वाले— कह रहे हैं कि इस प्रकार का बयान नहीं दिया गया है। (व्यवधान)... और दूसरी ओर मान्यवर, एक पत्रकार—अच्छी स्टैंडिंग का भले ही हो— जोकि उस समय उपस्थित नहीं था, वह एक दूसरे आदमी के बयान पर जोकि बगैर दस्तखत कराया हुआ था और जिसको टेलीफोन पर सुनाया गया, बयान देता है और जिसका खंडन किया गया। ऐसी दोनों चीजों को हमको एक तराजू पर संतुलन के साथ देखना और परखना है। लोकसभा में हमको बड़े अच्छे तरीके से सोचना है कि इस बारे में हमारा मापदंड क्या हो। हमको पत्रकारिता के स्तर के बारे में भी देखना है कि वह गिरने न पाये और पत्रकार लोगों के सामने जो खबरें लेकर जायं वह निचले की स्तर की न हों। हमारे मंत्री जी ने ठीक ही कहा है जबकि उन्होंने उनसे देश की राष्ट्रीयता के नाम पर अनुरोध किया है कि पत्रकारों को एक अपना स्तर कायम रखना चाहिए और उन्हें अपने पत्रों द्वारा पाठकों के सामने सेंसेशनल चीजें नहीं लानी है। ऐसी चीजें नहीं लानी हैं जिससे देशवासियों के अन्दर यह अलगाव, वर्गभेद या जातिभेद की भावना फैले। आज हमें ऐसी चीजें लानी हैं जिससे देश के अन्दर राष्ट्रीयता के सूत्र को अलग-अलग बिखरे पड़े हैं उनको हम पुनः

एक सूत्र में पिरो कर देश को एक राष्ट्रीयता के रूप में गठित करना है व एक करना है। ऐसा प्रयास अगर किया जाता है तो क्या गलत काम किया जा रहा है? अगर उन्होंने वैसा न किया होता और सत्य का आश्रय न लिया होता तो हम कभी उसको जस्टिफ़ाई करने की कोशिश नहीं करते।

दूसरा मेरा निवेदन यह है कि मुख्य मंत्री का जो स्टेटमेंट आया है आज लोकसभा में यह सोचना है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार को किसी अन्य राज्य सरकार के प्रशासन के बीच में पड़ना है अथवा नहीं। एक मुख्य मंत्री तब तक किसी को अपने मन्त्रीमंडल में मन्त्री बनाये रखता है जब तक कि उसका उसे विश्वास प्राप्त रहता है। मुख्य मंत्री सम्बन्धित मन्त्री से बयान मांगता है और वह बयान दे देता है और उस बयान आदि के आधार पर मुख्य मन्त्री सन्तुष्ट हो जाता है कि इस तरह की दुखदायी चीज दरअसल वहां पर नहीं हुई तो उसे पूर्ण अधिकार है कि वह उस मन्त्री को उसके पद पर बनाये रखे वैसे भी मुख्य मन्त्री को किसी को मंत्री बनाये रखने या बर्खास्त करने का पूर्ण अधिकार प्राप्त है। जैसा कि हमारे विरोधी दल के किसी सदस्य ने कहा कि यह मॅटर आफ कौंशंस है तो वास्तव में यह मॅटर आफ कौंशंस मुख्य मन्त्री का है। यह उसके अधिकार का मामला है।

तीसरी बात जो हमारे सामने आ रही है कि यह किस पत्र में आया है? अब पैट्रियाट अखबार की पैट्रियाटिज्म के सम्बन्ध में दो राय हैं और उन दो राय के बारे में सोचना है कि कुछ पत्र ऐसे हैं जिनमें कुछ सेंसेशनल खबरें छपी जाती हैं और वह कहां तक पैट्रियाटिज्म की भावना से मेल खाती है इसके बारे में हमको सोचना है?

चौथा मौलिक प्रश्न हमारे सामने यह आता है कि न्याय की बात हमको अपने सामने रखनी

है। एक आदमी जिसको यहां इस सदन में कुछ कहने का अधिकार नहीं है उसके खिलाफ बगैर उसका कोई बयान मंगाये हुए लोकसभा में लोग यह चाहते हैं कि उस आदमी को बर्खास्त किया जाय। न्याय के माने यह नहीं हैं कि बगैर तथ्य को जाने हुए हम किसी आदमी के खिलाफ कुछ कह दें। अभी 10 दिन पहले ही इसी लोकसभा में श्री ठेकर का मामला आया था। मैं माननीय सदस्यों को याद दिलाते हुए कहना चाहती हूँ कि सदन में इनके खिलाफ उस समय बातें चल रही थीं, उन पर पचासों तरह के आरोप लगाये जा रहे थे उसी सप्ताह में दूसरे दिन कुछ सदस्य हमारे बीच में ऐसे भी आ गये जो कि कह रहे थे कि खाली दोष ठेकर साहब का ही नहीं है बल्कि उनके द्वारा मन्त्री महोदय पर भी आरोप लगाये गये थे और मन्त्री को भी जिम्मेदार ठहराया गया था। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि हमें इन सारी चीजों को संतुलन कायम रखते हुए देखना और विचार करना है।

आज हमारे देश में तरह-तरह के हमारी राष्ट्रियता पर आघात हो रहे हैं। इस अवसर पर मुझे केवल एक बात कहनी है कि हमें हर कीमत पर अपनी राष्ट्रिय एकता कायम रखनी है। हमें माइनारिटीज, कास्ट्स और वर्ग आदि के प्रश्न इस रीति से नहीं लेने हैं जिससे कि देश में एक अलग-अलग की भावना पैदा हो। लेकिन वह जरूर है कि हरिजनों पर जहां भी अत्याचार हो वह समाप्त हो। हम लोगों की यह कमी भी नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि यह हरिजन भाई हमारे ही अंग हैं। यह इनको 'हरिजन' नाम देने वाले महात्मा गांधी ही थे और कोई दूसरा नहीं था। गांधीजी ही गंदी बस्ती में जाकर उनके बीच में रहे और उनको गले लगाया। आज यह नहीं मुला देना चाहिए कि यह हरिजनों को किसने गले लगाया था? आज हमारे संविधान में हरिजन भाइयों को जो मान्यता दी गई है और जो उनको अधिकार दिये गये हैं वह कांग्रेस ने ही उनको दिये हैं। कांग्रेस ने उनके प्रति अपनी जिम्मेदारी निभाई है। मेरा आज

अनुरोध है कि ऐसा कोई वातावरण या कानून बनाया जाय कि हमारी माइनारिटीज में एक अलग-अलग की भावना आये और वह राष्ट्रियता की भावना से परे हट कर अपने लिये कोई एक अलग मंच बनाने लगे। देश में राष्ट्रियता एकता बनी रहे इसके लिए हम सभी को गम्भीरता से इस पर विचार करना है।

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN (Badagara) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, some hon. Members of the ruling party cautioned us not grow emotional over this issue. I am plainly emotional over this issue because this is an issue which concerns the down-trodden people of our country who have been kept under subjugation by caste domination for nearly 2000 years.

Certainly people will become emotional on this. I am only sorry and I am also shocked that, during the evening of the 20th Century, when the citadels of caste are crushing and crumbling, there should be people in the Congress Party to defend Mr. Thimma Reddy, who is a rare combination of a paper Hitler, a feudal oligarch and a buffoon—all rolled into one.

Before I go into the antecedents of Mr. Thimma Reddy, before I wholly analyse the evidence that has been gathered from the Press representatives, before I look into the conduct of the Chief Minister, I would like to invite the House to two or three basic issues that are involved in this; the first is the attitude of the Government of India; the second is the nature of evidence and the enquiry conducted; and the third is the impact on the country at large and the forces of disruption that it has led to.

While replying to a call-attention on this issue on the 29th April, the hon. Home Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan, said :

"Then, I shall certainly make an assessment of my own."

Again, later, he added :

"As I said, I have got my own sources of information. That, of course, I cannot disclose now. Certainly I have got my machinery of knowing what happened... Certainly, if the House wants me to give my own personal assessment, naturally I will do that after the Chief Minister's report is received."

[Shri A. Sreedharan]

I would like to ask the hon. Home Minister, where is his report... (*Interruptions*) Has he thrown into the dustbin the report of the Central Intelligence Agency? My information is that he has not made an enquiry... (*Interruption*) I have some unimpeachable evidence to prove that. When the Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister asked one of the Press correspondents, 'Did any official ask you or inquire from you about the interview till now?', the reply 'No'—an emphatic 'no', a negative reply. I would like to ask the hon. Home Minister how he conducted the enquiry, from whom his agents gathered the information. Did they gather the information from the lamp-posts of Andhra Pradesh? Why was not an enquiry conducted? Why were not the results of the enquiry placed on the Table of the House? It is an insult to this august House.

In this country we find a tragic, lamentable spectacle of Hindu revivalism. The rights and liberties of Harijans are trampled into dust. Even in Parliament, people applaud Sankaracharya but they never talk of Tiruvalluvar, Nandanar or Pakkanar. The other day when the Minister for Civil Aviation and Tourism was replying to the debate, he said that Sankaracharya was the first tourist in this country, Sankaracharya was the father of tourism. ** (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH): This is most objectionable.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Sreedharan... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi): Dr. Karan Singh is a very honourable man. This kind of expression must be expunged.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN: There are nothing unparliamentary in what he said.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: It is undignified.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Sreedharan.

He must bear with me for a minute.

The statement that he made, namely, "..." must be withdrawn. About the other aspect of the statement, where he has criticised, I have nothing to say. But that part which I have indicated should be withdrawn...

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN: There is some relevance to the situation...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, no. This portion stands expunged.

Now, the hon. Member has got only one minute. He should finish.

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN: I will point out one or two instances to prove beyond any shadow of doubt how this enquiry has been vitiated.

SHRIMATI LAKASHMIKANTHAMMA rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have ordered expunction already.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा (सम्माम) :
शंकराचार्य के गुरु भी हरिजन थे ।

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN: She may claim Shankaracharya to be everything.

The Chief Minister asked one of the correspondents.

"Did the Minister say that journalists or press should be beaten for reporting incidents of thefts?"

And the reply was:

"No. He said that those who write about these incidents giving a colour of caste should 'beaten' (taken to task)."

The words 'taken to task' are put within brackets.

I do not know in which dictionary you find the meaning of the word 'beaten' as 'taken to task'. The Oxford Dictionary gives the meaning as 'to strike repeatedly'. But there is a Chief Minister gathering evidence and sending it to the House saying

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

that the meaning of 'beaten' is 'taken to task'. My feeling is that the Chief Minister has no right to stay and he should resign within five seconds. My submission is that every attempt has been made to save Shri Thimma Reddy. There is a conspiracy and an attempt to save Shri Thimma Reddy. We have no faith in this Chief Minister.

We have no faith in the inquiry conducted. We have no faith in the Governor who was sitting tight when all these things happened. We have no faith in this Home Minister. We have faith only in a judicial inquiry and, therefore, I urge that a judicial inquiry should be conducted.

श्री कार्तिक उराँव (लोहारडगा) । उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज हम लोग जो कुछ भी हरिजनों और आदिवासियों के प्रति सुन रहे हैं वह कोई नई चीज नहीं है । मुझे तो यही कहना है कि जहाँ तक थिम्मा रेड्डी का वक्तव्य का सवाल है गृह मंत्री का ध्येय यह होना चाहिये था कि :

"I will not try to corroborate anything which is wrong and which I do not believe to be true."

उसको यह पता लगाने की कोशिश करना चाहिये कि क्या कहा गया था । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर थिम्मा रेड्डी ने कुछ कहा नहीं तो फिर आखिर यह निकला कहाँ से ? मैं यहां पर यह बात बतला देना चाहता हूँ कि या तो थिम्मा रेड्डी सही हो सकते हैं या पेपर करेस्पॉण्डेंट सही हो सकता है या होम मिनिस्टर सही हो सकते हैं । सब सही नहीं हो सकते हैं, यह मानी हुई बात है ।

मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ हो रहा है वह कोई नई बात नहीं है । 3 अप्रैल को एक आदिवासी पोस्ट-ग्रेगुएट स्टूडेंट को रांची में उसके क्लास से निकाल कर मारा गया । उसके बाद वाइस चांसलर ने गाने वाले लड़को का रस्टिकेशन किया और बाद में फिर बापस ले लिया । थिम्मा रेड्डी का ऐसा वक्तव्य हुआ या नहीं या वह गलत है या सही है,

यह मैं नहीं कहना चाहता । लेकिन मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक बहुत जबर्दस्त दुश्मन हमारे देश में आ रहा है । वह कौन सी चीज है, उसको इस तरह से देखिये । एक प्रोफेसर साहब थे जो कहीं पैदल जा रहे थे । चार पांच लड़के आये और कहने लगे क्या हुआ ? साहब क्या हुआ ? वह बोले : यह अनुभव की बात है, अभी तुम नहीं समझोगे । कुछ दिन पढ़ो तब समझोगे । इसके बाद दूसरे लड़के आये । प्रोफेसर साहब पुल की तरफ ताक रहे थे । क्या हो गया साहब ? ...अरे यह अनुभव की बात है, तुम नहीं समझोगे । इसको सुन कर लड़के कहने लगे कि अरे यह पागल है । उन्होंने ने कहा "तुम पागल हो" । लड़कों ने गला पकड़ कर कहा कि बतलाओ क्या बात है ? उन्होंने कहा बतलाता हूँ क्या हुआ । पुल के अन्दर से एक चूहा पास हुआ । कहाँ से पास हुआ ? चूहा दोनों पैरों के बीच से पास हो गया और फिर पुल के अन्दर से । लड़कों ने कहा कि अरे, चूहा पुल के नीचे से पास हो गया तो इसमें घबराने की क्या बात है ? कहा : चूहा आज मेरे दोनों पैरों के बीच से निकल कर पुल के नीचे से पास हुआ, कल क्या होगा कि कुत्ता, बन्दर, भालू, गदहा सब पैरों के बीच से आयेंगे । मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह तो शुरूआत है । हमारे देश में आदिवासियों के प्रति जो कुछ हो रहा है, अगर उसको नहीं दबायेंगे तो देश में हमारा जीना मुश्किल हो जायेगा ।

इसलिये मैं गृह मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस मामले में फ्रम ऐक्शन लें । यह नहीं कि ब्रह्मानन्द रेड्डी को बुला कर पूछें कि क्या हुआ । उसके बाद यहां से लिखें । यह लिखना पढ़ना तो होता ही रहेगा । आज हमारे देश में सरकार की तरफ से कोई ऐक्शन नहीं लिया जा रहा है तो इसका मतलब क्या है ? वह लोग कहते हैं कि हम सरकार चला रहे हैं, सब ठीक कर देंगे । इसको सुन कर मुझ को एक कविता याद आती है :

[श्री कार्तिक उरांव]

दिल चाहता है कि किश्ती को किनारे लगा दूँ, लेकिन मैं तो डूबते को डुबाने का मजा ले रहा हूँ। आज यह सवाल आदिवासियों और हरिजनों का नहीं है। यह हमारे देश के नागरिकों का सवाल है। हर बात में यह कहना कि आदिवासियों के साथ यह हुआ, हरिजनों के साथ यह हुआ, यह गलत है। हमारे अन्दर तो यह भावना होनी चाहिये कि अगर किसी भी नागरिक के प्रति कुछ होता है तो वह देश के नागरिक के प्रति होता है और उसको बन्द करने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये।

मैं गृह मंत्री जी से इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब भी वह कोई लेजिस्लेशन यहां पर लावें या कानून बनवायें तो इस तरह से न रखें कि यह हरिजनों के लिये है, वह आदिवासियों के लिये है। अगर मुजरिम की तरफ से कोई गलती होती है जिसमें यह पता हो कि किसी ने जातीयता की भावना फैलाई है या हरिजनों के प्रति कोई डिसअफेक्शन पैदा करने की कोशिश की है, तो उसको कड़ी सजा होनी चाहिये। लेकिन हरिजन ऐक्ट, आदिवासी ऐक्ट, हिन्दू ऐक्ट, मुसलिम ऐक्ट इस तरह की चीज नहीं होनी चाहिये। यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है आज हम देश में एकता एकता बकते रहते हैं, लेकिन अगर कानून दस बनाते हैं तो दस में से एक भी ठीक से नहीं चलता। मंत्री जी को कड़ा कानून बनाना चाहिये, और कड़ा कानून बना कर उस को कड़ाई से इम्प्लेंट करना चाहिये। अगर हम उसको ठीक से इम्प्लेंट नहीं करेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश में लोग हमको दबाते जायेंगे और यह फोड़ा बढ़ता जायेगा और हम उस से कोलैप्स कर जायेंगे।

SHRI C. K. CHAKRAPANI (Poonani) : Some days back, our leader, Shri A. K. Gopalan, received a telegram from the Dalit Jatiya Sangh, Hyderabad, which reads :

"Andhra Agriculture Minister influencing Press to contradict stop Pray appoint parliamentary commission".

We have the statement of the Home Minister. Apart from that, we have two letters, one written by Shri Thimma Reddy to Shri Brahmananda Reddy and another letter written by the latter to Shri Chavan. After reading all these documents, my feeling is that a deliberate attempt has been made to shield the real culprit.

When this issue came up for discussion. Shri Chavan told us that he had asked Shri Brahmananda Reddy to submit a report on the incident. After that, Shri Brahmananda Reddy went on tour and after returning from it, he has written a casual report and sent it to Shri Chavan and that has been laid on the Table by Shri Chavan. In his letter Shri Brahmananda Reddy has not expressed any opinion, nor has Shri Chavan in his own statement to the house. My point is that a deliberate attempt has been made to shield the real culprit.

Why should Mr. Brahmananda Reddy and Mr. Chavan fail to express their opinion. Why has Mr. Chavan failed to get the correct information through his sources; he has an army of CID officials. It appears that he wants us to believe what he has placed on the Table of the House. My feeling is that Mr. Thimma Reddy has made that remark that Harijans deserve to be kicked. Even before that statement, what is the situation in Andhra? Harijans are being oppressed; they are being beaten to death. The women are molested and raped and oppression is let loose on Harijans in Andhra. That is the position. Untouchability is practised in its real form in Andhra, according to the report of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Commissioner. You say you have done many things for the uplift of the Harijans and Girijans in the country. Despite that, the reality is that they are being oppressed. Under these circumstances, I cannot expect any justice from the Government. In this connection, I should like to refer to police oppression let loose in Srikakulam district. Our party general secretary had addressed an open letter to the Prime Minister, Mr.

Indira Gandhi. Many decades ago, the traders and contractors from plains have penetrated into the tribal area and in course of time they have become exploiters. Land of the Girijans had passed into the hands of these exploiters. Debt bondage is still very common. These traders and contractors pay nominal prices for the forest produce sold by the Girijans.

In the end, what is happening in Andhra is only the untold story. I want a parliamentary committee to go into these affairs. It is high time to remove Thimma Reddi and Brahmananda Reddi from their office.....(Interruptions) If you are not prepared to do so, this country's Harijans will throw you out of power.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : I am afraid that there has been a confusion of issues. The issue of cruelty to Harijans is one question : what the Minister said is another question. I have really been wondering what we are discussing. Are we discussing the conduct of the Minister or are we discussing the condition of the Harijans? (An Hon. Member : It is mixed) : How can they be mixed up? If you want to hang the Minister, you must talk about the Minister and not about the general proposition of how the Harijans are being treated. We all know that in the villages Harijans are being treated very badly. There may be umpteen number of causes of that. But one great cause of this is that we, the educated people who call ourselves modern, yet pride ourselves on our caste. If a modern person is born a Brahmin, he thinks himself to be a superior being ; if he is a kshatriya, he thinks he is as brave as kshatriyal's of old. This is a disease from which we have been suffering for thousands of years and I do not know how long we will suffer. But this question must be kept apart in the present discussion because my friends want that something should be done to this Minister.

The Minister is at the bar of the House. If the Minister is at the bar of the House, I ask one simple question : supposing there was the word of the press representative and the word of a Member of Parliament, whom would you believe? I am not going into the evidence. Whom would you believe? There is the word of the Member of Parliament and there is the word of a press reporter. I am not talking

of the other evidence or what other reporters have said.

SHRI NAMBIAR : No press reporter of that paper was there.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I am not talking of any such evidence. I am only talking of this. Will any Member of Parliament here say that the Parliament should believe the word of a press reporter and not the word of a Member of Parliament? Let us discuss systematically. If we are to hang a man we must hang him properly ; we cannot hang him on doubtful evidence. I say when it is a Member of Parliament, the Member of Parliament will insist that his word should be believed more than the word of a reporter. And supposing that he is not only a Member of Parliament but he is a Minister, do not we consider Ministers to be honourable people? They are all honourable people. When did they ever utter a lie? Whatever questions are asked, day in and day out, they always tell the truth. And even the Speaker would say that the Minister has said like that and the discussion is at an end. Anyway, at least you will give the Minister the benefit of doubt or you will not give him benefit of doubt. Whatever else he might have said, is not the issue. Did he say that the Harijans, if they steel, must be kicked? This is the one issue, and we must not deviate from it. It is not a question of the treatment of the Harijans. It is a question of somebody whom you want to be at the bar of this House, whom you want to be dismissed. Will you dismiss him after proper evidence or will you dismiss him when the thing is doubtful?

AN HON. MEMBER : Hold an enquiry.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I think he should be given the benefit of doubt as we would all wish that the accused must be given the benefit of doubt. He said he has not said so. And when a man says he has not said it even if he had said it, it means that he takes back his words, but if you want to punish him, you can ask for a further enquiry. But you cannot hang a man on this evidence because it is not conclusive evidence.

AN HON. MEMBER : Judicial enquiry.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : There is a word of one man against the word of another man. I am not thinking in terms of what has been said by other reporters. Even that may be ignored. I do not want you to bring in what he the Minister said about the reporters. That is not the question at issue. The question at issue is not what he said about the reporters.

SHRI NAMBIAR : He has said it.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I say this member has no logic in his head. He is not judicious. We are discussing one question, and he says "he has said it."

SHRI NAMBIAR : Circumstantial evidence.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Circumstantial evidence is about what he said about the reporters. There is no such circumstantial evidence about what he said about Harijans. So, we must clear the issues. We must find out what we are here to decide and I believe that we are to decide about the conduct of this Minister in Andhra Pradesh : whether he has said the particular words that he is alleged to have said by one press reporter who was not present. I say in such circumstances, he must be given the advantage of doubt. Unless you have a judicial enquiry over him—(Interruption).

AN HON. MEMBER : A judicial enquiry.

19.00 hrs.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : That is another question.

You may ask for a judicial enquiry, but on the evidence before us, it is unreasonable to ask that he should resign. That evidence is not conclusive. It is for the Parliament to decide whether there should be a judicial enquiry in this matter. You cannot bring that issue in this. As long as a judicial enquiry has not been made, he is innocent. A man is considered to be innocent unless he is proved guilty. I say, he has not been proved guilty. You may

prove him to be guilty hereafter, but today you have no right to say that he is guilty. (Interruptions). What non-sense is this ? Are these people judicial minded or the people belonging to the bazaar ? This is not a bazaar, You are deciding about the conduct of a minister. You can call for an enquiry, but as long as the case is not clear, we ought to give this gentleman the benefit of doubt. It is up to you to bring another proportion that a judicial enquiry be made. But you have been saying that this man should be sacked, the Governor should be dismissed, the Chief Minister should be dismissed, the Home Minister should go home and so on. Is this the judicious way why Sir I suppose you are a lawyer Am I not saying what is the truth ? So for, there is no case against this gentleman. I do not know him from Adam. He may be a bad man in many respects. But the issue is about those words against the Harijans. You are sitting here as a judicial body deciding the fate of a minister. Shall I talk like a bazaar man or like an excited fool ? Sir, these people do not understand anything of law. They do not have a judicial mind, They talk as if I am related to that minister.

SHRI RABI RAY : You are related to Suchetaji.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : You are fools if you say like that. Every husband is under the thumb of his wife. You must give me credit that she is in one party and I am an Independent. Sir, they do not give me credit for being an independent husband.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBER rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : How long does the House want to continue this debate ? (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH (Rupar) ; Sir, on a point of order:

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What is the point of order ?

SHRI BUTA SINGH : In the meeting of the Business Advisory Committee yesterday the time for this discussion was

decided. Later on, I asked the hon. Speaker whether we can sit beyond the time he has fixed for this, that is, 7 O'Clock and he said "Yes, if the House wants, you can continue". Moreover, I have given notice of a motion. I must be allowed to move it and speak on it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have got such a big list with me.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : This was given with the consent of the Speaker. So, you must give me time to speak on that.....
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please resume your seat. Firstly, I have no knowledge of what transpired between you and the Speaker. Secondly, when he was in the Chair he announced that the time is two hours. I can extend it by 10 or 15 minutes because Acharyaji wanted to speak and the Home Minister has to reply. That is why I extended it a bit..... (interruptions) This is the rule which is generally followed. We extend it by 10 or 15 minutes. We generally sit till 7O'Clock. The Home Minister is bound to take 10 or 15 minutes.....(interruptions)

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: It may be extended by half an hour... (interruptions)

SHRI SHEO NARAIN : Sir, you must listen to me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Will he kindly resume his seat ?

SHRI SHEO NARAIN : You should listen to all of us..... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If I were to extend the time, keeping in view the sentiments of the House, by how much time should I extend it ? How many more hon. Members should be accommodate ? As I stated earlier, I have a big list with me and I have tried to accommodate as many as possible from this list. I have not deviated from it. If you want to extend the time, you must indicate how many members should be accommodated from both sides, so that I can distribute the time accordingly. I am saying this because

more than 10 members are standing from one side alone..... (interruptions)

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Six members may be accommodated in all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : All right. There will be three from the Congress side, one from the middle and one from the opposition. That is how I will distribute it, if they want extension of time. They will have to abide by this decision.

Maximum five more may be accommodated.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : We will give the list.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will accommodate one from this side, one from the centre and three from this side ; then, the Home Minister will be called. Will that be all right ? This will be the maximum.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Three from this side.

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR (Jhansi) : Surely, you must give a chance to those who gave notice of a motion for the appointment of a committee. My name was on the top of the list given from our side and you are not giving me a chance.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Shivajirao Deshmukh is also there. He had given notice of a motion. There are several others who have given notice of a motion. Shall I read out the names of all those ? It is not possible to accommodate all. We must abide by some discipline. Therefore, I shall call three hon. Members from this side, one from the front and one from this side ; that is all. Now, Shri Buta Singh. He will take only five minutes.

श्री बूटा सिंह (रौपड़) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका बहुत आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे हरिजनों के विरुद्ध आन्ध्र प्रदेश के कृषि मन्त्री द्वारा दिये गए कथित वक्तव्य के बारे में 6 मई, 1968 को गृह कार्य मन्त्री द्वारा दिये गए वक्तव्य पर अपने विचार प्रकट करने का मौका दिया।

[श्री बूटा सिंह]

श्रीमती जो इस पर चर्चा हुई है उसको मैंने बहुत गौर से सुना है। इस चर्चा को सुनने के बाद मुझे वह बचपन की कहानियाँ याद आ गयीं कि जब कभी हमारी माताएं, बहनें बाहर खेतों आदि में जाती थीं तो मुझे उन हरिजन औरतों को मारा करते थे। जब वह वापिस आकर पंचायत में शिकायत करती थीं तो वह हमारे पड़ोसी कहा करते थे कि भ्रूरे इन्हें तुमने क्यों मारा? यह तो तुम्हारी ताई थी। उसके पांव पकड़ लो। आज सचमुच वही कुछ इस सदन में हुआ है। हरिजनों के साथ जो क्रूर व्यवहार हुआ उसके बारे में जब चर्चा हुई और मन्त्री जी ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया उसके बाद जब वह विषय इस सदन में आया तो बड़ी-बड़ी पार्टियों के नेताओं ने मन्त्री महोदय को पेट किया। मुझे दुख है कि बहुत सारे कांग्रेसी नेताओं ने भी उनको पेट किया। यह तो हरिजन भाई हैं यह तो महात्मा गांधी के बच्चे हैं तुमने इनके बारे में यह क्यों कहा? बात यह नहीं है और हमें इस विषय को समझना चाहिए। आचार्य कृपालानी चले गये। वह कहते हैं कि इसका सम्बन्ध क्या है? हरिजनों के साथ जो हुआ और जो मन्त्री महोदय ने स्टेटमेंट दिया उन दोनों का रिश्ता क्या है? मैं उन्हें बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि वही रिश्ता है जो एक मजसूम और जालिम का होता है। वही रिश्ता जो एक लाश और कातिल का होता है। यह रिश्ता उनमें है। इस स्टेटमेंट के होने से पहले भ्रांघ्र में क्या हुआ था वह हमें सोचना चाहिए। भ्रांघ्र में कांचीकचर्ला में एक हरिजन लड़के को जिन्दा जला दिया गया। वह एक बूंद पानी के लिए चिल्लाता हुआ मर गया। किसी डाक्टर ने मरहम पट्टी नहीं की। उसके बाद क्या हुआ? एक वातावरण पैदा हुआ डर और भय का हरिजनों के अन्दर। जब पार्लियामेंट में हम लोगों ने उस विषय को उठाया और पार्लियामेंट ने जब अपना मंतव्य प्रकट किया तो दूसरी ओर जो लैड-लैसलोग थे और बेचारे हरिजनों के ऊपर जिन लोगों ने प्रत्याचार किया था उन

लोगों के पेट में गड़बड़ हुई उनको दुख हुआ और उनको दुख से बचाने के लिए उनकी मदद करने के लिए यह मन्त्री महोदय आगे आ गये। इन्होंने अपना स्टेटमेंट देकर उनको बचाने के लिए हरिजनों के जख्मों के ऊपर नमक छिड़का। अब चर्चा यह है कि आया उन्होंने स्टेटमेंट दिया है या नहीं दिया है? इस बात का फैसला कौन कर सकता है? जाहिर है कि इस बात का फैसला न्यायालय कर सकता है, कचहरी कर सकती है।

यह जो स्टेटमेंट मुख्य मन्त्री महोदय ने दिया उस स्टेटमेंट की क्या वकअत है? इस सदन में बड़े-बड़े वकील लोग बैठे हैं, कास्टी-ट्यूशन को जानने वाले बैठे हैं, हाई कोर्ट्स के जज बैठे हैं। मैं उनसे एक प्रश्न पूछता हूँ कि मुख्य मन्त्री के सामने दिये गये एक पत्रकार के स्टेटमेंट का कानून में क्या स्थान है? हम उस स्टेटमेंट को स्टेटमेंट नहीं मान सकते जो कोर्ट में कसम उठाने के बाद न दिया गया हो। यह स्टेटमेंट कोई कसम उठाकर नहीं दिया गया। शोध नहीं ली गई। जाहिर है कि उस स्टेटमेंट को कानून के मुताबिक स्टेटमेंट नहीं कहा जा सकता है। यह स्टेटमेंट हमारे सामने एक प्रमाण के तौर पर रक्खा गया है। यह स्टेटमेंट जाहिर है कि पत्रकारों ने मुख्य मन्त्री के साये के नीचे दिया है। अब पत्रकारों और मुख्य मन्त्री का रिश्ता क्या हो सकता है यह सभी माननीय मित्रों को पता है। इसलिए इस स्टेटमेंट के ऊपर हम कोई फैसला नहीं दे सकते। मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा है या नहीं कहा है, अगर इस का भी पता लगाना है तो यह काम भी हम लोग नहीं कर सकते। यह काम तो कोई कोर्ट ही कर सकता है। मन्त्री महोदय को किसी कोर्ट के सामने ले जाया जाय। इन पत्रकारों को किसी बोट के सामने ले जाया जाय। एक फुडिशिएल इनक्वायरी हो उसके बाद जो फैसला होगा उसके ऊपर हम लोग फूल चढ़ायेंगे। हम देखें कि आया यह सच है या झूठ है? मेरे

कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि मन्त्री महोदय के स्टेटमेंट ने जितना नुकसान करना था वह कर दिया। जो भावना पैदा करनी थी वह पैदा कर दी। हरिजनों के मन में जो जाग्रति आई थी जो सैल्फ कौन्सिलिंग आई थी उसका स्वात्मा कर दिया। जिसने यह गलती की है उसे इसके लिए पूरी सजा मिलनी चाहिए। यह गलती किसने की है? मेरी बहन ने कहा कि पत्रकारों के ऊपर पूरा यकीन नहीं करना चाहिए। मैं भी नहीं करता अगर कौन फंसला करने वाला है? आपने न्याय की बात कही तो न्याय का कौन जायजा ले सकता है? That only court of law can decide. Even we people cannot sit on the judgement of a court of law. हमें गृह मन्त्री महोदय से यह प्रार्थना करनी है कि मन्त्री महोदय के वक्तव्य को देखने के लिए, उसमें सच या झूठ निकालने के लिए एक ही रास्ता है और वह यह है कि इसकी जुडिशिएल इनक्वायरी हो और दूध का दूध और पानी का पानी हो जाय। ऐसा होने से ही हम इस विषय के साथ न्याय कर सकेंगे। इसी तरह हम मन्त्री महोदय और पत्रकारों के साथ न्याय कर सकेंगे।

दूसरी बात जो मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि आज हरिजन लोग जाग उठे हैं। आज हरिजन वह नहीं रहे जोकि गुलामों की तरह जातिवादी लोगों के पीछे, पीछे फिरते रहेंगे। हरिजन लोग अब भड़क उठे हैं, जाग उठे हैं और उन्हें अपने दायित्वों का पता चल गया है।

श्री हेम बरुआ ने श्री जगजीवन राम पर यह आरोप लगाया कि वह कुर्सी से चिपके रहना चाहते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है आज इस देश में अपने नेता श्री जगजीवन राम के नाम पर हजारों हरिजन लोग अपना सिर कटाने के लिए तैयार हैं और हर कुर्बानी देने के लिए तैयार हैं। देश में एक इन्किलाब आ चुका है और अगर कोई ऐसा सम्भ्रता है कि आज के दिन भी हरिजनों के साथ

वही बुरा सलूक व अत्याचार आदि हो सकता है जैसा कि सदियों से होता आया था तो वह भूल कर रहे हैं।

श्री थिम्मा रेड्डी ने कहा कि यह जो चोरियां आदि होती हैं यह हरिजन लोग करते हैं। यह मीटर और हल वगैरह जो चुराये जाते हैं तो यह हरिजन लोग ही चुराते हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ जिस कार पर वह चढ़ते हैं वह किन की कार है? वह हम गरीबों के झून से बनाई गई कार है। जो खाना वह खाते हैं वह हम लोगों का दिया हुआ टैंक्स डी है। इसलिए यह जो आप लोगों ने हम गरीब हरिजनों और आदिवासियों पर सदियों से चोरी की है, हमें लूटा है उसका बदला हम लेंगे लेकिन मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं हूँ जोकि कानून को अपने हाथ में लेते हैं और कहते हैं कि जो चोर हो उसको वहीं लुट पूरी सजा दे दी जाय। मेरा कहना है कि कानून को अपने हाथ में नहीं लिया जाना चाहिए। अलबत्ता जो चोरी करता है उसको पकड़कर थाने में भेजना चाहिए। अगर कचहरी में जाकर उसका चोरी का जुर्म साबित हो जाय तो उसको सजा दी जा सकती है। इस भावना का प्रचार करना चाहिए कि चोर को सजा देने से पहले उसे अदालत के सामने अपनी सफाई देने का मौका मिले और फिर खतावार साबित होने पर अदालत उसे सजा दे दे। लेकिन यह चीज चोर को उसी वक्त और उसी जगह सजा दी जाय मैं इसके विरुद्ध हूँ। हूँ मैं आपके माध्यम से गृह मन्त्री जी से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि यह मामला इस जगह को छोड़ना जाय वल्कि इस की वाक्यायदा किसी सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज द्वारा जुडिशिएल इनक्वायरी हो। वह इन तमाम तथ्यों के ऊपर जाय और फिर उनका पूरा निबटारा कर ले। अगर जुर्म साबित हो जाय तो जो भी मुबारिम हो उसको कड़ी से कड़ी सजा दें।

श्री राम चरण (खुर्जा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने वह जो श्री थिम्मा

[श्री राम चरण]

रेड्डी और प्रैस करसर्पोइंट्स के बयान पेश किये हैं उनसे यह साफ जाहिर हो जाता है कि वास्तव में श्री थिम्मा रेड्डी ने हरिजनों के विरुद्ध जानबूझ कर बैसे शब्द कहे थे जो कि एकदम भ्रवांछनीय और आपत्तिजनक थे। इस लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इसके खिलाफ एक जुडिशियल इनक्वायरी कराये और जिसका भी गुनाह हो, चाहे वह प्रैस करसर्पोइंट्स का हो या श्री थिम्मा रेड्डी का हो, सजा दिलवाये। अगर दोनों का गुनाह साबित हो जाय तो फिर दोनों को ही सजा मिलनी चाहिये।

जो चीज श्री थिम्मा रेड्डी ने कही उसी तरह की बात हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में श्री बनारसी दास जब मिनिस्टर होते थे तो उन्होंने एलैक्शन के दौरान में कही थी कि चमार और चना को जितना पीसो उतना ही मुलायम होता है। उनके ये शब्द जिले के विश्व प्रभात पेपर्स में मौजूद हैं और सी० आई० डी० की रिपोर्ट्स में दर्ज है। उसी तरह की चीज श्री थिम्मा रेड्डी ने कही है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो भ्रादमी हरिजनों की बेइज्जती करता है, जो उनके बारे में अपमानजनक शब्द कहता है, उसके खिलाफ जुडिशियल इनक्वायरी होनी चाहिये, चाहे वह मिनिस्टर हो या कोई हो। मैं दावे के साथ कहता हूँ कि वास्तव में थिम्मा रेड्डी ने यह बात जरूर कही है। अगर पहले उसको डिसमिस किया जाये और उसके बाद इस मामले की जुडिशियल एन्क्वायरी की जाये, तो यह बात साफ हो जायेगी।

15 20 hrs.

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha in the Chair]

श्रीमती मुचेता कृपलानी ने भी इस बहस में हिस्सा लिया है। जब वह यू० पी० की चीफ मिनिस्टर थीं, तब वहां हरिजनों पर क्या-क्या जुल्म नहीं हुआ। कुछ दिन पहले की बात है कि राजस्थान के एक फस्ट क्लास मैजिस्ट्रेट,

ए० पी० वर्मा, ने, जो शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स का है, किसी हिन्दू वकील पर कनटेम्प्ट ग्राफ कोर्ट का चार्ज लगाया। इस पर वहां के वकीलों ने उसको पीटा और वहां के एस० पी०, डी० एम० और पुलिस ने उस को कोई प्रोटेक्शन नहीं दी। इस बारे में ग्राज तक कोई एक्शन नहीं लिया गया है। बल्कि उसका ट्रांसफर कर दिया गया।

ऐसे एक नहीं, हजारों वाक्ये हैं। हम कहाँ तक सुनायें? हमारा दिल जलता है। हम हरिजन हैं, हम पर जुल्म होता है। होम मिनिस्टर साहब चले गये हैं, वर्मा मैं एक वाक्या सुना देता। यू० पी० में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के एक सब-इंसपेक्टर का पुलिस थाने में कत्ल हुआ, लेकिन ग्राज तक कोई एन्क्वायरी नहीं हुई। दिल्ली के दफ्तरों में इसी प्रकार की घटनायें होती हैं। यह कोई छोटी समस्या नहीं है। सरकार को इसके बारे में ठंडे दिल से दिल से सोचना पड़ेगा। अब हरिजन और शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स इन हरकतों को बर्दास्त करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। अगर कोई एक मारेगा तो हम उसका जवाब दो मार कर देंगे चाहे कोई मिनिस्टर हो या कोई हो। ग्राज माइना-रिटीज में जायति आ गई है।

जो प्रेस वाले हमारे साथ होने वाले जुल्म की घटनाओं को छापते हैं और उनके खिलाफ भ्रावाज उठाते हैं, हम उनको धन्यवाद देते हैं। पहले तो वे सोते रहते थे। ग्राज हमारे साथ जो जुल्म होता है, वह पेपर्ज में जरूर भ्राना चाहिये। मैं पेट्रियट को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उसने गरीबों पर होने वाले जुल्मों को छाप कर अपनी सोशलज्म का परिचय दिया है। हर एक पेपर को ऐसा करना चाहिए। गरीब लोगों पर होने वाले जुल्म की बात प्रेस में जरूर भ्रानी चाहिए। टाटा और बिड़ला के पेपर तो कभी भी हरिजनों के पक्ष में भ्रावाज नहीं उठाते हैं।

मुझे इस बात का अफसोस है कि यद्यपि

गांधी जो तो हमेशा सत्य बोलते थे, लेकिन उन के चेले सत्य नहीं बोलते हैं। अगर वे सत्य बोलते, तो थिम्मा रेड्डी दूसरे ही दिन यह कहते कि मैंने ये बात कही है, मैं गुनाहगार हूँ, मैं अपने शब्दों को वापस लेता हूँ। उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा, पहले तो चीफ मिनिस्टर ने उस पर मरहम-पट्टी लगाई और उसके बाद होम मिनिस्टर ने ठप्पा लगाया कि उन्होंने ऐसी बात नहीं कही। अगर होम मिनिस्टर साहब सेंट्रल इन्स्टीजेंस ब्यूरो की रिपोर्ट की आरिजिनल कापी यहाँ पर रखे, तो मैं साबित कर दूंगा कि थिम्मा रेड्डी ने ये शब्द कहे हैं। और होम मिनिस्टर साहब को यह बात पता है। अगर स्टेट सी० आई० डी० और सेंट्रल इन्स्टीजेंस ब्यूरो की रिपोर्ट्स की आरिजिनल कापीज यहाँ पर रखी जायें, तो साबित हो जायेगा कि चीफ मिनिस्टर और होम मिनिस्टर दोनों ने इस मामले में मरहम-पट्टी लगाई है। होम मिनिस्टर साहब आन्ध्र प्रदेश के गवर्नर को कहें कि वह थिम्मा रेड्डी को पहले डिसमिस करे और उसके बाद इस बारे में जुडिशल एन्क्वायरी हो।

श्री साधूराम (पिल्लोर) : सभापति महोदय, आज हाउस में थिम्मा रेड्डी की कही हुई बात पर बहस हो रही है। थिम्मा रेड्डी के स्टेटमेंट से सारे देश में एक आग सी भड़क उठी और यह ख्याल जाहिर किया गया कि उसने देश में करोड़ों लोगों, हरिजनों के खिलाफ बहुत बेइन्साफी की बात कही है। उसके बाद होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने आन्ध्र के चीफ मिनिस्टर को एन्क्वायरी करने के लिये कहा। मैं यह तो नहीं कहता कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने गलती की है, लेकिन मेरा अपना ख्याल है कि यह तरीका गलत था। सेंटर के होम मिनिस्टर की सी० आई० डी० सारे देश में फैली हुई है। अगर उसके जरिये रिपोर्ट हासिल की जाती है और उसको ब्रह्मानन्द रेड्डी की रिपोर्ट से मिलाया जाता, तो असलियत का पता चल जाता। या होम मिनिस्टर साहब को कोई

स्पेशल आफिसर भेज कर खुद एन्क्वायरी करनी चाहिये थी।

आन्ध्र के चीफ मिनिस्टर ने जो प्रेस रिपोर्ट्स के स्टेटमेंट इकट्ठे करके भेज दिये हैं, वह भी गलत है। स्टेट का चीफ मिनिस्टर सारे सूबे के लिये जिम्मेदार होता है। थिम्मा रेड्डी हो या कोई हो, सब उसके नीचे हैं। अगर वह चाहते, तो वह अपने तौर पर एन्क्वायरी करके अपनी रिपोर्ट पार्लियामेंट में भेज सकते थे। लेकिन उन्होंने भी ऐसा नहीं किया।

इसके अलावा हमारे देश में हरिजनों की अपलिफ्ट के लिये एक सोशल वेलफेयर डिपार्टमेंट बना हुआ है। क्या उसने कोई एन्क्वायरी करके कोई रिपोर्ट तैयार की है? अगर नहीं, तो इसका मतलब यह है कि जब होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी जाती तौर पर कोई एन्क्वायरी नहीं की, चीफ मिनिस्टर ने भी जाती तौर पर कोई एन्क्वायरी नहीं की और सोशल वेलफेयर डिपार्टमेंट ने भी कोई एन्क्वायरी नहीं की, तो मेरा ख्याल है कि यह टाल-मटोल की बात है।

हाउस के सामने जो रिपोर्ट है, उससे यह साबित हो जाता है कि थिम्मा रेड्डी ने यह कही तो जरूर है। लेकिन अब वह उस बात से इन्कार करना चाहते हैं। ठीक है, वह इन्कार करें। लेकिन हम सब लोग यह डिमांड करते हैं कि एक सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जरिये इस मामले की जुडिशल एन्क्वायरी कराई जाये। मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूँ कि इस बात से देश के करोड़ों लोगों को बहुत दुख हुआ है। अगर किसी ज़रूम पर नमक छिड़क दिया जाये, तो उससे ज्यादा दुःख होता है। इसलिये इस बारे में सिम्पथी जाहिर करना चाहिए थी।

मैं देख रहा हूँ कि हाउस में पार्टी की बात को उछाला जा रहा है। आपोजीशन के कुछ मेम्बरों ने यह समझा कि चूंकि आन्ध्र में कांग्रेस मिनिस्ट्री है, इस लिए थिम्मा रेड्डी की बात करो। मैं कहना चाहता है कि मध्य प्रदेश, यू० पी० और उड़ीसा में तो कांग्रेस मिनिस्ट्री

[श्री साधूराम]

नहीं है लेकिन आज सारे देश में हरिजनों पर जुल्म हो रहा है। इसमें पार्टी का सबाल नहीं है। किसी सूबे में जिस पार्टी की हुकूमत है, अगर वह जुल्म करने वाले आदमी को सजा देगी, तो सबसे ज्यादा फायदा और भला उस पार्टी का ही होगा। बिम्मा रेड्डी कांग्रेस पार्टी का है। मैं कांग्रेस पार्टी के लीडरों और गवर्नमेंट के लीडरों से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह साबित हो जाता है कि बिम्मा रेड्डी ने यह करतूत की है, तो उसको सजा देने से कांग्रेस का बकार बढ़ेगा और कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट और खादा मजबूत होगी।

मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस एन्क्वायरी को दबाया न जाये, क्योंकि देश में जो आग पैदा हो गई है, उसको बुझाने और ठंडा करने के लिये यह जरूरी है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर, होम मिनिस्टर और सोशल वेलफेयर मिनिस्टर इस मामले को अपने साथ में लें, अपने तौर पर इसकी एन्क्वायरी करायें और देश के सामने असली पिकचर पेश करें। सिर्फ कान्ट्राडिक्शन करके इस देश के करोड़ों हरिजनों को नहीं समझाया जा सकता है। जिस आदमी को सजा देना वाजिब है, उसको सजा दी जाये, चाहे वह पेट्रियट का रिपोर्टर हो, चाहे बिम्मा रेड्डी हो और चाहे कोई और हो। उनको सजा दिये बगैर, करोड़ों लोगों के दिलों में जो आग पैदा हुई है, वह ठंडी नहीं हो सकती है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं एन्क्वायरी की पुर-जोर मांग करता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I know how much time the hon. Home Minister would take?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS
SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: About 10 to 15 minutes.

SHRI M. N. REDDY (Nizamabad): As Shri J. B. Kripalani very rightly observed, we are mixing up the issues in this case. As far as the oppression and suppress-

sion and other types of ill-treatment of the Harijans all over the country are concerned, I share the views, of most of the Members who have expressed their views. But we are not concerned at the moment with that. If I understand the motion that is put before us correctly, the only issue that is before us is whether this particular Minister has observed like that or not.

I was rather surprised to hear many of the speeches. I can also substitute sound and fury for cold logic and reason. But sentiment played a large role in the first instance. That was understandable. But after reading and hearing and seeing the signed statements of all the correspondents without any exception, who were present as eye-witnesses, I think we should have reflected a little better and applied our own minds. If this is the standard of judging the people and issues in this august House, then I am afraid we are not projecting a better image of the Parliament before our people.

We have to be a little more dispassionate and objective and asses things on merits and not use a particular occasion for a particular purpose divorced completely from the facts of the case.

The hon. Home Minister must have noted two things which were missed in the discussion. I would like to refer to the statement of Shri Sitaram himself who was present at the press conference but merely relied on the hearsay evidence of Shri Parthasarathy. You must understand one thing. Why was this report not sent to the *Patriot* on the 22nd itself? It was sent on the 23rd, 24 hours latter.

The first question that confronted Shri Sitaram was the Minister's adverse remarks against journalists. It never occurred to him—read his own statement—that he was in any way concerned with the Harijans or there was any alleged remark against Harijans. He consulted his journalist colleagues who were present and wanted this matter to be taken up with the Minister. Then he went to the Ravindra Bharati. On the next morning when he found that his journalist colleagues did not co-operate with him, he gave a twist to the whole matter so that he could settle scores with Shri Thimma

Reddy. It is also clear that Shri Sitaram and Shri Thimma Reddy were not having cordial relations and have been hostile to each other for a very long time. That is obvious. It is also clear that what Shri Sitaram was concerned with was the offensive remark against the journalists; it never occurred to him that there was any remark by the Minister against Harijans.

The later twist that was given by him was an afterthought. I know all the correspondents in Hyderabad except Shri Pathasarathy who has been posted there only seven months ago. I know them all. Shri Sitaram is the Chief Reporter of UNI. He has not sent it as an item of the news service. He had merely sent it to the *Patriot* in Delhi because the Parliament is in session and it would be very nicely utilised by some people here.

The second thing is that we are passing adverse judgment on the other correspondents who represent outstanding papers, reputed and renowned papers. When they have not corroborated the story, we will be condemning people who have been patriots even before 1947 by passing this sort of judgment on them. This will be very unfair to the other correspondents.

As regards the demand for a judicial inquiry, I would humbly submit that when the persons concerned have given written statements denying the story, there would be no useful purpose served by appointing a judicial inquiry because they cannot go against their own statements. Anyone could file a defamation suit in a court of law and hang Shri Thimma Reddy after due trial, that would be a different thing. There is a case for defamation, libel and all that. But to insist on a parliamentary inquiry would be creating a very unhealthy precedent. We have already made a martyr of Shri Thimma Reddy, whether he said it or not. This is enough. I do not think we should proceed further in the matter as it will be lending encouragement to sensationalism among journalists. This would lead to a situation where anything can be said about any politician, whether he might have said it or not. Therefore, I submit we must be a little more restrained, and dignified and must close the matter,

श्री बं० ना० कुरील (रामसनेहीघाट) : सभापति जी, यह जो सारा विवाद है, यह इस बात को लेकर है कि थिम्मा रेड्डी साहब ने जो अपना स्टेटमेंट दिया है वह सही है या नहीं। इसके निषे जब गृह मन्त्री जी ने वहाँ से रिपोर्ट मांगी तो वहाँ के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब ने, पत्रकारों के स्टेटमेंट लेकर सीधे यहाँ भेज दिये और होम मिनिस्टर ने यह कहा कि उन्होंने अपनी कोई सम्मति नहीं दी, इस हाउस का अधिकार है कि जो पत्रकारों के स्टेटमेंट्स हैं उनसे नतीजा निकाले कि उन्होंने यह कहा है या नहीं। यह जो रामाराव जी का स्टेटमेंट है उससे साफ हो जाता है कि उन्होंने इतना तो कहा ही है—थिम्मा रेड्डी साहब ने कि हरिजन ग्राम तौर से चोरी करते हैं क्योंकि वे गरीब होने हैं और उनको किक करना चाहिए, इनको श्रंश करना चाहिए। यही नहीं, उन्होंने पत्रकारों से भी कहा कि जो उनकी हिमायत करेंगे उनको भी किक करना चाहिए। किसी दूसरे ने कहा कि सरकारी अफसर जो इस तरह जात-पात का नाम लेते हैं उनको भी किक करना चाहिए। तो ये दो-तीन चीजें हैं जो कि बोरिलेटेड हैं। इतना तो कहा ही है। मैं इतना जानना चाहता हूँ होम मिनिस्टर साहब से कि क्या वह थिम्मा रेड्डी से एक सवाल पूछेंगे, मेरी ओर से, कि जब वे कहते हैं कि हरिजन चोरी करते हैं इसलिए जलाये जाते हैं और मारे जाते हैं तो अगर कोई रेड्डी का लड़का चोरी करेगा, क्या उसे भी उसी तरह से बन्द करके जलाया जायेगा। तो इस तरह से यह जो चीज है वह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है। अगर स्पष्ट नहीं है तो फिर क्या ग्राम जुडिशल इनक्वायरी बिठावेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ मन्त्री पद जैसे पवित्र स्थान पर, जिसके इस प्रकार के बिचार हों उसे उस पर रहने का कोई औचित्य नहीं है। अन्त में मेरा गृह मन्त्री जी से निवेदन है कि अगर वे इन सारे स्टेटमेंट्स से कंविन्ड नहीं हैं तो इसके लिए एक जुडिशल इनक्वायरी बिठावें।

सभापति महोदय : होम मिनिस्टर !

श्री अ० दीपा (फूलबनी) : मुझे भी समय दिया जाये। मैंने लिखकर चिट्ठी भेजी थी।

सभापति महोदया : आपने जरूर चिट्ठी भेजी है लेकिन 8 बजे तक बैठने का फैसला किया गया था। अब हमारे पास जो समय है उसमें यह मन्त्री जी को बुलाना है और श्री हेम बरुआ अपना जवाब भी देंगे। इसके अलावा अब और समय नहीं है। ... (व्यवधान) ... मैंने होम मिनिस्टर को बुला दिया है। आप इस बात का भी ख्याल करें कि डिप्टी स्पीकर ने चार आदमियों के नाम दिये थे लेकिन मैंने अपनी तरफ से कुछ और सदस्यों को मौका दिया है। आप कृपया बैठ जायें।

श्री अ० दीपा : मैं नहीं बैठूंगा। मैं बाहर जा रहा हूँ।

(श्री अ० दीपा सदन के बाहर चले गए)

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Madam, this question has been discussed as thoroughly as it can possibly be. I agree with Acharya Kripalani about the character of the debate...

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : You are going to damn me if you agree with me.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I agree only on a limited point. I am afraid that we are apt to confuse the issues. I certainly share the feeling of the House, particularly the remarks of the hon. Members sitting on this side and on that side too. The problems of the Harijans require to be considered in greater depth, with more care and, with more intensity of feeling also, particularly in view of what is happening in the country during the last few weeks. I can very well understand the anger part of it and I can say that I share some of the anger too. But we are now considering a limited issue and I request the hon. Members to apply their objective judgment. Because here we are supposed to rise above our political prejudices, political parties and political loyalties and take a view on a certain set of facts as a House. Some of the

hon. Members asked, "Why is it that I did not send my machinery, the CID, or others. Sir,..."

AN HON. MEMBER : Madam.

SHRI NAMBIAR : In the Chair, madam becomes "Sir."

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Well, madam. It is out of sheer habit that I said it. Whenever by mistake I say, "Sir," You please take it as "madam."

MR. CHAIRMAN : I can assure him that I do not mind it.

SHRI HEM BARUA : The Chair is neutral.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I will first of all take certain set of facts because I do not want to go into the other political arguments of it. I have a responsibility to put the facts before the House as I see them. This news item was first published in the issue of the *Patriot* on the 24th. Naturally, that day the issue was raised here and emotions were aroused. I think it was very good that we decided to show some patience in getting the facts first. Then came the contradiction from Mr. Thimma Reddy himself; then came my discussion with the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh who happened to be in Delhi, who promised to look into the matter and report, and then came the report itself on the 4th evening which I submitted with all the facts before the hon. House.

Now, one of the criticisms of Mr. Hem Barua was : how did the Chief Minister draw a blank ? He did not give his comment or his assessment or his judgment or his opinion about it. If you see the letter of the Chief Minister—even if the Chief Minister belongs to other parties—I would expect Shri Hem Barua to give him due justice. It was out of sheer courtesy to this hon. House that he has said that he would leave it to the perusal and assessment of this hon. House. I must say he showed wisdom in not expressing his views, because he certainly liked to leave it to the whole issue to be judged by hon. Members. But here is somebody who says that it is all

blank, this and that. Well it can be very good political criticism, but then this will not be a very just assessment of a person who is holding a very high office.

Again, I was asked, "Why is it that I did not send some officer from here." When the Chief Minister himself, who is responsible for the legislature there, had agreed to look into it and send a report, am I to send some petty officer from here to enquire into it? How will it look to the dignity of this House, and to the dignity of that legislature to whom the Chief Minister is responsible? I cannot think of doing it.

Here is a series of statements which the Chief Minister had obtained: he took up the very relevant persons. What is a CID officer supposed to do? The interview took place between a certain number of pressmen and Mr. Thimma Reddy. The Chief Minister has taken the statements of all concerned, including the statement of Shri Thimma Reddy and sent it to us plus the statement of one man who was not present there but who has sent a report and whose report we are discussing. This is really speaking the set of facts.

Therefore, the central issue becomes, what exactly Mr. Thimma Reddy had said. Did he say what was reported in the *Patriot*? That is the whole issue. I understand the emotions of many Members on this side and on that side of the House. I wish I was a free Member to join them and condemn everything that is being done with all the force that I can command? I would appeal to them to accept our own feelings also on this matter.

श्री राम घन (लालगंज) : श्री थिममा रेड्डी ने पैट्रियट के संवाददाता पर कोई डिफेमेशन सूट क्यों नहीं दायर किया? इससे उन का कंडक्ट साफ़ हो जाता।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : This is a suggestion that he has made, which Mr. Thimma Reddy may or may not consider. I am not at all responsible for what Shri Thimma Reddy should do or should not do. Let us see what are the facts. Here are the statements of the different Members.

I have very carefully studied these

papers. We have to accept that these are all responsible persons. They are not making statements under compulsion; there is no fear complex involved in this matter.

Mr. Vaman Rao was asked: "Did the minister say that Harijans are thieves and they should be kicked?" The answer is, "No." Then he was asked, "Did Shri Sitaram ask you or enquire from you about the alleged remark of the minister about Harijans at the press interview on the 22nd?" The answer is, "No. He did not". Then he said,

"But on 23rd he read out to me on telephone the report he sent to *Patriot*. I told him that the minister did not make such a remark that Harijans are thieves and they should be kicked."

Probably this despatch was sent on 23rd. On 23rd, there was a talk between Mr. Sitaram and Mr. Vaman Rao who was present at the interview. When Mr. Sitaram read out the despatch to Mr. Vaman Rao, Mr. Vaman Rao told him that the minister did not make such a remark that Harijans are thieves and they should be kicked.

Then, Mr. Kurve was also asked the question, "Did the minister say that Harijans are generally thieves and they should be kicked?" The answer is, "Definitely not". (*Interruptions*). When a point goes against them, these people get excited. You have had your turn of speaking. Now you listen to me with patience. The same man, Mr. Kurve was asked, "Did Mr. Sitaram ask you or enquire from you as to what happened at the press interview on 22nd or 23rd April?"

The answer is, "No."

The same question was put to Mr. Sarma, viz.,

"Did the minister say that normally Harijans commit thefts and that they should be kicked?"

The answer is, "No." Then he was asked:

"Did Shri Sitaram enquire from you about what happened at the press interview or about the alleged treatment of Harijans."

The answer is, "He did not mention to me about the Harijans or any remarks the minister had alleged to have made about them." But he certainly mentioned that

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

he made some disparaging remarks about journalists.

My hon. friend from the DMK mentioned certain points. I would like to confront him with another thing. Mr. Sitaram's report depended upon the report that was given by Mr. Parthasarathy. Really speaking, in this whole set of evidence, if we have to evaluate it in a proper way, the most important evidence is that of Mr. Parthasarathy. According to Mr. Sitaram himself, he has based the despatch on what Mr. Parthasarathy told him. I would like to go into Mr. Parthasarathy's evidence. Mr. Parthasarathy was asked whether he has kept any note. He said, he has kept it somewhere and he has not a copy of it and he has not signed it. The Chief Minister asked him, "Can you give it to me now or later?" He said, "Not now. I have to check up and see if it is in the file. I told Shri Sitaram just what I said above." Mr. Parthasarathy says, what he has said above is what he has told Mr. Sitaram. What exactly has Mr. Parthasarathy said above? Please read it if you can.

I am reading it. I am reading a part of it because I do not want to read the whole extract.

"That he went on to explain about thieving in villages. He talked about gun-traps and electric traps in irrigation pump-rooms. He said thieves are usually beaten up in villages when caught red-handed. Some of the thieves happen to be harijans and they are thrashed."

He has not said that all harijans are thieves and they are thrashed. He said that some of the thieves happen to be harijans, who are also thrashed..... (Interruption). I am not defending what he has said or what he has not said. I am only saying what he has said and, really speaking Shri Sitaram himself depended upon the statement made to him by Shri Parthasarathy. And Shri Parthasarathy says this, not that generally all harijans are thieves but some of the thieves happen to be harijans. I am only quoting him.

SHRI UMANATH : Why does he specially mention that? I would like the

Home Minister to say on that very point why that Minister makes mention of harijans when he makes a general statement about thieves? Why not about other caste Hindus?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : He has said that.

SHRI UMANATH : Why has he singled out harijans?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : He has said that the thieves can be Brahmins also. He has said that. Now, if you ask me about the wisdom of discussing such matters, I would say a different thing. I am not justifying or not justifying what he said. We are interested in finding out what was said and what was not said.

Then I come to the latter part of the charge. I hold no brief for anybody. But may I ask a question? Here is a responsible person making a statement to the Chief Minister about a very serious allegation about Shri Thimma Reddy three years after the incident. I am referring to the Lakshmikantham business. He said that three years ago Shri Thimma Reddy told him something and he chose this time to report this matter to the Chief Minister. I do not know whether Shri Thimma Reddy has said it or not. I do not want to express any opinion about it, because that is not the issue before us. I am merely pointing out the fact that the person is making a statement, which is supposed to be so serious, three years after it was uttered... (Interruptions).

I am now coming to my conclusion. We have to be very objective in this matter. Let us not go by our subjective likes and dislikes. It is not merely trying to portray the character of Shri Thimma Reddy in a humorous or other manner. If we do that, some others may choose to discuss us in their legislature. This is not the right way of doing it. I think it is expected of us to do things in a proper way. We do not want a harijan boy to be lynched. So also, it is our responsibility to see that we do not punish a person without knowing the facts or without having proof of facts. That is equally important.

श्री रवि राय : तब आप जुडिशल एन्क्वायरी मान खीजिये ।

AN HON. MEMBER : That is why we want a judicial inquiry.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : A judicial inquiry can be asked for if there is a *prima facie* case. What is the *prima facie* case here ? There is no *prima facie* case here. In fact, most of the evidence is that the man has not uttered the words which he is alleged to have uttered. It may be that there is a political angle and a political party may want to attack the Chief Minister or Shri Thimma Reddy. That is a different matter. Whether such an issue should be discussed in this way or not, whether it is proper or not, whether it is wise or not, that is certainly a different thing. I entirely share the feelings of this House on that. But I do not think that there is a *prima facie* case for asking for a judicial inquiry.

श्री गंगा रेड्डी (आदिलाबाद) : इस रिपोर्ट को देखने के बाद यह साबित हो गया है कि कलम के हेर-हेर से बात कही गई है। क्या मन्त्री महोदय यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि इस गलत खबर देने वाले के खिलाफ क्या कार्रवाई की जायेगी ?

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य यह एक नया विषय ले आये हैं। इस समय इसके बारे में कोई क्लेरिफिकेशन नहीं हो सकता ।

SHRI HEM BARUA : Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the speech of the Home Minister with due respect and I shall be very brief in my reply.

It is a fact—it is evident from this correspondence also—that Shri Thimma Reddy singled out the Harijans when he described thieving in the villages. There is no doubt about it. What business did Shri Thimma Reddy have to make a pointed reference to Harijans as thieves ? He was talking of thieves and in the map of thieving Harijans are found to have a larger part, he says.

The hon. Home Minister has quoted from some of the letters, but I can quote

from the letter of the Chief Reporter of the *Hindu* where he says :—

“The minister referred to recent incidents in which harijans were involved.”

He talked of the Harijans in regard to the recent incidents. It is not out of context. There are other things also. He talked of the economic conditions of Harijans and all that. Whatever that might be, what business did Shri Thimma Reddy have to make a pointed reference to the role of Harijans and what business did he have to summon a press conference to talk about Harijans ?

Here this reporter says that there was informal discussion and that is why he did not send a report to his paper. At the same time he said another thing, namely, “Knowing as we do Shri Thimma Reddy.” I do not know. I have not even seen the shadow of that man. But this reporter knows about that man possibly and, therefore, he says, “Knowing as we do Shri Thimma Reddy” he did not feel like reporting what he said. From that you can deduce that Shri Thimma Reddy must be a loose tongue man who speaks whatever he wants to say.

I am sorry, there is a lingering doubt about this inquiry conducted by the Chief Minister. Therefore we wanted the Home Minister to institute an inquiry on his own, in order to remove this lingering doubt, instead of relying entirely on the Chief Minister's verdict.

The report appeared in the *Patriot* on the 24th April and Shri Thimma Reddy did not bother to say a single word ; he did not contradict the report. I hear, the ministers get newspapers free from the Government. Whatever that might be, to say that Shri Thimma Reddy did not see that report or did not read the *Patriot* that morning would be an insult to his intelligence which I do not want to do.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Many people outside Delhi do not even see the *Patriot*.

SHRI UMANATH : Ministers get the papers when ministers are referred to in news items.

SHRI HEM BARUA : If he could not read the report on the 24th April, possibly he read the report on the 25th April.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor) : *Patriot* does not go to Hyderabad.

SHRI HEM BARUA : There is a justification, namely, that that particular issue of the *Patriot* did not reach Hyderabad ; therefore, Shri Thimma Reddy could not read it.

Whatever that might be, the trouble is that he did not contradict the report that appeared in the *Patriot*. Then, only on the 3rd May he wrote a letter to his Chief Minister..... (Interruptions)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : No; he has sent a contradiction after reading the discussion in Parliament.

SHRI RABI RAY : After it was raised in the Lok Sabha.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Naturally ; but he has certainly taken the first opportunity to send his contradiction.

SHRI HEM BARUA : When ? We can say that the letter which Shri Thimma Reddy wrote to the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh on the 3rd May is the first opportunity taken by Shri Thimma Reddy to contradict it.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : No..... (Interruption)

SHRI HEM BARUA : The Home Minister might make a reference to this statement sent to the Home Minister, Government of India.

But, unfortunately there is no date here.

20.00 hrs.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I made a statement in the House.

SHRI HEM BARUA : Sir, Mr. Thimma Reddy calls himself a responsible Minister. Possibly, he is a very responsible

Minister who writes a letter or sends a communication to the Home Minister of India that does not bear any date.

I am very happy that the debate has pinpointed a situation in the country. About Mr. Thimma Reddy, I think, there be an inquiry into the entire gamut of things as to what is happening all over the country. The Harijans are insulted and humiliated not only in Andhra Pradesh but they are humiliated, tortured and butchered everywhere in this country. All minority communities are in danger. Therefore, I would like the Home Minister to take the matter very seriously. He is a very serious-hearted man. I know also there was a report in his own State of Maharashtra where three women were paraded naked in the streets and whipped.

SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH (Parbhani) : They were convicted and sentenced.

SHRI HEM BARUA : Only because of the fact that a so-called Harijan boy flirted with a so-called girl of high community in Maharashtra, the Harijan women were punished like that. You know, there cannot be love on one side and it is always a responsive affair.

MR. CHAIRMAN : May I request you to conclude now ?

SHRI HEM BARUA : I am concluding.

Whatever that might be, the Home Minister must not dismiss the matter because of these papers he has received from the Chief Minister of Andhra. Even if you go through the statements made by different journalists and pressmen who attended the Conference, you find there are so many loopholes and if a man says, they were forced to make the statements, they were asked to make the statements under duress, can you dislodge that argument. Therefore, there is a lingering doubt everywhere and, in order to remove this lingering doubt, in order to restore the shining colour of an angel to Mr. Thimma Reddy, I think, our Home Minister will institute an inquiry into this immediately.

MR, CHAIRMAN : So, this discussion is over.

20.03 hrs.

CONVICTION OF MEMBERS

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before we adjourn, I have to make an announcement regarding conviction of two Members.

In continuation of the telegram communicated to the House earlier today. I have to inform the House that the Speaker has received the following identical communications, dated the 7th May, 1968, from the Magistrate First Class, Ghaziabad :—

(I)

"I have the honour to inform you that Shri Sunder Lal and Shrimati Ganga Devi, Members, Lok Sabha, were tried at Ghaziabad court before me on a charge under Section 447, Indian Penal Code, for illegally occupying the land of Improvement Trust, Ghaziabad, at Mohalla Jatwara Kalan, Ghaziabad Police Station Sihani Gate.

On the 7th May, 1968, after a trial lasting for one year, eight months and fourteen days, I found them guilty of the offence under section 447, Indian Penal Code and sentenced them to pay a fine of Rs. 500/- or in default to undergo three months rigorous imprisonment."

(II)

"I have the honour to inform you that Shri Sunder Lal and Shrimati Ganga Devi, Members, Lok Sabha, who were convicted on the 7th May, 1968 for an offence under Section 447, Indian Penal Code to pay a fine of Rs. 500/- or in default to undergo three months rigorous imprisonment, were released on the 7th May, 1968 and ten days' time allowed to them to pay the fine imposed."

Now, the House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11 A.M.

20.05 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, May 9, 1968/Vatsakha 19,1890 (Saka)