

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES 25.11.2014

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

1771

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 11th March, 1953.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

3-3 P.M.

DEATH OF PROF. K. T. SHAH

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I regret to have to inform the House of the death of Prof. K. T. Shah who was a member of the provisional Parliament. I desire on behalf of the House to express our sense of the loss on the passing away of Prof. Shah and to convey our condolences to his family. The House may kindly stand in silence for a minute to express its sorrow.

MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATES

Secretary: I have to report the following two messages received from the Secretary of the Council of States:

1. "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to return herewith the Union Duties of Excise (Distribution) Bill, 1953, which was passed by the House of the People at its sitting held on the 3rd March, 1953, and transmitted to the Council of States for its recommendations and to state that the Council has no recommendations to make to the House of the People in regard to the said Bill."

2. "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and

1772

Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to return herewith the Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill, 1953, which was passed as amended by the House of the People at its sitting held on the 4th March, 1953, and transmitted to the Council of States for its recommendations and to state that the Council has no recommendations to make to the House of the People in regard to the said Bill."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY
SHRI V. G. DESHPANDE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yesterday, when the hon. Home Minister made a statement regarding the incidents which were the subject matter of an adjournment motion tabled by Mr. Deshpande, Mr. Deshpande wanted to make a personal explanation and I wanted time to consider whether that could be done. I am satisfied that any hon. Member to whom a reference is made on the floor of the House with respect to his conduct whether inside or outside the House must have an opportunity to explain. I, therefore, allow an opportunity to Mr. Deshpande to offer a personal explanation but I would always urge that that shall be brief and should not introduce any controversial matter, leaving controversy once again for any further reply.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): Sir, I thank you for having given me an opportunity to make a personal explanation regarding the statement of the hon. Home Minister with respect to the incident on Sunday, the 8th March, 1953 in Delhi in which some serious allegations on the personal part I played in that episode were made. I addressed a public meeting in Bara Tooti on 8th March at 5-30 P.M. As has been stated, when I addressed the meeting, there was no incident but at 7 P.M. a large number of the police was making a lathi charge on the peaceful citizens and I may point out that the

[Shri V. G. Deshpande]

persons sitting on the dais also received some lathi blows. Mr. J. D. Sharma, the Magistrate, then came there and saw me at the dais. I can very specifically state that the lathi charge was made before the Magistrate came there. The story of a bull is a cock and bull story.

Then I specifically and pointedly asked Mr. J. D. Sharma, the Magistrate, whether the meeting was banned. He told me there was no ban and we could proceed with the meeting. When people again assembled, some stones and brickbats were thrown on the audience from the first story of a building near that meeting. The name "Hem Chandra Jain's Hospital" is written on that building. There I was informed that some persons had assembled there to disturb the meeting. As I do not want to introduce any controversy here, I do not propose to go into the details as to who must be the persons who had thrown these stones. Mr. Sharma told me that stones were being thrown and it was not desirable to continue the meeting. I pointed out to him that those who were throwing stones could not be belonging to our party and we should send some police to that building but he told me that it was not possible to do so at that stage and he advised me to disperse the meeting as practically the proceedings had come to a conclusion. I accepted his advice and advised the persons who had assembled there of the part I played there. It has been alleged that I participated in an unlawful activity. I told all the persons assembled there that the meeting should be dissolved and I may here state that at least the Magistrate never came to us and told us that the meeting was declared unlawful. Then we told him that we were prepared to dissolve the meeting and conveyed to him that according to our programme, a procession would start from that place. I also told him that I was not going to participate in the procession and that I was leaving the place and Prof. Ram Singh would lead the procession. When I asked him whether there was any ban on the procession, Mr. Sharma again told me that there was no ban on the procession and that the procession could be taken out. When the procession was formed, I left the place and was going to New Delhi. Immediately after I left the place, Prof. Ram Singh was leading the procession. Immediately I found that tear gas was used in the meeting. Prof. Ram Singh was just forward and the police who threw the tear gas shells had separated Prof. Ram Singh from the remaining part of the crowd. Prof. Ram Singh, myself, the Magis-

trate and some police officers also had to suffer the effects of the tear gas. I naturally stood there and made enquiries from the police as to why this peaceful procession was being tear gassed and lathi charged. As a responsible Member of Parliament I thought it to be my duty to stand there and make enquiries and see whether unnecessary force was being used and whether innocent men were being tear gassed and lathi charged. I naturally stood there and made enquiries. (Interruptions). I again crave for the protection of the Chair as interruptions are being made. I made enquiries from the police as to why this peaceful procession was being tear gassed and lathi charged. The police said that they had no answer to give. They said that the procession was perfectly legal and we could take it out. People who were subjected to tear gas and lathi charges again formed themselves into a procession and began to march towards New Delhi which is purely a Hindu locality. I could not leave the people as police were making indiscriminate use of lathi charge and tear gas and innocent persons were suffering. When the procession reached Paharganj which is quite near from the place of the public meeting. I again saw the police making formations for lathi charge and for tear gassing the public. In spite of the threatening mood of the police, I approached Mr. J. D. Sharma and the D.S.P., Sadar Bazaar and asked them what their intentions were. One CID Inspector, who knows me too well asked me to see the D.S.P. and the Magistrate and to speak to them. I told them, "You should not give an impression to innocent people that the procession is perfectly legal and after they join it under the belief that they are doing nothing illegal, subject them to lathi charge and tear gas. It is not proper." I have seen with my own eyes nearly hundred persons injured. If it is unlawful you must tell them so. Calling people there and then beating them smacks of methods used by..... I would not use the expression because that would lead to controversy. Mr. Sharma then asked me and Prof. Ram Singh, whether the procession was going to the Parliament House. We told him that it might go to the Parliament House, and we further told him that he should clearly tell the people that even there in Paharganj and New Delhi, this procession was unlawful and that those who wanted to break the law might do it fully conscious of the consequences of such an action. It was not proper to assault them under a false belief. Then Mr. Sharma said, 'I will

think for a while, and you kindly give me two or three minutes'. He consulted the D.S.P. for some time, and came back and told me that he was declaring the procession unlawful and from the microphone in the police van a declaration to that effect was made. I actively assisted the police in dispersing the procession, and no lathi charge or tear gassing was required to get this done. Only those persons who wanted to offer *satyagraha* remained in the procession with Prof. Ram Singh at the head. The whole road was cleared. Prof. Ram Singh and others were arrested by the police, and the crowd which was standing by, with discipline, on the footpath shouted 'Prof. Ram Singh ki jai', and dispersed without any incident. The D.S.P. thanked me when I left the place for having helped the police force. I repel with all the emphasis at my command the baseless insinuations made by the hon. Home Minister against my personal honour. * * *

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): May I make a submission, Sir? You will kindly note that you allowed Shri Deshpande to make a personal statement, and not to make any attacks. But now he has attacked by saying 'the cock and bull story', 'baseless insinuations' etc. He has used these words against the hon. Home Minister, and that was not a personal explanation. I want your ruling in the matter.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I make a submission, before you give your ruling? As a matter of fact, when personal explanations are allowed, they are with reference to certain statements made by the other side. And as a matter of fact, I believe, as I understand the Parliamentary procedure, the right of making a personal explanation is unrestricted. If we look to the precedents from the House of Commons or the House of Lords in England, we find that as a matter of fact ample freedom is given for making personal explanations. If there is to be any restriction, then that would mean whittling down our rights.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is absolutely no ruling called for. I myself felt that. I gave an opportunity to the hon. Member to explain. He read out his statement, and I did not interfere at all. Towards the end, it was open to him to say that the allegations are all baseless. As for the remark that the allegations are baseless, that is a personal explanation and is quite in order. The rest are not in order.

* * * Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I am prepared to change that expression, and say that a person occupying such a high position should not have made it. That is very parliamentary. That is my submission.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I suggest, Sir, that the hon. Member's full statement should go in and that nothing should be deleted? It does not affect anybody.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. In accordance with the rules that I have been observing for myself as to what language, in the Parliament, ought to be used, I find that the last portion regarding the accusation against an hon. Member should not be there. The personal explanation is otherwise all right. The House has also heard it in detail. It is quite proper for him to say that all these allegations are baseless. And the hon. Member said so. But in the end he made certain remarks which I consider unparliamentary. Therefore that portion of the statement of the hon. Member will go out of the record. Whatever I expunge from the record shall not be published or broadcast anywhere by the Press or otherwise.

Shri S. S. More: Are we to understand that the word used is to be treated as unparliamentary, as part of your ruling?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The word may not be absolutely unparliamentary. I am not merely guided by one word only. If anybody thinks that I must blindly follow the interpretation in this matter of similar expressions used in May's 'Parliamentary Practice', then I should say I am not strictly bound by them. They are not exhaustive. According to the context, I find that the word used is not quite parliamentary. It is not the single word, but the entire expression, and the contents of it, that are not desirable in the interests of proper and harmonious relationship inside the House.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I agree I should not have made it. I am prepared to make the alteration I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. I would be gladder if the hon. Member would withdraw that last sentence. I think that would have been better.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I will change it and say that this should not have been done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right, that has been expunged already.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT BILL

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of certain Officers of Parliament.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of certain Officers of Parliament."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Biswas: I introduce the Bill.

GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the General Budget.

I propose to call the hon. Minister to reply at 6-30 P.M. He will have an hour's time till 7-30 P.M. So, the other Members will have their turns to speak before 6-30 P.M.

Yesterday, Mr. Muniswamy was on his legs. He will now resume his speech.

Shri Muniswamy (Tindivanam): I was saying yesterday that the Budget is based on the Five Year Plan, for the implementation of which the hon. Finance Minister has repeatedly stated that he seeks public co-operation. But I am at a loss to understand what attempts have been made to enlist public co-operation. It has been stated in the Five Year Plan that they have organised two associations, viz. the Bharat Sewak Samaj, and the National Advisory Board. As far as I know these two associations have been formed with the help of men belonging to one party only, and I must say that the whole thing has been done without any consultations with the leaders of all the other parties.

Looking into the Budget and its allotments, I must ask one question. What is meant by family planning?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find that there is so much of noise in the House. If hon. Members want to carry on conversations, they will go into the lobby and do so. We are not able to hear anything legitimately talked in the House.

Shri Muniswamy: In the Five Year Plan, an allocation of Rs. 65 lakhs has been made for family planning. As far as I remember, it has been discussed in the recent Conference at Bombay that family planning is an indirect way of advocating and supporting birth-control. It has been said by those who follow Gandhian ideologies, that Gandhiji was dead against this birth-control. It has not been explained clearly in the Five Year Plan, how this sum of Rs. 65 lakhs is going to be spent.

Coming to Education, in the Budget they have allotted only 40 lakhs for scholarships. In the recent list of scholarships published, not a single candidate from the backward communities from Tamil Nad has got it. So many castes, who are not really backward at all, have been included in the list of backward classes. In this connection, I would like to say one thing. The washerman community, which has a population of seven or eight lakhs in the Madras State, and the barber community have not been included in this list. This is an anomalous position. In all the other provinces, Madhya Pradesh, Bombay, etc., these communities have been included in the scheduled classes whereas in the Madras State, they have been brought into the list of backward communities. A memorandum was submitted to the Prime Minister when he was in Hyderabad. I request that these people should be brought in the list of scheduled classes immediately.

I would like to say something about the Archaeological Department. I can say that the money spent on the Archaeological Department is a sheer waste. There is the Nandikonda project. Formerly in Nagarjunakonda archaeological survey was carried on. They have spent thousands of rupees in Nagarjunakonda. If Nandikonda project is realised, the whole of Nagarjunakonda will, they say, be submerged in water. As far as I know, Government has not taken any steps to preserve the relics found in Nagarjunakonda. At this rate it is a sheer waste.

There are many more items which have not been attended to. Regarding this archaeological survey, I had a talk with the Director. They are spending money only in Northern India. In South India, especially in the Madras State, we have Kaveripumpattinam, Korkai and Madura where the Cheras, Cholas and Pandyas ruled. They are not doing any survey in these places at all. It does not mean that I am too pessimistic. There must be equal distribution. Either the