

meet at 10 o'clock or carry on till 6 o'clock

Sardar Hukam Singh: If the House so desires, instead of sitting till 7, we can sit up to 8 and we can finish off at 2 o'clock on Tuesday.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: You cannot put anything to vote till 2-30. There is no point in meeting at 10 o'clock.

I shall put the question, subject to these modifications.

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Sixth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House today, subject to the modification that instead of the House sitting on the 5th August, 1957 from 9 A.M. to 1 P.M. and again from 2-30 P.M. to 9-30 P.M., the House may sit from 11 A.M. to 7 P.M. on the 5th August, 1957 and the discussion on the Essential Services Maintenance Bill, 1957, may continue for three hours on the 6th August, 1957."

The motion was adopted.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT--
contd.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the adjournment motion of Shri Sadhan Gupta:

"The serious situation arising from the unjustified and wanton firing by Police into the Sweepers' Bustee at Reading Road, New Delhi, resulting in death and serious injuries to Sweepers"

Two and a half hours under the Rules from 4 to 6-30. If after two hours, I find interest is lagging, the debate need not continue.

So far as time for each speech is concerned, I will allow 20 minutes to the first speaker and 15 minutes to others.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta East):
Mr. Speaker, I raise this discussion not only to register my protest and

to seek the verdict of the House on a matter which has pained every one of us on both sides of this House, but also to draw the attention of this House and of the entire country through this House to a shameful phenomenon which we have been experiencing for ten years, the phenomenon of firing at every occasion when the common people fight for their rights. It is unfortunate in our country, unlike in other countries, that firing is so frequent and the authorities concerned are so callous that it has come to be accepted as an ordinary matter and there is nothing extraordinary about it. We have read in newspapers that it has happened in a country like France that when 200 people were being drafted and sent to Algeria for war in Algeria, 5000 people lifted them bodily away from the train and even then there was no firing. Here, just on the slightest occasion or even without any occasion, the trigger comes to our fingers. The trigger comes so easily to the fingers of our police that we have lost even the sense or capacity of being appalled at firing when we hear of one.

This particular firing has taken place in the metropolis of India and has taken place on a section of the population with which we all have sympathy, who are not only down-trodden but who work in inhuman conditions of service. They were fighting for their rights, just rights. Of course, I do not know much about their grievances, but from what appeared in the papers, I think they were *prima facie* absolutely unexceptionable. What they desired was gratuity after retirement. Obviously, they need it because they are ill-paid workers. They desired medical benefits. They have a right to demand it and they have a right to claim it. They have desired merger of dearness allowance with pay which is quite reasonable since it, presumably, affects the amount of retirement benefits they might get and so on. I am not concerned here with the justice or otherwise of their demands, with the propriety or impropriety of

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

their demands. What I want to establish here is that, whether their demands are proper or not, that could not be an excuse for suppressing a strike into which they entered, and still less, for suppressing it by bullets.

Now, the circumstances in which the whole thing took place are horrible by any standards of decency and humanity. I have been there with my Deputy Leader, Shri A. K. Gopalan, Shri Balmiki of the other side was also there. What we found there was that the bullets had shot right into the colony of the sweepers, into the colony where Mahatma Gandhi held his prayers, into the colony where Mahatma Gandhi had once resided along with them, these down-trodden fellowmen of our country. They had shot right into the colony. There are bullet marks on the walls, and as we learnt from them, and as was also apparent from the blood marks at the entrance to the colony, the injured and the dead were dragged out of the colony by the police.

This cannot be self-defence. This is pure vendetta. We learnt from the police there that they had to open fire because stones were thrown at them. We did not find any concentration of stones or any stones scattered in the vicinity, which must have been the case, if so many stones were thrown that the police were compelled to open fire in self-defence. It was pretty clear from the circumstances that it was pure vendetta, and nothing of self-defence at all.

Now, that was not the only circumstance to show the police vindictiveness. Yesterday we read in the papers that a twelve-year old boy who was injured and was taken to hospital was kept handcuffed in the hospital.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi). That is not correct. I have personally enquired.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I understand that some Minister had to intervene on his behalf to release it, or some

high authority had to intervene. That was the report in the papers.

The point is this, that a policeman in self-defence should open fire and injure twelve-year old boy is horrifying enough. And since Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani says so, there should be an enquiry whether at the initial stages, that boy had been handcuffed in the hospital. That would show the vendetta of the police also. In any case, there is no doubt that there was no justification for the opening of fire. I do not know whether it is a fact that they were trying to obstruct persons who are euphemistically called loyal workers, but who should be properly called black-legs, who were trying to prick the strike. I do not know whether it is a fact or not. But what I want to submit for the consideration of the House is this: Should we accept the condition that whenever anyone interferes with another, even illegally, fire should be opened on them? When can fire be opened? It is only in extreme cases, when life is in danger, that fire could be opened. Of course, when life is in imminent danger, fire can be opened.

Of course, the explanation has been given that the police were about to be opened. Now, as I told you, there was no external evidence of that fracas there, of that alleged assault on the police there, to show that there was justification for firing. On the other hand, this report, this excuse which was given to us is the stereotyped excuse in every case. I could have drafted it, without even knowing a single fact of the matter, because that is being done in every State today, where fire is opened—a violent mob, police about to be overwhelmed, fire in self-defence.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Brickbats.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: brick-bats, stones, lathis, and fire etc. That is the stock report. I do not know whether they have a cyclostyled we get

everywhere, in every place where firing takes place. But when it comes before an independent judicial enquiry, in most cases, you will find that the action of the police is held to be unjustified. In Patna, the same thing happened. In Hoshiarpur, of course, it was not firing, but the same verdict was given. At Kalka, I believe, the same verdict was given. In Calcutta, fire was opened on women, and the same verdict was given by the coroners' jury. In Indore, the same thing happened. In Bombay, they would not enquire, although about 150 people were killed.

Mr. Speaker: May I state that we are dealing only with the responsibility of the Central Government here and not with the responsibility of the State Governments or the acts of the State Governments? The accusation may be right, or there may be an exceedingly proper reply also and an explanation also for it. But those Ministers are not here to reply, and, therefore, we should not get into their affairs. The simple point here is whether there has been any excess, or whether there was any case for firing or there was no case at all, or even if there was a case, whether there was excess. That is the simple point before us, and not even the grievances of those people. So, hon. Members will confine themselves to this point.

Shri Punnoose (Ambalapuzha): The Bombay Minister is here.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: This is the kind of thing that goes on. Whenever the light of enquiry, whenever the light of independent investigation is focussed on it, it is almost universally found to be unjustified. And yet, what we see is that nothing is done to punish the persons guilty of it.

Let there be no mistake about it. When a firing is unjustified, those who indulged in it are guilty of murder, pure murder, and nothing else. And if you do not punish them, you are no better than abettors of murder.

I want to know whether this dastardly firing which has taken place in

Delhi, will not only be enquired into but whether it will be enquired into by an impartial authority—let it be a high judicial officer or a High Court judge. I want to know whether it will be enquired into in that way. We do not want an enquiry by an additional district magistrate. I do not know what that gentleman is like, what his independence is. But one thing is clear. If his report is in favour of the police, it will not command any confidence of the public, firstly, because the district magistrate who is the superior has expressed himself on the point, and secondly because he is an executive officer, and thirdly, because the very fact that he has been serving for 25 years makes it clear that he has been serving also under the British for a considerable time.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): And trained with them.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: . . . and so, his mental make-up is liable to be suspected. I am not saying anything about it because I do not know him, but that will be the idea of the public, if the report goes in favour of the police. Therefore, the inquiry should be by an authority whose impartiality is undoubted.

Now, if it is discovered that the police is guilty, there must be no attempt to shield them and save them from punishment. Let us remember that a life has been taken, and another life is threatened—it is reported that the boy is in a precarious condition. Now, if we have to do justice, then we must bring the guilty to book, we must not have any other consideration against it.

As I said, they are murderers. They do not deserve any consideration. They have treated human life as the lives of cats and dogs—even in the case of cats and dogs, we think twice before we kill them. But in the case of a human being, they do not do it. They should pay the full price of it. Therefore, if the police are found to

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

be guilty, the guilty persons must get exemplary punishment

In conclusion, I would appeal to the Government to set an example in this matter. As I said, it is a very shameful phenomenon in this country that firing is much too frequent. It is the duty of this Government to set an example of respect for human life, if it is inclined to do so, to set an example to all others to see that inquiries are not only made, but that reports of inquiries do not go to the wastepaper basket and proper action is taken, by 'proper action', I mean vigorous prosecution and punishment of the guilty.

It is also necessary that strictest instructions should be given to the police to keep clear of industrial disputes, unless there is great threat to person or property, and then not to indulge in pressing triggers in season and out of season. This trigger-happiness must be curbed and we must be able to feel secure about our lives and limbs when we enter into any struggle for the grievances of the common people.

There are many things which the common people have to fight for here, and if in every case, the police intervene and still more, if the police start showering bullets when we try to fight for our rights, it will be an evil day for the country. Let not the Government think that that way they will succeed in suppressing the struggle. If they think that they will cure lawlessness by it they are very much mistaken. If this order of things goes on, it will be lawlessness that will get the upper hand, because if we have the feeling that we can have no justice and we are likely to be mown when we fight for our rights, we shall only be compelled to take steps to protect ourselves against such attacks.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Mr Speaker, Sir, for the first time, the Hou. is getting an opportunity to discuss an adjournment motion, and

it is a happy augury that we begin with this question of firing.

This is not an isolated instance. Firing has occurred in this country more than what was in the Britishers' time. I want to be contradicted by the Home Minister that the incident of firing in this country after the Congress assumed government is not more than that was during the 200 years of British rule (*Interruptions*). Why is it so? I do not want to blame the poor policemen. The question is not whether a policeman fired or not. The question involves a policy, whether in a democracy we have not to change our rules which were based on the police state, or whether we shall carry on our work with the same old set of rules.

We have been preaching international concord and peace, going all round the world, clamouring for peace, goodwill and all that, but in our own country, we have left millions of our countrymen at the mercy of the police without giving them any guidance whatsoever.

I am not concerned, and I am not going to deal with the demands of these people—I know the demands are just—and they have called off the strike. You have promised them, at least you have satisfied them that their demands would be met. And you did it when? After you killed a man. The demands were with you a long time before. Actually two ladies began hunger-strike on the 22nd of July, and on the 29th they gave the strike call. Still there was no talk there was no attempt to see that the just demands were met. But on the 31st when an adjournment motion was tabled, the Prime Minister came forward and said 'I will consider them sympathetically'. Before that sympathy actually went to the people, sympathy was actually transferred to the people—through firing! (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati). Translated through bullets

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If this is your attitude, you are determined to kill democracy in this country. You do not want to follow democratic procedure, you do not want to set democratic principles, you do not want to meet the reasonable demands of the people, you do not want to discuss the matter with them, their difficulties. But whenever any demands are placed you just set them aside. So they are frustrated, they are goaded to some action. When they take the only alternative course left to them, that is, strike or any such method permissible—they have every right to strike when they feel injured—then what is your reply? Your reply is bullets and nothing else. This is a bureaucratic way of doing things. You will goad people to take recourse to violence. You do not want to set a pattern of democratic development in this country.

Therefore, this raises a fundamental question: what is our attitude towards firing? Take this Delhi firing. I do not know what is therein the report submitted by the ADM. But in the usual manner as was happening during the British days an Additional District Magistrate was appointed to go into the matter. The Home Minister was not even prepared to say

Yes, the Additional District Magistrate has been ordered by his superior authority he will go into it, and then we will appoint a Judicial. This should be the normal procedure. I think this should have been followed. This was not agreed and the matter of discussion was delayed on that account.

Take this Delhi incident. Friends have described how the firing occurred. Even Congressmen who had been to the place of occurrence have stated that this was irresponsible. A Congress M.P., who is associated with the sweepers' organisation, also stated that the police firing was unprovoked and uncalled for, and the situation there was not such as could not be controlled by lathi charge or by tear gas. If you read the official communique that has been issued, as has been pointed out by Shri Sadhan Gupta, the usual plea is there. It

says that 'a constable who was hit on the head by lathi, dropped on the spot, and several others sustained injury by brickbats and lathis. Finding themselves in danger of being overwhelmed, and the sanitary staff and the installation at the mercy of the mob, the police opened fire'. There was no Magistrate there. There was no warning issued. Nor was there use of tear gas or water hose or lathi charges, nothing of the kind. Simply because some hundreds of people prevented the police, who even successfully broke the cordon and took away one lorry, only the second lorry was prevented by the people, simply because that was prevented from passing, this firing was resorted to. I would ask the hon. Home Minister is it at all permissible under the circumstances? I think this is a dastardly act. There was no magistrate it has been admitted, and no reasonable time was given to the people to disperse, which is ordinarily done even when firing is resorted to sometimes by the indiscretion of the policeman. We have seen these firing during the British days the civil disobedience days and we have our own experience of firings.

I know when I was addressing a meeting, the crowd was fired upon. Unfortunately, I was arrested and was not fired at. But we have seen occasions like that (*Interruptions*).

I say unfortunate because I escaped and went to jail they arrested me first and then fired on the people.

Even on occasions before they simply fire in the air so that people may disperse. On that day even this was not done. I would humbly ask the Home Minister to tell me was that done on the occasion? Nothing of the kind was done. Why is it so? It is because you have not applied your mind as to when and how firing should be resorted to.

My feeling is that when we are discussing this question let us go into the entire matter. If we want to set up a standard the first thing would be to go into the entire matter as to how the Police should conduct itself in a democratic set-up. There are only two fundamental principles that

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]
 the police should follow according to me. Each policeman is responsible for what he does. Secondly, he must not act outside the laws. We should carefully define his powers. The Police must also understand that in democracy they are there to preserve peace no doubt, to apprehend the guilty persons, but they have also a duty to protect and help members of the public. Their role is mainly that of a friend, guardian and servant. Excepting that, the Police should not have any other role.

About firing, I would also say that we must set up a standard as to on which occasions really firing should be resorted to. We may discuss all these things and we may condemn the poor policeman but the fact remains that these things would be pursued in this country as it was being done before unless we have some principles. I would suggest that if Government agrees to accept these standards it would be good. Unless the crowd is so violent, unless they are armed with deadly weapons and they threaten to take action as would endanger life and property, no firing should be resorted to. Unless the contending group is in such a bellicose and aggressive mood, firing should not be resorted to. When there is obstruction of traffic—in this case there was no obstruction of traffic—even on that occasion, I would say, if there is no other possible route to take the conveyance or if it is such that if it does not go at that moment it will really endanger life and property, then, they may be permitted to fire. Otherwise, I do not see any reason why we should permit policemen to fire at their sweet will.

This question of firing has been hanging before us in this country since a long time. I may tell my friends in this House, when in Travancore-Cochin, for some time the P.S.P. was in office, firing was resorted to. The entire P.S.P. sat in the National Conference, apologised to the people and condemned the firing and decided that whenever firing is resorted to, as a matter of fact, a

judicial enquiry should be ordered into it. The judicial enquiry in Travancore-Cochin—when the P.S.P. was in office—held that the firing was justified. Not that I support that firing—let Congressmen laugh at it—but I want to say this. Are you prepared to say that whenever firing occurs anywhere, you will, as a normal course, order a judicial enquiry? Are you prepared to accept this? That is my challenge to you. P.S.P. ministry accepted this principle.

We may very much express our concern for the Second Five Year Plan. We may say, we have to carry it through, we have to look to the international situation and all that. All this clamour will not have any effect unless your administrative set-up is changed, unless we apply our mind very seriously as to how we should deal with our own people.

The Prime Minister has so far established a good record outside. We are proud of it. There are a few world statesmen and he is one of them. But I would humbly request him to have a little mercy on the people, on the masses who have sent him here. Today you have killed a *mehtar*; you have killed a most down trodden member of our society. Does it not in any way make you think very seriously? There must be something very wrong in this administration. This has happened under your very nose, where everything is available; the head of the Administration is available for talk and negotiation. I am told that the Delhi *Mehtar* Union is controlled by Congressmen. Certainly, they cannot be accused of being anti-national, anti-government and anti-social and what not. I do not think they can be accused like that. Still, I want to ask the Government, why was it that only after firing you agreed to meet their demands and not before.

What I mean to say is this. When the House has got this opportunity to discuss a matter of great importance, we must discuss not only the thing that has happened but much more to enable us to set up

our standards for the future. I would like the Administration, the Home Minister and the Government of India to think over this matter and come out with a policy as to how the Police should behave on occasions like this.

Shri B. C. Kamble (Kopergaon): Sir, it is really very unfortunate that one of the blackest incidents in the history of the last few years has taken place against the defenceless people, namely sweepers. I am not prepared to take this as an isolated incident. We in Bombay State know what is police firing under the Congress regime where on an average two bullets in a minute were fired and thus the Congress regime has turned the whole country into a police State. Ultimately, after this firing was over, the sweepers were brought down and now they have called off their strike. I do not know whether they agreed very willingly or not. What can those poor people do except calling off the strike in these circumstances? There is a sweet assurance that the hon. Home Minister will be pleased to call upon the representatives of the sweepers and the officials. This sweet assurance is given after this ghastly incident.

I would have been glad if the Government had automatically conceded the demands about which there was the dispute. Nothing of that kind has been done.

With regard to this incident and with regard to such incidents in various parts of the country, I was searching for the rules. Which are the rules which govern police firing? It is unfortunate that even all our libraries were not able to get me a single copy of the rules which govern the police firing. Ultimately, I got hold of Halsbury's laws from England and I could see a certain portion concerning police firing. In the absence of such rules, I cannot but refer to that particular portion. I have taken an extract from it—*Halsbury's Laws of England*, Second Edition, Volume 9, page 316. It says that if any police firing is to be resorted to then a declaration in the prescribed form must

be made first and there should be at least a magistrate or a bailiff. Applying these two tests, I would like to know categorically from the hon. Home Minister whether there was in the prescribed manner any declaration made by the officer concerned before he resorted to firing and secondly also whether there was any person of the status of a magistrate. We would also like to know whether the police officer tried to fire in the air and thereby he wanted to disperse the crowd. That is to say whether the intention was to disperse the crowd or the intention was to kill the person. I charge that the intention was to kill the man and not to disperse the crowd. As was the experience in Bombay State, they should have been let out to kill.... (*Interruptions*).

I would also like to know whether the minimum force was used in this matter. What was the strength of the crowd collected there? Was minimum force used? My submission is that the minimum force was not used at all. I would like to know further details from the hon. Minister. When did the firing actually commence? When did it end? How many rounds were fired? What is the total number of bullets and what is the nature of the injury? What is the state of affairs of those who were injured? What do the Government do about them? How do the Government propose to compensate those who are injured and the family where there has been a victim?

The Lok Sabha is in session. The negotiations were going on. The Prime Minister made a certain statement here and there were telephoning communications. How is it that the leaders of the union were not informed or the police officers were not informed with regard to the negotiations which were going on? It is most ironical. As a matter of fact negotiations were going on and the police officers ought to have been informed.

According to me, only three reasons could be given. Firstly, the total and complete strike made the Government

[Shri B C Kamble]

and the Delhi Municipal Authorities terrified. They felt that if the strike becomes successful, then they will be completely defeated in their endeavour. The second reason is the utter contempt for the lower order. That is an important reason. That is the value attached to the lives of these sweepers. I had gone there. I saw the trails of blood stains. People were dragged. This is the way in which things are being done. I could also see this. When the Minister of Health was making a statement, I could see the exchanges which the Prime Minister had with others there. He did not like the idea that he should make a statement next day. Therefore, he rose and immediately made a statement. The hon. Prime Minister is against the strike. Therefore, they might have taken drastic action. These are perhaps important reasons, as to why this action in the drastic form was taken by the police.

Finally, I would like to know from the Government this thing. I repeat what my hon. friend just now said. What is the method or procedure which should govern police firing throughout this country? It must be explained and settled once for all.

Finally, I would like to say this. Gandhiji had gone to that particular place. He was there. Bullets were shot and that particular area is blood stained. At least now wash off these blood stains by instituting an impartial judicial enquiry headed by one of the High Court Judges. Then alone things can be well settled. Otherwise, we shall always believe that the Government wants to rely mainly on the brutal force in order to suppress the movement of the people who propose to rise up and find their standard along with the others.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Sir, we are all gathered here to discuss a very tragic occurrence. It is a matter of great pain and distress not only to the Members of the Opposition but to the whole House and I am sure that the matter is of even greater

distress to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Home Minister and it is seen by what they said two days back in the Parliament and from what we have heard from them. I do feel that they are most anxious not only to have a proper enquiry into the matter but to punish the culprits and render justice to the people who have suffered. Day before yesterday, the matter was raised and the hon. Home Minister made it clear that he was not anxious to suppress the matter. I am confident that they will do what is just and right in the matter.

The hon. Prime Minister visited the place soon after the occurrence and has seen all the things for himself. He has himself seen the blood stains and the bullet marks on the walls there. He knows facts and how the police have gone inside and what they did. At least I will be surprised and shocked if after all this a proper enquiry is not instituted.

I would now like to correct some of the facts narrated by the Opposition Members here. Some hon. Members said that nothing was done at all before the firing took place to meet the strikers and to meet their demands. It is not correct. The leaders had discussed with the Health Minister at half past two and the discussion was fairly satisfactory. There was general agreement and many of the important points were discussed. While the discussion was taking place at that time, there was this incidental occurrence. This was not part of any deliberate suppression. My friend, Shri Sadhan Gupta, said so. It was purely accidental and incidental matter. (Interruptions)

Another point to which he referred was in respect of the injured persons. I personally along with Shri Radha Raman and the President of the New Delhi Municipal Committee went to the hospitals where there were two persons who were hand-cuffed. There was another boy but he was not hand-cuffed. His hands were tied to the bed in order that he may not move.

from his bed It is correct to say that the small boy was lying there but his hands were not handcuffed They were tied to the leg of the bed under doctor's orders as he should not move After we saw the hand-cuffs of the other two persons, we went to the Home Minister's house and the moment he heard of it, he spoke on the telephone and the hand-cuffs were removed (Interruptions) The child was there and under the doctor's orders his hands were tied with the bandage to the bed I have seen such a bandage in other cases also The child had an injury in the abdomen The doctors did not want the child to sit up or stir, and therefore this was done under the orders of the doctors The doctors were present when we three went there I am sure we do not want to tell you any lie If you are feeling indignant about the firing, we are certainly feeling equally indignant, if not more

I, for one, am absolutely against the use of arms in controlling civilian crowds I would not like to justify firing under any circumstances I have not had the opportunity to read the report of the Magistrate I had just a chance to glance through it I find in the report they say that had they not resorted to firing a petrol pump might have been set fire to and the stores of the municipal department might have been looted

Whatever it is, the police officer there from a narrow point of view was perhaps justified He might have thought that if he did not resort to firing greater trouble would occur But, I want to raise some very fundamental issues There was this strike, and an attempt was being made with the help of outsiders to carry on the sanitary work I have some sympathy for the police also The police people are low paid people They were there to help, to serve us If the sanitary condition of the town was not brought under control even you and I would not have been able to save the situation It is an exceptionally difficult job They were going to help the black-legs in

clearing the town So, the situation was fraught with trouble. I do not blame the officer or the constables concerned

But, I do ask the Delhi Administration why they were not more imaginative Why did not the Delhi Administration equip the police with something other than bullets There has been considerable scientific advancement There are instruments with which we can control crowds Tear gas could have been used, or some other things could have been used to control the crowd Why were they not used? If they had resorted to tear gas and other methods, and having failed there resorted to firing then I could have understood Under no circumstances would I justify this firing I do not blame the man on the spot He might have been confused He might have been overwhelmed seeing a big crowd But, the police, when they went with the workers, should have been equipped with something other than bullets

Therefore, Sir, as the other two hon Members have said, it is time, after ten years of freedom, to decide the policy as to how we are going to control a civilian crowd During the British days it was all right, when for a little thing we were shot at I feel that this ease with which firing is resorted to is a legacy of British tradition it is a hang-over of British imperialism I think it is time we discarded it We should adopt some other methods As I said there are very effective methods The other day some people said that tear gas is not effective I said "I am sorry, I beg to differ from you, because I know how tear gas was used on us on 9th August, 1942 in Bombay, on a huge crowd at Shivaji Park" Shri Masani is shaking his head, he knows about it, how a huge crowd was dispersed only with tear gas Therefore, tear gas is equally effective

I would request the Government to issue orders that in future for controlling civilian crowds other methods should be used and not bullets Once bullets are used and life is lost the

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

whole blame comes to us, the Government is discredited, and it gives immense distress to all of us. Therefore, Sir, in all humility, I request that the policy should be decided with regard to this matter.

I wish to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the hon Home Minister to certain other matters with regard to the administration of the New Delhi Municipal Committee. The New Delhi Municipal Committee is a nominated body. It is presumed that a nominated body functions better. That is the argument that is given for its non-inclusion in the Corporation that is to come. I am very sorry to say that by performance the New Delhi Municipal Committee does not show any better standards than other municipalities. They are nominated people. It is a small body. I suppose they are six or eight in number. But this small body is riven with factions. The members are fighting with each other. These things are known to the Home Minister.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the hon Member is opening a big question.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani. This is very relevant to the point. How did the strike take place? How did a strike situation come? Why did it take place? For the last four years the demand of the workers are before the Municipal Committee and they have not been able to come to a decision. There are many demands which are perfectly justified. These demands are such, that unless they are conceded the poor people who are drawing small salaries, people who are living on the margin will be put to considerable distress. I will give one example. There are arrears of increment withheld for the last eight years, increments of eight annas. Labour Officer was there. He did not pay any heed. The workers were again and again bringing the matter before the Municipal Committee, but there was so much trouble in the administration that these matters could not be attended to. Ultimately they went on

hunger-strike and all these things took place. I have other experiences in other matters to show how things are delayed. I will just quote another example, if the hon. Speaker will excuse me.

There was the case of *rarewallahs*. They are hawkers who go with push-carts. For the last two years I am personally dealing with their case. It is a small matter. Their licences were taken away. They have not come to a decision as to how to provide these persons to earn their living. I had been going from Raj Kumari Amrit Kaur right down to the chaprasi to solve the problem. Ultimately I placed it before the Advisory Committee. The hon Home Minister who did not know about this case was sympathetic. He ordered that this matter should be settled immediately and shops should be allotted to them. I suggested that a date should be fixed within which it should be done, because for two years I had gone from pillar to post and nothing happened. The meeting took place on 10th June. One month was fixed within which this matter was to be settled. I am very sorry to say that I went again on the 10th July, but nothing has happened. I have today addressed a letter to the Home Minister to see that something is done.

Because fight was going on between the members of the Municipal Committee the shops that were built on Humayun Road could not be allotted for months together. The refugees were sitting on the pavement of another road, dirtying the place and creating nuisance. The shops could not be given because one member was pulling in one way and another member in another way.

This sort of things in the administration only create disaffection among the people. Therefore I urge upon the Home Minister to see that the work is handled with more sympathy. The new official Chairman of the NDMC, I am very sorry to say, has a very unsympathetic attitude. The previous

Chairman used to be very sympathetic. He used to talk to the workers. Even if a worker does not get payment of his wages, if he gets one or two sweet words he goes away satisfied. Even that is not being given by the present Chairman. That is why there is disaffection among the New Delhi Municipal sweepers and due to which this situation arose.

We are all very sorry that this situation has come about. Let us take this opportunity to decide the policy as to how we are going to control civilian crowds. Let us also see that the administration is put right so that in future such things do not occur.

Dr. P. Subbarayan (Tiruchengode): Mr Speaker, Sir, no doubt every one in this House sympathises with the man who has died, but I would like hon Members opposite to place themselves in the position of 30 or 35 constables situated in a crowd of about 500 to 600, and the crowd in a threatening mood. What will they do if they were in the position the police were in? I would like to ask the hon. Members what they would have done placed under such a situation in their self defence? It is all very well to laugh, but you must understand ...

The Minister of Railways (Shri Jagjivan Ram): Run away

Dr. P. Subbarayan: The Minister for Railways says, "run away". I do not think, situated as the police were protecting Government property, if they had run away the hon Minister would have commended them for their action in any manner. What happened was there was a threatening crowd

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What was the danger then?

Dr. P. Subbarayan: The danger was to the policemen themselves and to the stores which belonged to the Government where there were many gallons of petrol, and what might have happened if the crowd got into the place and set fire to the petrol tank.

That is what I want to ask hon. Members opposite. It is all very easy to criticise. It is all very easy to stir up trouble. When there is trouble, I know my hon. friends would always like to get in and stir up trouble.

17 hrs.

Shri Nath Pai: It was a loyal trade union; you cannot question the integrity of the trade union. You cannot raise the bogey.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: You have been loyal, I am prepared to admit it. The situation was that these poor constables were in trouble. They were trying to protect this workshop and the petrol bunk and what is the action you would take in such circumstances? They could not possibly run away. They had to protect the workshop, they had to protect the vehicles in the workshop and they had to protect the amount of petrol that was in the workshop. No doubt we are all sorry—as my friend Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani explained, that a life should have been lost in the process. I can understand my hon friend asking me if there is no Government at all. (*Interruptions*) I would like to come to a time when there will be non-violence, but if my friends on the other side are non-violent, then non-violence will be practised. But what I feel is that my friends on the other side always like to get into trouble, and would like to stir up trouble and they would try to make it impossible for the authorities to carry on their normal activities. (*Interruptions*)

Shri Easwara Iyer (Trivendrum): On a point of order. Can the hon. Member refer to the conduct of Members of this House?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the hon Member referred to the interruptions here. That is all that I saw.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: He was raising a point of order and that is why I sat down. I see there is no point of order. All that I am stating is—

An Hon. Member: You are getting into trouble.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: I am glad some of the friends of my hon. friends on the other side of the house are running a Government in the Kerala State. How are they running the Government,—that is what I ask. It is a pertinent question to ask.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member need not refer to other hon. Members of this House. He may refer to the party. All these matters need not be referred to unless it is a specific issue, when the dignity of an hon. Member and how to expel him comes up before this House. Conduct need not be referred to. But party may be referred to.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: I am not referring to anybody's conduct. I am only saying that I am very glad that those gentlemen on the other side have been placed in positions of responsibility.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: It is a predication, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Not these gentlemen, but their party.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: All that I wish to say is that these gentlemen had passed a resolution in their central committee criticising their Government even. That is what I mean. They are responsible in their own way, in their own party, Politburo or whatever they call it, for the running of the Government in Kerala in which I am sure they will acquit themselves—

Shri Warior (Trichur): Can an hon. Member refer to the State Government?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is a veteran politician and a parliamentarian.

Shri Nath Pai: He does not look like one.

Mr. Speaker: He treads on dangerous grounds. I already said that the conduct of any Ministry whether Communist or any other, ought not to be brought up here. Those ministers are not here to defend themselves. Therefore, even without such references, the hon. Member can address his arguments in this House.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: With all due deference to what you, Sir, have said, I would say that I was referring to it as an example of how law and order can be managed. I was only saying that they are responsible, at least their party is responsible, for law and order in a particular part of this country, and I think I am entitled to refer to that in spite of what has been said. All that I say is that they know what the trouble is. They know what happens when a crowd gathers. They know also what happens when a crowd gets unruly and what is to be done under such circumstances. That was all that I was referring to.

What happened really, as I have come to know, is that two of the police constables were very badly injured. Their lives were in danger, and the D.S.P. tried his best to get the crowd expelled. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Members will kindly hear the Member who is speaking.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: The D.S.P. on the spot tried his best to get the crowd under control without resorting to force if I may say so. He tried to push them, and there were lathi charges not from the police but from the other side, and so, situated as he was, what was he to do? He patiently bore the thing. Three or four constables were badly injured, and they had to be carried away to the hospital. When such conditions existed, and when the police were overpowered, they had ordered shooting.

We have heard so much about the Additional District Magistrate holding an enquiry. I do not think that justice has come down so much in this country that you cannot trust an Additional District Magistrate to hold an enquiry on whatever has happened, even though the District Magistrate might have been concerned with it. I say our judicial officers are as keen on their work, and they know what they have got to do and that they take evidence and on the evidence they come to their conclusion—

Shri Nath Pai: No; they come to the conclusion and then collect evidence.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: The Additional District Magistrate, as far as I can see, held a complete enquiry, wanted everybody to appear before him including the people who were injured, including the people who claimed that these people ran into the Harijan colony and shot them, etc, which is not true to the facts of the case and which, of course, can be utilised for throwing mud at the Government

What really happened was that those people were warned and then it was followed by shots. There were only three or four shots. When there is shooting, some injury is bound to occur. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker: The hon Members might have seen it. Some might have seen more and some might have seen less. Let there be no interruption.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: What I can say is that there have been exaggerated notions of what happened on the spot.

Shri Nath Pai: I am not interrupting, but I might point out that even the District Magistrate, in his report said that more than 13 shots were fired.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): The hon Members' arithmetic is different from each other.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: I can only talk from what I know of the facts of the case. The hon gentleman opposite might know better than I do, but about the conditions and the situation that existed, I say that what was resorted to was the minimum that could be resorted to. I feel that having read the report and having read the accounts there has been no unnecessary force used which was not necessary in the circumstances. No doubt, there may be conditions under which a judicial enquiry might be held and I am sure the hon Minister of Home Affairs, if he feels that justice has not been done, will hold such an enquiry. But, as far as I am concerned, all that I have got to say is "Do not fish in troubled waters".

Shri S. Ghose (Burdwan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are now discussing whether there was any justification for the firing. Assuming for a moment—I do not admit the truth of the statement on the face of it—that the statement is correct, should we take it that India would have gone to the fathomless depths of the ocean had there been no firing at that time? That is the question which is agitating the minds of the people. From the Britishers we have got many legacies, but two of them are of a precious character. One is bricks and the other is police. Whenever the Government is in a tight corner, the Government will introduce the bricks. Whenever there was any firing, the police comes in with such story.

Thus, another precious legacy is the police. The police which was thought to be of a debased metal during the time of the Britishers, is now said to be made of unalloyed gold.

An Hon. Member: Overnight.

Shri S. Ghose: That is the character that the present Government has assumed. They have assumed a role of the proverbial mother-in-law. I do not want to make light of a serious thing, but it should be told before this House that a beggar went to beg alms in a family consisting of a daughter-in-law and the mother-in-law. The mother-in-law was at that time outside the house, and the daughter-in-law was inside. He was begging for alms. The daughter-in-law said, "We are engaged in household work and so we cannot give you alms." The beggar went away disappointed. When he had proceeded some distance, the mother-in-law asked him what had happened and he told her. The mother-in-law flared up at once and said, "She is not the owner of the House and she has no right to say like this. You beggar, come to my house." The beggar was elated with joy and he came to the house along with the mother-in-law. After coming to the house, the mother-in-law told the beggar, "I am the owner of the house and I say that we are engaged

[Shri S. Ghose]

in household affairs and therefore we will not be in a position to give you alms". That is the position that has been taken up by the present Government. The daughter-in-law is the Britishers; the beggars are the Indian people and the proverbial mother-in-law is the Treasury Bench. The Treasury Benches used to denounce the Britishers by bell, book and candle for whatever they said and did but now they are imitating the same thing.

Had this been done by the Britishers, the whole India would have been stirred to its foundation. There would have been a chorus of protest from Cape Comorin to Himalayas and from Gujerat to Assam, but now we are told that we should take it in a complacent mood, as it has done by our benevolent Government. Now I think, viewed from any angle, there cannot be any justification whatsoever for this firing. These poor people were crying in hunger rightly or wrongly and instead of satisfying for their hunger, and they have been given satisfaction not by food, but by bullets. That is the tactics adopted by the present Government.

The present Government will run from one corner of the globe to the other with Panch Shila and various other theories for peace, but when our countrymen are concerned, they will find the peace of the grave. In conclusion, I repeat the utterance of an ex-Chief Minister of old Bengal. He had occasion to say that at a certain time when Bengal was suffering from hoarding . . .

Mr. Speaker: How is it relevant to the discussion?

Shri S. Ghose: I will explain it, Sir. In the Assembly, one European belonging to a firm which was doing business in hoarding, was denouncing the hoarding, although he was connected with that firm. The Chief Minister in his speech said, "There was a thief who used to steal all through the night, but in day time he used to denounce the villagers

saying, 'you should stop this theft'. I looked at that man with an amazed eye and said, "I do not know whether that Shema chora has changed his colour and taken the colour of a European." I submit, Sir, read it in a converse way and it will be found correct in this case and it will also be found that it fits in with the present Government.

श्री० ब्रह्म प्रकाश (दिल्ली सदर) :

जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, जो फार्मिंग हुआ, हाउस के हर एक मेम्बर को मेरे स्थाल मे उस पर दुख और प्रफसोस है। इसमे कोई मतभेद नहीं है। वसूर किसका है—पुलिस का है या माब का है इसमे इस बन्त जाना बेसूद है। मुझे खास तौर पर दुख इन बात का है कि पिछले दिनों मे बाकये हुए और दो बाकये ऐसे है जो पिछले छ माल में नहीं हुए। एक बाकया यह हुआ कि कुछ लोग प्राये और उन पर फौरन टीयर-नीस हो गया और दूसरा बाकया यह हुआ कि कुछ झगडा शुरू हुआ तो चहा पर फार्मिंग हो गया। जनाब यह कहा जाता है—एक ध्योरी बनी हुई है—कि बगैर पुलिस के और बगैर लाठी और गोली के माब का कंट्रोल नहीं किया जा सकता है और एडमिनिस्ट्रेंटज की यह राय है कि यह नहीं हो सकता है। मैं बुनियादी तौर पर इस बात से इस्लिफ करना हू और इस्लिफ ऐसे नहीं करता हू कि मैं कोई ध्योरी की बात कह रहा हू बल्कि मैं प्रैक्टिस की बात कहना चाहता हू।

पिछले छ माल मे एक गोली दिल्ली मे नहीं चली। लाठी के मुतालिक मैं ज्यादा कुछ नहीं कह सकता, लेकिन जहा तक मेरा स्थाल है, कभी शाजोनादर ही ऐसा कोई मौका प्राया, होगा, जिस की इस बन्त मुझे याद नहीं है। उस दौरान मे जिन काउन्सिल को फेस करना पडा, वे बहुत ज्यादा सख्त और तेज थे, इससे ज्यादा थे। लेकिन कैसे कंट्रोल किया गया उन को? जनाब, पुलिस

को धीर मैजिस्ट्रेट्स को—चिन्मेदार लोगो को प्रत्यक्षनी तौर पर कहा गया था कि चाहे कितने ही सक्त गिराहू का तुम्हें मुकाबला करना पड़े, तुम्हें गोली नहीं चलायी है किसी भी कीमत पर, और तुम्हें बे तरीके अख्तियार करने हैं, जिससे बगैर गोली चलाए आप फ़ाउड को विसर्पस कर सकें या उस को शान्ति में ला सकें। उन की मीटिंग्ज की गई और उन को यह बाब समझाई गई। मैं यह बात तजुबे की बिना पर कह रहा हूँ। और ऐसे मीके आए कि जहा पुलिस वालो को जीयर किया गया, उन के मुह पर थूका गया, उन को परेशान किया गया, उन की पगडी उतारी गई, लेकिन उन्होने कुछ नहीं किया, क्योंकि सिपाही मे यह एक खूबी होती है कि वह डिसिप्लिन का पालन होता है, और अगर उस को शान्ति के साथ किसी से लडने के लिए कहे और किसी सिचुएशन का मुकाबला करने के लिए कहे, तो वह शान्ति स मर भी सकता है, लेकिन अगर गोली चनाने के लिए कहा जाय, तो उस की गोली कभी ठडी नहीं पडती।

जनाब, मैं किसी खास सिचुएशन के बारे में नहीं कह सकता, क्योंकि यहा पर बहुत से मेम्बर साहबान मिनिस्टर्ज भी रहे हैं, चीफ मिनिस्टर्ज भी रहे हैं, वे अपने अपने तजुबे यहा पर बयान कर सकते हैं, लेकिन मेरा पूरा यकीन है कि चाहे कैसा भी माब हो, बगैर गोली के उस को काबू किया जा सकता है, बशर्ते कि पुलिस आफिसर्ज और गवर्नमेंट आफिसर्ज को इस के लिए ट्रेन करे, उन को साइकालोजी समझाये और उन को बताये कि उन को किस तरह की सिचुएशन में क्या करना है।

हालाकि इतना झगडा चल रहा था, लेकिन बहा पर सिर्फ एक डिप्टी सुपरिन्टेन्डेन्ट आफ पुलिस मौजूद थे। मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि पहले जब कभी भी इस किस्म के मीके आए, तो वहा पर एक दम आई. जी., चीफ

कमिश्नर, डिप्टी कमिश्नर और मिनिस्टर्ज मौजूद हो जाते थे—बोडी सी ही देर में वे सब इकट्ठे हो जाते थे और यह एक नामुमकिन बात थी कि इस किस्म का मीका आए, इस किस्म की सिचुएशन सामने आए और धुम-धदली हो जाय। आखिर पापुलर गवर्नमेंट और ब्युरोक्रैसी में फर्क क्या है? ब्युरोक्रैसी यह समझती है कि हम दफतर में बैठ कर पुलिस के जरिये, हुकमत के जरिये, काबू कर सकते हैं। पापुलर गवर्नमेंट और उस के नुमायदो का यह फर्क होता है कि वे जा कर माब्ज को फेस करे और उस को काबू करें। मुझे मालूम है कि यह काफी सल्ल काम है और मैं कहूंगा कि बारहा मौफा मुझे पडा है माब्ज को फेस करने का। मुझे जीयर किया गया है, मुझे काफी कुछ कहा गया है, लेकिन गोली नहीं चली और चाहे कुछ भी हुआ हो। यह गलत बात है कि हम गोली के बगैर कंट्रोल नहीं कर सकते, कोई इन्तजाम नहीं कर सकते। जनाब, यह दिल्ली है। यहा सारी पार्टियों का अखाडा है और यहा पर रोख मर्रा जलने जलुम निकलने डिमास्ट्रेशन्ज होते हैं। यहा पर छ साल तक गोली नहीं चली, जब कि वह इससे बराब वक्त था, जब कि काफी ज्यादा डिमास्ट्रेशन होते थे। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आगे नहीं होंगे, क्योंकि यहा पर सब को अपनी अपनी ताकत प्राबुवाई करनी है। उन को फेस करने का कोई दूसरा तरीका अख्तियार करना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि उस का कोई तरीका नहीं है सिवा इस के कि हम मीके पर जा कर शान्ति के साथ फ़ाउड को फेस करे और उस को कंट्रोल करने की कोशिश करे। जब हम इस तरह फेस करते हैं, तो जो माब्ज और उन पार्टिज के लीडर होते हैं, जिन्होने स्ट्राइक कराई होनी है, उन को शरमिन्दी होती है। अगर पुलिस का एक सिपाही मारा जाता है, तो मैं उस को बेहतर समझता हूँ बनिस्वत इस के कि एक गरीब भादमी मारा जाय, क्योंकि सिपाही के मारे जाने से पार्टियों के नेताओं पर चिन्मेदारी आती है कि आधा

[बी० ब्रह्म प्रकाश]

हम लालसनेस को बर्दास्त करेंगे या पीसकूल डिमास्ट्रेशन करेंगे। ऐसा किया गया होता, तो फिर ऐसा शोर नहीं मचता और अगर मचता तो हम उन को कनडेम करते। यहां पर जिन्होंने हड़ताल और डिमास्ट्रेशन कराई, उन के बारे में यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि वे झगडा कराना चाहते थे या खराबी पैदा करना चाहते थे। इसलिए मैं भ्रम से भ्रज कराना चाहता हूँ कि मेहरबानी कर के इस नए टैकनीक को बरतने की कोशिश की जाय— इस टैकनीक को कि यहां पर गोली न चले, भ्रमल में लाने की कोशिश की जाय। मुझे पूरा यकीन है कि अगर यहां की पुलिस और मैजिस्ट्रेसी को समझाया जायगा, बतलाया जायगा, तो वह उस को अपनायगी और मैं समझता हूँ कि लोगो का को-अपरेशन भी ज्यादा मिलेगा। हालांकि बात जरा भ्रलग हो जाती है, लेकिन मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि अगर जनाब को कभी जरूरत पड़े इस बात की किसी बुरे डिमास्ट्रेशन को और बहुत सख्त खतरनाक डिमास्ट्रेशन को फेंस करना है, तो उस के लिए मेरी सर्विसिबल हाजिर हूँ—मैं उस को फेंस करने के लिए तैयार हूँ। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह से आप दिल्ली में और खास तौर पर दिल्ली शहर में इन्तजाम ज्यादा बेहतर तरीके से चला सकेगे। गोली पर अगर आप वा भरोसा रहेगा, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आप का इन्तजाम खराब होगा। और यहां की सिचुएशन दिन-ब-दिन ज्यादा खराब होगी।

बम जनाब, मैं यही भ्रज कराना चाहता था और खाली थ्योरी की बिना पर नहीं, बल्कि तजुबों की बिना पर-उस तजुबों की बिना पर, जो कि पाच साल में हासिल किया गया था, मैं ने यह भ्रज किया है।

The Minister of Health (Shri Kar-markar): Mr Speaker, I think I should intervene in this debate at this stage

because some things have been said and said in an inaccurate manner about the background of this unfortunate incident.

As the hon House is already aware, it was on the 25th that this question of the grievances of the employees of the New Delhi Municipal Committee was raised on the floor of this House and it was brought to the attention of this House that a bhokh hartal, fast had begun on account of these grievances. I had then occasion to reply to my esteemed friend who raised this point at that time that it was a fact that certain grievances were there before the New Delhi Municipal Committee, that the New Delhi Municipal Committee, with a view to consider these demands had a meeting on the 17th, but because the parties who had brought these grievances before the Committee or their representatives were not present, this question was postponed to the 22nd, that these questions were being considered and on some of the points certain decisions were being taken and at that time when the meeting was going on, outside, the hunger strike began. These were the facts that I then stated.

After that, some time, a couple of days later, I think, the secretary of the concerned Sangh, Shri Rattan Lal Valmiki came up with a deputation to me. I had a full talk with him. He explained many of the grievances. He gave me a copy of the list of the grievances that he had submitted to the New Delhi Municipal Committee. I then thought that a number of those grievances required redress and I was quite sure that the New Delhi Municipal Committee, when they considered the matter, would have to concede them. I told him likewise I kept the Home Minister apprised of this fact and I think that both the New Delhi Municipal Committee Chairman as also the Chief Commissioner were asked to go into the matter with sympathy.

Then, there was another motion—more than one motion—some for adjournment and some asking for information on the 31st morning, I think, because there was a sort of a token strike on the 30th morning and the same strike continued on the 31st also. It was then that I had occasion to say as also my esteemed Chief, the Prime Minister that these were matters towards which we are bound to look sympathetically. In fact, as I could have it, within an hour after I left this House, after the Lunch hour, I got into touch with the representatives, the President of the Sangh, the secretary of the Sangh and a colleague of theirs. Again, I went through the list of grievances. I indicated the points on which I said I felt very great sympathy for their demands. There were certain other points regarding, for instance, merging of dearness allowance with pay and things like that, which they agreed, would have repercussions on the other municipalities. The New Delhi Municipality has a fairly good deal of income as also, perhaps the Old Delhi municipality. There are two other municipalities which were subsidised. I explained to them that whatever we decide with regard to this will have to be decided by the Delhi Administration taking all things into consideration. They agreed with that line of reasoning.

On an earlier day, the deputation, I understand, also went to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister got his Private Secretary to go into the matter and he was kind enough to send me a précis of what they had told him. He had asked me to examine these matters with as sympathetic an attitude as possible.

Therefore, it is a tragic irony that when these people came to me on that day afternoon, it was round about 2.30. I am very sorry to tell this House that, in fact, it was my over-zeal that kept them waiting a little longer than they would have. I said, since you have come, I would like to discuss and I would indicate what I feel. They were with me almost till

3.20. What they said was, "all that we wanted was that either the Home Minister or the Health Minister should give us an assurance." They did not want any commitment by us on the spot there and then regarding any categorical demand that they had made. But, they wanted sympathetic consideration. I told them what was obvious that not only the Home Minister, but the whole Government is bound to look upon these demands with sympathy. They were content with that assurance.

They left my place telling me that they would straightaway go to the hunger strikers. They fixed a programme as to how the hunger strike was to end, what was to be done, what was to be explained in a public meeting. In that discussion, my colleague in this House, Shri Valmiki was there as also Shri Rattan Lal Valmiki and another colleague was also there. They left. They later met me in the evening and said, we reached the Parliament House when we heard of this unfortunate occurrence. They said, it makes our position now very difficult in the face of the firing to continue to do what we wanted to do, namely, to ask the hunger strikers to abandon the strike. They said, after all that has happened, we shall consider the matter. I could understand their point of view.

In the mean time, as soon as they left my place I went to my office. I had called the authorities, representatives, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and I think, the Health Inspector of the New Delhi Municipal Committee to meet me in order to have it from them how far they can go and what were the difficulties. In fact, we were going through itemwise one after another. On many of the points, they were quite amenable to a sympathetic consideration of the problem. Just then, at 4.10 on that afternoon, we received a telephone in the office that there was firing. This is the factual background of what actually happened. Any insinuation or any suggestion that this firing had anything to do with our sympathetic

[Shri Karmarkar]

consideration or otherwise of the demands that were put before us, is absolutely without foundation

I am very sorry to tell this House that it is purely in a sense as tragic irony that if the representatives had gone ahead one hour earlier and made them break the fast, may be, there may have been no occasion at all for anything that has happened later. Leaders of both sides, leaders of the particular point of view, representatives of those who had put forward the grievances, were absent from the scene as also the officials—because the principal one of them, the Chairman happens to be also the Deputy Commissioner—were absent from the scene. They could not go to the scene. All of them happened by tragic irony to be busy. We had almost succeeded in ending the immediate trouble, namely the hunger strike and the calling off of the strike

I should like also to add one small thing by way of supplement as to what happened after that. Immediately this matter came up before the House day before yesterday, after the Home Minister said what he said that day morning, representatives on behalf of the Sweepers' organisation and I again met. I had a meeting with them this morning also. I had an informal chat the day before yesterday.

I think it is my duty to share with this House one information which these representatives gave us. Shri Balmiki was there, the other Shri Rattan Lal Valmiki, the secretary was there, Shri Radha Raman was there, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani was there, there were a number of representatives, Shri Shankara was there, this morning. We again frankly discussed. As I said before, there are certain matters, what one may call, by way of relief. There is no difficulty about that. There are certain matters about pay and dearness allowance and things like that, which cannot be isolated for consideration. And they were

reasonable in their attitude and in their understanding of the position.

In the course of the discussion, they shared with me the contents of a printed pamphlet, about four pages long, published by some people who had been utterly dissatisfied with the fact of the strike having been called off, and that contains, if I may say so, an incitement to those who have gone off from the strike to again continue that strike on the 9th instant or thereabouts saying 'Your so-called representatives have played false to you, they have given you false assurance on the strength of false assurances given by the Minister. Therefore, it is your duty to go back upon what you have done and again rejoin the strike when there will be another strike'. I am mentioning this fact because all the relevant facts should be placed before the House.

I do not want to dwell on the question under consideration regarding the firing, but I thought giving this factual background might be useful in some way in appreciating the situation that arose.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central) I just want to touch upon certain problems of a far more serious nature that arise from this incident and this motion. I do not want to go into the details of the incidents or into the other demands that followed from the motion and the speeches that have been made.

The problem which I am posing is very simple. Why does this thing happen again and again, as it has been asked by several other Members? Some explanation also has been given. But what I want to submit before you is this, that the explanations do not follow a correct angle of vision on such matters, and, therefore, there is no solution so far, and there will be no solution in the future.

I quite accept the fact that Government wish to avoid firing. I quite accept the fact that Government wish

to consider the demands of the workers sympathetically. But then how is it that it comes to strikes and it comes to firing? Why is it that it happens? Now, I am very thankful to the speeches made, especially by Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani and the Minister here, because they can illustrate the way to the solution.

Here, we have an incident of firing. What are the preceding stages as related by our friends here? There were grievances pending for a number of months. The first question that should be asked is, when in an essential service like the municipality, its workers raise a problem, and when they know that if the problems are not resolved, it may lead to a strike why in such an essential service, steps are not quickly taken in a city like Delhi where the Central Government have power to resolve these questions sympathetically, and why this sympathy flows from the ministerial ranks only when a strike notice is served? That is my question. Why should sympathy not be generated, when the demands are formulated rather than that the sympathy should ooze out in the terms of a settlement or something else after a strike notice is served?

And even here, as some people were saying people were fishing in troubled waters. If that were so, the demands, when they were served, should have immediately led to a strike, and the strike immediately to trouble. But there is no such thing. As the police report, and as our friends were saying, the demands were served, were being argued for months but there were squabbles in the municipality, and they could not be resolved. If the squabbles in the municipality lead to pollution of water and the Ministry does not act, then there are diseases in the town, if squabbles in the municipality lead to strikes and garbage on the streets and the threat of epidemics, and the Ministry does not act, then, what are we to do? What are the workers to do, if not strike? They serve their demand notice, and then they go on strike. Even after strike, is there

fishing in troubled waters? The police report also mentions, and our friends also acknowledge that it was followed by hunger-strike. Is that trouble? Serving a notice of demands is trouble; asking for more pay is trouble, hunger-strike is trouble, satyagraha is trouble; demonstration is trouble, strike is the highest trouble, and till then, they do not do anything except saying 'We are looking into it, and sympathy will come gradually'.

This is the way which leads to all this situation. The very approach of the ruling party, the very approach of the Ministry is of a kind which is bound to lead to such crisis. What is the approach? The approach is to shout at the workers 'Oh! Demands? These fellows will always demand'. Their principle or their duty is to rule, and keep law and order, and finance to be properly managed, and when it comes to workers' demands to say 'Demands? We will see'. And when the demands lead to trouble, then it is treated as "trouble". To look at strikes and demands as trouble is the root of the whole trouble of firing, because you look on the working classes not as a class which is entitled to ask for certain amenities, for a higher standard of living. All that is written in the Plan, the Plan will do it but if the working classes begin to formulate their demands and go on strike hunger-strike or demonstration it is trouble, and trouble must be suppressed by force, and as for force, they begin to ask seriously "how much? Was it little or more or minimum, and under what rules was it used?" I do not accept that kind of dealing with "trouble" and arguing about firing.

The question is this. These things are happening because our friends on the Treasury Benches have not got the correct approach to the present situation as it is in India. I do not want to go into the other sentiments mentioned here, that Mahatmaji was praying at the Bhangi Colony, and that it was tragic that shooting should take place in that very colony. It is for the Congress Party to decide

[Shri S. A. Dange]

whether that is the fittest way of raising a memorial to Mahatma Gandhi. We are not to judge about it. Why should we? If they think this is the fittest memorial, they have raised it, and we do not know what will be the outcome of it. I am not going to discuss that. I am not going to go into sentiments.

I want only to discuss this question—how can you prevent these things? My solution or my proposal would be that this can be prevented if the whole outlook is changed, that is, not to deal with the working class's demands as demands of a hostile class, antagonistic to Government, antagonistic to society, and antagonistic to everything that should be decent in society. This very approach of calling the workers' action as anti-social and antagonistic leads to moving other forces into the direction of attacking them.

Here is this incident which has a wonderful lesson for us. Our Prime Minister makes a statement that he does not want to wield the big club, and he does not want the big club from the workers' side also. A good sentiment, I agree with it. But the trouble is that while he has those sentiments, the club is not in his hands. The club is in somebody else's hands. He expresses a sentiment, but the very opposite of it takes place, because between the sentiment and the club, there is no link or no proper effective authority.

I will illustrate that from another example. The very picture painted by the Minister is a horrifying picture. He is calling the workers to negotiate. He is very pleased to sit with the workers and come to a settlement. At the very time when the negotiations were being carried on what was happening at the other end?

An Hon. Member: Others were busy.

Shri S. A. Dange: The police reports say that carts were being pushed

under police protection. If the Minister was in a mood to consider things with sympathy, if the whole Ministry had taken possession of the matter, why was not black-legging stopped? Why were carts being forcibly pushed on? Do they not know from experience of strikes, that when you try to put in black-legs and when you try to take in work like that, there is bound to be a certain disturbance and a certain clash. It was known; it is on record, it is the experience of strike struggles. If the Ministry was dealing sympathetically with this question, why did they not order the police force to stop clearing the garbage by force? One day would not have mattered much. It was there for two days or three days, and after all, in the city of Delhi, epidemics have become such an ordinary affair nowadays. Why should one cart being pushed by force be a fundamental principle with a Ministry, when demands were being satisfied, or were being argued, and when the Minister himself was negotiating? That means that between the Ministry's sympathy—if they are good sympathies—and the action of the police, there is no link that means there is some force there in the police ranks or in the ministerial ranks to destroy policy, which in sentiments appears to be good, but which becomes the opposite in action. This is the conclusion from the narrative that is given here.

For here are good sentiments. I was very glad to hear our Prime Minister saying, 'I have taken personal interest in the matter'. It seems that somebody there disliked it that he was taking personal interest. Somebody disliked that he does not like the policy of the club. Therefore, an atmosphere had to be created that his policy is wrong. Am I to read the truth like that? Am I to read that the Home Minister is blind to this line and that his line and that of the Prime Minister are different? They are not, because we do not have any such indication.

On the one side, there is sympathy. But when does sympathy come? Sympathy comes when a strike notice is served, and sympathy is served after at least one firing takes place; otherwise nothing. These are the two pillars on which working class policy of the Government stands. Sympathy in words, no demands to be conceded. It must be argued when strike notice is given, and when strike notice is given, a counter-threat is given, and when strike takes place, fire and shoot. Then consider the demands, give a little and say "we are conceding, but these people are rather antagonistic or rather hostile and obstinate so we cannot do anything else."

If this is the approach, then, Sir, there can be no solution. Always there will be demands, always there will be strikes, always sympathetic consideration, always firing, and we will always have, most probably adjournment motions, some to be allowed and some to be disallowed. Is this way the Parliament is going to function? This is not the correct way.

Therefore, I would request Government to change its approach to the questions posed by the working class. If that is done, you will find a real solution, easy solution and you will find co-operation from all sides.

Somebody asked as to what we would do if we were in their position. Well, that we can only answer when we are in their position, not now. And wherever we are in that position, we are showing what we can do. As somebody said, yes, we are showing and we will continue to show. *(Interruptions)*

The Minister of Mines and Oil (Shri K. D. Malaviya) We know what you are showing.

Shri S. A. Dange: If we are in that position, if the crowds threaten, we shall face them, we shall talk to them and sometimes we shall, if necessary, be killed before we order firing like that.

Some Hon. Members What happened in Hungary?

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Look what is happening in Kerala (*Interruptions*).

Shri S. A. Dange: Some of my hon. friends do not know even a little bit of history. I am not going to deal with that problem, that is not the subject matter here, as to what happened in other countries. If they want to know something of that, we shall have a debate, on another occasion if you permit it, how strikes come, how we deal with them.

Somebody raised the question of how stores had to be protected. One petrol pump has more value than the life of two people or one man killed and a twelve-year old boy injured. If this is the equation of values, then such values ought to be destroyed. I would far better prefer to have one cart destroyed, one store destroyed and one petrol pump destroyed than a man being destroyed by firing. If this is your standard, then I reject that standard.

Talking of protecting stores, when my Minister was settling things, it was simply a question of ordering the NDMC or the police to stop black-legs and not to give police guards for removing carts, and telling them we are settling things. If that were done, things would have been settled.

The sequence of events shows that there is a consistent line on behalf of either the whole Congress Party, the whole Cabinet or some members of the Cabinet who are in charge of their own departments, that things which lead to a peaceful settlement must not be allowed to be peacefully settled and there must be an enforcement, a show of force and a show of the dignity of the Government. If such is the division in their ranks, I do not know, I have no solution for that. That is their affair. As far myself I would only simply put down one or two rules for discussion and for their sympathetic consideration.

I do not want to put down rules as to when firing should be resorted to. No I do not want to argue on how much minimum force should be used.

[Shri S A Dange]

No I do not want to argue that I only want to argue from the very foundations When the demands come, please quickly consider them If a strike notice comes, do not consider it as a hostile act meant to overthrow the Government If it takes place, on both sides let there be a guarantee that it shall be peaceful, and when the majority of workers strike, do not try to break it by a handful of blacklegs, because that is the real source of trouble After that, argue, talk to them and you will see that the people are with you But if you do not talk to them in that language, if you talk only in the language of bullets, then the people certainly will carry on defending their own rights, despite your sympathies, because sympathies must be translated into concrete action Mere statements are no good

Therefore, finally I appeal to you to change the outlook Do not consider the workers as hostile, do not consider their demands as something of an attack on you, and order the police that this State must rest on argument and conviction and not on bayonets If that kind of mentality is not given to the Police no amount of expression of sympathy and even an attempt at settlement will lead to correct results On the one side you will settle, on another side, they will start firing Therefore, the Police force also needs correction and sometimes dismissals and heavy attacks on their practices Mere transfers, warning or suspensions are no good Here is a question of human life and suspension and transfers are not any real solution to the suffering inflicted on human life So, I would say, please consider these suggestions of ours and if you try to adopt some of them, I am sure we can avoid these incidents

Raja Mehendra Pratap (Mathura)
Can I say a word, Sir?

Mr Speaker: What time will the hon Home Minister take?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): I will take about half an hour or 40 minutes
17.46 hrs.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I have a word to say about peace, Sir Only the other day when there was a question of going to Pakistan to change the ideas of the Pakistani people, our hon Prime Minister told me that he would give me every facility to go there and change the ideas of the Pakistani people But I find that it is urgently needed that we should change the ideas of the people here in this House I beg to say that it is an unfortunate fact that we people are led by certain ideas which make us fight I think, the very first thing to do is that our ideas are changed We should go above party ideas, we should go above petty factions, we should try for humanity's sake to see real justice is established

I must say with all great respect to our Mahatma Gandhi, our late leader, that this hunger-strike comes from him So, we have to finish the age of Mahatma Gandhi and start an age of world federation and of universal unity I beg to say that one great cause underlying this trouble was the hunger-strike taught by our great Mahatma Gandhi and the shooting which occurred is a legacy of the British Empire The British Empire, during the 160 years, developed the Government and engaged the people Whom did they engage? They picked up brothers of mine for their own sake They were wise enough to select from us such people who would sell the people for a few pieces of shining gold and serve the foreigners in their own interests and not in the interests of our country This Government has gone on like that for over a hundred years

Our hon Home Minister happened to say the other day that we have to rely on that man who has the experience of 25 years But, Sir, this Congress Government is only 10 years old His 15 years experience was under the British Government The British selected that man because the

British found that he would be more loyal to London than to India. If such persons are going to investigate things, this is only a show I proposed the other day that let us form a Committee from the House and we may go and see and we will bring a report to the hon Speaker Then the hon Speaker was free to reject or accept it That was not done

I say again that our ideas have to be changed I think we can establish a moral laboratory or thought laboratory and it can find out what ideas make us fight—party ideas or social ideas or religious ideas A Hindu says Muslims are very bad It is not good The Muslims also say that they can only give a ticket to heaven and that the *kafirs* should be burnt Then there will be fighting

Similarly, if the Congress says that it alone can manage the country and if the Communists say that they will make the best Government, there will not be peace They only lead us to fight outside and inside Let us stop these quarrels

My simple suggestion is this The whole Government should be overhauled There should be a coalition Government I think I can give Shri Dange a portfolio Shri Kripalani who speaks so well can also be a Minister Where is the harm? I say that these people are not fools In the interest of the country, we should all join hands Let there be no such idea that we have a majority and we have the money and we have got the police to obey us All these ideas should go We are all human beings and we have been elected by the people of this country We have not come here to fight and quarrel We have come here to bring peace to the country and to the world But, how can we bring peace to the country and to the world when we have no peace in this House?

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: The hon Member has exceeded his time He may now resume his seat. The Home Minister.

श्री वात्सनीकी । बुल-दशहर मे रक्षित ।
अनुसूचित जातियो के कल्याण महोदय, मुझे

थोड़ा सा पांच मिनट का समय दिया जाय ।

Mr. Speaker: I have heard enough about this matter I have called upon the hon Home Minister

Pandit G. B. Pant: Sir, I listened to the speeches that had been delivered, especially by the hon Members sitting in the Opposition Benches with undivided attention The subject of discussion, in my view, is a pretty solemn one The sanctity of human life must be recognised by everyone. We are not only interested in the safety of the citizens of this country but also in raising their status, their stature and their standards in every possible way So, while I appreciate some of the sentiments that were expressed by the hon Members, the atmosphere and the spirit do not seem to me quite in accord with what they say There was so much of laughter, shouting and chuckling that I felt as though we were unconscious, whatever we might have been saying, whatever words we might have been using, so far as our hearts and our spirit were concerned, we did not quite realise what we were talking about

Shri Tagamani: That is an insinuation

Pandit G. B. Pant: Consequently, high sentiments expressed in clear terms do not impress much when one notices that, perhaps, all that is said is not what we felt, and that political considerations often out-weigh our judgment and cloud our vision

When there was so much talk about a single individual being entitled to every possible respect and, also, that everyone will render homage, undergo any sacrifice so that no man should suffer any injury, my mind happened to go to Telangana I felt that there could be such a realisation of the dignity of man, the efficacy of non-violence, and of the sacred duty that one owes to a fellow citizen Well, there have been reports, but if I were to refer to them, if I were to give details about these matters, perhaps,

[Pandit G B Pant]

the whole of my time would be taken up by such references.

Shri Tangamani: You are dilating the whole issue

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have referred to a series of incidents, but by one name—Telangana—only That covers hundreds and thousands of tragic chapters So, when we talk glibly about the lack of respect for human life in others let us not forget what has already been done

Shri Punnoose (Ambalapuzha): Sir, I rise on a point of order How can Telangana come in when we are discussing about Delhi? (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: I do not find any point of order in this Hon Members on this side referred to the general way and the manner in which the Government is carrying on the administration, and said that under no circumstances force ought to be used, because life is more sacred to an individual than other liberties that he enjoys The hon Minister only tries to justify it by the situation and atmosphere that has developed and reference has been made to what has been happening in all these ten years Therefore, he has to refer to what has been happening in a general way He does not refer to any particular Minister or any hon Member in a particular State (*Interruption*) Order order The public have not been co-operating and they have been taking the law into their own hands What they have done here or there has led to the continuation of the policy in some matters, that is all There is no point of order

Shri S. A. Dange: Am I to understand that you want Telangana to be repeated? We do not want Telangana here What is the relevance? If you let loose the Army against the peasants in Telangana what will you get? I am prepared for an enquiry

into what has happened in Telangana in 1948-49.

Mr. Speaker: Telanganas are somehow in the hiding and are coming up, that is all what he says I have decided the point of order and I am satisfied about the relevancy. He might say that Telangana has gone but other Telanganas are coming. Hon Members need not lose their patience

Shri Anthony Pillai (Madras North): Does he want to organise "counter-Telanganas"?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order I allowed hon Members to speak on the subject Let them now wait and hear the hon Minister

Shri Tangamani: He is referring to a particular State

16 hrs.

Shri Tangamani: He is referring to individual characteristics

Pandit G. B. Pant: I had not thought that one innocent word used by me would be so effective, that a little information will go so deep

Shri Jadhav (Malegaon) It would be better if the hon Home Minister spoke rather loudly It is difficult to make out anything now

Mr. Speaker: Is it not that much noise has subdued his voice?

An Hon. Member: The loudspeaker is there

Mr. Speaker: The hon Member will hear with patience

Pandit G. B. Pant: One of the Members who I think belongs to the Socialist Party also reminded us of the firings that had taken place in Travancore-Cochin

Shri Nath Pai: How do two lies make one truth?

Pandit G. B. Pant: When the Socialist Party was in power, I am sorry

that such tragic events have happened there, and I am distressed that any such occurrence should have happened now. But I will remind him and some of his colleagues of what his leader said. He said:

"The warped outlook of communism condemns outright police firings however justified by non-communist government, while it extols all firing and killing done consciously by itself. This is placing the sub-human view under the pretext of class conflict".

An Hon. Member: Who said that?

Pandit G. B. Pant: Dr. Lohia. Well, I have no quarrel with the friends opposite. I want to learn lessons from every hon. Member, and I have tried to benefit by their speeches. But one of the requests that I would like to make to them, when they talk of democracy, is that democracy requires an unbounded fund of patience, the capacity to listen to opinions which may not be palatable and not to be upset when one is reminded about one's past errors and blunders. If we have to live in a democratic system, then we must realise that there are certain fundamentals on which the fabric of popular rule is built,—

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Including firing.

Pandit G. B. Pant:—and on which it rests, and one of them is the allegiance to the creed of non-violence and the acceptance of peaceful methods unconditionally, under any circumstances whatsoever, discarding all methods of direct action, no threats of any sort whatsoever; if possible, settlement of disputes by negotiation failing that by adjudication, but not big clubs or big lathis. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Or rifles.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am sorry I cannot judge all words when they are spoken by ten men simultaneously,

especially when the voices are not in symphony. So, what I have to say is this. We have to look at this question from two aspects. One is the general attitude of Government towards these matters. I must speak in an unreserved and candid way that the Government does not want firing in any single instance anywhere in the country and nothing causes more anguish to Government than any news to the effect that the police have had to resort to firing in any case. I do not know if that is exactly the reaction of the hon. Members opposite. It gives them an opportunity for condemning Government; it gives them an opportunity for exploiting the sentiments of the unwary, of going to those who can be easily misguided and who are unable to appreciate the difficulties under which sometimes those who had to maintain peace and order had to labour. It must be admitted by all that we do not want chaos in this country.

An Hon. Member: That is not questioned.

Pandit G. B. Pant: If that is not questioned, I think such a betrayal is not necessary. (*Interruptions*). But if chaos is really going to come, we have to see to it that the chaos does not take place.

We have been listening to strike. Are all strikes really of an economic character? How are things handled and how, whenever there is any possibility of any trouble being created at any place, certain classes and certain political parties feel somewhat happy over the prospect of getting a profitable pastime for themselves? Well, if that is so, then I wish to know frankly who suffers more from these firings, whether we or they who are sitting on the other side. I think there has been some laughter and such laughter would not have been possible if the hon. Members opposite had really thought that the firing is a way that leads to disaster. In a country like ours, which is judged by the tenets and principles of Gandhiji,

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

that there should be occasion for firing is a matter of regret. I am prepared to accept any adjective for it. But let us realise that we can avoid the use of force only if we work as disciplined citizens, if you do not have recourse to subversive methods, if all of us are wedded to

Shri Anthony Pillai: On a point of order. I want to know whether an insinuation is being made that the present strike which led to the firing was led by some political parties antagonistic to the Government. Otherwise

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order, unless the hon. Member thinks that he has been thought of in this connection. What is all this? What is the point of order? It is open to anybody to say that this is all communal; this is all political. That is his view. There is no point of order in this.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I was also told that we do not attend to the grievances of our own workers till they serve notices of strikes. Notices of strikes from public servants are, I think, almost a modern invention in our country. Otherwise, there was hardly any such occasion and public servants considered it to be their duty to carry out the work allotted to them without resorting to direct action in any shape or form. But, there are forces which work from long distances and which can influence the attitude and activity of public servants who have to labour in the distant corners of our country.

I am reminded of the I.N.T.U.C. that, I think, is an institution looking after the interests of labour, working for it. Any sort of insinuation that those who are sitting on this side are callous and do not at all care for interests of workmen is, I think, belied by the record of the I.N.T.U.C. The difference between the I.N.T.U.C. and others is this. While the I.N.T.U.C. labours hard day in and day out for the maintenance of peace and goodwill among workmen and many

others, there is an attempt on the other side not to promote such a spirit of harmony and goodwill, but to see whether and where any occasion arises when they could fish and fish in one way or other or in many ways at one and the same time.

So, to say that no regard is paid to the grievances of public servants or of labour is not correct. May I know what was the wage of workmen in this country ten years ago? What was the approach of the Government towards labour problems? How do our labour laws compare today with those in Japan, Germany or other modern countries? If they show a genuine regard and solicitude for the welfare of the workmen, then, I do not know, who can claim credit therefor? We do not ourselves, because we have only done our duty. We will continue to do our duty regardless of the comments or abuses showered on us.

So far as this general question of firing goes, I have been giving thought to it since I came here. I have appointed committees I have discussed it with friends. I have also consulted the Chief Ministers of all States and I found that some of their views were confirmed even by the Chief Minister of Kerala. If the report that I saw some days ago in a paper is correct, when he was asked, should firing by the police be abolished, he said, then, the police will have to be abolished. I do not know if the report was correct.

We have to realise, after all, the State has to have some sanction behind it so that the anti-social elements—I do not refer to any political party here—so that anti-social elements may be kept under check and may be prevented from doing irreparable mischief and damage to society and social institutions. That is essential. Without that, no ordered Government can be carried on. Then, we must recognise that in our country, we, several among us, have not yet

developed that democratic discipline, that democratic conscience, that sense of civic responsibility which not only enables, but almost compels a citizen to go to the aid of constituted authority. Our mental attitude even today is mostly like this that whatever Government does is suspected and that the motives of Government may not be quite pure, so long as we cherish some views, and we look at things in this manner. We cannot compare the conditions in our country with conditions in other countries

What happens in other countries? You have heard of the constable in London. The constable in London says a word, and no man dare defy him, and if anyone does, then the entire populace falls upon him and he is in a way ostracised. That is the attitude of the people. I assure you, let us have similar co-operation, and no occasion will arise for raising any single lathi or baton by any police; it is then that the responsibility will be ours. But if, day in and day out, you go on condemning the police and everybody who is connected with administration, then you undermine his capacity for serving the people in a dignified and decent manner.

We are told, 'What does it matter if 500 gallons of petrol are blown off?' Well, it may not matter much but if the entire mohalla is blown off because of the soil being set on fire, then I do not know how many motions of adjournment would have been brought here or whether those who have brought these motions would have been there to bring them?

So, let us look at things from a correct perspective. Let us understand them in a right manner, and let us not make statements in a glib and irresponsible way, so that we all may benefit by each other's counsel and advice.

I have advised the States that so far as is possible, policemen should have helmets when they go out, and that tear-gas should be kept in sufficient and adequate quantity every-

where, so that no occasion for fire may arise, and also that these rifles may be replaced by muskets which do not fire far, and which can do little harm. I am prepared to accept any other suggestions that may be made, and that may be reasonable, and that may help the cause of peace. After all, when anyone is killed, we lose the sympathy of a large section

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Thiruvellah): May I know why tear-gas was not used here in Delhi?

An Hon. Member: That is an exception

Pandit G. B. Pant: The place where this mishap happened did not have and the answering is there. (*Laughter*).

Laughing is no substitute for tear-gas. One has to laugh when tear-gas is there, but when it is not there, it is not necessary to laugh. Tear-gas had not been stocked there because nobody apprehended trouble. You may call it an error of judgment. We should, I think, be prepared.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Why did the police go with loaded rifles? (*Interruptions*)

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am sorry the sands of time are running fast; so, I cannot answer every question. I am prepared to stand cross-examination even outside this House

As I said, it is our desire that no such occasion may arise. We want the co-operation of hon. Members of this House and also of all political parties. Let us also remember this that these outbursts are often the result of developments of many days and if all could adopt an attitude of virtue and of patriotism towards these questions, perhaps the stage would not arise when clashes of this character would take place. So I appeal to all to look at things from a truly democratic angle and to place before them the tenets of Gandhiji, to which reference was made in the course of the debate here

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

Now about this particular case, I do not think I should say much. I have the report of the Additional District Magistrate before me. I have placed a copy on the Table. In fact, I placed it before the debate started; and copies have also perhaps been furnished to some of the Members. But I would request those who have not got the copies to take the trouble of going through the report and to see whether all that they have said is true and correct, whether the deductions drawn by them are really justified by the data and the facts of this particular case. They will find that they have rather jumped to conclusions which were not and which are not right.

I will just read out to you the last three sentences from this report. This is a full-scale report which covers about 25 pages, and there are statements of witnesses which cover another 25 pages. I think if we are interested in finding out the truth about this affair, we should not be perplexed by the length of this report. We should be prepared even to undergo greater pains and trouble for the purpose of digging out the truth. I will read out to you only a few sentences. These run thus:

“To summarise, my findings are as follows: The situation very rapidly became so intense and acute and dangerous to the lives of Sadho Singh and Tara Chand”—I may say they were two of the constables who were present there—“who had fallen into the hands of the mob which had threatened to kill them and the danger was so imminent that it was necessary to resort to firing. Had firing not been resorted to, the police force present at the spot, which, in my opinion, was inadequate to meet the situation, would have been overwhelmed by the determined mob resulting in further possible loss of life. Another consequence would have been great damage to the stores,

possibly the blowing up of the petrol pump and the vehicles. I think that the quantum of force was not in excess of the requirements of self-defence, the saving of two lives and the prevention of great damage to property inside the stores. I am convinced that excessive force was not used. The theory that the police resorted to firing inside the colony is not supported by the oral or circumstantial evidence such as the marks on the walls or the injuries”.

I do not think I should read the other paragraphs. I may, however, state that the Additional District Magistrate had, because of this debate, to hustle through the matter. He could not examine all the witnesses whom he would have liked to examine. So I will see that a judicial officer is appointed to make an inquiry into this matter. I hope hereafter we all will agree on one point at least that our regard for human life and our desire to protect every citizen in this land is in no way weaker or feebler than that of any other section which is represented in this House today.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Can we pray for the soul of the dead?

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Sir,....

Mr. Speaker: There is no right of reply.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: There is a right of reply under Rule 358.

Mr. Speaker: It is not definite. Yes, the hon. Member may speak.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I think in spite of what the hon. Home Minister said, morally the House is convinced that the firing was unjustified. All except one hon. Member—of course the hon. Home Minister excepted—whether on this side or the other, could not convince themselves that the firing was justified.

I shall make certain remarks about the points made by the hon. Member, Dr. Subbarayan.

Some Hon. Members: Leave him alone.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Except for him, no one has justified the firing or could see any justification in the firing.

The hon. Home Minister has accused us of having political considerations in bringing up this matter. He has deduced it from the fact of laughter. Yet, when there was laughter at the points he made, he had no objection to it. He was laughing himself, I am told. Therefore, from this very fact the House will know where the political consideration is and what was the consideration in referring demagogically to this laughter. He has also said in the same breath that firing gives us an opportunity to make a point against the Government. On behalf of ourselves, on behalf of the whole people of our country, may I very earnestly request him not to give us any such opportunity in the future.

The question now is, what should we do in these matters. The hon. Home Minister has said: We feel compelled to resort to firing because all government action is suspected in this country and therefore the position is not as it is in other places. He quoted the example of England where every one unquestionably accepts the words of the constable. Apart from the fact that constables in England are of a different type, he must know and he cannot be unaware of the fact that it is not always so in England. Only two or three days ago, I think, there was a news item in the papers that in a meat market, the meat sellers—the picketers—held up a lorry. It was just the same kind of thing that happened. The rifles were fired—not even the muskets which the Home Minister mentioned. Does he realise why the Government action

is suspected? Does he not realise why the very people who have been held as idols of the country for years become suspects today when they are involved? There is something wrong not in the people but in themselves. It is really an objectionable thing to parade before the world that our people are of an inferior quality or that they are indisciplined than other people in other countries. The fact is that people's movements are always suppressed and the provocation comes from the Government. I strongly deny the contention that crowds are uncontrollable without resort to firing.

Some hon. Members have referred to our Party and asked what we will do. We have done in Kerala. I would draw the Home Minister's attention to what we have done in Kerala. Hundreds of people marched to the Assembly. Only a few window panes were smashed and the crowd was controlled without firing. I want the Government to follow that way. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member need not introduce new facts which may be refuted.

Shri Dasappa: May I know if we are sitting beyond 6.30?

Mr. Speaker: I am not bound to conclude at 6.30. After the reply I will put the question. I am not authorised to conclude before 6.30.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): The procedure in the past has been that when the time is over the motion for adjournment is deemed to have been talked out.

Some Hon. Members: The rule is changed.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: He has also spoken about Telangana. We have always demanded an enquiry into Telangana and we stick to that demand. Let us see who was wrong and who was right in Telangana.

The main objection still remains. We are sought to be served with an enquiry report by an official magistrate. Every section of the House the other day expressed a wish that an impartial judicial enquiry by a high authority should be held and it is this demand that we again reiterate. There should be a judicial enquiry by a High Court Judge—not in *camera* or in secret but an open judicial enquiry—so that the public can appear and the representatives of the public can appear and cross-examine the witnesses and get at the facts. It shall be decided by an eminent judicial authority. Nothing short of that will satisfy us and certainly not an enquiry by a magistrate of any kind or by any judicial officer who is less than a High Court Judge. This is the thing we want and not replacement of rifles by muskets.

There is only one point which I want to make. The Home Minister says that danger was not apprehended and so tear gas was not taken there and so there was no tear gas there. I cannot understand it. If danger was not apprehended why were rifles and bullets taken there while tear gas was not taken. All these are lame excuses and nothing short of a judicial enquiry will be able to assess the facts. Therefore, I would ask the Home Minister to give us an assurance on this. I want to know from him whether such a judicial enquiry is going to be instituted—an open enquiry by a High Court Judge.

Pandit G. B. Pant: There will be a judicial enquiry. I think that meets the wishes of Shri Sadhan Gupta and, in the circumstances, he will withdraw his motion.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Will it be open?

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I said that there must be an open, judicial enquiry by a High Court Judge.

Mr. Speaker: He said that there will be a judicial enquiry, and he stops with that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We want to know whether it will be open and by a High Court Judge.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member, Shri Sadhan Gupta, in his reply suggested that there should be a judicial enquiry, it should be open and by a High Court Judge. The hon. Home Minister stated that there will be a judicial enquiry.

Shri S. A. Dange: Open?

Mr. Speaker: A question was put and the answering is there. (*Interruption*) Order, order. Can I force any particular Member to say something?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: On that basis we may withdraw the motion.

Mr. Speaker: The whole House has heard the question and the reply. The House will now hear the question that I am going to put.

The question is:

“That this House do now adjourn.”

The Lok Sabha divided:

Ayes: 53; Noes: 196.

Division No. 8]

AYES

[12.39 hrs.]

Assar, Shri
Bansjee, Shri Pramanathan
Barua, Shri Hem
Bharucha, Shri Nanshir
Brij Narayan "Brijbhai", Pandit J
Chakraverty, Shrimati Ranu
Chavan, Shri D. R.
Dange, Shri S. A.
Dasartha Deb, Shri
Dasgupta, Shri B.
Deb, Shri P. G.
Deo, Shri P.K.
Dige, Shri
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Golkwad, Shri B. K.
Ghosal, Shri
Ghose, Shri S.
Gopalan, Shri S. T.

Gupta, Shri Sadhan
Hynniewtsa, Shri
Iyer, Shri Baswara
Jadhav, Shri
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Kamble, Shri B. C.
Katti, Shri D. A.
Kodiyar, Shri
Krishnaswami, Dr.
Kumaraj, Shri
Kumbhar, Shri
Mahagonkar, Shri
Mahanty, Shri
Matera, Shri
Matin, Shri
Menon, Shri Narayanaikutty
More, Shri
Mullick, Shri S. T.

Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Nayar, Shri V. P.
Parulakar, Shri
Parvathi Krishnan, Shrimati
Pillai, Shri Anthony
Punnoose, Shri
Radha Raman, Shri
Rao, Shri Khushwagt
Rao, Shri T. B. Vittal
Singh, Shri L. Achaw
Soren, Shri
Sugandhi, Shri
Tangamani, Shri
Vijayee, Shri
Warior, Shri
Yainik, Shri

NOES

Achar, Shri
Alva, Shri Joachim
Ambalam, Shri Subbiah
Arumugham, Shri S. R.
Ayyappan, Shri
Banesji, Shri P. B.
Banshi Thakur, Shri
Berman, Shri
Berupal, Shri P. L.
Bisappa, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakti Durban, Shri
Bhargava, Pandit Thekur Das
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Birendra Singhji, Shri
Boroosh, Shri P. C.
Bose, Shri P. C.
Brahm Perkaash, Ch
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chandok, Shri
Chandra Shankar, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri
Chavda, Shri
Chettiar, Shri R. Ramanathan
Choudhry, Shri C. L.
Chuni Lal, Shri
Dasappa, Shri
Das, Shri K. K.
Das, Shri Ramdhanu
Das, Shri Shree Narayan
Datar, Shri
Deb, Shri N. M.

Deshmukh, Dr. P. S.
Dindod, Shri
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Dubliah, Shri
Hacharan, Shri I.
Gadkwar, Shri Pateanghree
Ganapathy, Shri
Gandhi, Shri Peroze
Gandhi, Shri M. M.
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Godson, Shri S. C.
Goundes, Shri K. P.
Govind Das, Seth
Guba, Shri A. C.
Hajarnava, Shri
Hathu, Shri
Hazareika, Shri J. N.
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Hukam Singh, Sardar
Jagivan Ram, Shri
Jain, Shri A. P.
Jangde, Shri
Jedhe, Shri
Jinachandran, Shri
Jogendra Singh, Sardar
Joshi, Shri A. C.
Jyotish, Pandit J. P.
Kale, Shrimati A.
Kalita Singh, Shri
Kanakasabai, Shri
Kanjung, Shri
Karmakar, Shri

Karni Singhji, Shri
Kaulwal, Shri
Keekar, Dr
Khadwala, Shri
Khan, Shri Osman Ali
Khan, Shri Sadath A.
Khan, Shri Shahmawaz
Khunji, Shri
Khuda Bukhsh, Shri M.
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
Krishna Chandra, Shri
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Lahari, Shri
Lal, Shri R. S.
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Mafida Ahmed, Shrimati
Majitha, Sardar
Manti, Shri N. B.
Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Malviya, Shri Motilal
Manasa, Shri
Mandal, Shri J.
Mandal, Dr. Pambupati
Maniyangadan, Shri
Masani, Shri M. R.
Mehta, Shri J. R.
Menon, Shri Krishna
Munmota, Shrimati
Mishra, Shri B. D.
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Mishra, Shri M. P.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Mitra, Shri R. D.
Mokhammad, Shri

Morarka, Shri	Ram Krishna, Shri	Singh, Shri M. N.
Nadar, Shri P. T.	Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.	Singh, Shri T. N.
Naidu, Shri Govindarajulu	Rama, Shri	Sinha, Shri Anirudh
Nanda, Shri	Ranga, Shri	Sinha, Shri B. P.
Nanjappa, Shri	Rangarao, Shri	Sinha, Shri Jhulan
Narayanasamy, Shri	Rao, Shri E. M.	Sinha, Shri K. P.
Neskar, Shri P. S.	Rao, Shri R. J.	Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Nathvam, Shri	Raut, Shri Bholu	Sinha, Shrimati Tusheshwari
Nayak, Shri Mohan	Ray, Shrimati Renuka	Sinhaen Singh, Shri
Nayar, Dr. Sushila	Reddy, Shri Bali	Sostak, Shri Nardeo
Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal	Reddy, Shri K. C.	Somani, Shri
Nehru, Shrimati Uma	Sadhu Ram, Shri	Subbarayan, Dr. P.
Oza, Shri	Sahodrabai, Shrimati	Subramanyam, Shri T.
Padara Dev, Shri	Samanta, Shri S. C.	Sumat Prasad, Shri
Pahadia, Shri	Samantsinhar, Dr.	Swaran Singh, Sardar
Palchoudhuri, Shrimati Ila	Sarbadi, Shri A. S.	Tewari, Shri Dwariknath
Pandey, Shri K. N.	Scindia, Shrimati Vijaya Raju	Thalambiah, Shri
Parmar, Shri Y. S.	Selku, Shri	Thomas, Shri A. M.
Patel, Shrimati Maniber	Shah, Shrimati Jayaben	Tiwari, Shri Babu Lal
Patal, Shri Rajeshwar	Shah, Shri Manabendra	Tiwari, Shri R. S.
Pillai, Shri Thanu	Shakuntala Devi Shrimati	Tiwary, Pandit D. N.
Prabhakar, Shri Naval	Shankaraiya, Shri	Tyagi, Shri
Pragi Lal, Ch	Sharma, Shri D. C.	Tyabji, Shri
Raghubir Sehgal, Shri	Sharma, Shri H. C.	Ulke, Shri
Raghubath Singh, Shri	Sharma, Pandit K. C.	Upadhyay, Pandit Munshwar Dutt
Rai Bahadur, Shri	Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur	Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Datt
Raju, Shri V.	Shivananjappa, Shri	Vedakumari, Kuzari M.
Raman, Shri Pettabhi	Shobha Ram, Shri	Vuhwanath Prasad, Shri
Ramananda Tirtha, Swami	Siddiah, Shri	Vyas, Shri R. C.
amaswami, Shri S. V.	Singh, Shri Babunath	Vyas, Shri Radheai
Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.	Singh, Shri D. N.	
Rameshwar Rao, Shri	Singh, Shri Kamal	

The motion was negated.

18.42 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: It is too late to take up any other business. The House will now stand adjourned and will meet again at 11-0 a.m. on Monday.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 5th August, 1957.