

करोड़ टन अनाज आयात करने का निर्णय किया है ;

(ख) क्या सरकार को गत वर्ष की तुलना में इस वर्ष अनाज के लिए दुगुनी कीमत देनी पड़ेगी, और

(ग) क्या विदेशों में गेहूँ के मूल्य में भारी वृद्धि हुई है ।

कृषि मन्त्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री अण्णासाहेब पी० शिन्डे) : (क) से (ग). बाहरी देशों से 20 लाख मी० टन गेहूँ/माइलो खरीदने का निर्णय किया गया है । यह खरीदारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार में चल रहे मूल्यों पर की जा रही है जोकि पिछले वर्षों की अपेक्षा बहुत अधिक चल रहे बताए जाते हैं ।

भारत और मिश्र में चावल और कपास का औसत उत्पादन

4726. डा० लक्ष्मी नारायण पांडेय : क्या कृषि मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि भारत और मिश्र में चावल और कपास का प्रति हेक्टेयर औसतन उत्पादन कितना होता है?

कृषि मन्त्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री अण्णासाहेब पी० शिन्डे) : भारत और मिश्र में चावल (छिलके सहित) और कपास (लिंग्ट) के प्रति हेक्टेयर औसत उत्पादन के आकड़े नीचे दिये गये हैं —

(किबटलो)

देश	वर्ष	प्रति हेक्टेर	उत्पादन
		चावल ।	धान कपास
भारत	1971-72	11 5	1 5
		(चावल)	
		17.2	
		(धान)	
मिश्र	1971	54.4	7.8
		(धान)	

क.—भारत में धान तथा चबल के मध्य परिवर्तन का अनुपात 3:2 माना जाता है ।

Study of the use of Agricultural machinery and its incidence on employment in Agricultural operations

4727 SHRI D D DESAI: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have carried out any studies or considered studies carried out by other organisations about the relation between the use of agricultural machinery on our farms and the increase or decrease of the incidence of employment in agricultural operations; and

(b) if so, the conclusions of these studies?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHAB P SHINDE): (a) and (b) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha

12 00 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

FIRING BY THE CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE IN THE PREMISES OF N.G.O'S OFFICE AT CUDDAPAH, ANDHRA PRADESH

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Eluru). Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

"Reported firing on the 19th March, 1973 by the Central Reserve Police in the premises of N.G.O.'s office at Cuddapah, Andhra Pradesh."

Sir, we have not received any statement from the government. Usually they supply the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Suryanarayana may I know from you one fact, whether this matter is sub judice or not.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: We want the facts only, what is going on there. We want only this information as to what action the government is taking there.

MR. SPEAKER: I was told the very evening after I had admitted it that the matter is under judicial enquiry. So, we have to be very careful in our observations. I did not know when I admitted it. I came to know of it later on, when it was already in the agenda. You can have only information and not go into its merits and demerits.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : If the matter is not before a court of law, how can the word 'sub judice' be used?

MR. SPEAKER: This is a very wide term.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): On certain past occasions a certain matter which was sought to be raised by the hon. Members was not permitted on the ground that a judicial enquiry was going on. I do not know actually what is your ruling in the matter.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. C. PANT): Sir, it is a fact that a judicial enquiry has been ordered and a serving judge of the High Court is going to hold the enquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we should not take it up when a judicial enquiry is already there. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): Sir, when a judicial enquiry has been ordered, does it automatically preclude any discussion on the subject? They have only ordered an enquiry. It is only in a court of law where judgement is prejudiced as a result of this discussion. It has not even commenced inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: Who is the inquiring officer, a Magistrate?

SHRI K. C. PANT: He is Justice K. Madhava Reddy, a serving Judge of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh.

MR. SPEAKER: When this matter is already before a judge, we cannot go into it.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: It has not commenced its inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a number of precedents, a number of decisions of the Presiding Officers' conference and other laws on it. There is a rule also; of course, hon. members know about it.

SHRI K. C. PANT: If you will permit me, I would just like to give the terms of reference of the inquiry so that they are satisfied that the truth will come out and whatever action necessary will be taken. The judicial inquiry will cover the following ...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I will object to the reading of that statement.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Then I am not reading it. I withdraw the offer.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: First, please dispose of the particular point before you. Here as well as in the House of Commons there are enough precedents to indicate that even when a matter is pending judicial inquiry, within certain limitations on the part of the Treasury Benches and the members of the Opposition, the matter can be discussed and debated keeping in view that the matter is pending inquiry. It cannot be ruled out.

SHRI K. C. PANT: In view of the objection, I withdraw the offer to read out the terms of reference.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, if he gives information about it, that it is being entrusted to a Judge and these are the terms of reference, there is nothing wrong. If we go into the facts and then express opinions about them, that will not be proper. I am sorry when he came to me, he did not

tell me about this. In the evening, I came to learn about this.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: It has come in the press.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Minister should be allowed to give the information in reply to the call attention, concerning on what date, which judge and what reference or procedure etc.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: On a point of order. Rule 352(i) says:

"A member while speaking shall not refer to any matter of fact on which a judicial decision is pending".

A judicial inquiry does not ultimately end in a judicial decision. We are mixing up the two things together.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: A judicial enquiry is a fact-finding affair. A judicial decision is given by a court of law. You are a lawyer and certainly know better than I that this House is not debarred from discussing this matter at length because it is not a matter before a court of law and no decision by a court is pending.

MR. SPEAKER: He can give information about the matter, the reference to inquiry and other facts, but not go farther than that.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: I want to give my comments on the information. We will give our information also. It will be helpful to the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a very delicate matter. Your rules are also there. The Speaker shall decide whether a question or part thereof is or is not admissible under the rules and may disallow any question or part thereof....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You have allowed it.

MR. SPEAKER: When in his opinion, it is an abuse of the right of questioning or is calculated to obstruct or prejudicially affect the procedure of the House or is in contravention of the rules. There is a delicate line. Even in the few observations that you may make, no one knows what may be the implications thereof. All of you are quite competent and I would request you to follow the procedure laid down in rules.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have made a clear submission because it affects vital rights of the members..

MR. SPEAKER: That is my definite ruling.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Rule 352 (a) (i) clearly lays down:

"A member while speaking shall not refer to any matter of fact on which a judicial decision is pending"

This is not a matter where a judicial decision is pending.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Cooch-Bihar): It is a judicial inquiry. Under the Commissions of Inquiry Act it is a court.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I want to quote a definite precedent in the House. You can check it from the record.

MR. SPEAKER: We have observed it in the past. There is a definite rule on it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Even after going through the rules you have said in this very House on the occasion of the debate on Nagarwala episode "I am permitting this matter. But the members who participate in the discussion should bear in mind the limitation." There are ten precedents which have been followed here. The same thing applies here also and the call attention should be permitted.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Madras South): The Government itself has accepted the call attention. I want to read that *the Hindu* of Madras writes It says that the Government has agreed to the motion in the hope that it will put the records straight.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a question of going into the interpretation. The rules are very clear. I have already quoted to you Rule 41(2) (xxii) which says:

"It shall not ordinarily ask about matters pending before any statutory tribunal or statutory authority performing any judicial or quasi-judicial functions or any commission or court of enquiry appointed to enquire into, or investigate, any matter but may refer to matters concerned with procedure or subject or stage of enquiry."

That is all. (Interruptions).

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): Once you have admitted the call attention, to raise objections at this stage is something extraordinary.

MR. SPEAKER: I had no information. I read it in the evening.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why did not the Government point it out to you?

MR. SPEAKER: My request to you is that while seeking information about the procedure or subject or stage of enquiry, please be careful that you do not make comments which may prejudice the inquiry.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: This is a matter of principle. It affects the rights of the members.

MR. SPEAKER: The member has no unlimited right.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The Government wants to hide the facts. They want to take shelter under this pretext.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I do not know what is your view on the submission made by some hon. Members here, that a discussion on this may be helpful for the inquiry itself. If that is your view also, that it may be helpful, then, I would humbly submit that it should not come in the form of a call attention notice. If it is a general discussion, all the points of view can be put forth.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karimnagar): It is not for the CPI leaders to say whether it is in your discretion or not. He is dictating to the Chair. Once you have allowed the call attention, it is not proper.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is very clear. I shall read 41(2) (xxii) again.

"It shall not ordinarily ask about matters pending before any statutory tribunal or statutory authority performing any judicial or quasi-judicial functions or any commission or court of enquiry appointed to enquire into, or investigate, any matter but may refer to subject or stage of enquiry."

Even in these three cases,

"...if it is, not likely to prejudice consideration of the matter by the tribunal or commission or court of enquiry."

So, the rule is very clear. You can ask about procedure.

SHRI R. S. PANDEY (Rajnandgaon): My submission is very simple

Now, the call attention was admitted. Now you will ask the Home Minister to make a statement. If you take the statement as made on the floor of the House, naturally, all the members, who have moved the call attention are entitled to put questions. I now wanted to seek your ruling precisely whether you are going to allow the Minister to come out with a statement or not.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The word 'ordinarily' gives you a lot of latitude and all the disorder can be avoided.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: This rule is a guidance to you while admitting the motion. But once the motion has been admitted, then it should be open for discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: So many subjects come before the House that sometimes they do not give you any information as to at what stage the matters stand. It was only in the evening while I was in the Business Advisory Committee meeting that I learnt that there is a judicial inquiry going into it. It does not mean that once I have admitted, I should ignore the relevant rule on it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to know whether the Government did not point out to you that the matter is under judicial inquiry. They had prior intimation. The Government is deliberately trying to stall this discussion because they sent the CRP to shoot down people in Andhra.... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I have just said that you can seek information on these two matters, (1) procedure, (2) subject and stage of inquiry but not on matters which may prejudice the enquiry. That is all.... (Interruptions).

Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, please do not do it. You should not make such irresponsible remarks.... (Interruptions). He says 'Don't allow them to take shelter under the Chair.' I am saying it is a matter *sub judice*. The member is taking too much liberty. (Interruptions).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Once you have admitted the call attention, it becomes a property of the House.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I have quoted your ruling at the time of Nagarwala episode. You have given a ruling and you can check the record.

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I have said even at that time that within these limits you can ask your questions.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. C. PANT): Let me at the outset point out to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu that he is labouring under an misapprehension if he think that for calling attention motions, Government's agreement is required. It is in respect of Short Notice Questions. Therefore, he is completely wrong. This he must bear in mind.

The Government are distressed over the incident that occurred at Cuddapah on the 19th March, 1973, in which four persons lost their lives as a result of police firing and some others were injured. I would like to convey to the injured persons and the families of the deceased, my deepest sympathies. Judicial enquiry by a serving Judge of the High Court, has been ordered to go into the entire incident. If you permit me, Sir, I may add that the judicial enquiry will cover the following:

- (1) The circumstances which led to the use of force by the Police to disperse the persons who had gathered to attend a meeting in the temporary NGO's Home at Cuddapah on the evening of the 19th March 1973,
- (2) Whether the use of force was justified,
- (3) Whether the amount of force employed by the Police was or was not in excess of the requirements of the situation.
- (4) Whether there was any lapse on the part of any other authority or person or persons,
- (5) Any other matter having relevance to the above. The enquiry is expected to be completed within a period of two months.....

The Revenue Divisional Officer of Cuddapah has been relieved of his charge. The two companies of CRP involved in the incident have been withdrawn and departmental inquiries

[Shri K. C. Pant]

are in progress. As the judicial inquiry and other departmental inquiries are being held, it would not be appropriate to add anything more at this stage. While Government are aware of the responsibilities and difficulties of the Police in dealing with situations, of violence and lawlessness, we would like to assure the House that no indiscipline, misdemeanour or excess on the part of any personnel on duty would be tolerated and stern action would be taken against whomsoever is found at fault.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: I regret very much at the version of the hon. Home Minister in regard to the atrocities that occurred on the 19th of this month at Cuddapah. My information is that nearly 18 people were missing so far and 150 people were beaten and nearly 400 chappals were lying at the place. The information which he gave is not satisfactory. (Inter-jections)

Once the full attention is allowed, the members who are very much worried about this incident and who have raised this matter should be allowed to have their say. Others have no experience of the 1921 or 1930 or the 1942 incidents when also there were police firings and there were lathi charges and I would say Sir, such a thing never happened in this country. That is what is worrying us, Sir. Now, we are being harassed by the people there because we are the people's representatives here and we have been elected by the people to this People's House. They think that we are not taking any proper interest because we are in one Party and, therefore, I cannot ask all these things. They are thinking like that. Sir, even though I am in one Party, every time I am bringing it to the notice of the Government and I am also acquainting them with what is going on there in this matter.

Just let me read one statement given by one MLA who is an eye-witness to this incident. I have got so many telegrams ...

MR. SPEAKER: Again I must remind the hon. Member of the rule which is very clear....

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: What is the use of our raising this matter if you do not allow us to ask questions? Only a Judge has been appointed. The Court has not yet begun. Where is the question of any court?

MR. SPEAKER: Without quoting the MLA, you can give the information.

SHRI M. S. SANJEEVI RAO (Kakinada): The statement given by the Minister at the recent Cuddapah Police firing resulting in the death of many more persons than the official figure, which is the estimate of the people present on the scene, has been most disappointing and disheartening. They have, not unexpectedly, concealed more than they have revealed.

The horrifying police exercises at Cuddapah were not only entirely unprovoked, but there is ample evidence to show that they were premeditated, pre-planned and master-minded by the District Collector in collusion with the so-called integrationist leaders with the sole object of terrorising and thereby demoralising the mass of the people who have been peacefully agitating for the bifurcation of the State. Otherwise, how do you explain the sudden invasion of CRP in mufti bearing all colourful marks of Holi Spirits, and most of them intoxicated, attacking with lathis and rifles without any slightest precious warning, and that too when the peaceful meeting in a private premises was about to be concluded?

Will the Minister assure us that in order to lay bare this diabolic conspiracy to terrorise the separatist agitation by butchering a few, the main culprits, the District Collector and his tool in this nefarious design, the RDO would be immediately sent out to facilitate a free and fair judicial inquiry which would otherwise be only a farce?

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps you wrote this statement before I gave my ruling. After the ruling I have given, you can just ask your questions.

SHRI M. S. SANJEEVI RAO: Will the hon. Minister also assure us that the many reports that are widely circulating that the Collector in collusion with the integrationist leader have even gone to the extent of killing Subha Reddy utilising the expected opportunity on that fateful day are not correct?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Thrice you have warned the hon. Member. You have given a clear ruling. I seek your protection. If he keeps on asking these questions, how am I expected to reply to the.... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I gave the rule. It should be concerned with the procedure or subject or the stage of enquiry. That is all.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: But you are not taking into account rule 352(i)

MR. SPEAKER: What is that rule? Yes, it says:

"A member while speaking shall not refer to any matter of fact on which a judicial decision is pending."

What is the new thing you have brought?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Where is the judicial decision here? Where is the court here?

MR. SPEAKER: 'Judicial decision' is a very wide term.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: I want to request the Government to immediately transfer the Collector who may influence the inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: The discussion has a very limited scope. Otherwise, if you go on asking all sorts of questions, I will have to stop the discussion.

SHRI M. S. SANJEEVI RAO: I want to ask the hon. Minister whether he has taken any effective steps to transfer the District Collector, the District Superintendent of Police and the RDO in order to facilitate a free and fair judicial probe so that undue influence is not brought to bear upon the witnesses?

My second question: I would also like to know whether there is any deep-rooted understanding and collaboration between the Collector and the integrationists to liquidate Mr. B. V. Subha Reddy at the same meeting

SHRI K. C. PANT: I have already said that the Revenue Divisional Officer has been relieved of his charge.

SHRI M. S. SANJEEVI RAO: He is not the Collector, he is only RDO.... (Interruptions).

SHRI K. C. PANT: I would appeal to the fair-mindedness of the members in this House that when a judicial inquiry is going on, they should not prejudice the issue.

SHRI T. BALAKRISHNIAH (Tirupathi). I want to submit that the hon. Minister has just now said that he has ordered a judicial inquiry and also a departmental inquiry. We are very thankful to him for having taken an appropriate step to find out the truth. But, in this particular case, what I would like to submit or ask him is whether any action has been taken, because a judicial inquiry is going on as also a departmental enquiry. Two types of inquiries are going on. In this particular case, as a legally trained man, you know very well, witnesses sometimes may be tampered with and the truth may not come out.

The people who are involved in the particular incident may try to manoeuvre. I am not going into the judicial matter. As far as the departmental enquiry is concerned, what I want to know is whether all the persons concerned in this particular incident,

[Shri T Balakrishniah]
including the Collector, the RDO, the Tehsildar, the SP and the Inspector of Police are being transferred so that there can be an impartial enquiry into the matter

Then, I also request the Government to find out whether this particular first-class magistrate was present at the time of the firing and whether he had ordered the firing (*Interruptions*) I only want information I am not going into the facts You know, the Hindu has given a very clear report, and every word is important in that report Again the local Telugu news papers have given more details But since you have restricted us—

MR SPEAKER I do not restrict the rules restrict

SHRI T BALAKRISHNIAH I want to know whether in these kinds of firing the officers had acted with a legal judicial mind with responsibility I request that this matter should also be gone into

SHRI K C PANT I want to clarify one point This departmental enquiry relates to the CRP only and there is no conflict between the two enquiries Instea of leaving it to the local officers of the CRP to give the version of the CRP we have asked the IG himself to go into this so that he can also apply his mind to the problem and speak on behalf of the CRP So this is the purpose of the departmental enquiry

SHRI T BALAKRISHNIAH My submission is that whenever such incidents have occurred (*Interruptions*) Mr Sarm who has been appointed as Adviser to the Governor has stated—

MR SPEAKER You are going beyond the scope of this matter

SHRI T BALAKRISHNIAH The hon Minister has said that the enquiry relates only to the CRP But what I submit to him is whether the civil authorities who are mainly responsible

for maintaining law and order, namely, the District Collector, RDO, etc have been given orders of transfer I want to know whether they were present at that time I want to know that

MR SPEAKER Please do not get up again and again

SHRI K C PANT I have already indicated the facts that the others have not been transferred namely, the persons whom he has referred to I have indicated that the departmental enquiry is related to the CRP I have indicated the purpose of the enquiry I would also like to repeat once again although I have stated it earlier, that two companies of the CRP have been withdrawn from there So there is no question of their tampering with any evidence

SHRI P NARASIMHA REDDY Chittoor) I deeply regret that this ghastly tragedy that has happened at Cuddapah has not evoked the sympathy or even a full statement of facts or even a correct version as seen by the Government In fact we expect that on such an unprecedented tragedy an incident of such tragic proportions in Cuddapah the Government should have the very next day come out with a statement of facts as to how such an unprovoked firing resulted in so many deaths It only shows the indifference the Government is exhibiting with regard to the tragedy and the forces of repression let loose on the unfortunate people of the State

Without encroaching upon the judicial part of the question and keeping within the bounds of the rule I want to say this

I should like to ask the Minister whether the tragedy, the unprovoked incident at Cuddapah which took a heavy toll of life was not an isolated one but one of a series of incidents that have occurred recently after the imposition of the President's rule and they are occurring with increasing frequency Does that not indicate that the policy of the Government

with regard to solving this question has not at all changed and that in fact it has hardened? It is due to that policy, due to such attitude that the Cuddapah incident took place, and many more incidents might take place, who knows, if the same policy is pursued, I would like to put one question. The other day the Prime Minister put a pertinent question to the world: if incidents of annihilation, attacks of annihilation such as the ones which happened in Viet Nam, had occurred elsewhere in any other part of the world in Europe, would the world have tolerated it? I put a question to this Government. If incidents such as this, if the tragic acts of repression that are now happening in Andhra happened elsewhere in the country, would the people have tolerated it? I am hoping that this House at least will not tolerate such incidents and that the Government will be forced to change its double-talk, double-thinking and double-dealing policy in regard to Andhra Pradesh and that there will be no repetition of the Cuddapah incidents.

SHRI K. C. PANT: My hon friend wanted a fuller statement of facts, I would have thought that when ordinarily such incidents take place, about which hon. friends are exercised, the main demand is that there should be a judicial enquiry, and I hope he will not take the Government to task for anticipating the wishes of hon. friends and instituting a judicial enquiry without any delay. If that is objected to, I am guilty of that, of instituting that enquiry. Once an enquiry is instituted, one cannot go into details of the case; one has to leave it to the enquiry to determine the facts and assess the guilt or otherwise of the persons concerned. Therefore I do not know what he is really objecting to. He said Cuddapah was not an isolated incident; there are other incidents also. I do not really want to get into the larger argument because this has been discussed in the House on other occasions, and there will be other

occasions to discuss it in future. I should not like to think that my hon. friend is ignorant of the lawlessness and violence that is perpetrated in Andhra Pradesh; he is certainly not ignorant of the destruction of railway property and P & T property in particular. Where there is destruction of property I do not think any Government can have a policy of remaining indifferent or that it should not try to restore order; that can never be the policy.... (Interruptions) My hon. friend generalised the statement. With the greatest respect, I was pointing out to the destruction of public property. Is that not a fact?.... (Interruptions).

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO: I submit that it is the Home Ministry which is responsible for this; it is at your instance that these things are happening. That is my charge. It is not a matter between the Member and the Home Minister now; it is a matter for the House....

MR. SPEAKER: I am not prepared to allow you any more. Please resume your seat.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I think what the hon. Member has said just now is not called for here. Let him listen to me and then come to his judgment.

MR. SPEAKER: There is another gentleman who goes on making a running commentary. I do not allow the hon. Members to interrupt him. Let him finish.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I have said so earlier, and I am repeating it now. I am making general remarks. I do not think that the House can take objection to this, because I am not referring to the incident.

He said that normalcy should be restored. I entirely agree with him. I have already told the House before, and I would like to say so again, that wherever normalcy is restored in any part of the country, the C.R.P.

[Shri K. C. Pant]

is withdrawn; the army is also withdrawn, and this has been the practice during the last so many weeks. In so many districts the army has been withdrawn. Therefore, we are doing everything possible to expedite the return of normalcy.

Now, I am glad that by large, generally, there has been an agreement in regard to the situation. I would appeal to the hon. Members not to make any statements in this House. That is the policy of the Government also. Recently the C.R.P. have been withdrawn from the area. I hope that this will result in quicker normalcy.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Dhandapani. (Interruptions).

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI (Dhara-puram): Mr. Speaker, Sir, just now, the hon. Minister stated about the destruction to railway property and the P. & T. property. It seems that he attaches more value to the Government property than human lives. We are glad that peace and normalcy are being restored. But, peace in Andhra Pradesh should not be in concentration camps or grave yard alone. In Andhra Pradesh, children were murdered; women were molested and raped. The N.G.Os., students, doctors and lawyers were shot at and mercilessly killed. This particular incident which took place in the course of meetings held in Cuddapah is being drawn as a parallel to what took place in Jallianwala Bagh.

I want to pose some questions, because you have put some restrictions on us. The hon. Minister just now defended the action of the C.R.P. in other areas. I want to know one thing from the hon. Minister. That is about a specific case about the morale of the C.R.P. men in Andhra Pradesh. It is learnt that the C.R.P. constable has been arrested and is placed under suspension on a charge of theft following a complaint lodged by Shri Challa Subbanayadu that a

suit-case containing Rs. 11,000 was lost during the incidents in Cuddapah. The police have recovered Rs. 6,000 from the C.R.P. constable and about Rs. 1,000 each from the driver and cleaner of the lorry in which the C.R.Ps. came. A sum of Rs. 3,000 lost from the NGOs, is still to be accounted for.

I want to know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that these things have happened and, if so, what action is the Government going to take on this. I want to know whether the shootings and killings resorted to on the people of Andhra Pradesh recently is the only case for which the Government had ordered an enquiry or whether the Government would order an overall enquiry into all the incidents which took place in Andhra in the recent months. Is it also true that C.R.P. men in *mufuti* disturbed public meetings arranged by separatists and beat up the public beat up the public with deadly weapons? What protection is Government going to give to the common people in future? About the attempt on the life of Shri B. V. Subha Reddy, I want to know whether Government would give protection to him and other separatist leaders in Andhra.

According to the Government's report only 4 persons have been killed—2 NGOs and 2 others who were not identified. NGOs' families were given Rs. 2,000 as compensation and other were give Rs. 1,000. Why this discrimination? I want that this amount should be increased.

Then, is it a fact that the NGOs have constituted a five-man team to look into the Cuddapah incident. It was reported that 19 persons were still missing. I want to know whether the Government would enquire into it.

SHRI K. C. PANT: On the last point, I have already given the information I have with me. According

to the information with me, 16 persons were injured and were taken to hospital for treatment

With regard to the return of normalcy and peace, I hope my hon friend would support me in seeing that normalcy and peace would return soon. I wish he had said so categorically. It would have helped to clear some doubts. Some students are still not returning to their classes. I would appeal to the students, through this House and through you Sir to return to their classes because they would be needlessly wasting a year. Particularly when talks are going on and the matter is being discussed there is little point in their wasting a year.

About the theft in Mr Chella Subbarah Reddy's car that is my information also. There has been a theft and enquiries are going on into it. As I said earlier I am holding no brief for anybody. If anybody has committed a crime or has done anything wrong, he must be punished for it and he will be punished. That is why we have instituted a judicial enquiry. There is no question of instituting an overall enquiry. Regarding the CRP men in mufti if he lets me know about any specific incident I can look into it. There cannot be a general charge.

About the compensation, I hope he does not object to our giving the NGOs a little more because Government has some responsibility towards its own employees.

SHRI C T DHANDAPANI I am saying Rs 2000 is not enough. The amount should be enhanced for the NGOs families as well as others.

SHRI K C PANT About his statement that the Government is not considerate with regard to loss of human lives, I would like to protest against that statement. I have already expressed my sympathies for those who have suffered, most sincerely. I would like to remind him

that even in Tamilnadu there have been occasions when the police have had to fire and human beings have been killed. There has been criticism of that, but such occasions do arise. While the Government must have behaved with the restraint that is expected of the police in such situations, he will appreciate that there are occasions when the police have to resort to firing. (Interruptions)

12 50 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT REPORT OF COMMISSIONER FOR THE PORT OF CALCUTTA FOR 1970-71

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Accounts (Hindi and English versions) of the Commissioners for the Port of Calcutta for the year 1970-71 and the Audit Report thereon.

[Placed in Library See No LT-4589/73]

STATEMENTS OF CBI

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (PROF D P CHATTOPADHYAYA) I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following statements (Hindi and English versions) —

- (1) Statement showing addresses of firms raided by the Central Bureau of Investigation on 17th February, 1973
- (2) Statement showing details of preliminary enquiries so far registered by the Central Bureau of Investigation
- (3) Statement showing cases registered by the Central Bureau of Investigation as a result of their investigation in connection with rags scandal

[Placed in Library See No LT-4590/73]