

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

2761

2762

LOK SABHA

Friday, 10th August, 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12.01 P.M.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

SITUATION IN AHMEDABAD

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Shri A. K. Gopalan, Shri Kamath, Shri H. N. Mukerjee and Shrimati Renu Chakravarty, saying:

"This House is of the opinion that the business of the Lok Sabha be adjourned today to consider the dislocation of the communication of railways, postal and telegraphic wires connecting the main cities of Gujarat, especially of Ahmedabad, by the demonstrators of pro-Maha Gujarat State."

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): This is not ours.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. This motion is by Shri Sivamurthi Swami. The other one has not been typed properly.

Shri Kamath: Kindly read the names of the signatories.

Mr. Speaker: The motion reads:

"The serious situation arising out of the calling out of troops since yesterday in the city of

Ahmedabad where the popular demonstrations of the people for a separate unilingual State of Maha Gujarat are being sought to be crushed by ruthless repression, resulting in the death already of twelve and injuries to many".

Where does he get this from?

Shri Kamath: On the front-page of today's paper, we have seen the news that troops have been called out. You have allowed question on such matters in the past. The House, therefore can take notice of it.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I also got a telephone message from Ahmedabad explaining these facts.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): I have not, in fact, closely read the adjournment motion, but it seems to be a protest against the decision taken by the House yesterday....

Shri Kamath: No, no.

Pandit G. B. Pant:..By 241 to 40 votes, the House accepted the proposal for setting up a bilingual State for Bombay instead of three separate units which had been proposed in the Bill.

Shri Kamath: The Minister of Defence ought to make a statement.

Pandit G. B. Pant: No armed troops, I understand, were called, except perhaps that one electric power house was guarded by about 20 men belonging to the army. But no one from the army was called to protect the people in the course of these disturbances or to take any part in connection with these disturbances at any time. The army has nothing

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

to do with it. It was perhaps alerted but not called.

**Shri Kamath:** In the papers it is said that military police have been called in. May I know whether these military police function under the jurisdiction of the Defence Ministry—not the State Government?

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** I again understand that there was no military police but armed police. But it was police as such.

**Shri Kamath:** They had said 'military police.' Is it denied or they do not know?

**Mr. Speaker:** It is only armed police and not military police. There is a difference.

**Shri Kamath:** It is not a matter for laughter.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is unfortunate that so many people should have died. But this House cannot take notice of it and allow an adjournment motion to censure the Government or for allowing the demonstrators to take the law into their own hands and protest against a decision of this House. By this demonstration can a bilingual State be converted into a unilingual State? If all protests have failed here by representatives who come from all those areas, we should not allow those people there to take the law into their own hands. If in the face of the majority view of this House, their representations have failed, we should not allow the demonstrators to take the law into their hands and expect this House to come to their rescue. I do not give my consent to this adjournment.

**Shri Kamath:** On a point of order. Is an adjournment motion always tantamount to a censure motion? That is what I would like to know.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not giving my consent to this motion.

The other matter is a different matter. He may refer to the various rulings regarding the implications of that in a general manner.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South East):** On a point of order. You have referred to the demonstrators as having taken the law into their own hands. We do not as yet know the full facts regarding what has happened there, whether they took the law into their own hands or not. Sometimes it happens that the police provoke the people by shooting. There is no laughter about it. I have seen a number of cases where the police provoked the people into desperation, and sometimes it is only a few antisocial elements...

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not giving any opinion regarding who was responsible. Anyhow, the adjournment motion itself says that a number of people went there for the purpose of demonstrating against the unilingual State and then 'they are sought to be crushed.' There can be an opinion that no firing would take place except for the matter of law and order. This is a matter entirely of law and order. It is rather unfortunate that so many people should have died. But this House or this Government is not responsible for the same, and we cannot revoke a decision that this House has taken after consideration.

**Shri Kamath:** I hope you do not hold the demonstration illegal?

**Mr. Speaker:** No, not at all.

## BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### THIRTY-NINTH REPORT

**Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda):** I beg to present the Thirty-ninth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.