

The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): (a) All existing stations are provided with platforms, either High Level, Medium Level or Rail Level

(b) Does not arise but platforms are being provided where new crossing stations are being opened for passenger booking

Old Coaches on Western Railway

441. Shri N. N. Patel: Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the coaches of First Class of Tapti line on the Western Railway running between Surat and Bhusaval are too old; and

(b) if so, when they will be replaced?

The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): (a) No

(b) Does not arise

Janata Trains

442. { Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:
Shri Onkar Lal:

Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) how much of the seating accommodation available on the air-conditioned Janata train service to Madras, Calcutta and Bombay from Delhi is filled on an average per trip,

(b) the average revenue per trip on each route and the average expenditure on each trip, and,

(c) the proportion of travel of the pass-holders if any, to the total travellers on each route?

The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT AND CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

SWEEPERS STRIKE IN DELHI AND POLICE FIRING

12 hrs

Mr. Speaker: I have received notices of adjournment motions from as many as 13 hon Members—Shri S C. Gupta, Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, Shri Nath Pai, Shri T C N. Menon, Shri N G Goray, Shri Jagdish Awasthy, Shri Achaw Singh, Shri Supakar, Shri Hem Barua, Shri B C Kamble, Shri G K. Manay, Shri Vajpayee and Shri Brajnarayan Brajesh, on the same subject:

“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.”

I received yesterday calling attention notices under rule 197 from Dr Ram Subhag Singh and Shri K L Balmiki relating to the same matter which I have admitted for today Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, Shri Radha Raman and Shri Yadav Narayan Jadhav have also given calling attention notices today. As hon Members will see, I have put down the calling attention notice in the Order Paper in the name of Dr Ram Subhag Singh and Shri K L Balmiki. But I would like to hear the hon Minister first.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore) May I point out that on occasions like this, a calling attention motion is not the proper method of discussing these things, because we will not be allowed to put any questions or have our say over this matter. That is one aspect of the matter and a very serious aspect which we should take into consideration. The hon Prime Minister made a statement yesterday and within five hours of that, this incident took place, blood was spilt and one life has been lost. The House should be given an opportunity to discuss this thing.

Mr. Speaker: Let us first of all hear the hon. Minister. Then we shall see what should be done in the matter. (*Interruptions*). Hon. Members are aware that even in the case of an adjournment motion or even when a calling attention motion has been tabled, what I generally do is to read out the adjournment motion or the calling attention motion and request the hon. Minister to say what he has to say on behalf of the Government. That is the procedure adopted. Hon. Members are aware that in addition to the adjournment motions, there is a calling attention notice. That is, the hon. Minister will make a statement as to what exactly happened both relating to the adjournment motions and also the calling attention motion. If any thing more has to be done, we will consider the matter.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Bashirhat): Are we to understand that the adjournment motions are held over till the calling attention motion is disposed of?

Mr. Speaker: Both of them are taken together.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: What we fear that you will say, "In view of the statement made by the hon. Minister, the adjournment motion is not allowed". Before that, I want to know the position.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is well aware of what I say. Even apart from the calling attention notice, I have always been saying that in cases where I am satisfied that after hearing the hon. Minister there is nothing more to be done, I have been withholding consent. Merely because there is a calling attention notice, I am not going to be carried away by it. But if I feel satisfied that the hon. Minister has said what all has to be said in this matter and it is no good having any further discussion, independently of the calling attention notice, I may withhold my consent. If I am not satisfied, I may allow it or I may allow a discussion separately. Let no hon. Member pre-

judge what will be done. I am not disposing of the adjournment motions without hearing the hon. Minister first. After the hon. Minister has made the statement, if anything has to be said by the hon. Members who have tabled adjournment motions also, then I will see what is to be done.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): Myself and Shri Radha Raman have also sought permission for a discussion under Rule 184.

Mr. Speaker: Let us wait and hear the hon. Minister.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): As we have just been reminded by one of the hon. Members opposite, this matter was referred to yesterday just about this time. The hon. Prime Minister then expressed the definite view and his attitude towards problems of this type.

The sympathy for the class to which the strikers belong cannot be a subject of any controversy. What I see is only their expression to the deep-seated sentiments and notions in this regard. It is a matter of extreme regret to me and I may say even of deep distress, that such an incident, a tragic one, should have happened within a few hours of the statement that was made in this House by the Prime Minister. Not only did the Prime Minister give expression to his feelings, but he immediately instructed the Health Minister to get in touch with the leaders of the Sangh in order to explore the possibilities of a settlement and to make every effort to reach an agreement with them. The Health Minister soon after got in touch with those people and also with the local authorities. They discussed matters and some items are agreed to. I had incidentally asked the Deputy Commissioner to look into these matters himself. He also joined the meeting called by the Health Minister.

It is an irony of fate (*Interruptions*) that when all these proceedings were going on, these developments should have taken place in ignorance of what

[Shri G B Pant]
has been done in another place I read the narrative as it has been reported in the papers that contains the account of this incident that has been issued by the District Magistrate I must state, however, that the matter is still under enquiry and I cannot make up my mind even about the facts of the case, until the full enquiry has been made, for which the Chief Commissioner has already appointed an Additional Magistrate. It is difficult for me to make a definite statement, otherwise, the enquiry would lose some of its value (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: I will allow hon Members to put questions afterwards

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have no objection to listening to hon Members, I respect their opinion But, I will be happy if I am allowed to make a short statement, I do not want to take much time

I was just saying that an officer has been appointed to make an enquiry The District Magistrate has issued a statement If the House so wishes, I can read out the statement that the District Magistrate has issued

Some Hon. Members: We have seen it in the papers

Other Hon Members: Defending the shooters

Pandit G. B. Pant. I do not know if it would not be regarded as an omission on my part if I did not read it So, I can ask for the indulgence of hon Members just for reading out what the District Magistrate has stated in his report I am not adding a word to it nor taking away anything from it and I reserve my own judgment on the matter till I have seen the report of the officer who is conducting the enquiry The statement issued by the Deputy Commissioner runs thus:

"Reports have already appeared in the Press of the hunger strike by some members of the New Delhi Municipal Committee Sanitary staff which started on July

22 On July 30, all the Sanitary staff of the New Delhi Municipal Committee went on a strike and the sanitary services in New Delhi were paralysed. A small number of substitutes were hurriedly secured and an attempt made to maintain the essential sanitary services on the next day This afternoon at 3-30 P.M. when the temporary staff recruited for the purpose was setting out from the New Delhi Municipal Committee sanitary store on Reading Road, their lorry was surrounded by 600-700 strikers who had gathered there earlier apparently with the intention of preventing the substitutes from performing their functions The police tactfully cleared the passage for one of the lorries, but, when the second lorry was on the way, it was mobbed and it became necessary to push the crowd of the strikers back with lathis

As their attempts to stop the lorries were foiled, the crowd who seemed to be excited and determined to prevent any more lorries coming out of the stores, attacked the police with brickbats and lathis A constable who was hit on his head by a lathi, dropped on the spot and several other constables sustained injuries 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 One person was killed and two injured, one of them seriously The injured persons were immediately removed to hospital

The Chief Commissioner has detailed the Additional District Magistrate to make an inquiry into the firing

At about the same time, two lorries manned by the temporary recruits which were clearing refuse in Kaka Nagar, were also attacked by about 200 strikers.

The crowd of strikers pulled out the wiring of one of the trucks. The police had to make a mild charge when some of the strikers stoned the police and the vehicle. There were several other incidents in other parts of New Delhi in which the mob prevented the operation of the sanitary services."

I may just state a few facts which preceded this incident. On the 1st of July, I understand the Secretary of the Sangh gave a notice to the Municipal Committee and enclosed therewith certain demands. The Committee fixed the 17th of July for discussing the proposals of the Sangh with their representatives. But, on that day, the representatives could not attend. Then, on the 22nd, a meeting was held in which the representatives of the Sangh and the representatives of the Committee were both present to discuss those demands. Many of them, I am told, were accepted. A few appeared to be very difficult as they involved expenditure of a recurring type. I would not refer to the details. Even about others, the Committee assured the representatives of the Sangh that it would give sympathetic consideration to them and they could pursue the matter further.

Then, notice was originally given that on the 22nd, two of the members of this Sangh would go on hunger strike and thereafter two would be added to the number of hunger strikers every day. So there are 12 hunger strikers, I think, at present.

On the 29th, a notice was given that there would be a strike on the 30th. There was a strike on the 30th accordingly and most of the members refrained from doing their work. Then, a further notice followed that day saying that there would be a strike also on the 31st and indefinitely on the following days. The authorities felt that the sanitary conditions were deteriorating and in order to avert the danger, they considered it necessary to make alternative arrangements. So, they called other

people in order to provide the minimum services necessary for maintaining the health and sanitation of the city. Their anxiety is also shown by the fact that the Chief Commissioner himself wrote a letter to the leader of the Sangh to meet him and discuss this matter. But, there was no response. The Deputy Commissioner himself wrote a letter on the 27th. But, it was not accepted and it was brought back to him by the messenger who took it there. So, it is unfortunate that these matters could not be settled.

It is our anxiety, it is our desire that these outstanding questions should, to the extent it is possible, be settled in a generous and sympathetic spirit. We realise that the class to which these people belong have not had the benefit of education or even of refinement. They can be easily led away and their difficulties did not always receive that amount of sympathy and attention which one would very much wish should be given to them. So, it will be our attempt to see that these matters should be looked into and settled. Maximum effort should be made for that purpose.

I appreciate the feelings of hon. Members of the House. When any person dies, to whichever community he may belong, when any citizen loses his life, we must naturally feel that such a thing should not happen and that we should be able to carry out our functions in a normal way. But, as I said, circumstances do not always allow us to shape things as we would like them to be moulded. And these small happenings, or big happenings, whatever one may call them, create an atmosphere in the country which is not confined to one particular place but infects large numbers even in other places. So, Government could not but be sad and sorry when such incidents happen, but duties have to be performed, and in any case, no judgment can be reached till an enquiry has been made, for, the sanitation of the city has to be maintained and in other ways too larger in-

Attention to Matter of Urgent
Public Importance

[Pandit G. B. Pant]
terests have to be guarded. Every attempt should be made to ensure these purposes without having recourse to force in any shape or form, but there are sometimes reasons, occasions and circumstances which may compel us to adopt a method which may be altogether unpalatable and even detestable for the sake of guarding the health of large numbers.

I am not prepared at this stage to pronounce my opinion as to what judgment we will come to. I feel I am as anxious as any Member in this House that the question should be looked into with care and if there has been anything wrong.....

Shri Warior (Trichur): How can he get the life of the person dead whose blood has been spilt?

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am sorry, and I wish that the occasion had not arisen, but there are, I am sorry to say, sometimes happenings which we all deplore, but till the full facts are before us, it is difficult to say whether anyone was blameworthy or whether in the circumstances it was proper or it was necessary or it was unavoidable. About that I can only make up my mind after I have seen the report of the officer who has been appointed for this purpose. But, in the meantime, we will continue our efforts to settle the problems and demands, and to redress the grievances to the maximum extent we can reasonably do.

Mr. Speaker: When does the hon. Minister expect the report of this officer? (Interruptions).

Shri Parulekar (Thana): The report will not contain new facts.

Mr. Speaker: There is no good all the hon. Members rising. Am I not entitled to put a question to the hon. Minister as to when the report is expected? Thereafter I will hear one of the spokesmen of the hon. Members. They have tabled adjournment motions with respect to the same matter, more or less in the same words, and therefore, any one hon. Member may say what he wants to say. I am only eliciting information

from the hon. Minister. Thereafter, I will call upon Shri Sadhan Gupta to say what he wants to say and then reserve my judgment.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I hope the report will be available in four or five days.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Sadhan Gupta, on behalf of all the adjournment motions.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): No, Sir, not on behalf of all.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta-East): The whole point is that the hon. Minister seems to rely on the findings of an officer appointed to enquire into the matter.

First of all, let us remember that the officer is the Additional Magistrate, and the District Magistrate has already pronounced his views on the facts. Therefore, the Additional District Magistrate's report cannot be of any value under the circumstances.

Secondly, this is such a serious matter that we cannot go by the report of an executive officer in a matter where the executive, according to us, has committed a monstrous crime. The enquiry body should be a body on which the people as a whole must have entire confidence. Otherwise, we cannot go by the report of such an officer.

We have been to this place. I have been to this place along with Shri A. K. Gopalan yesterday. The allegation is that there was so much stonethrowing that the police feared to be overwhelmed and had to open fire. I have seen the place, Shri A. K. Gopalan has seen the place, Shri Balmiki was there also, and he will bear me out. In a small way it was a replica of Jallianwala Bagh. There was a small walled up colony. The bullets were showered into the colony. The walls even now bear bullet marks. And then, it is hard to describe in what condition the people, injured people or dead people, were dragged out by the police. Blood is on the entrance of the colony. And then I am told by the representatives of the sweepers today that even a 13 year old child has been injured.

Under those circumstances, I think there is every ground for having a discussion because we cannot rely on the finding of an enquiry officer subordinate to the District Magistrate who has pronounced his views already. And in any case, we cannot rely upon the finding of an executive officer in such a grave case, and we want an impartial enquiry in which all sections of the people and all sections of the House will have complete confidence.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram): It is not clear from the statement of the District Magistrate or the statement of the Home Minister as to what were the demands of the sweepers and how many demands were met by the Municipality and which demands were not accepted by the Municipality. If it becomes clear, it will be easier to understand the problem.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Balmiki.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): Has the hon Prime Minister or the Home Minister visited the place?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will sit down. Shri Balmiki.

श्री बास्कीके: (बुन्दशहर-जित अनुमन्त्रित जातिया) अध्येत महोदय दिल्ली के इतिहास मे अगियो के आंदोलन के इतिहास मे, कल जो शमनाक घटना घटी है इन देश के अन्दर, उससे हम सब का सिर शर्म से नीचे झुक जाना है। यह घटना उस स्थान पर घटी है, जहाँ बापू की आत्मा नोई दुई है जहाँ स्वयं बापू रहे हैं। जो कुछ भी माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने कहा है उसको मैं बड़े ध्यान से सुना है। लेकिन मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यह सब नई दिल्ली के आधिकारियों की उदासीनता के कारण, उनके निकम्पेन के कारण हुआ है वे ही इस सब के लिये जिम्मेदार हैं। यह जो खून बहा है, यह जो गोनी चली है, इसके लिए उनके सिबय और कोई जिम्मेदार नहीं है। दो तीन महीने पहले मैंने डी० सी० से स्वयं जा कर कहा था कि वे इन बातों पर ध्यान गौर करें और इन लोगों की भाँपों पर सबेँ बिचारें।

मैं भी सब का एक प्रश्न हूँ एक स्पेक्समैन हूँ। लेकिन मुझे अफ़सोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारी बातों पर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया और यहाँ पर यह पेश की गई है कि २२ जोलाई को बात हुई थी। लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि २२ जोलाई को कोई बात नहीं हुई थी। सैटर भेजा गया उसमे किसी तरह की मांगो का जिक्र नहीं किया गया था और किसी बात पर भी ध्यान नहीं दिया गया था।

मैं मानता हूँ कि मजदूरों की शिकायतें हुआ करती हैं और उनको इस तरह का कदम उठाने के लिए बाध्य भी होना पड़ता है। लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाऊँ कि इस तरह का कदम उठा कर हमें कोई खुशी नहीं होती है। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि म्यूनिसिपैलिटी के अन्दर काम करने वाले लोगों के साथ सदियों से अन्याय होना आया है लेकिन इस अन्याय का कभी निराकरण करने की चेष्टा नहीं की गई है। कल हमारे अन्दर एक अजीब खुशी को लहर दौड़ी हुई थी कल हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने या स्वास्थ्य मंत्री ने जो बात कही और जिस शान से कही, हम उसके लिये उनके आभारी हैं। लेकिन दिल्ली राज्य के अधिकारियों ने इस बात से क्या नतीजा निकाला, क्या माने निकाले, यह बात देखने की है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री एक बात कहे और उस पर अमल न हो, उसकी भावना के भूताबिक अमल न हो, उसका उन लोगों पर कुछ भी असर न हो, लोगों की शिकायतों का निराकरण न हो, तो इससे ज्यादा अफ़सोस की बात और क्या हो सकती है। यहाँ पर आपके पास वायरलेस है और मिनटों में कोई चीज कराई जा सकती है। यहाँ पर यह कहा गया है कि आदमियों को रोका गया है, यह बात बिल्कुल ग़लत है और हमने उनको जाने दिया है। यह जो इस्तेमाल हम पर लगाया गया है, निहायत ग़लत है और

[श्री बास्कीकी]

इसमें किसी तरह की भी कोई सच्चाई नहीं है। डी० सी० में जो बयान जारी किया है, वह भी निहायत गलत बयान है और उसमें कोई सच्चाई नहीं है। केवल चन्द लड़के खड़े हुये थे। वहाँ पर टिमलू नाम का छादमी था जिस पर लाठियां बरसाई गई थीं। वहाँ पर हेल्थ आफिसर लैफ्टि० बर्नल बोपा राय ने और पाच छः सी के करीब पुलिस के छादमी ने। ऐसी स्थिति में मेहतरों के लिये वहाँ गड़बड़ी करना तो दूर रहा प्रदर्शन करना भी सम्भव नहीं था। गोली चलाने के लिये कोई कारण नहीं था उसे टाला जा सकता था, पर ऐसा नहीं हुआ। व्यर्थ एक छादमी की जेब गई और कइसों को घायल होना पड़ा।

इस दुखद घटना पर हमें यह जान कर प्रसन्नता हुई कि एक इनक्वायरी होने वाली है लेकिन यह जो ए० डी० एम० और डी० सी० को उस इनक्वायरी में लेने की बात है, तो मैं उसका खुल कर विरोध करता हूँ और मैं उस इनक्वायरी को मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं तो चाहूँगा कि जहाँ पर मेहतरों के साथ इस तरीके से साफ़ तौर से अन्याय किया गया हो, जब कि मैं समझता हूँ कि आपके हृदय के अन्दर, प्रधान मंत्री के हृदय के अन्दर और हमारे पन्त जी जिनके कि हृदय में अंगियों के लिये वही दर्द है जैसा कि बापू जी के दिल में था और जिनको कि हम बापू जी का प्रतीक सा मानते हैं और गांधी जी का हृदय यदि हम लोगों के लिये एक बापू का सा था तो पत जी का हृदय हम लोगों के लिये एक मां का सा है, मैं उसकी बहुत कद्र करता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस इनक्वायरी के लिये हाईकोर्ट का एक जज मुफरर किया जाये जो निष्पक्ष हो कर जांच करे। जब कि वहाँ की नालियों में वृत्त है खिड़कियों वीबारों पर गोलियां हैं, गांधी अबूतरे पर गोलियां दागी गई और शोपड़ियों में गोलियां हैं, जहां कि भंगी बस्ती

के अन्दर घुस कर गोलियां बरहमी से चलाई गई हों और इस तरीके से लाशों को खींचा गया हो। "शेम, शेम" की आवाजें। मैं इस बात को बर्दास्त नहीं कर सकता। हमारे दिल और दिमाग गुस्से और सदमे से भरे हैं, और यह बात मैं साफ़ तौर से कह देना चाहता हूँ कि जिन हालात में आज भंगी लोग रह रहे हैं उन हालात में नहीं रहेंगे। हम जानते हैं कि आज अगर हमारी कमर झुक रही तो वह झाड़ू के दम पर झुक रही है, हम आज गोलियों के आगे झुकना नहीं चाहते हैं और हम चाहते हैं कि हमारी कमरे सीधी हों और आज जो स्थिति पेश है उसका हम डट कर मुकाबला करना जानते हैं हम उससे किसी तरह घबड़ाते नहीं हैं। मेरे अन्दर पूरी ताकत है और मैं तमाम देश के अंगियों का खिम्मा लेता हूँ, मैं किसी के मुह की तरफ देखता नहीं हूँ। "बी आर विद यू" की आवाजें।

इस दर्दनाक घटना के कारण मेरा दिल और दिमाग सदमे से भरा हुआ है और हम इस अन्याय को सहन नहीं करेंगे। मैं ज्यादा न कह कर यही दुहराना चाहता हूँ कि हम इनक्वायरी के लिये एक निष्पक्ष जज को मुफरर किया जाय ताकि जिन लोगों के साथ अन्याय हुआ है उनको रिलीफ मिले। इस दुखद कांड के लिये मैं डी० सी०, श्री बोपा राय और पुलिस अफसरान को जिम्मेदार मानता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि उनको जल्दी से जल्दी सस्पेंड कर दिया जाय। हमारे लोगों के दिमाग में एक गुस्से का लहर दौड़ो हुई है और मैं ज्यादा न कह कर सिर्फ यही कहना कि इस कांड की इनक्वायरी कराने के लिये एक हाईकोर्ट के जज को मुफरर किया जाय।

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow all this. The point is whether this motion is to be admitted or not.

and what the facts are. That is all the issue at present.

Shri Manay (Bombay City Central—Reserved—Sch. Castes): On a point of information. Has the Prime Minister or the Home Minister or the Health Minister visited the place of firing or the hospitals where the wounded have been admitted?

Mr. Speaker: That does not arise out of this. **Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani** has also given a similar notice. I shall hear her also.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I just want to get some further information from the Hon. Home Minister as to who ordered the firing. As far as we know, there was no magistrate present. How did the firing take place? Secondly, there is considerable truth in what has been said on the floor of the House as to the manner in which the shooting took place.

I was there last night; we were there in the morning; we went all over, and we saw how the police had penetrated into the courtyard, into the covered area, and shot them at random. We saw bullet shots over the wall at this distance; we saw bullet shots at a distance of four feet from the floor. The place was congested, there were women and children all over the place. I cannot, for the life of me, understand how the police penetrated inside and how they shot at them, there. If they had shot outside, I could have understood. I feel that the police have behaved in a very irresponsible manner. I feel that a judicial enquiry must be instituted, because we must also take into notice the fact that the chairman of the New Delhi Municipal Committee is the Deputy Commissioner. How can the magistrate who is below him hold an enquiry into all these matters?

Therefore, I most humbly urge that a proper judicial enquiry should be instituted to go into the matter.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): On a point of order.....

Mr. Speaker: I am calling the Home Minister now.

Shri Tyagi: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri Tyagi: My point of order is that for the last so many years, adjournment motions are rejected by the Chair, taking advantage of the discretion given to it.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): But that does not arise just now. You have not disallowed the motion.

Shri Tyagi: It is a point of order, and I have the right to make it. Let not the hon. Member try these tactics with me.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members need not be impatient. Let me hear the point of order; I am bound to. Now, what is the point of order?

Shri Tyagi: This privilege of the Chair is given also in the Parliament in U.K., and there also, the Chair exercises this discretion.

This Parliament is now establishing the practice where adjournment motions are generally not permitted, on the plea that the Speaker does not exercise his discretion in favour of them.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Because there are so many.

Shri Tyagi: Whatever be the case, even the Speaker's discretion....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Members who want to raise a point of order will state the point briefly, and if I want further elucidation, I will ask them. If the hon. Member is pre-facing everything, I do not know when he would come to the point of order.

Shri Tyagi: I would submit that there are set rules for the conduct of business, and particularly, in the matter of adjournment motions....

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri Tyagi: . . . and the decision must be given according to those rules. It must be seen whether an adjournment motion pertains to any specific instance or specific point or not, whether it is urgent or not and is it of public importance. It is on these merits only that the adjournment motion may be disallowed. I, therefore, feel that since this adjournment motion which has been moved is on a matter which is very serious, where people are really moved, and feelings are high, I would suggest that you may kindly exercise your discretion in favour of this.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order is simply this that the Speaker must act according to the rules. Is that the point of order? Very well. Now, the Home Minister.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): I have also tabled a similar notice.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a general discussion now.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I was on the spot. . . .

Shri Anthony Pillai (Madras North): On a point of order. May I know whether at this stage the Speaker is allowing the motion or not? You are now calling upon the Home Minister to reply.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a reply. I am only trying to gather, just for the purpose of settling in my mind as to whether I should give my consent to the adjournment motion or not, what exactly the position is. I shall hear the hon. Members, and the three representative Members who have tabled the adjournment motion, calling-attention-notice etc. and the others also. I am now calling the Minister, and I shall make up my mind. I have heard the representatives. Now, I am calling the Minister. When I allow the motion, I will hear everyone.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani has put the question as to who ordered the firing. Well, I understand that there was a Deputy

Superintendent of Police, and he ordered the firing.

Some Hon. Members: Suspend him.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not know what the provocation is in this reply. I am trying to give the information that I possess. The question was put, and I answered it.

An Hon. Member: You have already read out that statement.

Pandit G. B. Pant: As for the judicial enquiry or anything like that, I do not rule out anything, but before I make up my mind in a matter of this type, I must have the report of the officer who is making an enquiry.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): What is the use of that enquiry? He is only a subordinate.

Pandit G. B. Pant: So far as this enquiry is concerned, I must see his report before I come to any judgment.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: The issue is very simple. Let us call a committee of our Members to enquire into this matter.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I must wait for the report of the officer. He has already started his investigation. . . .

Some Hon. Members: What is this 'must'? He is only a subordinate.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am not prepared to concede and I do not accept the argument because the Additional District Magistrate is a man of, I think, twenty-five years' standing, and with such a long experience. I do not think that we could carry on the administration if we regard a responsible officer as altogether unworthy of credit or that he will manipulate things and send wrong reports. But after the receipt of the report, I shall see if the situation demands any further investigation.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: On a point of order. I presume we are discussing the question of the admissibility of the motion. We are not discussing—though that question has come up—

the advisability or otherwise of appointing a Judicial Commission to go into this, although from this side of the House we do demand it. The real question before the House is about the admissibility of the motion, and I would appeal to the Chair that it may kindly take into consideration the provisions of rule 88 of the Rules of Procedure, and either allow or disallow it according to the 8 provisions which are there. Otherwise, these discussions would go on pointlessly and we would never be allowed an opportunity to move an adjournment motion in this House. I would appeal to you to take into consideration this particular rule and then give your decision on the admissibility of the motion.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Before you decide whether this adjournment motion should be allowed or not, I would like to make a humble submission here.

Generally adjournment motions are tabled on the basis of reports received. But today as far as this adjournment motion is concerned, many of the Members, not only from the Opposition but also from the other side, have visited the place. Shri Balmiki, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani and Shri Radha Raman and others have gone to the place. Many of us from this side also have been to the place. When we had been discussing about admissibility of adjournment motions before, when certain things had taken place in some place, our information was based on reports received. That is a different matter. But here many of us who went and saw—it may be right or wrong—are under the impression that this is unwarranted and it could have been avoided. That is our feeling, not only of Members on this side but also, as we have just seen, of Members on the other side, who have gone to the spot and inquired. We went there and we did not inquire from the persons who are in the basti. We asked those persons who are living on the other side as ordinary people, as to what happened. We are convinced that certainly the firing was

unwarranted. We are convinced that there has not been such violence on the other side. Even supposing there had been violence, shooting should not have been ordered and it should have been avoided.

Shri Tyagi: On a point of order. My hon. friend is entering into details. This is not the stage to discuss the motion. Now the point is whether it should be allowed or not.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I am not discussing. I am only submitting that as far as this adjournment motion is concerned, it may be admitted and we may have a discussion so that as a result of it, certain directions as regards firing and what the police should do in such circumstances may be evolved. So I request that the motion may be allowed.

Several hon. Members rose

Mr. Speaker: I have heard enough.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): This is extraordinary.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): May I make a submission? I feel, on the strength of opinion that has been expressed from all sections of the House, that why Shri Tyagi has submitted is worthy of your consideration. Whether we should have a magisterial inquiry or a judicial inquiry—these are not pertinent to the application of rule 58. All that rule 58 postulates are certain conditions—the matter should be specific and it should be a matter of urgent public importance. It is specific, it is urgent and it is certainly of public importance, and I feel it would represent the almost unanimous feeling of the House if the matter is in terms of rule 58, admitted.

Shri Nath Pai: You have not given me a chance.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow....

Shri Nath Pai: I want to submit on the admissibility of the motion. I just want a minute.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard all sections of the House.

Shri Nath Pai: No, Sir. You are anticipating. We were never given a chance.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Shri Nath Pai: You are not giving me a chance? This is unfair....

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I say a few words?

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the House will have preference over others normally.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The motion for adjournment to consider the matter, I take it, means that this matter—what has happened—should be discussed properly in this House. Then the House may decide as it chooses. Now, if it is a question of looking into this matter thoroughly, every aspect of it, so far as Government is concerned, we are entirely in agreement with it. There is no question of a matter of this kind being passed by, by-passed, hushed up or anything. The question is what will be the best time when this House has as full possession of the facts as it can be, so that it can discuss it?

Whether it is this motion or any other motion—it is immaterial what form the motion takes—Government would like this matter to be considered by this House. But all I would say is that it would be desirable, I take it, to consider it when as many facts as possible are available.

Now we are just within less than 24 hours of this very unfortunate occurrence. As hon. Members know, only yesterday I said something about it. Within an hour of what I had said yesterday, my colleague, the Health Minister, met the representatives of the Sangh and in fact the matter appeared to be—so far as the demands were concerned—well on the way to a settlement.... (*Interruptions*). That was my information. Then late in the afternoon, he informed me of the present occurrence.

Now, nobody can doubt that it is a tragic occurrence. There is no doubt about it, and it deserves the fullest and the most impartial inquiry and any action that may come out of that inquiry. We are all agreed about that, whatever side of the House we may sit. The point is, how best to approach, to go into this matter, and in what circumstances the House can consider it fully. Government is prepared to give full time to the House. I do not mind whether the discussion is in the shape of this motion—adjournment motion—or any other motion. It is immaterial. It is not that we shirk the discussion.

But I would submit for your consideration what would be the proper time for such a discussion in this House. I think it would probably be better if we had fuller facts. Neither my colleague, the Home Minister, nor anyone who has been inquiring, has been able to get all the facts. Some of the hon. Members have visited the place. I intended visiting the place this morning, but I was told that it would not be a suitable time. I am going probably sometime today. But my going there and seeing the place, of course, is not an inquiry. It is just satisfying an urge that I may have. That is all. But I can assure the House that nobody wants an inquiry into this matter in a hush-hush way. We want a full consideration of it, a full inquiry. It is not a prestige of Government involved in this matter so that Government may foolishly try to hush up something or postpone something. We want the fullest inquiry, as the House wants it, and we want action taken as a result of that inquiry. We also want this House to consider this matter fully. As to when it should consider it, and in what form, it is for you to consider.

Shri Nath Pai: In spite of this explanation, and the statement made by the Home Minister and the Prime Minister, I feel that we are not satisfied; I, at least, am not satisfied....

Some Hon. Members: We are not satisfied. .

Shri Nath Pai: I submit that you should give time for this adjournment motion to be taken up, and this is my reason. I am afraid that this is not an isolated instance. I am constrained to say—I submit this in spite of what the Prime Minister and Home Minister have said—that we are very much afraid and exercised that this may unfortunately be a taste of the shape of things to come. It is for this reason that we want this matter to be taken up and discussed.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. So far as this question is concerned—involving the death of one person and injury to various persons—it has happened in the capital itself. I am not going to cloud the issue by questions as to who ought to make the inquiry or not. The point is for a full discussion in this matter. There are hon. Members who have gone and seen the place; others have heard, and a third set of Members have read about it in the newspapers. But so far as Government is concerned, for an authoritative statement, the hon. Home Minister requires—whether it is accepted or not—a statement from his own officer, and as he claims, an independent authority, though he is a subordinate.

Under the circumstances, I would like to allow a discussion. I am postponing the discussion till day after tomorrow, Saturday, within which time, being near to the place, the hon. Home Minister will make every effort to get the report and make a statement that morning. As to what further has to be done, if we are not satisfied, I shall try to provide for a discussion that evening.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Can we not have an enquiry committee?

Mr. Speaker: All these motions are postponed to the day after tomorrow. I will keep them pending. They will stand over, these adjournment motions, the calling attention notice and the other matters that I read out just now. In the meanwhile, the hon. Home Minister will expedite getting the report from his own officers so as to enable him to place

the facts before the House. And, after his statement—whether a statement is made or not—we will have a discussion that evening. Whether the adjournment motions shall be allowed or not or whether the discussion shall be on the calling attention notice, I shall decide that morning. All these will now stand over.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Under the rules, an adjournment motion, if it is allowed, should be put for discussion at the end of the day—whenever the sitting of the House ends—and should be discussed for 2-1/2 hours. That is the rule for adjournment motions. This House is going to adjourn at 5:30 this evening and under the rules you are required to put the motion for discussion at 5:30 P.M. to be discussed till 8 P.M. Is it the case that the Home Minister or the Prime Minister cannot within that time get possession of the facts from their officers? This was in Delhi and 5 hours or 5-1/2 hours is a long enough time to get possession of the facts from the city. So, may I suggest that we should conform to the normal rule in this matter?

Mr. Speaker: There cannot be endless discussion on this matter. If I admit the motion today, it is true that I must take it up this evening, whether it is accepted or not. If it is admitted further work of the House will be adjourned. But, I am not coming to any decision on this. There is nothing in the rule which prevents me from taking my own time and adjourning the matter. The matter will be kept alive and if I decide that day in favour of the adjournment motion the discussion will take place.

As regards the matter having taken place in Delhi and an enquiry being instituted, the hon. Home Minister said—I understood to him to say—that it will take 4 or 5 days. Therefore, I restricted it and said that it must be disposed of in this week. Saturday is only day after tomorrow. Therefore, I do not think it necessary to continue this matter. The whole thing will stand over. I am not deciding any of these issues.

Shri Tyagi: So, may we take it that you are holding over your ruling?

Mr. Speaker: I am agreeing with the hon. Member.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.
MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER—
contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion of the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Irrigation and Power. Out of the 9 hours allotted for the Demands of this Ministry, about 5 hours have already been availed of and 4 hours remain. Now, it is 5 minutes to 1. Let me take it as one o'clock. The debate will close by 5 o'clock today. The list of cut motions relating to these Demands have already been circulated to the Members on 31st July, 1957. I shall call upon the Minister for Irrigation and Power to reply to the debate at 4 o'clock, after which the cut motions will be disposed of and the Demands put to vote.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur may continue his speech.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta-East): Sir, I gave notice of cut motion No. 697. I sent a chit; but, probably, the chit that was sent by my party did not contain that number. I do not find it in the list of selected cut motions. I would like it to be included.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow it. Cut motion No. 697 may also be moved.

Sale of electric energy by D. V. C. to calculate E.S.C.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head of 'Ministry of Irrigation and Power' be reduced to Re. 1."

Mr. Speaker: This cut motion is also before the House.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had quoted figures from the Five Year Plan's reviewed to show how deplorable the progress both in the field of irrigation and power in Rajasthan was. We had very low targets and the fact is that even those low targets have not been fulfilled. In respect of irrigation, the shortfall is 55 per cent. And the situation would have been still worse had it not been for the fact that a project called the Jawai had been taken up about 4 years before the first Five Year Plan was conceived or born. The shortfall is staggering in the case of power projects also; it is about 62 per cent. And, again, this shortfall does not take into account the fact that one of the turbines has already burst killing a labourer; it does not take into account the make-shift arrangement made by rushing a second turbine from Panipat to cater to the needs of Jodhpur.

This very clearly discloses how the progress of development in the State has been betrayed. I have invited particular attention of the Minister to these facts not because I am anxious to make any complaints or ask for any explanation. But the fact remains that during the Second Five Year Plan we are likely to be faced with many difficulties, particularly, difficulties regarding foreign exchange. Until and unless the hon. Minister pays special attention to the problems of the State, the progress is likely to be locked. My reason for bringing all these facts to the notice of the Minister is to ask for his sympathy and to seek his assistance in giving top priority to the demands of Rajasthan, particularly in view of the betrayal of the progress of the State during the years so far.

I shall not refer to the Bhakra Nangal project. The story is said. I shall not refer to Chambal which is being looked after by the Deputy Minister for Irrigation. But, I think he will take us into confidence, for