

[श्री अब्दुल रहमान शेख]

जी० साहब तथा आई० जी० पुलिस ने कनफर्म किया है कि 200 के करीब पाकिस्तानी इन्फिल्ट्रेटर जिनके पास अच्छा असला और अच्छा मादा है, इस किस्म की डिस्टरबेंस का नाजाज्य फायदा उठा सकते हैं इसलिए मरकजी हुकूमत का विशेष तौर पर मैं ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरफ फौरन ध्यान दिया जाए। धन्यवाद।

श्री रामलखन प्रसाद गुप्त (बिहार) : श्रीमन्, मैं भी इसी विषय की ओर सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। जैसे कि समाचार आज स्टेट्समैन में निकला 'जम्मू बंध टर्न्ज वायलेंट 41 इंज्योर्ड'। यह प्रश्न कितना अहम है। पुंछ एक सेंसेटिव जगह है। यहाँ तक समाचार आया है कि कर्फ्यू के बावजूद भी वहाँ पर बहुत बड़ी रैली हुई और दुकानों में लोग आते जाते रहे जम्मू में भी जो बंध हुआ है वहाँ पर 41 व्यक्ति घायल हो गए हैं। इसकी गम्भीरता से मालूम होता है कि वहाँ पर समस्या कितनी गम्भीर है। वहाँ पर बार एसोसिएशन की तरफ से वहाँ पर जितने वकील हैं उनकी तरफ से एक साइलेंट जुलूस निकाला गया और आज यह बहुत आवश्यक है कि वहाँ पर जो नेशनल कान्फ्रेस की सरकार है वह सरकार ठीक हालत में नहीं चल रही है। रीजनल इम्बेलेन्स वहाँ पर है हर तरह की बातें और जो बातें मेरे पूर्व वक्ता ने कही हैं वे वहाँ पर हो रही हैं, इसलिए मैं गृह मंत्री महोदय से यह आग्रह करूंगा और यह मांग करूंगा कि वहाँ पर जो घटनायें पुंछ में हुई हैं उनकी ज्यूडिशियल इन्क्वायरी होनी चाहिए और तदनुसार कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए।

SHRI M. KADERSHAH (Tamil Nadu): Sir, may I know from the Chair on what basis the Matter of Urgent Public Importance is permitted in the House? For instance,

on the opening day I wanted to make mention of dismissal of the Pondicherry Government which is more relevant to the administration of the Centre. Here what the Members stated was merely concerning with a stray incident in a State and particularly that too ruled by a different regional party. So, when the President's rule was imposed in a State like Pondicherry we should have been given an opportunity, which I think, would have been more worthwhile to discuss in the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Legislative business. Mrs. Ambika Soni.

REFERENCE TO THE ARREST OF SHRIMATI SAROJ KHAPARDE

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA (Andhra Pradesh): Just one minute Sir. Sir, we were told that the Home Minister was to make the statement this afternoon. He himself told me that at 2.30 he will make the statement.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. D. PATIL): I am making it after some time.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: What is this? I do not know what type of functioning this is.

SHRI S. D. PATIL: Latest events are to be incorporated.

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI (Punjab): What is the meaning of the latest events? She has spent a night in this Parliament House and he is still collecting latest events. This is very bad. He should state very clearly whether he is making the statement or he is not making the statement.

SHRI S. D. PATIL: I am making a statement.

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI: I think they are tampering with the facts.

SHRI S. D. PATIL: If they want a half statement, I am prepared to make it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister make the statement at a time when he feels like.

SHRIMATI KUMUDBEN MANISH-ANKER JOSHI (Gujarat): Let him fix the time so that the House may know.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): We are interested in the Statement. We must be told when he is going to make it. It should be made clear as to when he is going to make the statement because it is not in the agenda and the Members are so interested in it. Let him say at time he is going to make the statement.

SHRI S. D. PATIL: At 4.30 P.M.

THE SUPPRESSION OF IMMORAL TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND GIRLS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1978—contd.

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI (Punjab): Sir, I stand to speak on this Bill which has been brought forward for amending the 1956 Act on the Suppression of Immoral Traffic in women and girls. I welcome the intentions of the hon. Minister that he is at least wanting to make a beginning in what he calls the 'suppression of immoral traffic', but I would like to say that he has only begun investigating as to how this evil of prostitution can be done away with from our country.

The speakers before me, irrespective of party affiliations, and also when the debate took place in the Lok Sabha the speakers were almost unanimous that this is an issue where one cannot compromise with. This is an issue on which we cannot put an official seal and say that we cannot ban it since in those countries where it was banned it could not be a success; so, we are only suppressing

it or enlarging the areas for banning, so that larger areas can be covered. Sir, scriptures have been quoted in this House. Mahatma Gandhi's sayings have been quoted in this House on this issue. The Minister in his statement has brought to light the fact that there was no Act here till a convention took place in New York in 1950 and subsequently in 1956 this Act was passed in India. That is why we are just proceeding slowly. Sir, an issue like this which affects self-respect, dignity and honour of human beings, cannot be dealt with in halves. You cannot say that you are prepared to give so much self-respect to a human being or safeguard so much of the honour of the citizens but not fully because you are not capable of doing that. This is something which cannot be said. Sir, the Constitution was again amended recently and a clause was brought about that a citizen should be free from exploitation. The very clause is being constantly violated in our country because exploitation would mean physical exploitation you have to be safeguarded against and economic exploitation you have to be safe-guarded against. Sir, there is gross economic exploitation in this country when there are millions of people who are unemployed. Sir, there is gross social exploitation in this country when casteism is indulged in, when people are still serving under bonded labour, when women have to sell their flesh to earn their livelihood; there cannot be a greater exploitation socially than this. I want to tell the hon. Minister that in his statement he should have been honest to say that he himself is putting this amendment half-heartedly. He should have admitted it before this House and said: "I want the Members of this House to consider it only as a first step" rather than say that if a private Member brings forward a Bill, he will ask the Law Ministry to consider it. Why are you depending on a Private Member's Bill? Has the Government not got adequate