

would get another opportunity to discuss the working of the Maintenance of Internal Security Act when the reply would of course be forthcoming. When we are discussing the limited scope of the Bill, I do not think that it would be very much relevant to do so now.

Mr. Rajnarain, as is usual with him has taken this forum to criticize some individuals, some dignitaries, who are not at all concerned with this Bill nor with the Maintenance of Internal Security Act. He has tried to make references to writ petitions pending against Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed as Minister. This is not the first occasion when he has brought in the name of Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed. Even when legislation was being passed on the Rampur Raza Library, he brought in his name. That is very unbecoming of a man of his stature to bring in some one who is not concerned with this law or with this Bill. He has made some uncalled for allegations. This is not the forum to discuss all these things. Parliament cannot be made the forum to discuss all these things. Such allegations are being made by one paper which is indulging in such things. We know its intentions. We know what it stands for. But to quote what a party paper says in this House is not proper. Anyway, he has tried to discuss so many things which are not very relevant. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has stated the reasons for bringing this Bill. He says MISA has been used to suppress Opposition parties. Many other Members have also made similar allegations, including Dr. Mathew Kurian, Mr. Chandrasekharan, Mr. Rajnarain and so many others. I have to state that when the question of security is involved and the law and order has to be maintained, we do not make any difference between this party and that party. Whoever is involved in that, we do not hesitate to take action against him, even if he happens to be a Congress man, even if he is a member of the ruling party.

To substantiate that I have got figures to show that there are quite a large number of Congress men who are also detained under the provisions of this particular Act. Sir, for the information of this House. I may quote figures of the number of persons detained during the period from 7-5-71 to 30-6-72 that 7 Congress men were detained.

Congress (O) people were 13, Jana Sangh 1, CPI 1, CPI (M) 517 and Akali Dal 1. You will notice that there were 7 Congressmen and

CPI Member was only 1. It cannot be said that it was meant to suppress the opposition parties. For the period from 1-7-72 to 30-6-73, the total detentions were 520. Out of that, 82 were Congressmen, Congress (O) 1, Jana Sangh 29, Swatantra Party 5, CPI (M) 388, Akali Dal 1 and DMK 1.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : Does it mean that your main opposition is CPI (M) ?

SHRI F.H. MOHSIN : The time is also over. It is not true to say that MISA Act was intended to suppress the opposition parties. It is intended to see that the essential supplies are made available to the people at large. It was used against the black-marketeers and hoarders. It was also used against those who created a law and order problem, and who are dangerous for the security of the country. The MISA has been useful for maintaining peace and tranquility in the whole country. Therefore, I refute the allegations made in this respect by the various Members. The Bill is not acceptable to us. Of course, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is not here. I appeal to the House to reject it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR): The question is :

"That the Bill to provide for immunity to Members of Parliament and State Legislatures from detention without trial be taken into consideration."

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR): There are others in the names of Shri Bhupesh Gupta, Shri Sen Gupta and Shri Shyam Lal Yadav. They are not here.

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICES OF PROFIT

SHRI A. K. REFAYE (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Tenth Report of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR) : The House stands adjourned till 11-00 A.M. on Monday. the 5th August, 1974.

The House then adjourned at five eight minutes past four of the clock¹¹ eleven of the clock on Monday^{he} 5th August, 1974.