

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Gujarat): Sir, there is no Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. Ministers sitting here.

श्री भोला प्रसाद :

बिहार के कई जिलों में फसल की बुवाई नहीं हो रही है। खुद बिहार सरकार ने जो कबूल किया है, उसके मुताबिक 2 परसेंट से ले कर 10 परसेंट तक, कहीं 20 परसेंट तक और ज्यादा से ज्यादा किसी जिले में 40 परसेंट तक, धान की बुवाई हुई है और दूसरी तरफ भदौही की फसल 50 परसेंट से ज्यादा खराब हो गई है और फिर जो बाढ़ से नुकसान हुआ है वह अलग है। ऐसी मूर्त में वहां परिस्थिति ऐसी हो गई है कि तुरंत वहां अकाल क्षेत्र घोषित किया जाना चाहिये जो कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के सहयोग के बिना बिहार सरकार नहीं कर सकती है।

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, आपने कह दिया।

श्री भोला प्रसाद : और दूसरी ओर वहां के लोगों को लगातार और बार-बार के अकाल और सूखे से बचाने के लिये सिंचाई के प्रबन्ध के बारे में श्री के० एल० राव ने बिहार का दौरा करने के बाद बिहार सरकार को जो सुझाव दिया है, उसको अमल में लाना चाहिये और तीन चार सिंचाई योजनाओं के बारे में जांच-पड़ताल करने की बात की है, उसको किया जाना चाहिये। लेकिन अभी तक यह निश्चिन्ता नहीं है कि चौथी पंचसाला योजना में यह योजना ली जायगी या नहीं ली जायगी।

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, आपने कह दिया, अब समाप्त कर दीजिये।

The House stands adjourned till 3-00 P.M. today

The House then adjourned for lunch at forty-nine minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at three of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) No. 3 BILL, 1970

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 1970, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 27th August, 1970.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

RESOLUTION *RE* ALARMING DETERIORATION IN THE MAINTENANCE OF LAW AND ORDER IN SEVERAL REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY, PARTICULARLY IN THE TERRITORIES UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S RULE—*contd.*

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Assam): Mr. Deputy Chairman, there is no denial of the fact that the law and order situation in this country is not in a good shape. The more proper way of describing it will be that the climate of violence is growing in this country. But I do not agree that this climate of violence has come up suddenly during the past few months only as has been put by Mr. Tyagi in his resolution. I am afraid when Mr. Tyagi says that this alarming deterioration has taken place only during the past few months, he has put into the resolution a kind of political motivation for which I regret very much. Now although this climate of violence is growing and it is in some sense a law and order problem no doubt, yet I believe that this situation cannot be met or this problem cannot be solved merely by enforcement of law and order. Therefore it is neces-

[Shri Bipinpal Das.]

sary for us to go deeper into the matter and examine why such a situation is developing in this country not only during the past few months but quite for some time and also since those days when Shri Tyagi shared power in this country.

In my opinion there are three basic causes. One is the socio-economic problem. I know there are some Members and there are some people in this country who always ridicule the idea whenever we say that all this is mainly due to socio-economic problems. But one cannot be blind to the actual situation in this country. The economic and social issues have become very acute and there is a large volume of this discontent in this country. So many issues are there. I would point out five basic problems that are agitating the minds of the people in this country to-day. The land problem is there. The problem of prices is there, the problem of growing economic disparities is also there. And there is the explosive problem of unemployment and the problem of regional imbalances. These are the basic problems in this country which are agitating the people and which lead to various conflicts and tensions. There are also social problems like the caste problem. The caste problem is very acute in some areas of this country. There are also communal problems, communal tensions and communal conflicts. These are there. These are the causes which lead to hatred, to the creation of a climate of violence in this country which law and order alone cannot solve. I quite agree, I quite admit, that the Government should try its best to enforce law and order. But merely by enforcing law and order this problem cannot be solved. Simultaneously with the enforcement of law and order, the Government should also go ahead with measures for solving these basic social and economic problems.

Then Sir, with regard to unrest among students, my long contact with the students has taught me a few things which I will place before this House. The students today are in unrest. This unrest is growing not in this country alone. I may point out that this is the general phenomenon throughout the

world. I was fortunate to be in Paris immediately after the big student revolution which took place in May and June, 1968. I was also fortunate to be in the U.K. when large-scale demonstration took place throughout the U.K. and particularly on that famous 27th of October, 1968 when Tariq Ali led a mammoth rally in London. I saw all that. I met those students. I talked to them. I also attended some meetings of the students in some universities and discussed this problem. Everywhere this unrest is there and the Indian students' unrest also is a part of that. This unrest has arisen because the younger generation has no faith in the existing systems. In the democratic countries they have lost faith in democracy. In countries under dictatorship they have no faith in dictatorship. In the capitalist countries they are anti-capitalist. In Communist countries they are anti-Communist. This is what is happening. Why? If I may put it in a general way, the growing generation has become anti-establishment. They have lost faith in the existing systems, in the existing values. I met those students in Paris. Most of them call themselves Marxists. But they condemn all the Communist parties in France. They condemn Russia. They condemn all Communist parties. Yet they call themselves Marxists. They led the revolution in Paris. Similar was my experience in London and other places in the U.K. This is the problem to which I invite the attention of honourable Members, particularly of Mr. Tyagi. It needs a very careful examination. Why is it so? The fact is that the younger generation of today has lost faith in the existing systems and existing values. They have rejected all those values. I met a Communist professor, Professor Simionescu, Vice-Chancellor of the Iasi Polytechnic University in Rumania. I put this problem before him and asked him what was the answer. He was also aware of this problem. But what was the answer? He had no answer. The younger generation has rejected the existing values, but they have not found out new values. It is a very basic question.

Then, Sir, in India, as far as my experience for long years with the stu-

dents goes, they are in unrest because they see the whole future dark and uncertain. Their unrest is because they have lost all faith in the older generation like Shri Tyagi and myself. Why have they lost faith in us, the leadership, irrespective of parties? Why? There are various reasons. The students think that in our generation there is a divorce between profession and practice. About the parties in power—they have seen all parties in power in this country—they are thoroughly disappointed. If this party is bad when in Government, that party says something good while in Opposition. When the Opposition party comes to power, the result is the same. That is in our political life. In day-to-day life, in social life, everywhere they find a very serious divorce between profession and practice in the older generation. That is what they told me.

Once I hauled up two or three students for creating rowdy scenes in a union meeting. And the students very quietly said, "Sir, why do you accuse us for this rowdism? What is happening in your Legislatures and Parliament?" I had no answer. (Shri Mahavir Tyagi laughed at this point.) This is not a matter for laughter. It only shows how the young people are reacting to what you and I are doing. This is a very serious issue. This is one of the reasons why the younger generation today are in a state of unrest. There are other problems also, the problems of educational reform, examination reform, behaviour of teachers, text-books, poverty, hostel accommodation and so on. All these issues are also there, and they are creating unrest among the younger generation, not only in this country but also in the world at large. But what I referred to earlier is the basic problem and the basic issue affecting the younger generation. It is the attitude that we ourselves adopt—which naturally spreads—that leads to a climate of violence in the country.

Now I make my most important point. Is it a democratic system which we are conducting today? What has it produced? What has been its result? We have failed to solve the basic socio-

economic problems in the country. And why is it so? Either the fault is the system itself, or the fault is in those who are running this system. The younger generation see the number of parties growing up, not so much on principles or ideologies, but on some other alignments and loyalties. They see corruption all round. They see corruption when elections are fought. Elections are fought through money, through appeals in the name of community, caste, creed and so on, and all tall talks about the manifestoes enunciating the policies and programmes of the different parties vanish completely at the time of the actual election campaign, when the people are asked for their votes in the name of their community or religion or creed or caste, and ultimately with the help of money. The large number of parties has weakened our democracy and they have caused loss of faith in our democratic system. Parties are not based always on principles and ideologies—I need not go into it in detail. The parties are mostly based on personal loyalties, personal prejudices and all that kind of thing and sometimes on caste, community, etc. Then, Sir, we have miserably failed in solving the problems of this country. May be the fault lies with the Government. And when I say the fault lies with the Government, Mr. Hyagi also cannot escape from that blame. He was in the Government till the other day. Some parties were in power in some States and some are even to-day. Nobody can escape now by simply saying that only one Government is responsible and the others are not responsible. But apart from that, what are we doing here? May I point it out, Sir? Are we really conducting ourselves perfectly in tune with the democratic system in this Parliament, in this House? Do we obey the Chair? Do we obey the Rules and Regulations? Do we not threaten the Chair sometimes by showing red eyes and by pointing our forefinger at the Chair? I have seen no less a person than the hon. Leader of the Opposition himself showing red eyes and pointing his forefinger at the Chair. I have seen how much time we take to make our speeches. If we are allowed fifteen minutes, we take one hour. If the Chair

[Shri Bipinpal Singh.]

asks a Member to sit down, the Member very bravely says, "I shall not sit down." These things are happening here and all these people (pointing to the galleries) are looking at us. And they carry a very bad impression about this House.

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

जब राजनारायण जीमौजूद नहीं है तो उन पर ऐसा अटेक ठीक नहीं है ।

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA (Bihar): On a point of order, Sir. This is not a college class that he is conducting here. This should be stopped.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order, please.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : I am speaking quite relevant points.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu): Why are you worried about him?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Order, order, please.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : I am not saying a single word which is not relevant.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He has not mentioned any names.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : I never interrupt anybody and I expect the same treatment from everybody.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA): Mr. Deputy Chairman,...

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : I never interrupt Mr. Mishra.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : With all respect to the hon. Member may I say that even now I point my fingers at you but that does not mean anything. After all, after every sentence he is also pointing his finger. That does not mean anything at all. Why are you interpreting an ordinary thing like this?

SHRI HAYATULLAH ANSARI : It is not fair to attack Mr. Rajnarain who is not here present in the House.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : This is how we are conducting ourselves. Only the other day on the 29th July three students came to see the proceedings of this House. They were sitting in the gallery and they left the gallery after half an hour. When I met them during the lunch period they told me that they left after half an hour. I said, "You are students of political science and you should have been interested in seeing how the democratic institutions function." They said, "Sir, we had headache; if this is your parliamentary system, better do away with it; let us have some kind of distatorship." This is the reaction of the students; I am telling the truth. This is the reaction of the students who came all the way from Assam to Delhi to see how the Parliament functions; students of political science after seeing the House functioning go back with the impression that it is better not to have this system.

AN HON. MEMBER : Quite right you are.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : Why talk of Naxalites only? Why talk of the unemployed youth who have some grievances and who create some problems somewhere? How are we conducting ourselves here? These are the basic things.

Now for the benefit of the hon. Leader of the Opposition let me point out one more thing. Take the case of day before yesterday. The hon. Leader of the Opposition staged a walk-out with his group and what was the issue, Sir? The issue was Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, according to him, did not rise up in time and challenge the decision of the Chair in a proper form.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : The walk-out was in protest against the ruling of the Chair.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : Was that an issue worth staging a walk-out?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : It is not for you to judge that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : Has anywhere in the world at any time such a walk-out taken place ?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : It is parliamentary procedure.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I think you are taking too much upon yourself to pronounce on a party which is just half of the ruling party. You are a party of one; are you taking upon yourself to judge the behaviour of another party ?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : I never interrupt you; why do you trouble me ? I am pointing out that in this House we are not behaving as though we are functioning in a true democratic spirit. That is my point and that is one of the reasons why these young boys who are called Naxalites have lost faith in this system. Now my friend, Mr. Gupta, will understand that I am raising these points only because we are not conducting ourselves properly in this House. We have not shown responsibility in conducting the democratic system and we are functioning in a bad way and that is why these young boys have lost faith in us.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Did you say this thing when the Prime Minister said that the shouting here would not make any difference to the public ? Did you say anything or are you acting as her man though sitting on this side ?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : I have already condemned the Government, criticised the Government, for their failures. The Prime Minister's statement cannot be condemned because the Chair ruled that she had not said anything unparliamentary. What can we do ?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Will you please pass on to your next point ?

SHRI BAIKRISHNA GUPTA : Sir, on a point of order. This is not a college class he is conducting here; he should be stopped.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) : Sir, his remarks are very much offensive. He is not acting...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : But he is relevant to the subject.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : One can excuse him because he is speaking for the second time and this is the first time he is making a speech without reading from the notes. Therefore one can sympathise with him.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : Please go through the proceedings...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. You have taken twenty minutes. Will you please wind up now ?

SHRI BIPINPAL DASS : This is the sixth time I am speaking. My last point is this. Tyagiji referred to the naxalite activities in my State. I have heard all kinds of talks in and outside the House about the situation in my State. I have great respect for Tyagiji. With all respect to him, I submit that he made that reference in that speech of his without much information. In that area Naxalism has failed to find a foothold in the rural areas. In that area Naxalism has found some accommodation in certain sectors like the Railways, LIC, banks, posts and telegraphs and all that. I request Tyagiji to take up this question and find out why is it that the Naxalite elements find some accommodation in these sectors and not in the rural areas at all. Please find out. In that place, in that region the problem is not Naxalism. The problem is something more serious and that serious situation prevails there because of the feeling, of the people that they have been neglected so far. Economic development has not taken place. The region is quite backward. Even in the matter of employment—leave aside the private sector who will not employ the local boys—the Central sector, I submit, has failed to employ sufficient number of local boys in my area. This is why the people are aggrieved, agitated and their agitation may not be expressed in the usual form of Naxalism. It may take

[Shri Bipinpal Dass.]

a much more serious form. I hope Tyagiji will try to understand the problems of that area. Tyagiji, even when you were the Chairman of the Finance Commission, you failed to do justice to us. We, therefore, have some grievance. I would now conclude. In this situation, if Tyagiji wants that the problem should be solved only by maintaining law and order, that is, by giving more powers to the police, to the Prime Minister and to the Home Minister, I am afraid he is inviting dictatorship and fascism. I am not against law and order. I want law and order to be maintained, but simultaneously, you must solve the problems of the people. If the problems are not solved and people agitate, if you answer it only by law and order, by bullet and bayonet, the result will be fascism, the result will be dictatorship.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Chitta Basu.

SHRI MAHITOSH PURAKAYASTHA (Assam) : Sir, we have discussed this matter for two days. I move that the discussion be closed today. It is for the third day we are discussing it. Let us have an opportunity to discuss another Resolution. I move for the closure of the discussion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You should move a formal motion.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Mysore) : We accept the motion.

SHRI MAHITOSH PURAKAYASTHA : Sir, I move :

"That the question be now put."

SHRI CHITTA BASU : No closure now. After me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Is it a formal motion or not ?

SHRI MAHITOSH PURAKAYASTHA : It is a formal motion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If it is a formal motion, then, I have no other option but to put the motion of closure before the House. Therefore, I

am putting the motion of closure before the House. The question is :

"That the question be now put."

I think the 'Ayes' have it.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : No. I want a division. It is not the way. We should have been consulted. The House should not go by the whims of somebody. We should have been consulted. He should have asked us. If you want to get it by vote, all right, let us also record our vote.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Chitta Basu...

SHRI CHITTA BASU : I want division.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : One minute. The position under the rules is very clear. When any hon. Member wants to move a closure motion and wants to press for it, there is no option to the Chair but to put that question, particularly when this subject has been discussed for two days, and this is the third day. Now I have to put the question before the House. If you want division, I can call for division.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : I have got nothing to say against you. You are perfectly within the rules. Now I want my vote to be recorded.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : On a point of order. May I remind the Chair that even when a motion for closure is moved, the Chair should be satisfied that there has been sufficient debate on this question? The Chair has to satisfy itself that there has been sufficient debate on this question. Only then it can accept the motion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have said we have discussed this resolution for two days. Today is the third day. Do you want a division, Mr. Basu ?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : I insist on a division.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am putting the closure motion before the House.

The question is :

"That the question be now put."
The House divided.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Ayes—37; Noes—21.

AYES—37

Advani, Shri Lal K.
Anandam, Shri M.
Anandan, Shri T. V.
Appan, Shri C. A.
Bachchan, Dr. H. R.
Baharul Islam, Shri
Chaudhri, Shri N. P.
Chavda, Shri F. S.
Deshmukh, Shri F. G.
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar
Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla
Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
Kalyan Chand, Shri
Kaul, Shri B. K.
Khaitan, Shri R. P.
Krishan Kant, Shri
Mangladevi Edwar, Dr. (Mrs.)
Mathur, Shri Jagdish Prasad
Mishra, Shri J. N.
Misra, Shri Lokanath
Mohamed Usman, Shri
Murthy, Shri B. P. Nagaraja
Narayani Devi Manaklal, Shrimati
Neki Ram, Shri
Patil, Shri P. S.
Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
Purakayastha, Shri Mahitosh
Rao, Shri K. ragadda Srinivas
Roshan Lal, Shri
Roy, Shri Biren
Sangma, Shri E. M.
Satyavati Dang, Shrimati
Shukla, Shri Chakrapani
Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati

Singh, Shri Dalpat
Varma, Shri Niranjan
Vero, Shri M.

NOES—21

Alva, Shri Joachim
Ansari, Shri Hayatullah
Basu, Shri Chitta
Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
Choudhury, Shri Subrid Mullick
Gowda, Shri U. K. Lakshmana
Gupta, Shri Balkrishna
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh
Koya, Shri B. V. Abdulla
Menon, Shri Balachandra
Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja
Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar
Panda, Shri Brahmananda
Puri, Shri Dev Datt
Raju, Shri V. B.
Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
Saha, Shri Surajmal
Schamnad, Shri Hamid Ali
Sen, Dr. Juguna
Sen Gupta, Shri Dwijendralal
Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap

The motion was adopted

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The closure motion is adopted. The hon. Minister will now intervene. Mr. Pant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : The hon. Minister can speak for two minutes because you have closed this thing. This is a formality. Let us go on with the other business. Therefore, in deference to the wishes of your party, you speak for two minutes.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE, DEPARTMENTS OF ELECTRONICS AND SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH (SHRI K. C. PANT) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir I am completely in the hands of the

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

House. If it is a mere formality, I need not go through it.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : You must answer the points that have been raised in the House. The point is that you should be in a position to touch on those points. For the second Resolution there is sufficient time (*Interruptions*) So many Members have participated already and the Minister is expected to throw some light on all the points raised in the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All right. If my Swatantra friend seeks light from you, throw some light. They want light and throw light.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : He creates more darkness than light.

SHRI K. C. PANT : If it is the wish of the House that I should try to meet all the points raised, it will naturally take some time.

I need not read out the Resolution of my hon. friend, Shri Tyagi. Tyagi's Resolution is before the House, and now it is for three days that we have been discussing it.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS) in the Chair]

I know Tyagi personally also very well. I have often had the benefit of discussing various problems with him. I know that he is a patriot of long standing, and has sacrificed for the country, and has served the country in various ways. I can understand his anxiety in the matter of the increasing evidence of lawlessness in some parts of the country. I can understand that anxiety, and I can also understand the spirit in which he has moved the Resolution which is to strengthen the hands of the Government in dealing with the situation of lawlessness in those areas.

Sir, as I deal with this matter, I shall try to put before him the picture as we see it and the steps that we are taking

to meet the situation in which he as referred eloquently in his opening speech. Sir, this debate has been rewarding in many ways because it has covered a lot of ground, and a number of hon. Members have spoken with a great deal of experience, a great deal of personal knowledge and administrative experience. If I may not be charged with being individual, I would like to say that I for one found the speech of my hon'ble friend, Shri Goray, exceedingly thoughtful and thought-provoking. Shri Triloki Singh gave us an insight into one aspect of this law and order problem, and he feels strongly about his particular approach to the problem. Then today, I thought, my hon'ble friend, Shri Das, was developing his points very well. But suddenly, I do not know, how he seemed to have got involved in other matters. Anyway, on the whole, the debate has been very rewarding. While I shall try to deal with some of the major points that have emerged, Sir, the hon'ble Members will excuse me if I cannot reply to their individual points. It simply is not possible because the area covered has been too large.

One point that I would like to make in the beginning is about the wording of Shri Tyagi's Resolution with reference to the President's Rule in West Bengal. I would like to point out to him that the situation in West Bengal is not the creation of yesterday or to day. The situation in West Bengal has been created over a period of time. If we look back to 1967, then we find that in 1967 for the first time certain groups in the C.P.M. broke away from the parent party. The C.P.M. decided to get into the U.F. Government and decided to tread the Parliamentary path. They felt that the revolutionary path of violence was not the correct one and they broke away from the C.P.M. That was the beginning of the Naxalites and the other extremists group in 1967. We saw the Naxalbari incidents of violence. In several other parts of the country also there were instances of such violence. For instance, in Srikakulam in Andhra Pradesh and in the Telicherry area of Kerala co-ordination committees were set up by these small groups. It was

against this background that measures began to be taken by these various State Governments against these groups. In West Bengal also measures were taken. And if we look back we find that the Naxalite movement was controlled in West Bengal at a certain point of time. The leaders of the movement were in jail. They had been tried, found guilty and jailed, and the movement which had started off with a lot of publicity about the happenings in Naxalbari, more or less, petered out at one stage. But at that stage the United Front Government came into power. They thought it fit to release Shri Charu Mazumdar, Shri Kanu Sanyal and many others.

References were made in the course of the debate to the fact that various cases had been withdrawn. Reference also was made to the fact that there was remission of sentences against persons convicted for major offences. Sir, I think it would be correct in the historical perspective today to understand that this remission of sentences did contribute definitely to the growth of movement there and to the fact that the Naxalites could organise themselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The release took place in April and the United Front Government continued till November. During that time the Naxalite movement was always on the ebb. It was the political situation and the climate created at that time by the United Front Government which led to the decline of their activities. Therefore, in historical retrospect it would seem that this action, coupled with the political climate under the United Front Government was conducive to the kind of situation that many hon'ble Members would like to have in West Bengal today.

SHRI K. C. PANT : I was only pointing out that had they not been released at that stage, particularly after, being tried and found guilty in courts of law, they would not have had a chance to organise themselves. They would not have had a chance to go underground and go out of reach for the police and thereby organise a movement as they have organised subsequently. Certainly

there would have been little possibility in 1969 of all these groups forming an all-India platform under CP-ML. I would also like to bring to the attention of my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that in some of the other States where police measures were taken firmly, this situation was controlled. Not only in Andhra Pradesh where there was a Congress Government but in Kerala also, where the police took firm action, whether it was the Government of Mr. Nambudiripad or the subsequent Government, this particular activity, the extremist activity or the Naxalite activity, was controlled. So, I am not trying to malign any Government or malign any party. I am trying to like an objective view of the situation as developed in West Bengal. I was trying to say that all this has to be kept in mind when you consider the efforts being made by the Governor or the others there under President's rule, to bring the situation under control. In the last few months there has been a determined effort to bring the law and order situation under control in West Bengal. As I said in answer to a question the other day, and as the Prime Minister also later on said on the basis of her personal experience, there is to-day a certain change in the law and order situation in that the people are not so fearful as they were. They go to cinemas in Calcutta, they move about freely at night also and the atmosphere of fear has lessened. But there are incidents, a number of them, and the House almost every week asks us about these incidents and we give all the facts. Among these incidents unfortunately are incidents involving dishonour to the portraits and statue of national heroes like Gandhiji, Jawaharlalji, Ashutosh Mukherjee, Netaji, Tagore and Vivekananda.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Gujarat) : National flag also.

SHRI K. C. PANT : People who have symbolised the greatness of India, who have moulded the Indian nation, who have contributed to its cultural renaissance, people who have kindled faith in the hours of darkness in this country and people who have represented the best in Indian traditions and culture, it

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

is these persons whose portraits and statues they sought to disfigure. If it were not so reprehensible, I would call it childish because these are not the methods which could erase the memory of the deeds of these giants or of their life histories or of what they stood for, from the minds of the Indian people. Nevertheless, all these things are there. And what is more, there are inter-party clashes in which nobody is spared, neither the CPI, nor the CPM, nor the Congress nor the others. Those who know the situation know how many members of parties and others are being killed or wounded in various inter-party clashes. So, these are the things that are happening to-day. And when we consider suggestions for early elections, these things have to be kept in mind. I find certain amendments moved to that effect. Now, if we do not take these things into account, then you cannot proceed in a vacuum. Elections are not a matter of form. Elections must be free and fearless. In order to have free and fearless elections, you must have conditions in which free and fearless elections can be held. And that is what we are striving for. Now, I mentioned this about West Bengal. West Bengal is something about which I can speak today because it is under President's rule and there is a certain amount of direct responsibility of the Centre in the matter. But as the House knows, in respect of other States, there are certain constitutional limitations within which we must act while not in the least trying to disown our responsibility because the Centre has a duty to protect all the States not only against external aggression, but also against internal disturbances. And I would say that under Constitution the matter of police administration and public order is largely the responsibility of the States. No doubt, the provisions of Article 355 and other provisions have been referred to in the debate. The Centre also has a right to issue directions to the State Governments to ensure compliance with the existing laws. This also was referred to by Tyagiji while moving the Resolution. But the Central Government's role has not been envisaged by the Constitution-makers nor has it been the practice during all

these years in terms of constitutional sanctions of a kind which would enable the Centre to have direct responsibility for the law and order in all the States under normal circumstances. Our approach has been to advise the State Governments and to go to their assistance with additional resources. We have sought to coordinate inter-State cooperation. Particularly of late there has been anxiety expressed in this House and the other House on the matter of dacoity and we have taken various steps to coordinate the activities. We have sought to provide reasonable assistance to modernise the law and order machinery, to improve the existing system of communications, transport and intelligence coverage. Here if I may refer, we have helped them in the matter of providing wireless sets or jeeps or of the communication of intelligence, information, etc. We are quite clear in our mind that our future endeavour also should be in this direction.

Then there is another very important question, in many ways in the context of the happenings of today to which various honourable Members referred. That question is : What do we expect of the law and order machinery in the India of today ? I am referring to this question because even this debate has shown certain differences in approach in this matter. And if I may say so, this is a basic matter. In a growing economy, seeking to undo the injustice of centuries and seeking to curb the imbalances that have come about due to decades of neglect, there are bound to be tensions. There are also bound to be unfulfilled aspirations which would breed frustration. The reference to the socio-economic conditions is, therefore, quite natural. But such references do not seek to clarify the task entrusted to the law and order agencies. On the other hand, if any person in charge of law and order were to have listened to the debate in the House, he would be left completely confused as to what he was expected to do. More than the debate in the House, the House is fully aware that several parties have been systematically organising agitations on whatever they may consider appropriate to bring pressure

on the Government. When leaders of public opinion and leaders of political parties take to organising such agitations, it would also be necessary for them to indicate clearly what the law and order machinery is supposed to do in respect of such agitations. Several references were made to Gandhiji in the course of the debate. And while I cannot claim the kind of acquaintance with Gandhiji which many elder statesmen can, all of us, even of my generation, are aware of Gandhiji's philosophy of civil disobedience. He was quite clear in his mind that it was everyone's duty to resist what he considered wrong. But he was equally clear as to what the duty of the law and order machinery was in cases of such resistance. It was their duty to deal with that resistance and prosecute and punish according to the law those who are guilty of defiance of law...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : So, your officials are quoting Gandhism.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Why are you feeling uncomfortable?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : There he was talking of an alien Government. Here we are having a national Government.

SHRI K. C. PANT : I agree that Gandhiji said all these even though he was fighting an alien Government. Today it is the national Government...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Gandhiji did not expect a decent behaviour from the British Government and therefore he said : "Do whatever you like". Are you following the footsteps of the British Government in regard to the various movements? You are reading from your note something which is very insulting. This insulting thing should not be read on the floor of the House. The issue is one of the democratic rights of the people. You are denying them employment and you are denying them other things. They have every right to go and defy the law, if necessary. Your job is to see that the demands of the people are met rather than letting loose your police force. You are talking like Charan Singh, Shri Pant.

SHRI K. C. PANT : These days that has become a term of abuse for you. I hope you would not call me by that name. Nowadays it is almost a term of abuse.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Do not take it in that light. I said you are speaking like Charan Singh. It is a most distressing thing. We are a great country. The problems of this country have not been settled after independence. You are now reading out what Gandhiji said in the case of salt satyagraha and other satyagraha movements. Is it the correct analogy? We are not Gandhites. We shall defy the law, if the law comes in the way of the people. Do whatever you like.

SHRI K. C. PANT : I should have thought that it need not be stated. It is quite obvious that you are not Gandhites.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You are hypocritical Gandhites selling your conscience to blackmarketeers and giving licences to the Birlas and arresting patriots like Shri Prem Bhasin, Shri Madhu Limaye, Shri Rajnarain and Shri Dange and even Shri Goray if he had gone with them. I had been arrested because I went to Birla's land. Now you are talking of Gandhism. There should be a limit to this ...

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मेरा एक निवेदन है। श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने अपने विचारों के समर्थन में दो बातें कही हैं। मंत्री महोदय के लिये केवल यह कह देना कि उनके पूरे भाषण में उसका जवाब आयेगा, मैं समझता हूँ, भ्रम के लिये गुंजायश छोड़ेगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय इस अवसर पर यह बताएं कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त जिस प्रकार की हिंसा की और कानून तोड़ने की वकालत यहां कर रहे हैं, क्या सरकार किसी भी आर्थिक प्रश्न या आर्थिक समस्या के समाधान के लिये उसको स्वीकार करना चाहती है?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a of personal clarification. I never spoke of violence. I said about defying the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

law. Even Shri Vajpayee defied the law-section 144. I do not think that we should hear a lecture on violence and non-violence.

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : आन् ए पोइन्ट आफ इन्फार्मेशन । क्या मुझे यह मालूम हो सकता है कि भूपेश जी और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी कब से प्रो गांधी हो गए हैं ?

श्री बी० के० कौल (राजस्थान) : जब से ब्रिटिशर्स की मदद की थी उन्होंने ।

SHRI K. C. PANT : I think it would be good to resume the debate now from where we left it.

AN. HON. MEMBER : You could have continued.

SHRI K. C. PANT : I would be impolite for me. It is for you, Sir, to guide me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS) : I saw you yielding. There was no occasion for me to intervene.

SHRI K. C. PANT : I hope he will give you more occasions to test you, Sir, if we are true to Gandhiji's teachings and emphasise that law and order machinery should deal with all those agitations strictly according to law and that those who defy the law should receive the penalties according to the law of such defiance, we would not have been left with the present unhappy situation. I am referring to this aspect because in our zeal for social justice and socio-economic development, we should not be guilty of opposing those who are charged with the maintenance of law and order. Land laws have not been implemented as vigorously as some of us would have wanted. There are obvious injustices in the agrarian sector. But, if, according to the existing law, criminal trespass takes place, there cannot be any justification for an attack on the law, and order machinery for apprehending those responsible for the commission of such an offence. It is when such attacks are made and when an impression is created that those who are enforcing law and order...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I would like to know what that law and order machinery was doing when the land laws were violated and the ceiling laws were violated. Even the Planning Commission and the Chief Ministers' Conference have noted it. What were they doing when the landlords were violating the ceiling laws? Was there prosecution. This kind of thing I will never tolerate. This kind of thing should not go unchallenged anywhere.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS) : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, one thing I will tell.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I could have understood if he has said that even that law and order authority did not enforce the law when the landlords were violating the laws. But, Sir, this kind of utterance of his is intolerable. 22 years of violation of land laws protected by this Government because they get money from the landlords and now they are telling that we are violating law, we are committing criminal trespass and therefore, law is to be applied. What happened to the ceiling laws? ...

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS) : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, there should not be any running commentary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is running commentary? It is a thundering interruption.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Sir, has your intervention been successful?

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : By this way you intend to help the Chair?

SHRI K. C. PANT : No, I am strengthening him. Sir, it is when such attacks are made and when an impression is created that those who are enforcing the law and order are creating injustice or committing repression that the law and order machinery does not know what it should do. After all, we live in one society. The ideas and values given expression to in this House are ex-

pected to have and should have an impact on the mind of the people outside. I would, therefore, like the House to consider as to how we are going to strike a balance between the requirements of law and the right to protest.

If the House would categorically express itself in favour of the proposition that the law as it exists should be strictly enforced until it is changed and that protest is permissible only within the limits of law, I am sure the law and order machinery all over the country will get a clearer idea of its own task. Sir, this is the crux of the matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Rubbish, utter rubbish.

SHRI K. C. PANT : If the law is bad, you in Parliament can change that law.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But in the the case of the Birlas you did not enforce this law. We know very well the attitude with regard to law when it comes to the big man and we know very well what it is when it comes to the poor man, you come down upon him.

SHRI K. C. PANT : If the Government of the day fails in its duty to implement the law, it should be changed. It is open to you and it is open to the electorate.

Sir, we are discussing an important matter. And I have myself said that there is place for protest in a democracy obviously and in Gandhian terms obviously, when it is a matter of conscience, then Gandhiji always wanted a man to protest. But what is the law and order machinery supposed to do? You pass certain laws. You in Parliament charge the law and order machinery with the task of seeing that these laws are upheld and when they uphold them, you say they are indulging in repression. That is the crux of the problem.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : Sir, is he really opening out for a debate? Then I would like to say something because it is a very debatable point.

SHRI K. C. PANT : It is debatable, I agree. I think we will be entering into a long debate perhaps. But, I will move on, Sir, to the other more concrete matters.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Then do not raise to the philosophical levels.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Many of the speeches had been so philosophical that the temptation was put before me.

Sir, the question of commitment came up. Sir, the real question is what our commitment is to. Is it not our commitment to uphold the basic principles on which the Constitution has been framed and which the founding fathers have given to this country, the principles of secularism, of democracy and of socialism? Now, ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes, children of the founding fathers.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Well, we are all children of the founding fathers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The child of an eminent founding father is going wrong.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Sir, I cannot possibly object to that statement. But the only thing is, he thought my father was going wrong in his days.
4 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Then he was going wrong as a founding father.

SHRI K. C. PANT : I accept the compliment. The question is, how do we wish to proceed? As far as the basic principle of secularism is concerned, in spite of all the efforts made in the country in the last so many years time and again, we find communal violence springing up in the various parts of the country, erupting. In recent months we have seen several instances. The House has been deeply concerned, the secular people in this country have been deeply concerned and the National Integration Council has taken up this question. I shall go into that a little because there were reference to this here but here is a challenge to one of the basic principles which we adhere to,

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

which we believe in, which we consider as fundamental to the polity, which we want to create in this country. Then there is democracy. Here we are faced with a challenge which is very basic again. We are faced with the challenge whether the Parliament and the Assemblies in this country will decide the fate of this country or whether its fate will be decided on the streets, whether it will be through debates and discussions or whether it will be through a clash of arms on the roads. These are the important questions. After all if you accept the democratic path, you have to accept its disciplines, you have to accept its limitation. Sometimes you have to accept the fact that this path is a slower path. It cannot be as quick as the dictatorial path, the path of the sword or the battle but it is a path of listening to another, of persuasion, of talking a cross the table, of trying to carry the people with you and necessarily sometimes it takes longer but the end product or effect is better and this is the basic consideration which led, as I said, our founding fathers to accept this way. It was open to them at that stage to have adopted for this country any political pattern that they liked. They had the choice of the world's political pattern before them and they chose the parliamentary system of democracy. This is being challenged in many ways and it is this challenge that has to be met.

Then there is socialism. Here we have another kind of violence. Various kinds of vested interests are there. My friend, Shri Gupta, referred to some of them. We have to find ways and means of seeing to it that our system promises a better life to the bulk of our people and brings about conditions in which we can ensure social justice, economic growth and better standard of living for our people and these are 'musts' in any scheme of things that you envisage and if in arriving at this scheme of things you face struggle from those who vested interests are affected, certainly by legislation or whatever you like you have to overcome those difficulties so that you create the conditions which you are committed to create under your Consti-

tution, under the dream which the founding fathers have put before you. These are the basic concepts and here I would also refer to another form of violence which is endangering this country and that is the violence which has its roots in the fissiparous tendencies that sometimes erupt from place to place and which threatens the unity of this country.

These are the things with which we have been faced in the past and all these a way are deep-seated and deep-rooted problems but we, from here in the Parliament, have to give a lead to the country and to see that all these forms of violence are met and that they are not allowed to grow because, otherwise, they affect one or the other of the basic pillars upon which our whole parliamentary system is based. We are a large country. We aspire to be a great one and we can only be a great country if we are true to our own genius, our own traditions, our own history, our own culture and civilisation. We cannot be a great country if we are pale copy of some other country.

Those who look today to Mao for leadership, those who think that the Chinese experiment is the only right experiment for this country, they do great injustice to the genius of this country to its ancient civilisation, to its capacity to produce men of vision, men of great stature who have provided illumination to the world from time to time. Whether it is Buddha or Asoka or Gandhi or Akbar—men of very great stature—they have not looked to some other countries for guidance of how they should build this country. Of course we welcome thoughts from all directions, but it is not with any slavish mentality to copy blindly whatever someone else lays down as the law. So we have to be very careful that we do not fall into this trap of regarding everything that is projected in propaganda materials as being the right path for us to follow. That would be tragic. It would be untrue to the greatness of this country. It would be untrue to our capacity to find our own way. What had happened after independence? When we first took to planning and democracy, you know that there were

many in the world who questioned the congruity of these two ideas. They said it is not possible to have planning and democracy together in the sense that the Western democracies said that total planning is something that belongs to the Soviet Union or other countries, and the other countries said, "Well, this cannot go with democracy." But here we tried parliamentary democracy and planning combining the two. And similarly, at a time when the world was divided between two warring camps in the cold war, we chose the path of non-alignment. So let us not be too timid in these matters. We are a great country. We have also perhaps something to contribute to others, and so we cannot be a pale shadow of any other country. This is a basic concept that we must accept.

Now, Sir, the broad questions that have been raised, I shall leave out; I shall come to some of the specific points that were raised. About the communal situation somebody asked me—I think it was Mr. Goray—about what happened after the National Integration Council. Now before I come to that, I just tried to see whether the communal situation has deteriorated of late, or whether, all along, in the last twenty years, it has been at a steady level. I find that it has sometimes grown worse and it has sometimes grown better, and for a long period of years I find that the tendency was for the situation generally to improve and for communal violence practically to end. There was hardly any communal violence for a period of years. And then there was a short period in which there was again a recurrence of communal violence. 1962 saw an end to it. 1965 saw an end to it. Then, in the last three years, we have had many instances which, as I said earlier, caused a great deal of concern. So it is not as though there is a uniform pattern or a uniform level of communal violence in the country all through. We have to go deeper into this. Of course the causes are very deep, and we know

the historical reasons. But we are committed to uproot these causes, to go into the depth of this problem, and therefore we have to understand also as to what brings about these things and how we can tackle them. And the National Integration Council has, in fact, been going into only the manifestation aspect but into the causative aspect also. Sir, the National Integration Council was reconstituted in the second half of 1967 with a view to developing a national consensus against communalism, which posed a serious threat to the secular democracy in this country. The Council met in Srinagar in June, 1968, and in its declared objectives expressed the strong resolve of the nation to fight against communal and the other divisive forces. The National Integration Council in June 1968 had made a number of recommendations for action at the governmental level. Some of these required legislative action which has been taken with the enactment of the Criminal and Election Laws (Amendment) Act 1969. The scope of sections 153A and 505 of the IPC has been enlarged and heavier punishments have been provided for offence committed in places of worship and the Central and State Governments have been given powers to prevent the publication of such matters as may tend to promote feelings of disharmony or illwill between different communities. There were several other recommendations which required action at the administrative level. These related to the strengthening of arrangements for the collection of intelligence, making the district officials squarely responsible for the maintenance of communal peace, prompt investigation and trial of cases arising out of communal riots, constitution of Citizens Committees, revision of text-books, etc. Action has been taken by the Central and State Governments in the light of those recommendations. The Prime Minister has had discussions with the Chief Ministers on two occasions and after her meeting in May 1970 she wrote a letter to the Chief Ministers emphasizing the various points. I think you are all aware of those points;

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

they have come up during Question Hour and so I think I need not repeat them.

Sir, I think it is also not necessary for me to go into the details of how we are tackling the Naxalite question because I have during questions and answers here given on several occasions the steps that we have been taking and I can only assure the House that we shall continue to take these steps on the law and order front. Now we have been repeatedly referring to the need for a political approach even to the problem created by the activities of the Naxalites and other allied extremist groups. We have come in for a great deal of criticism and our approach has also been deliberately misinterpreted. What we were interested in emphasizing was that it is the vigilance of the people, of the common man, that alone can ultimately contain and control these groups with extra-territorial links. By political approach we had in mind a dialogue with the impressionable young to expose the fallacies of a particular kind of reasoning, a dialogue to furnish information that is deliberately suppressed particularly about what is happening elsewhere, a dialogue with a view to educate them. It is of course always necessary. What we have in mind and what we have been steadily encouraging is that the ordinary man and woman, the student in the college, the worker in the factory and the labourer in the field, should all realise the threat which these groups pose to our democracy, to our nation and to our cherished values. It is when they become so aware that the administration and the law and order machinery can secure the necessary co-operation from them in dealing with these groups. If the law and order machinery were to act in isolation no results can be achieved. So to that extent I welcome the suggestion and I may assure the House that we have already been acting in the spirit of the suggestion particularly in West Bengal in getting the people themselves involved in meeting the

challenge which these extremist groups pose. Our approach does not mean that the vigilance of our administrative agencies or the endeavour of the law and order machinery should slacken, nor has it in fact in any way slackened. We have been vigorously enforcing the legal provisions, preventive as well as penal, in dealing with the activities particularly of the extremist groups. Prosecution of a large number of individuals prosecution of the printers and publishers of subversive literature, systematic drive to recover illicitly held firearms and explosives and vigorous police action, these are some of the measures that are being taken and that will continue to be taken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Dialogue? you have mentioned, does it mean political dialogue?

SHRI K. C. PANT: That is what I said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If that is so, then the treatment in the jails should become better and frame-up should not be there as was there in the case of Shri Nagi Reddy who was in our party and this shooting people at sight and then saying they have been killed in encounters must be stopped. If you want at all any political approach, the political approach cannot be accompanied by totalitarian methods. Even now Bengal is demanding; Mr. Kanu Sanyal, you are not giving him even the status of a political prisoner; you are denying him class I status though all of us are demanding that. We are fighting also ideologically and politically these Naxalites and we get killed also in the process. That is what I say.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Nobody is killing you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know, Sir, nobody is killing me...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: The Naxalites are killing us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is all right. It is a serious matter...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: The Naxalites are killing us, not the CPI. The CPI are harbouring them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I must say...

SHRI K. C. PANT: I think I can end your quarrel by saying that both have been killed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My friend can say that, but having gone out of our party. They are killing us. In Bengal for one CPM killed, ten Naxalites are killed. I am certain of that...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: That is a slander.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because we are a strong party...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): Mr. Minister, you must know that normally you should take thirty minutes in a non-official debate.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: On a point of order. The next Resolution is very important. If the Minister takes all the time...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): I have already told him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I request you to give class I to Kanu Sanyal and other prisoners.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Since you want me to finish and since several Members are keen to take up the next item and since you could not, with all respect, succeed in containing Shri Bhupesh Gupta...

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He has left now.

SHRI K. C. PANT: ... I think I should not continue. I do not want to take the time of the House. I would only like to end by saying that when we consider the economic situation in this country, we have to bear in mind that the poverty of this country is not

something that can be wished away, its grinding poverty. We, in this House are all committed to taking steps to remove it, but we are committed to doing so in a democratic way. We had in 1947 inherited a certain situation, at the time of independence, a huge country with a huge population, with centuries of colonial exploitation behind us, with no industries, no scientific manpower worth the name, and with a tremendous backlog in various areas of development. It is from that stage that we have tried to lift ourselves up. One can always quarrel with little things, but taking a broad sweep of what has happened in the last twenty years, anyone who says that nothing has happened at all is casting a slur on the Indian people as a whole. It is not a question of a handful of Government servants or Ministers. It is on the efforts of the Indian people as a whole that a slur is cast. So, in future also, we have to consider whether we, as a nation, can pull together or not and whether we in Parliament can give the right lead to the country or not in considering fundamental questions of this kind. On crucial questions if we can give the right lead that will help to take the country forward. If law and order is maintained, it will help the economic growth also. If this House creates a sense of discipline in the country, a sense of adherence to the rules of democracy, if this House creates that feeling in the country that each one, each individual, wherever he is, rather than go on strike, rather than go slow, goes as fast as he can, and produces more wealth, we can ameliorate the conditions of the very poor and the down-trodden. If we can give that kind of lead, it will be lead in the right direction. It is, I think, essential for this House to create an impression in this country that whatever else we may do, we are not going to allow that framework of democracy in this country to crumble and it is on this not that I would like to end this particular speech today.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: Just one question. I was very much interested when the Minister said that they would like to join in dialogue with the Naxalite

[Shri N. G. Goray.]
elements. I would like to know from the Minister whether they have realised that the Naxalites are not only fighting with spears and shotguns but they have the background of a philosophy, and to meet that philosophical challenge what do the Government propose to do, and how do they propose to approach the younger elements which they are drawing to themselves?

SHRI K. C. PANT: That is not a task for the Government, if I may say so with all respect, alone. It is a task for all of us, and it is a task in which I know I can count upon Shri Goray for assistance, and I know that he can spell out the ideological challenge much clearer than I can, and he realises it and he knows it. I would seek his help in spelling it out.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I thank the hon. Minister for his very logical and reasonable intervention and for the way he has put the case before the House. It is very difficult for me to reply in detail to the whole debate because my hon. friend there is waiting for his resolution which is as important, and I would therefore not take much time of the House but let me repeat the resolution as it is:

"This House takes a grave view of the alarming deterioration that has occurred during the past few months in the maintenance of law and order in several regions of the country, particularly in the territories under President's rule, and regrets the failure of the Government to take effective and timely steps to curb and suppress the disruptive and subversive forces that are progressively gaining ascendancy in the country with the result that people are fast losing faith in the security of their lives and property."

Sir, practically all the hon. Members of this House have expressed sentiments which are quite relevant to the resolution I have moved. None of them has opposed the resolution. Most of the Members who argued just a little differently, their argument basic-

ally was that these movements and this violence and disturbance of law and order have got a background of socio-economic problems, landless labour, unemployment, all these things. That does not mean that it is such a natural phenomenon that Government does not own any responsibility for it. Even for the purpose of solving those problems of the poorer classes, unemployment and all that, even for that the ultimate responsibility vests in the Government either at the Centre or in the States. That is a different case. But Government cannot wash off their hands because this problem has arisen, as my friend Mr. Krishna Kant has said, on account of the unemployment situation and other things. That is right, I can well understand. When I say that law and order should be maintained, I do not mean that it must be maintained at the point of the bullet or the gun. It must be maintained by doing away with the causes which have created such a situation. Even that is the responsibility of the Planning Commission or the Government or their policy. Therefore, the law and order situation, whatever be the grounds, whatever be the justification for it, is again ultimately the responsibility of the Government. But I agree with the hon. Minister that Government alone cannot maintain law and order. Actually speaking, in a society it is most of the social values recognised by the society that are responsible for maintaining law and order; 90 per cent of it is maintained by the social and moral values recognised by the society. It is those values which are controlling all activities. It is against those who violate those values that the police comes in. Factually speaking, the strength of the society is the basic ground on which such situations and crises could be avoided. For that purpose I am afraid, although my hon. friend has agreed with this idea—he has already emphasized it in better terms than I can do, he has done it very well—but nothing has been done so far to strengthen the hands of society.

Communal difference were there, and there were communal riots also.

There was the National Integration Coordination Committee also appointed. Months ago it met once. It was to do something. Nothing has been done. What has the Government done to strengthen the hands of the society? I appeal again to all the parties to come together because it is not a question of party politics. Law and order is a common factor for all political parties. All can stand together and organise among the society, as I have suggested, a Ralsha Dal or some sort of organisation, so that in each village, in each mohalla, the society might organise itself and guarantee the safety and defence of their life and property. Those very people who organise this should see that they have a sense of unity in the whole population. Whether the Scheduled Castes or other Castes, or Muslims or Hindus or anybody, we want all in the village to become united together, and they will have the privilege to see that they keep law and order. Certain genuine grievances, as the hon. Minister said, must be redressed by means of law. Therefore, Government must be vigilant enough to give relief, whatever relief is needed, whatever is possible to give. If those forces are organised in the localities to strengthen the hands of society, those people could forward the claims of those people who claim relief. (*Interruptions*) That is another matter. It is not for me to give any suggestions as to what minor things could be done. But I understand, for the purpose of just maintaining law and order—I have read some news—some parties may be declared unlawful or something. I do not know if that is done; let the Government do it. But I have moved this Resolution—I want to make this clear—not with a view to condemning the Government. That was not my view. Factually speaking, as a patriot, as an MP, as a Member of this House, it is my duty to strengthen the hands of the Government for the purpose of maintaining law and order. It is for that purpose. Suppose the Government starts a campaign of relief, shall we not all be a party to it? Shall we not give our cooperation?

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SAN-YAL (West Bengal): What is the point in strengthening the hands of a weak and wicked Government?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Suppose there is famine relief work started by the Government, shall we not help the Government? Shall we not cooperate with the Government in the task? If we are patriotic, for anything patriotic, we must stand by the Government in spite of our being in the Opposition. So, I have moved this Resolution just to make the world understand just to make our people appreciate that this is the demand unanimously voiced by all parties so that when the Government takes to it, they will have behind them the whole forces of the country together. It was for this reason, it was not with a view to condemning the Government... (*Interruptions*) Basically, I wanted to highlight the point so that the Government is justified in taking action, in whatever action they have to take.

I have been able to—if you pardon me, Sir—just pickpocket one of the Members of the Treasury Benches. Luckily, I got a document. It is a sort of a cyclostyled briefing given by the Government to its party people in which there is something relevant. I do not want to quote the whole of it. But about the so-called extremists they have enumerated their aims and objectives, and I quote—

- (i) Their open adherence to the ideology of Mao and the Chinese Communist Party.
- (ii) Their total repudiation of the Constitution and constitutional forums."

This is what they know, so that it gives me the satisfaction that the Government is vigilant about this matter. I am very glad.

- "(iii) Their belief is violent overthrow of Government by armed struggles."

The Government knows that these are the principles on which these so-called extremists are working.

[Shri Mahavir Tyagi.]

“(iv) Their belief that conditions are ripe for a revolution and that revolutionary struggles should be organised all over the country.

(v) Their recourse, in practice, to terrorist attacks on individuals and institutions whom they classify as ‘class enemies’.”

These are the points which the Government knows. They have circulated them to their Members to understand what actually the situation is. After reading this I am fully satisfied that the Government is vigilant enough and I hope they would do the needful.

I do not want to take much time of the House. I would not emphasise that in this matter they must devise a method whereby all political parties with a patriotic outlook might give their co-operation to them so that the situation is soon improved. But pray, do not call them ‘extremists’ as you have been doing so far. They are not adventurists either. Rebels are not adventurists. Those who want to crush the Constitution, finish with the Government, do not believe in the sovereignty of India and are inspired from our enemies are not extremists.

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SAN-YAL : This Government is unconstitutional and has lost the faith of the country.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : It is not adventure. It is treachery. And, therefore, they must be treated as rebels. I hope the Government will do the needful in this matter.

I do not want to take much time of the House because my friend has just half an hour to move his Resolution. The purpose of my Resolution has been served and I would beg of you to permit me to withdraw my Resolution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS) : I think according to the procedure I will have to go by the amendments. There is an amendment by Sri Chitta Basu.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Since you have not allowed me to speak, please read out my amendment.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Since the mover is withdrawing his Resolution how can there be an amendment? What is the amendment to?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS) : Unless the House give the permission to withdraw the Resolution cannot be withdrawn. Therefore, I will have to go by the amendments. Then I will come to the Resolution.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Must you pit the procedure against our intention?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : I entirely agree that without the approval of the House it cannot be withdrawn. But if it is withdrawn, there is no question of amendment.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : श्रीमन्, प्रोसीजर के तरीके से विद्वाल एक्सेप्टेस या रिजेक्शन का सवाल जब तक अमेडमेंट्स डिस्पोज ऑफ नहीं हो जाते जब तक लिया नहीं जा सकता। इस लिए उन्होंने अपनी मंशा प्रकट की है। अब सदन के हाथ में यह प्रस्ताव है कि वह उस पर क्या राय दें पर सदन उस को पहले ले नहीं सकता जब तक कि उन अमेडमेंट्स को पहले नहीं लिया जाता। पूरे रूजोल्यूशन पर सदन कोई निर्णय अभी नहीं ले सकता।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : विद्वाल के लिए मैंने रेक्वेस्ट की है सदन से। सदन की इजाजत जब तक नहीं मिलती विद्वाल नहीं हो सकता। अमेडमेंट पर वोट लेने के बाद जब प्रस्ताव आयेगा तो मैं हाउस से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि मुझे विद्वाल की इजाजत दी जाय।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS) : The question is :

1. “That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely :—

‘and this House is of the considered opinion that the Government

of the State under the President's rule run by the bureaucracy divorced from the people cannot to order fresh poll in order to facilitate the installation of popularly elected representatives Government which can, alone, with the popular co-operation, ensure the law and order for the people."

The motion was negatived.

SHRI HAYATULLAH ANSARI : Sir, on a point of order. Suppose some amendment is passed in the House and after that the Resolution is withdrawn, what will be the position?

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): That is a hypothetical question.

Now, I shall put amendment No. 2 to vote.

The question is :

2. "That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely :—

'and calls for immediate mid-term election with a view to getting a responsible Government in West Bengal'."

The House divided.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): Ayes—6; Noes—57.

AYES—6

Basu, Shri Chitta.
Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
Choudhury, Shri Suhrid Mullick.
Menon, Shri Balachandra.
Rao, Shri Katragadda Srinivas.
Sanyal, Shri Sasankasekhar.

NOES—57

Alva, Shri Joachim.
Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.
Appan, Shri G. A.
Baharul Islam, Shri.

Brar, Sardar Narindar Singh.

Chaudhari, Shri N. P.

Das, Shri Balaram

Das, Shri Bipinpal.

Deshmukh, Shri T. G.

Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.

Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.

Gujral, Shri I. K.

Gupta, Shri Balkrishna.

Kalyan Chand, Shri.

Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.

Kollur, Shri M. L.

Koya, Shri B. V. Abdulla.

Krishan Kant, Shri.

Kulkarni, Shri A. G.

Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.)

Mehta, Shri Om.

Mohamod Usman, Shri.

Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja.

Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar.

Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.

Narayani Devi Mankaiyal, Shrimati.

Neki Ram, Shri.

Panda, Shri Brahmananda.

Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.

Patil, Shri G. R.

Patil, Shri P. S.

Purabi Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati.

Purakayastha, Shri Mahitosh.

Puri, Shri Dev Datt.

Raju, Shri V. B.

Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.

Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.

Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa.

Roshan Lal, Shri.

Saha, Shri Surajmal.

Sangma, Shri E. M.

Satyavati Dang, Shrimati.

Schamnad, Shri Hamid Ali.

Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.

Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.

Singh, Shri Dalpat.

Singh, Shri Jogendra.

Singh, Shri Phool.
Singh, Raja Shankar Pratap.
Singh, Shri Triloki.
Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad.
Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.
Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi.
Venigalla Satyanarayana, Shri.
Vero, Shri M.
Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): The question is :

3. "That—

(i) in line 5 of the Resolution, after the words 'of the Government' the words 'and political parties' be inserted.

(ii) in lines 6-7 of the Resolution, for the words 'are progressively gaining ascendancy' the words 'have been encouraged to gain ascendancy' be substituted.

(iii) in lines 8-9 of the Resolution, for the words 'people are fast losing faith in the security of their lives and property' the words 'it has become increasingly difficult to carry on Government in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution with due regard to Fundamental Rights enshrined in the Constitution' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): The question is :

4. "That in line 4 of the Resolution for the word 'failure' the words *the utter incapacity*' be substituted
The motion was negatived.

DR. K. NAGAPPA ALVA (Mysore): Sir, I would like to withdraw my amendment.

*Amendment No. 5 was, by leave, withdrawn.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my Resolution.
The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

RESOLUTION RE RECASTING THE STRATEGY OF NATIONAL PLANNING AND THE FIVE YEAR PLAN

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir...

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Sir, is it also assured that after the Resolution is moved, the amendments also will be allowed to be moved before the House adjourns?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): No, it cannot be done. Unless the Motion is put, no amendments can be moved.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: I would entreat you to arrange the programme in such a way that along with the Resolution the amendments are also moved.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS): Let us see how it progresses. Now, Mr. Krishan Kant, you please proceed.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg to move :

"That this House is of opinion and recommends that the strategy of national planning should be so oriented and the Five Year Plan so recast that—

(i) the basic minimum needs of the people are provided by 1975;

(ii) the disparities in ownership of wealth and control over means of production are so reduced that the ratio between the minimum and the maximum incomes deriv-

*For text of the amendment *vide* R.S. Debate, dated the 31st July, 1970.