

1966

THE ARMED FORCES (SPECIAL POWERS) CONTINUANCE BILL, 1968

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill to continue the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Regulation, 1958 for a further period.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

RESULT OF ELECTION TO THE CENTRAL ADVISORY BOARD OF ARCHAEOLOGY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Hayatullah Ansari, being the only candidate nominated for election to the Central Advisory Board of Archaeology, is declared duly elected to be a member of the said Board.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

THE CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL SECURITY FORCE BILL, 1966—contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chitta Basu You have taken eight minutes yesterday and you have five minutes left.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): I want 10 minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Madam, I was yesterday discussing about the reactions of the State Governments with regard to this Central Industrial Security Force Bill. And by quoting the opinions of the different State Governments, I sought to make it clear to this House that most of the State Governments, either run by Congress Ministries or by non-Congress Ministries, have expressed their total or partial opposition to this proposed measure.

Now, I want to draw your attention to the relevant portion of the speech made by the hon. Minister while piloting this Bill. There, he wanted to make out that the object of the Bill was simply to reorganise, to reorient or to modernise the vast system of different Central undertakings. But then, if it had been the real object of this Bill, this Bill in its body should have got included certain clauses or provisions in the matter of recruitment of Watch and Ward personnel, in the matter of their training, in the matter of modernisation and in the matter of the co-ordination of the Watch and Ward personnel scattered round the country. But to my great surprise, I find—I think you will also agree with me—that there has been no clause or provision, not even some sort of discussion, as to the measures the Government proposes to take with regard to reorganisation or co-ordination or modernisation or any of the purposes of the Watch and Ward staff. From this it is clear that the fundamental object of the Bill is not being pursued. The actual object of the Bill is not to strengthen the Watch and Ward Forces but to have other things. And which are those other things? I will come to that point later on.

Therefore, one of my arguments for opposing this Bill is that although it has been said that the purpose of this Bill has been to reorganise the Watch and Ward staff, it has not been included in the body of the Bill. If that is the object, that object cannot be fulfilled by the passage of this Bill into an Act as it is.

My second point is this. It has been said by many hon. Members in this House that it is something like the Railway Protection Force; simply, the object is to protect the properties of the Central industrial undertakings. I will draw your attention to the activities of the Railway Protection Force itself. It has been made abundantly