

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You reply now.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I had given an amendment at that time which has lapsed now, and from that point of view I did not know whether it was necessary to make further changes. I had promised at that time that I would consult Members, and I am glad to say that the consensus of our discussion is that for the time being, as the limited step that we are taking under the Bill will be adequate though not quite complete, the Bill in its present form could be proceeded with. So, Sir, I commend the Bill for the acceptance of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, I move:

2. "That at page 1, line 4, for the figure '1959' the figure '1960' be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Enacting Formula

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, I move:

1. "That at page 1, line 1, for the word 'Tenth' the word 'Eleventh' be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH PREMISES AND ECCLESIASTIC ORDER (RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITY) BILL, 1959—continued

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, the House adjourned immediately after I had begun my speech on this Bill, the Catholic Church Premises and Ecclesiastic Order (Restriction of Political Activity) Bill, 1959. This is an important subject, and it is becoming more and more clear that we have to carry out the intention and purposes of the Constitution and to provide for restricting the political activities of the religious institutions as religious institutions and the Catholic Church as Catholic Church. I make it again clear that my intention is not to put restrictions on any person belonging to any religion, because it is his fundamental right to take part in political activities. It is a fundamental right to cast vote in whichever manner he or she likes. That is not at all the point. My object is to bring about certain restrictions on the institutions or on the persons functioning in a religious capacity and employing that capacity for political activities.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Sir, this should not be a controversial thesis, because our country and our national movement in particular stand committed to the position which I have suggested. When the matter was discussed in the Constituent Assembly, many Members spoke expressing concern at the manner in which the Church and its employees were indulging in political activities, and in fact in pursuance of that kind of thought and trend of ideas it had been incorporated even in the Constitution, provided for in the Constitution itself, that laws might be passed to restrict such activities as would come into conflict with the conception of a secular State. Unfortunately, since the Constitution has been passed, we have done nothing in the matter. Therefore, I said that we should begin here after the experiences we had gone through to carry out the directives of the Constitution and the intentions and even the letter of the Constitution insofar as this matter went.

As I said, this is a non-controversial proposition. I know that when I speak from this side, I am liable to be understood as being partisan. Sir, just now you saw that I introduced a Bill containing verbatim the provisions of another Bill of the Government, and just because it sprang up from the Communist Party some Members opposed it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): You need not explain what the Bill was.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Others thought that since their Party men were opposing it, they should also oppose it. Sir, I think in this matter there should not be any partisan element introduced. Now, the national movement, I said, is committed to a stand of the kind I have proposed in this Bill. Here I have got before me the Report of the Christian Missionary Activities Enquiry Committee of Madhya Pradesh, 1956. I just referred to it when during the debate over this Bill last time my speech ended

due to want of time. Here at page 159 you will find a separate Chapter: "Admonition by National Leaders". The Report says:

"On this point, we may turn to the opinion of some of the national leaders. Sardar Patel said, 'Let them (the Missionaries) go on serving the suffering with their hospitals and dispensaries, educate the poor and give selfless service to the people. They can even carry on their propaganda in a peaceful manner. But let them not use mass conversions for political ends. We want them to identify themselves with the people and make India their home.'"

Then I think a speech was made by the hon. Member, Rajkumari Amrit Kaur. That is also quoted here in this Report. I need not read it out because she is here and I asked her personally to speak on this Bill because she made the statement in 1948. About twelve years have passed since she had made that statement. I do not know if she remembers what she said. But I reminded her this morning that on this subject she should speak again. We would like to hear her.

Then there is the Neogy Committee's Report. It says:

"The manner in which the missionary movement goes on in certain places is clearly intended to serve some political purpose in the cold war. If an activity is found to be political but carried on under the cloak of religion, the continuance of such activity is fraught with danger to the security of the State. Moreover, to exploit the need and distress of the people for adding to the numbers of what is styled 'world community' for the purpose of promoting the cause of world peace and justice as conceived by a foreign nation is interference in the internal affairs of India."

It says that the Committee is very clear that such activities should not be

favoured in our system of Constitution. It is on page 164. I am reading it out because you could get only one copy of the Report. After a lot of difficulty, I got this Report.

"We find that the Roman Catholic Church engages itself in the recruitment of labour and uses it as a means of proselytisation. Religious bodies, we recommend, should be prohibited from engaging in such occupations."

Then they recommended—

"We consider it desirable that the matter should not be left vague or indefinite and recommend that an amendment of the Constitution be sought, firstly to clarify that the right of propagation has been given only to the citizens of India and secondly that it does not include conversion brought about by force, fraud or illicit means."

Strong words are used in this Report about the religious organisation indulging in political activities. And as you know, in our country they have been institutionalised in the various missions and in the Order of the Church. That has been more or less the accepted theme of the national mind on this particular subject. Then what happened? I think I mentioned that Gandhiji opposed it; he wrote articles saying that a religious body should not indulge in such political activities. And the Prime Minister—if he were here, he would have told us—has written many things. He has been taking serious exception to the intrusion of religion into politics, to the intrusion of religious orders into the political activities of the country. Therefore, in that way it is not at all a thesis which is being advanced by me or by the Communist Party for the first time. It has been the line of thought of the entire national movement for, I think, two or three generations. Since the inception of the movement that idea developed and it was developed continuously and when more public men came into the picture, the more they expanded these

ideas and developed this theme stressing the need for separating politics from religion. You know how we had to suffer because a certain party introduced religion, not by way of bringing in any particular Order. The Muslim League brought religion into politics and we had to pay heavily for it. I need not go into it. Therefore, our experience also tells us that this matter should be taken serious view of. Here are interesting things of this Order. I collected a lot of material, and let alone the recent experience in Kerala and other places; here I draw your attention to some of the interesting things. I think in Madras steps were taken against a student. For what? The student says:

"I was an intermediate student. I know to my bitter experience how I had been fined simply because I attended Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's meeting in Madras."

And then somebody said while giving evidence or making a statement that he attended a meeting addressed by Jawaharlal Nehru and the college which was under Catholic control took action for having attended Jawaharlal Nehru's meeting.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): May I know in which year the incident occurred?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will know everything.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Kindly give me the date also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You want the date? I will give you the date later on. It was said by a Member of the other House, and he is a member of the Communist Party.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants the date.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The date? Let me read that out.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Is it the statement of the student or of the Communist Party?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A student can be a Communist as well. The hon. Member can know that much.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Is he a Communist?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He may be a Communist but he is also a student. And he attended not a meeting addressed by any Communist Party leader but by the leader of your Party. It is not that we should not go to Jawaharlal Nehru's meeting. I thought that you would like us . . . (*Interruption.*)

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): If the student is a Communist, it is quite understandable. I can appreciate it also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Some people do not quite understand as you readily do.

That is the position. Again he revealed it in the other House. While the brother of that student was reading in the Loyola College in Madras, he was castigated and penalised by the Catholic authorities controlling that college because he was reading a news magazine called 'Blitz.' What a revolutionary . . .

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): He is making an insinuation against the Loyola College and I would ask him to give me full facts because that is absolutely unfounded. I was a student of the Loyola College and know the entire thing. I would ask him to give me full facts; let him not give very small things without giving full particulars.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad that the Loyola College has at least produced one good interrupter.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Not a bluffer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is very good. I hope too many are not there, produced from that college like that. Anyway, the *Alma Mater* is there; no

information is needed. The information is, I have said that a Member of Parliament said it in the other House. You can find out from him or I can ask him to furnish it.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Member of Parliament?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, he is a Member of Parliament.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Who is that?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Nagi Reddy.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): Is it your contention that the Loyola College is maintaining some secular status?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. You are interrupting your own leader.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is not interrupting me . . .

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Not like those people.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: He is proud of all that has been done. Do not impose it on him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your leader can take care of himself.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I need some friendly assistance. As you know, we are a collective body and we function as such.

Here is a case regarding the Rev. Maria Doss. In Tuticorin, in the examination-in-chief, he said:

"The church is bound to be interested in all elections held under the Indian Constitution."

That was the line of the acting Bishop. He further said:

"The church is interested in safeguarding the interests of the Catholics."

That is what he said. The acting Bishop there, the Rev. Maria Doss, got up and said that. How can they tell a lie? They are telling what they are doing. He said:

"And this objective, to be achieved in a full measure, required such interference by the church."

Again—

"Should there be a Papal Edict directing the Catholics in India not to vote for the Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, the church in India would demand of the layman of the community strict compliance with that directive of His Holiness. The Catholics are enjoined to have implicit faith in the wisdom of His Holiness whose decisions they are not expected to question under any circumstances."

I am not concerned with their implicit loyalty, but I am concerned with that point where he says that it is open to the Catholic Church to call upon the layman not to vote for the Prime Minister. I am concerned with that point where he says that it is open to the Catholic Church to call upon the laymen following that faith not to vote for the Prime Minister or anybody for that matter, and this is made a papal edict. This is the position. Status of religion is brought in here and the religious authority and weight is introduced with a view to conditioning or directing or interfering with matters of a secular State—even in elections. Now, this is what he said. Then, Sir, this has been going on and Government has been watching it. I do not know why they did not do something about it. I shall tell you more—let me go to the 1955 Andhra elections—the mid-term election in 1955. From Bishop's house, Nellore, on the 20th January, 1955 a circular was issued—I have got a copy of the circular that was issued. The circular begins with, "Dear Reverend Father". Then in another portion a general edict is given. It is:

"As the Andhra State elections are coming nearer, I request you to instruct our people that it is their duty to vote, a conscientious duty to be fulfilled according to the laws of God and the Church. I further request you to warn our people against joining or supporting the Communist Party in any way, either by voting or by spreading its literature or by becoming members of the Communist Party. A Catholic may, on no account, vote for candidates belonging to the Communist Party. In this connection I may remind you of the solemn warning of the Hierarchy of India as stated in their joint Pastoral on the condemnation of Communism by the Holy Sea (11th December, 1949)."

It is signed by him. Now, what is this? I don't mind if this Bishop in his individual capacity asks anybody to vote in a particular manner or not to vote in a particular manner, but you will have noted from what I have read out and brought to your notice that he was functioning in the capacity of a Bishop, and he was addressing his letter to the Father and other people, and he was issuing it from the Bishop's house. He signs over this description, "Bishop of Nellore". He does not say, "a citizen of India". He is the Bishop of Nellore. That is how it happened. Now, it is a clear case. Hon. Members may think . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Friendly advice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The only thing is if too many friends of the Catholic Church and the papal coterie start advising in this manner in the name of religion, our Constitution will disappear from this earth to some other distant world and there will be no debate here based on the Constitution; it will not be any secular Constitution any more. Our Constitution enjoins precisely against that kind of advice. You are right—

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

it is advice, but I would only ask you to note that he is asking as a Bishop to do or not to do a certain political act, and how one should vote is none of the functions of a Bishop. He may say he does not like Communism. They may say such things, but even so I doubt whether it would not be interfering in political matters. It is patently political of some people, even liberal people, even non-political people say, "We do not want to go and participate in elections; it is party politics". Here a Bishop comes in, enters it and tells how one should vote. Not only tells, he wants the institution over which he presides, that organisation to influence the course of elections. It is gross interference in the secular political affairs of the country, undermining and subverting not only the spirit but the letter of the Constitution. Are we or are we not to take notice of it? Are we or are we not to defend all the secular concepts of the State? Are we to pass over these things in silence just because they do not matter very much at the moment? But I tell you from the experience of past history that, if we do not put a check on this kind of thing, these things may develop in such a manner that it will be a menace, a great national menace—already it is a menace in certain parts of India, but it will be a greater menace. Therefore, it is the duty of the Government to take action.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of our recent experience in the Kerala elections. Elections, let us forget. Kerala elections is not the point. The point is interference.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: We wish to hear about Kerala.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not petty-minded people. We play no tricks in politics. Well, about Kerala? Kerala is a part of India; it is a part of India although it is in wrong hands at the moment. Now, what happened there? Right from

the beginning things were happening in a manner which, I think, the Central Government should take note of. Forget about the elections. Suppose you were in our position, still I would have brought forward this Bill. Still I would have spoken against alliance with the Catholic Church if it had happened, and if somebody had done it, I would have come here to support you or to oppose such kind of alliances with the Catholic Church. But here how it began right from the beginning? Father Gracius made a statement in Bombay, which was a political speech. He called a meeting in his religious capacity. Devotees came there and did all kinds of things that they do, and that platform, that rostrum was used as a religious rostrum in order to make a political harangue against the Communist Party; they were matters which concerned politics.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Maharashtra): Do you say that it was in his religious capacity that he called the meeting?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Absolutely. I think the hon. Member reads, learned man, as he is. I think he is busy otherwise, so he forgets what he has read. He is a busy man—I know it. Therefore, maybe he has forgotten it; it is understandable for an erudite person like him to forget what is not very important for him but important for the nation and others. It was a religious meeting; it was announced as such and the report appeared as such in the "Times of India" in Bombay, in all Bombay papers also. The hon. Member can read them again. I am sure he has read them but forgotten per chance. Now, Sir, that happened. Then what happened. Following is the full text of the pastoral letter jointly issued by sixteen Bishops of the Catholic Church in Kerala. It appeared in Kerala on May 7, 1959, and was published in the "Deepika", a Malayalam daily, which was their chief mouth-piece.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: May I interrupt the hon. Member and ask if he is going to introduce another Bill about Gurdwaras?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As you know, hon. Members sometimes make an interruption which is off the line but not altogether out of the way. As far as Gurdwaras are concerned, we are not in favour of Gurdwaras being used for political purposes.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: At one stage our Congress friends entered Gurdwaras but subsequently they were turned out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Congress Party not only entered the Gurdwaras, they also hugged the Akalis and advertised the greatest alliance going on in the Punjab. It was hailed as a historic thing and a historic utterance was made by Mr. Dhebar, the then President of the Congress. And now, you have fallen apart, I know. Therefore, Sir, it is for you to go and enter there and then come back, just as you like. Sometimes you go to the Catholic Church to drive us out. Sometimes you go to the Akalis to send somebody out. Whenever you are in trouble, you come out of it. You do so many things—changeable people. I agree but we do not support it. If you like, you bring forward a Bill; we will support it.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I am not interested in it; I am opposing even this Bill of yours.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will not bring it forward—I know—because you have the next General Elections in your mind. You have now given up Master Tara Singh but some day you may get near him—I know it.

Now, Sir, what was the pastoral letter? I agree such letters can be written—nobody objects to it . . .

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN (Madras): What has this House to do with

pastoral letters? This is a secular State even according to your own statement. Then why do you worry? What have you to do with religious institutions?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The House has to do. You are absolutely right—it is a secular State. Then you ask me what we have got to do with those religious institutions. We should not have anything to do with them, but if the Bishops come to have something to do with politics of the secular State, then we have something to do with them—you understand that logic. In the pastoral letter this is what is in the first paragraph—leave alone all the other things.

“There was not a period when our enemies have so forcefully moved forward against our faith. The godless and the anti-religious Communists, who are against all that we consider sacred, have come to power in Kerala. A struggle against religion and God under a Communist regime cannot be an unexpected event.”

Bishops have come to the secular State to wage a struggle.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Are we to understand that the Catholics opposed the godless and anti-religious communism?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member can oppose the godless and go to the Himalayas and pray. The hon. Member can oppose the godless and worship the god of Mammon—I have no objection. But that is not the point. The point is pastoral Bishops cannot say this kind of thing, behave in this manner, because it is an encroachment of religion on politics. That is all.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Do you mean to say that you believe in God and in religion?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let him continue. You will have your say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You ask whether I believe in God and religion. For the present, I believe in your interruptions, if they are good. Struggle against religion and God under the Communist regime cannot be unexpected either.

The whole pastoral letter is a political document, is a kind of long political manifesto issued by the Catholic Order in Kerala. Is it permissible? I ask the hon. Minister here, "Is it permissible?" Is it permissible, under the regime, for the Catholic Church to issue pastoral letters and to speak of politics openly in this manner when the great ones in Delhi shut their eyes for party advantages?

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN: Sir . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not mind. Let him interrupt.

So, Sir, that is the position. It is a long letter. I do not wish to read it, but I have got two copies of it with me. Let the hon. Member sit by my side and read this thing. I will have the benefit of his company as well.

Then, Sir, a series of things follow. I think that I have come armed with documents. Here is a photostat copy of a letter issued by Father Bonarenture, O.C.D., Director of Third Order to some dear brother. The letter is dated 21st January, 1960. It says:

"Dear Brother,

I have received reliable information that you, a member of the Carmelite Third Order of the Catholic Church are working for the success of the Communist Party and its candidate in Ernakulam. You know that it is prohibited for any Catholic to work for the Communist Party or its candidates. Therefore, unless you inform me before next Sunday (Jan. 24th, 1960)

that you have withdrawn from such activities, you will be excommunicated from the Church and your ex-communication be announced publicly from the Pulpit."

Now, is it not politics? Is it not openly indulging in politics where a religious personality threatens somebody by saying "Unless you do this thing, vote against the Communist Party, unless you do such things, you will be ex-communicated."? What else could be religious terrorism if not this? What else could be more intimidatory than this? Is it permissible? I ask the hon. Minister: Can you cite any secular State in the world where such things are allowed to go on openly? I know that there are secular States where things are done secretly, without writing, without documentary evidence. But here, in India, thanks to the expediency of the Congress Party or the hon. Minister, things go on openly. A letter was written. It was published.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): I would like to know one thing from the hon. Member. Is there any State in the world where ex-communication is prohibited by law?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member, a Supreme Court lawyer, is sometimes so abysmally irrelevant that I cannot meet his demand. It is not at all the point whether ex-communication is prohibited by law. I am not questioning the right of ex-communication on the part of the Catholic Church. You should understand it. I had not been in the court of law for a single day, even so I understand it. But having spent so many years in the courts of law, this simple point should be immediately caught by so intelligent a person as the hon Member. It is not ex-communication. He says that you must not do such and such a thing. If you are a Communist supporter, if you do certain things for the Communists,

you shall be ex-communicated, and as a Catholic you cannot vote for Communists.

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON (Kerala): There is a provision in our election law against this. As such, why should there be a separate Bill?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Madhava Menon is a distant echo by now, but still I would remind him that election law is not involved here. Here we are concerned with whether a religious order can be issued in this manner, whether ex-communication, as a religious weapon, could be utilised for grinding the axe of certain political parties introducing politics in a particular manner into certain elections. This is the issue. You cannot do such things openly.

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN: Where did you get this definition of ex-communication? I am not aware of it either in law or in religion. You are giving your own definition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member says I am giving my own definition of ex-communication. Suppose you ask, Sir, on our behalf, for the ex-communication of the hon. Member from this House, it will be ex-communication. You take the same logic to the religious field, issue this religious order, not for doing something which has something to do with religion, not for doing something which is political. That is the point. At least you will concede that this is a political document. You will also concede that this asks a certain person to do something political and not to do something which is also political. That you must concede. I am not trying to secure a debating point over so important a matter.

Then, Sir, the Bishop of Mangalore issued a circular on the 23rd Sep-
 463 RS.—4.

tember, 1959. Now, Sir, Bishops can issue circulars—I anticipate interruption—and I straightway say that they have an inherent right, defined or maintained whatever you say, to issue circulars. I am not questioning that. The letter reads in part:

“While giving one’s vote a Catholic should clearly bear in mind that he is forbidden under pain on ex-communication to vote for Communist candidates. It does not matter what enticing promises he makes for what beneficial undertakings he gives, the very fact that he is a Communist is unworthy, unstable and dangerous candidate for us, Catholics. I repeat again the recent Vatican decree which forbids voting for a candidate, even a self-styled Christian who favours Communism. Catholics who join the Communist Party and work for it knowingly and freely, who defend or propagate it in any way, *ipso facto* incur ex-communication specially reserved to the Holy See.”

Is it not intrusion of religion into politics? Italy, for instance, where the Vatican is there, the Holy See is there, there are many Christians there who vote for the Communist Party. They are not ex-communicated. The Communist Party of Italy is the second largest party and got six million votes in the last general elections. As you know, in spite of the influence of the Catholic Church, the Christian population there votes for Communists. These things are not done in a manner as was done in the case of Kerala. Here you have seen another example of this thing.

Now, Sir, it went on during the entire period. One was at a loss to understand whether this campaign was being run by the Catholic Church or the Congress Party. Sometimes it seems to have coalesced. It is difficult to discriminate. And once it happens, it is dangerous to the country, specially in the case of the ruling party whose job is to protect the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
 Constitution, to safeguard the interest of the people. They indulge in this kind of narrow partisan interest. This is what I am trying to point out.

So, Sir, you will see that they have issued this thing, and they get angry with the Communists. After all, they are God-fearing people and, therefore, they get angry with the Communists, and they did this thing. It was backed up by an organisation. It is not merely a circular or pastoral letter that was issued. What happened was that an organisation was set up by the Catholic Church all over Kerala to go into politics in an organised manner. It was an invasion of the Catholic Church into politics and the door was thrown wide open by the Congress Party in distress. That was what happened. Significantly enough, I have asked my colleague, Mr. Govindan Nair, to come and speak the home truths in the afternoon because it relates to his State. I will now read the excerpts:

"The Church Bells began to toll and people collected like flood waters when the police party left the place taking with them those whom they could lay hand on . . ."

The Kerala Church bells were on to get the people together in the Church and to direct them into political activities, not to God. The way to God was not taught. What was taught was the way to the Trivandrum Ministry and when God-fearing people and religious men depart from the ways of God and take to the way of politics to get into the Ministry or to put their men in the Ministry, I say, that it is a naked aggression of religion into politics. It has to be admitted. What happened? There Christophers were organised by the Church in every parish. The head of the parish, the priest, became the Christopher of the organisation. Somebody might say that it is a Communist allegation. It is not a Communist allegation because 'Deepika' the paper of the Kerala Catholics

themselves, admitted that this was being done. I will read out from "Deepika":

"There should be committees in all parishes for taking up the leadership of the fight and volunteer corps for action. It will not be too much if at least one young man from every house is encouraged to come forward and enlist himself as volunteer." (Deepika, 2-4-1959).

The paper writes 'Organise it in the Parish and the priest in the parish must be the volunteer-in-chief, the local *Gauleiter*, to carry on a crusade against the Communists or the Communist Government. Can you imagine it? It is an interference with politics by a religious Order. "Deepika" is not the paper of a party. It says that it is an organ of the Catholics and some Congressmen like it, not all, but some who were in trouble liked it for a while and that paper wrote such things. Then what happened? The liberation struggle was organised and the Church became the centre where people collected, where people were brought together and told what to do and what not to do. Meetings were held, masses were held specially; from the pulpit, not lectures on Christ were given. The Bible was set aside for a while and lectures were delivered on politics, on how to drive the Communists out, on how to befriend Mr. Mannath Padmanabhan and get on the right side of the Congress and somehow or other . . .

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Is Mr. Mannath Padmanabhan a Catholic?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, but your catholicity of heart in politics went so far as to embrace Mr. Mannath Padmanabhan. That is what I say.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Occasionally, you are also very irrelevant.

SHRI M. BASAVAPUNNAIAH: Not always as you are.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There was catholicity of heart in this because you joined with all—Muslim League on the one side, Mr. Padmanabhan on the other, the Congress in the front and the P.S.P. in the back. It was a great show, a great and remarkable show, indeed!

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN: Why are you attacking the Catholic clergy only when everybody combined together except you?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He admits that the Catholics combined and he was a party to the same. Therefore, he has confessed. I am not blaming the Catholics for embracing. I am blaming the Catholic clergy for embracing religion and politics. That is my case.

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN: They were not the only ones. The Muslim League, the Nairs and others combined but you attack only the Catholics.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If he is accusing that I have not attacked the Muslim League, I am very sorry for it. Maybe I will bring another Bill. Will he support it? He might support it. It is a good proposal that you make and I will consider it. Sometimes even in interruptions, you suggest some good things.

Then election leadership through the Church is organised. Election is politics. No God comes in there because God does not seek election nor Parliament is some divine forum, the Assembly is no divine forum. Elections are elections. Men of common clay only are concerned . . .

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Were there not Catholic Parties in Germany, Italy and France fighting elections to Parliament?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You may say the Congress Party and put in brackets Catholic. People may call themselves belonging to the Catholic Party. What I am concerned with is,

Catholic as a religious Order. For instance, if you say that you are a member of the Congress Party, Hindu, I have no objection. That is not the point. My point is whether as a priest of the Banaras Temple, you can come and ask for votes invoking divine authority. That is the point. There may be a Christian Democratic Party in Italy. I know about them and you may know better perhaps. The only thing is sometimes you do not give out your wisdom. In the elections the Catholics came in a big way. The "Indian Express" reported on 5th December:

"During its 50-hour deliberations, the Conference spent most of the time to discuss reports on the Communist danger in India, especially the Communist danger in Kerala State. The Conference sharply criticised the Kerala Education Bill and expressed its concern."

That is how they discussed elections.

"The Conference discussed developments in Kerala. Many suggestions to fight and defeat Communism had been discussed."

The "Deepika", the organ of the Catholic Church, in an editorial gave an open call to break the law. Political agitation is to indulge in politics. It is not something religious. "Deepika", in an editorial on 3rd May, 1959, gave an open call. When I ask somebody to use force against the Government, what is it? "Deepika", as I told you, is a religious paper and it called upon the people to use force against the Kerala Government. Is it not politics and is it not asking its religious supporters to go not only into political action but violent political action? I know that you have succeeded in capturing power . . .

SHRI J. S. BISHT: What did the Communist Government do when they incited violence?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Communist Government was a very moderate Government and we thought that

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

you would learn lessons. You were doing this and the Communist Government said that it was a wrong thing. You would have put us under the Preventive Detention Act, I know. You would have done it. But we said that it was not right to do so. We did not go in for arrests. Master Tara Singh has been put in prison by you. We did not do so. We could have done that and we had the power and authority but we did not do it. We said that ideological questions must be settled otherwise. You do not believe in that. You put people under lock and key as you have done in the case of Master Tara Singh but you should take note of what was done. You will remember that I am not saying this just to dig up the old story of how you drove out the Communists.

Addressing a meeting in connection with the school closure agitation at Tiruvalla, His Grace, Metropolitan Mar Dinysius, characterised the agitation as a liberation struggle and said that the fight against the Education Act was really religious. This was given in Deepika.

So, the educational fight was made into a religious fight and religion, education and everything were mixed up together with a view to continuing what they called 'Liberation struggle'. I say that the hon. Minister should make it a point to have the copies of "Deepika" of that period examined by some competent people in his Ministry. Let him take his own time and he will find many such articles written in them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will continue after lunch.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, before the break for lunch, I was pointing out how the Catholic Church and the clergy were organised in political actions and political activity. I am not giving any evidence from sources which may be called Communist sources. Generally, I have taken pains to find out evidence of this from sources which were sympathetic to the struggle that was conducted against the Communist Ministry in Kerala. I would refer to the "Hindusthan Standard" of Calcutta of the 19th June, 1959. An article was written in that paper by one who had gone to Kerala. "Every Parish now a fortress"—that was the title of that article. You may think that somewhere perhaps Christianity was in peril and, therefore, a religious crusade was launched against some other religion. Nothing of that kind was there. It only shows how the Catholics were politically acting against the Communist Ministry in Kerala.

"The palm-fringed Kerala has been turned into a battle-field for the Catholic crusaders against their arch enemy, the Reds."

They call us Reds, you know.

"Every Parish and church of the State has now been converted into a sort of Catholic fortress.

The bogey of 'religion in danger' has been raised all over the State to rouse the religious feeling of the god-fearing and peace-loving Catholics. The Bishops are going about villages calling upon their followers to be ready to sacrifice everything in the struggle to save 'our religion and culture'.

In many Catholic strongholds in the State which I have visited I found the priests inciting people to violence saying that the Communists might give up their 'mischief' if they found 'us ready to face them'."

This is how the paper reported. This reporter gives an idea of the action taken by them, and an idea of the organisation.

"According to an organiser of the Catholic volunteer force, a volunteer corps having a strength of about one lakh has been organised in Trichur district. About 1,000 volunteers have been organised in Kothanallor, 750 trained volunteers and 5,000 non-trained volunteers in Karimannor, 450 volunteers in the Eravipuram parish, 800 in Aloor, 300 at Chemmalamattom, 500 at Thottakkad, 2,000 at Vazhoor and 500 in Mattakkara. Thirty lakh Christians, he said, were ready to lay down their lives to save their religion."

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: There are no such places in Kerala.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My pronouncement might be defective; you may correct it. Mr. Govindan Nair will perhaps tell you. I may not have correctly pronounced it. I have given you the date; you can refer to that issue.

"Priests of Trichur Diocese are reported to have visited every Catholic house in the area taking a census of all adults and exhorting them to 'get ready for the crusade'."

Then it goes on to say:

"To find out the truth of these allegations I attended a Sunday prayer in a church in Trivandrum."

I suppose, there is a place called Trivandrum.

"After the usual prayer was over, the priest began giving sermon in Malayali. Though I could not understand it—and none was willing to give me an English translation of the sermon—the speech was full of references to 'Communists', 'The Education Act', 'Nampoodiripad'. The priest also appeared to be in an excited mood when he spoke.

Allegations are made by the Government, and some of these are supported by even those Hindus who are opposed to the Government, that the preparations have been made in

the churches to organise an armed conflict with the Government. The Catholic churches in Meenachil taluk, the most important Catholic centre in the State, are reported to have been transformed into arsenals. However, the Government has so far not been able to recover any arms. All parish priests are reported to have received instructions to organise 'suicide squads' at the rate of one for every 10 persons in each parish."

This is what the "Hindustan Standard" wrote. I come from Calcutta and it is very well known that this paper is anti-Communist, and naturally it would not write something with a view to helping us. Perhaps the reporter did not know when he was writing this that I should be reading some portions from it.

Then, Sir, there is another paper which is also anti-Communist. It is a Delhi paper, and you can imagine. It is the "Hindustan Times" and it wrote on the 22nd May, 1959 under the heading "Fears of the Church" as follows:

"The Act is being opposed by the Catholic Church which runs a large number of educational institutions in the State as it is afraid that, under the new regulations, it will not be in a position to keep these schools going in the way it has been doing."

Then it gives an account of the Education Act and says,

"The agitation has thus become a part of the war between Catholics and Communists, which has been waged with greater or less intensity in many countries of Europe."

Some kind of a crusade was organised by the Catholics in Kerala against the Communists. It is interference in political affairs. The Bible does not say that you have to fight the Communists to go to God. It does not say so. You have read the Ten Commandments and it has not said, "Thou shalt fight the Communists". There is

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
nothing of the kind there. The paper goes on to say:

"It will be remembered that during the bus fare agitation Congressmen actively took part in all the illegal and unlawful activities . . ."

I am not against Congressmen now, my case here is only against the Catholic Church, not against the Congressmen as such. This is what this paper has said. There were also very many articles and news items published all over the country to show how they were indulging in politics.

An hon. Member there—I think he is no longer there—asked me, when I was referring to Cardinal Gracias, as to whether he was speaking in his ecclesiastical capacity. I have found out the report and I shall read it for his benefit. This is what he said:

"Valerian Cardinal Gracias said here yesterday that while the Catholic church as such would not engage in Kerala politics, individual Christians could not remain indifferent to issues of tyranny and freedom involved in the conflict there. While it may suffice to remember that the most serious issue which confronted the people of Kerala today was that of tyranny against freedom, it must be remembered . . ."

Then he went on to say,

" . . . the Catholic had to Christianise the public life of the country according to the measure of their ability and special vocation. Christian citizens could not, therefore, be indifferent to so important an arena of conflict as politics."

Father Gracias wanted to christianise the public life and, according to him, it was a fight going on in Kerala and how could they remain indifferent? The objective before them was to christianise the public or at least christianise Kerala. They can christianise them, I have no objection, if they

have a separate religious body but what they did was to make the people join the political Vimochan struggle, a violent political struggle in order to further their own ends, for christianising what they call christianising, public life. Well, what is it? Is it not politics? It is open, clear-cut; they came into politics. I am sorry he is not here; otherwise he would have seen that what I said at that time was quite correct. When I speak about the Catholics, I am not blaming everyone of them. There are so many good people among them who would not like to be drawn into politics in this manner. I think in all fairness I must also mention, lest I give the impression that I am tarring all of them with the same brush, that in other places the Catholics made a statement. I think it was in Bangalore—it is your place, Sir—that a statement was issued by certain Catholics protesting against the kind of thing that the Kerala Catholic Church was doing. That statement was signed by a number of prominent Catholic religious leaders.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Just one point. What my hon. friend said is misleading. What is meant by 'christianise' is not to make everybody Christians but to purify according to Christian principles. Maybe, they may purify the Communists also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has a lot of ingenuity undoubtedly. He is a journalist, I am told, and he has substituted the word 'purify' for 'christianise'. Then he said that even the Communists could be christianised. But fighting against the Kerala Ministry was Vimochan struggle with weapons in hand. It was a political struggle and I do not think that is necessarily purified by this sort of christianisation. Then you all become Christians because you are supposed to be all pure opposite. But that is not so. Twelve Christian leaders prominent in public life have asked the Churches in Kerala—

"seriously to consider their responsibility at the present time to

give to the people the right lead, so that by whatever action they take now, they will strengthen and not in any way weaken the democratic framework of our political life."

The signatories included Mr. Samuel Ranganathan and they criticised this action on the part of the Catholic Church in Kerala. They issued a statement and appealed to them saying, 'Don't go in for this kind of political activity'. Therefore, in all fairness, I must also mention this fact that there are people who do not believe in this kind of thing and in fact have implored the authorities of the Catholic Church in Kerala not to go in for such kind of things.

Sir, I have collected another thing. One has to take a lot of trouble to convince hon. Members opposite. It is a newsletter published from far away California. I will never be there perhaps, thanks to the American policy, but many of my hon. friends may be there through United Nations Delegations or some such thing. They might call on these people and find out what they mean when they write such things. Here is their bulletin—"The Evangelistic Educational Dedicational". That is their religious bulletin. They say here, 'Tragedy to Triumph in Kerala, India'. There is a full-page article as you see. It was sent to us. Here interestingly enough you will see how the foreigners take interest and inspire the followers of the religious Order to meddle in politics. Here is a letter received from George Thomas and here is the gentleman's photograph. He seems to be a smart young man but highly religious and, what is more, highly charged with politics. He is something like a mixed economy. Politics and religion are fairly mixed up in him. This is what is said here:

"If democratic parties have not joined together the Communists would have come back to power. In other words the danger is still there. If we let go things, we will be engulfed. So, you can be sure that

we will continue the fight with all our might and I am sure you will also rise to the occasion and be equal to the challenge.

With best personal regards,
 Cordially yours,

K. George Thomas."

After publishing this in print the editor of the paper says immediately:

"Now is no time to relax. This paper is needed more than ever. The urgent needs at present are:

1. 5,000 dollars monthly subsidy.
2. 9,000 dollars accumulated deficit.
3. 20,000 dollars for a rotary press."

SHRI ABDUL RAHIM (Madras): Is it a Communist paper? It seems to be red.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For once the Catholics took a liking for red and here it is. This paper is a religious organ and it is the March 1960 issue. They say, 'We have won the elections in Kerala. Give us money, 5,000, 10,000, 15,000 dollars'. You see how things are connected. Why should the religious Order in California be interested in publishing this and why should it then ask for money? There is connection, because the money flows into India. The hon. Minister will remember that his senior colleague gave some information in this connection in the other House. From January 1950 to June 1954 about Rs. 30 crores were received by these missionaries in India. From January 1956 to June 1958 Rs. 24 crores were received. So large sums of money come in.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: What about the amount received by Mr. Dange?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So, Rs. 24 crores came in during the 30 months ending June 1958. Everybody knows that the missionaries in our country are receiving subsidy from foreign sources and much of the money comes

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

from the United States of America. We get wheat but we get many other things also. Our Catholic Church and other missionaries get money from them. According to information given in the other House in reply to certain questions it was found that it was precisely during the period of the Vimochan struggle that crores and crores of rupees came to the Kerala Catholic Order and other missionaries in the country. You might see, Sir, there is a coincidence but such a coincidence should be gone into by the hon. Minister in order to find out why, when the struggle was on money was coming in in such large amounts to India. Therefore, they are organised people and they are well financed from outside. It is thus that interference takes place in the internal affairs of the country with inspiration and also with the help of the resources coming from there. Today it may be the Communist Party against which the forces and the resources of the Catholic Church were utilised. Tomorrow it may be the Congress. By going in for this kind of thing we are inviting as it were with open arms these elements to interfere in politics. Are we to do that? Your children may repent for what the fathers have done. This is what I say. Therefore, we must not do such things. Now, the Congress was in difficulty in Kerala but even so you had your Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others but others did not make much impression. Even Jawaharlal Nehru did not make much impression there. But anyway you could have conducted the political struggle on a political plane. It is all right you united with the Muslim League but why bring in the Catholic element? That is how it was done and the result has been demoralisation and today you see that the Catholics are very powerful in Kerala and everybody knows that they play an important part in the general political life of that State as far as the ruling classes are concerned. I do not know how far the Congress is powerful but certainly the Catholics are extremely powerful in Kerala.

According to the Neogi Committee Report there were 4,626 Catholic missionaries in our country; maybe the number is now a little more. The figures vary from time to time. Anyway, a large number of missionaries are there. Who does not know that in the Nagaland it is these missionaries who incite the hostile Nagas to indulge in such activities? You know it very well. The Government knows it. Therefore, what you are doing legally, what you are encouraging yourself, is happening against you, already before our eyes, in Nagaland, where certain missionaries directly or indirectly—why indirectly, directly—are helping the hostiles. This is well known to the Government. As far as Madhya Pradesh is concerned, the Neogi Committee confines many of its observations and findings to what is happening in Madhya Pradesh. All kinds of findings are there to show how in Madhya Pradesh, the missionaries, the religious order, were interfering with the politics of that State. Such is the position.

Now, the time has come to take serious note of this development. Mr. Deputy Chairman, that is why I have brought forward this Bill before this House. I expected that the Government itself would do it. They would not do it, because they are in an embarrassing position. What has happened, as you know, now people feel that religion should be brought in. If the ruling party, the Congress, can bring in religion into politics, why not bring in religion in Punjab, where Gurdwaras are used? And when protest was made by Congress leaders that Gurdwaras should not be used, the answer came from the Akalis that the Congress people in Kerala used the church for their political campaign and propaganda. It was a boomerang. Pat came the answer from the Akalis. And naturally they could not deny it, having done that thing. Now, the Muslim League is being revived and when we say that in a secular State the Muslim League has really no place, then they say: "What of that? All these were there. We are also with

the Ministry and the Muslim League is there and the Muslim League is with the Congress". So, we come into a posture of things when you see that these religious-minded elements are trying to reorganise themselves, regroup themselves, with a view to coming into politics in a big way. In some places they have succeeded. In other places they have not succeeded, but the omens are there, bad omens are there. We must take full note of that with a view to safeguarding our secular State and our concept of parliamentary institutions and democracy as we understand it in a secular State.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not know how the Government will react to my proposals. Mr. Datar has the supreme knack of having everything talked out, not so much by reason as by the rule of thumb. He has mastered that art very well and I have no doubt in my mind that he will make a speech which will sound good.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I point out to the hon. Member that he is helping Mr. Datar in getting this Bill talked out?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As long as he is his follower, Mr. Datar will succeed in it. There is no doubt about it.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: The hon. Member has already spoken for an hour and twenty minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is trying to convince you about the necessity of his Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are absolutely right.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But I am afraid if you continue like this, you will lose the sympathy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But the result will be the same, as you know. Therefore, I have a little bite out of it. The result is the same, because he has made up his mind, not today.

He made up his mind even when I gave notice of the Bill. Irrespective of my arguments, Mr. Datar is clear that he is not to support this Bill. Now, Sir, this is the position. What are we going to do? Now, some hon. Members say that Catholics have a right to participate. I do not deny it. Let there be no confusion about it. Now, my Bill is very clear and I have carefully drafted it to make it appear that it is nothing of the kind. I do not want to curtail their fundamental rights. Here I have got a letter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it only 'appear'? Make it real.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Really also it is so. It should be obvious to everybody. Sometimes things are left vague. It should be obvious to everybody, even to the layman. Here I have got a letter from the Kerala Catholic League General Council, Ernakulam. They support the position that we are taking in this matter.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Is he going to lay the letter on the Table of the House?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: She wants it to be read. I do not get any letter which cannot be read.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: To be laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have no objection to that. I do not receive any letter, nor do I write, which cannot be read. The only letters which cannot be read are letters written to me about certain Ministers' activities, because you will not allow them to be read.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The letter says:

"We read with interest the news item about your bill proposing curbs on the political activities of Catholic

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

priests. We hope you mean by this the use of religious influence by religious leaders of the Catholic Church to gain victories on the party politics plane. This organisation which represents a considerable segment in the Kerala Catholic community, finds it necessary to make a distinction between the afore-mentioned activity and the citizenship rights of Catholic priests. You no doubt realise that as citizens Catholic priests too have all the rights of citizenship including the right to take part in political activity. This organisation, however, objects to the use of religious influence by religious organisations to canvass votes for a political party. Let us illustrate. We shall not feel called upon to protest in the event a Catholic priest or for that matter any priest were to address a public meeting and to include party politics in his speech. If, however, the priest were to include party politics in his sermon inside the church to a religious congregation, we shall regard his action as a breach of the secular State that India is."

Then, it goes on:—

" . . . we are prepared to extend to your bill the support of the Catholics coming under our influence. Before we issue any statement, however, we shall need to read and study the text of the bill"

They wanted to have a copy of the Bill, and so on. What are my general arguments? Generally they are also concerned that fundamental rights should not be curtailed . . .

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Is he going to lay it on the Table of the House?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why, I can give it to her. If I lay it on the Table, you will not read it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you finished your speech?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have finished the letter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. Your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have finished with the letter, but it is the only copy. Please do not deprive me of it, but she can read it. It is not a very intriguing letter anyway.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: She is interested in letters. Anyway, now that is the position. Apart from the diversion that took place, I may say that the Kerala experience has made it very clear to us that we must take action. The only ground, which I can think of, on which the Government is not taking action is their political consideration. Otherwise, they would be well advised to take action. Now, I do not think they are in any trouble any more for the present. A general law should be passed and the Constitution should be amended to make it even more categorically clear, as was suggested by the Neogi Committee. Unless we do this thing, religion will continue to creep in this matter and every party—I am not talking about any particular party—will then go in for—in times of election—having some truck with religion and bring religion into politics. As you know, religious institutions and religious orders have considerable influence to exert on their followers. The tendency will be there to bring them in, whether you like it or not. Many parties, even against you people, will do it, those who believe in bring religion into politics. That is going to happen. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that we do something about it.

Finally, I would like to criticise the Government, because they have completely ignored the discussion that took place when this particular matter came up before the Constituent Assembly. I do not know if

Mr. Datar had time to read the proceedings of those days. They had completely ignored the suggestion in the Constituent Assembly that there should be a law. Powers have been given to them and the powers should be utilised. Now, the situation warrants such exercise of power.

They are not doing it. I
 3 P.M. regret that this is only due to the fact that they think that they might need their help, need the help of the religious institutions, and so on. Now, we cannot allow the Government to place, their party interests above the interests of the State, we cannot allow the Government to place their concept of politics above the concept of politics emanating from a secular State. We cannot allow them to run away in this manner with religion with a view to winning this or that election. I think it is a very reasonable suggestion I have made before the House, and I have given plenty of facts and figures.

I would like to mention only one thing in this connection because I think that is an interesting thing. Father Albert Mendoza was a member of the Jesuit Order. After 29 years of service there he had to leave that Order because he felt that nationalist sentiments were being curbed and restricted. This is the public statement he made, and he came out of the Jesuit Order because of nationalist sentiments. You have heard yesterday things being said, 'anti-national', 'unpatriotic,' and so on. This is what he said. They do not like nationalism, nationalist sentiments, patriotism, and so on. Therefore, he is leaving the Jesuit Order after 29 years of very devoted service.

Now, Sir, as far as patriotism is concerned, I do not want to say very much, but sometimes I feel that there should be a day set apart when we can discuss the question of patriotism, nationalism, and so on. Then we can bring a catalogue of things about them and they can bring a catalogue of things about us. And then you

can decide who is patriotic. You can leave it to the world to judge. If we would lay the things that are done by the Congress Party, one, two, three, indeed a catalogue of them . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You come to the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your conscience will be shocked. You talk about patriotism and nationalism. Give an indication of it by accepting my Bill. Here is a patriotic Bill. Here is a Bill which safeguards the fundamental, genuine national interests. Here is a Bill which emanates from the spirit of our national struggle. Here is a Bill which embodies the spirit of the national liberation movement against the British when we were fighting the British as well as against the interference of the Catholic and other missionaries in the internal affairs of our country against the freedom movement. It is no use talking every day about nationalist sentiment, patriotism, and so on, when you go the other way. We have come with a Bill. Tell us which syllable of the Bill is unpatriotic. Every syllable of this Bill is charged with high patriotism and love for the country, charged with a high spirit of genuine nationalism. Every syllable of the Bill seeks to carry forward the fine traditions of our love for our country. This is what we mean by patriotism. Patriotism is not like the fur coat of a lady which is to be hung, only to be used now and thrown off at convenience. It is an article of faith. It is a way of life, it is an outlook, it is an ethical way. We give an account of ourselves as to how we behave in this country. Therefore, your patriotism, your love for nationalism, Mr. Datar, if I may say so through you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is on test in this Bill, because your leaders, Sardar Patel, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Mahatma Gandhi and others, condemned such interference by the religious Church and its employees as unpatriotic and anti-national and things to be put

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

down and given no quarter. Today we echo the sentiments of the old days, the undegenerate days of certain political parties, and come forward with this measure calling upon you to show your patriotism, to show your love for the nation, to show your love for freedom in the internal affairs of the country. That is the position. We should not get mixed up with that kind of things. I have read out that letter. The entire Catholic world was writing so many things when the Kerala situation was in a turmoil. Therefore, interference took place. Therefore, I say that patriotism demands that you accept our suggestion. Patriotism demands that you ban the political activity of the Catholic Order or religious Order, activity of the religious Order I repeat. What I demand is you create a situation in the country when the Californian Catholic Order or missionaries will not be smacking their lips in this manner over the elections in Kerala, giving a call for contributions to their fund, flaunting the victory they won in Kerala and calling it the delightful victory of the Catholic Order. I call upon the Government to consider as to where they are leading the country. They are leading the country down the garden path because of their narrow party interests. Now, I can give you many examples. These are having repercussions all over the country.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wish you had also made a speech from here, when the Chairman was there, in support of my cause, because I know that every sensible person would support the point of view that I am taking up in this connection, and try to convince Mr. Datar and his friends on the Treasury Benches, the unconvinced, whom you cannot convince at all easily. Well, Sir, I do not know to whom I should appeal. Therefore, I would appeal to hon. Members to speak frankly on this subject. Even if for party reasons, due to reasons of whip of the party, they do not support my Bill when it comes to voting,

I still appeal to them because I have faith in their intrinsic goodness. I would appeal to them to speak in such a manner that the Catholic Order and the missionaries in India know that their game is up, that their game is up as far as intrusion of religion into politics is concerned. That should be known to them. Public opinion should be created, and in this forum at least we can help to create public opinion in the country. Public opinion is there, we can strengthen it, and we can impress upon the Government also to consider legislation on their own initiative.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, on a point of information, Has the hon. Member's party given its members freedom to speak though not to vote against the policy of the party? I want to know this. He has made an appeal that Members should speak even if the whip is there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does your party give freedom to speak against the policy of the party?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I want a declaration from him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will answer Dr. Seeta Parmanand for it is so delightful. One gets almost excited even on such questions. Have you not heard in these Benches speeches being made in opposite directions? Have you not heard . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: She is asking about your party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Our party is consistent. Our party brings the right thing and votes for it. Your party is in difficulty, I know, because you have got Swatantra label, Hindu Mahasabha label, Jana Sangh label . . .

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I put a specific question and he must answer that. The question is this: Does his party, the Communist Party, allow its members even to speak

against the policy of the party though not vote against it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They think in only one way and vote in one way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The trouble with the Communist Party's policy is that things are discussed and decided upon. Then we go into the battle as disciplined soldiers. But what do you do? You hear your Prime Minister deciding your policy you come here and speak in different voices, then under the whip you vote, then divide in the lobby, and outside in the country you run riot. That is the position. Some day even Dr. Seeta Parmanand will join the Communist Party. Then she will understand what the discipline of the Communist Party means. I think she would understand the point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us proceed with the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This has nothing to do with the Bill but has a lot to do with her interruptions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us proceed with the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are quite right, Sir. I would have proceeded with the Bill but for the delightful and exciting interruptions. Therefore, I said this thing because I know your difficulty. When Mr. Datar says, 'Don't support the Bill', you will not support it. I will not quarrel with you as to how reasonable the Communists are. How reasonable we Communists are sometimes! I say, 'All right. Do not support, if you like, due to the party whip'. Dissensions and factions are your creations. But then speak in support of it, criticise the Government, criticise the intrusion of religion in politics and display your good sense and patriotism, not at all being afraid of the Treasury Benches. I am making this appeal to the hon. lady

Member, and she has listened to so many appeals in this House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: She will not listen to you. Why do you waste your time?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sometimes, Dr. Parmanand is very obliging. I am not quite sure, but still I appeal to her. I started the speech in no partisan spirit and that is why I want to end my speech in no partisan spirit. Even if, for party reasons, they are not in a position to vote—I would like them to vote—I would like them to convince Mr. Datar and see that they get the vote. Should they find it difficult for some superior or overriding reasons, then I would ask them to lend their voice at least, if not their vote, to this grand, progressive measure, consistent with the secular concept of our State, befitting the fine traditions of our national liberation struggle.

The question was proposed.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, It was very refreshing to hear from the hon. friend opposite a small lecture on patriotism. I admire his mental capacity. I have always been one of his admirers and have never underestimated his intelligence. He has very conveniently and intelligently used the word 'patriotism' in regard to this Bill, but he completely forgot to mention China in foreign affairs debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: China here?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: In the foreign affairs debate, I said. There is his intelligence. After the speech of the leader of the Communist Group here, I may not be a match to his oration, but his oration and his long laborious speech only go to show that his case is a weak one, and he himself confessed that he was trying to convince us. But I would like to tell him at the beginning itself that he has failed to do it.

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.]

Sir, he said that the Constitution gave the right to the State to interfere in such matters. The Constitution has given a right to the State, when the occasion arises, to bring in a Bill for such things. I am referring to article 25 which I will just read out, to refresh the memory of hon. Members here. It says—

"Freedom of conscience and free profession, practice and propagation of religion.—Subject to public order, morality and health and to the other provisions of this Part, all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practise and propagate religion.

Nothing in this article shall affect the operation of any existing law or prevent the State from making any law—"

"Sir, this is what is said here. The Constitution has given the State that right. I do not deny it. So far we both agree, but not further. I feel that the first and foremost right that the Constitution has given us is the fundamental right of equality in all spheres and if an occasion arose, of course, the State can intervene. But now the most important thing for us to decide is whether that occasion has arisen. In my opinion, no.

Sir, he began his speech with reference to the secular State. He argued for nearly two odd hours about the secular State. I do agree that ours is a secular State and the Constitution has defined it so, and we do believe in it. And we can find it if we go through articles 15 and 16. Article 15 prohibits discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth and article 16 speaks of equality of opportunity in matters of public employment. These show that we are a secular State. But I would like to ask him whether the church is the State. What has the church got to do with this? You are not discussing the State. You are discussing the working or something

which the church has done. How does that affect the secular nature of the State? The church is a separate body. It does not represent the State. If the Government of India had done anything to give preferential treatment or discriminatory treatment to any particular religion or religious order, then you might say that the State is going against the principles of a secular State. But when you say something against some section of the people or some religious order, it is a thing to be blamed and you yourself go against your concept of a secular State. That is one thing.

The second thing is, this Bill prohibits only the Catholics. At least, the one virtue of the Communists is to be consistent. I do not have that virtue here. Why do you discriminate only the Catholics? Why don't you bring in the Hindus, Muslims and others? After all . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think the hon. lady Member might try these other Bills because sometimes she should also do good things.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Today, particularly I refrained from interrupting him and I request him give me the same treatment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You asked me, that is why I replied.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: He himself said that. That is one of the great virtues of the Communists and he is a leader of the Communists. Why can't he be virtuous at least in this? Participation of the Catholic church in politics is one of the main objections that he has. Then why do you prohibit one religious order only? He was talking of precedents. And I say that this is a dangerous precedent. Nobody can deny that, not even my friend there. Will he be prepared at my suggestion to bring forward a Bill prohibiting the Gurdwaras in

this connection? He is still labouring under the defeat at Kerala. I am not just saying this. If you go through the whole of his speech, if you have heard him from the beginning to the end, you will find that it is nothing but . . .

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): Frustration.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Call it by whatever name you like. He is still labouring under the defeat in Kerala and that is why he has brought in this Bill and this is what has been working inside him. He is not able to separate himself. He calls himself a person who does not bring in all such sort of things. He is not able to disentangle himself. A great leader as he is . . .

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: He is a Communist.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: He is a Communist, I do not deny that. And he is a good Communist and an honest Communist. He himself said it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not say it.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: You said it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I say, an honest Communist.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: We go further and say that you are honest because you are Bhupesh Gupta and not because you are a Communist.

I say, if you want to have a principle, have it for all sections of the religion and I would have thought it to be a little more reasonable, a little more consistent. What is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. Why should it be one thing for somebody and some other thing for others? That is the question.

I would like to say something about his psychological and mental attitude in bringing forward this Bill. He said that in Kerala the church had indulged in political activities. I would like to come to that political activity a little later. I do agree with him on principle that no religion should in-

terfere in politics as far as possible. Whether the activity of the church has been political or religious, I will tell that a bit later. He is a man who does not believe in religion. The other day he said that he had no existence, temporal or spiritual. He has no existence; he has no faith in God . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Temporal? I said I had no existence except as a Communist.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: He himself said that he had no existence. It is his word—I am not saying anything. So being a man who has no faith in religion, who has no faith in anything other than materialistic things, he cannot understand what religion is. There is a saying that for those who believe in God no explanation is necessary and for those who do not believe in God no explanation is possible. Here is a man who has no faith, who has no religion, who cannot think of anything but politics. And everything is politics to him. He cannot disentangle politics and religion. I do not blame him—it is his mental make-up; that is his faith, and whatever anyone does becomes politics for him. He was once accusing us that our thinking was one-sided; that we did not consider the opponent's point of view. I would now like to say, let him for one moment come out of his mental attitude, come out of his political attitude and think how a religious order or a responsible man would look at it from his point of view. That much at least he should do. I shall come to that later when I say whether the objection of the Catholic Church in Kerala was political or not. That I shall deal with slightly later. Now I ask: Why has my friend, brought this Bill? Even if he means that a religious order has taken part in political affairs and even if I concede that it is not correct, has he not got any other remedy if only he is not seeking something more than what the Constitution, the Penal Code and the Election Manual have given him? What is it that he wants by this Bill.

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.]
 if it is not for the propaganda value of it? He wants that any person who uses any Catholic church or church premises or resources for any political activity should be warned and his name together with the warning should be published in the Official Gazette. What is it going to do if a person's name or the name of a Bishop or Archbishop or Cardinal or Vicar is put in the Gazette? This is all that he seeks in this Bill—nothing more. And if my hon. friend will bear with me for a minute I shall show him that the Indian Penal Code has got a specific provision to deal with such offences. Let me read it out for him. His memory does not fail him generally and it is wonderful to see how delightfully conveniently his memory works here.

SHRI ABDUL RAHIM: But you have one thing in common; you both are lawyers.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Yes, both of us are law graduates.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Shri Bhupesh Gupta is a barrister.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Yes, Sir, of course he is a barrister; I am only an advocate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you have beaten all barristers.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I thank him for the compliment. I am only trying to convince him that the Bill is not necessary and that he should withdraw it, and if I succeed in making him do so, I shall be quite happy.

Now, Sir, I refer to section 171C in the Indian Penal Code in chapter 9A dealing with offences relating to elections. The first thing is every citizen, whoever he is, whatever may be his religion, has got a fundamental right to vote and as long as he does not interfere in matters of law and order and as long as he does not take to subversive methods nobody can punish him. This is what that chapter says. Then there is a specific provi-

sion made against religious people exerting undue influence at elections. Now, I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend to section 171C which states as follows:

"171C. Undue influence at elections.—(1) Whoever voluntarily interferes or attempts to interfere with the free exercise of any electoral right commits the offence of undue influence at an election;

(2) Without prejudice to the generality of the provisions of subsection (1), whoever:—

(a) threatens any candidate or voter, or any person in whom a candidate or voter is interested, with injury of any kind, or

(b) induces or attempts to induce a candidate or voter to believe that he or any person in whom he is interested will become or will be rendered an object of Divine displeasure or of spiritual censure

shall be deemed to interfere with the free exercise of the electoral right of such candidate or voter, within the meaning of sub-section (1)."

So specifically it prohibits such acts and if anybody is using his or her religious powers to induce or even to threaten a candidate or voter with Divine displeasure, he can be brought to book. What else does he want in this Bill which is not there in the Penal Code? If any such offence has been committed in Kerala, it is for him to move the law there and seek protection. Why should he bring this Bill here if it is not just to show that he was labouring under a misconception of things and wanted to put the blame somehow somewhere. This is just an opportunity for him to say something against somebody here—nothing more than that.

Now coming to the part about the Catholic Church allegedly indulging in political activities, I do agree that it is objectionable if a religious order has used its resources—and "resources" according to his definition means

funds or other properties including printing press, newspapers and journals owned by or on behalf of the Catholic Church used in political activities. Sir, as I have just told you, for him politics is religion; everything you say or do is politics for him, but for the Catholic Church—here I am only referring to the Catholic Church with specific reference to Kerala because reference was made to it—religion is more important. They cannot mix up religion with politics; they are not interested in it and cannot be. Their mission is faith in religion and their life's mission is to preach faith in God and faith in religion. And if at all they opposed the Communists, it was not because they called themselves Communists or followed Communism but because they were opposing an anti-religious group, who happened to be Communists.

SRI N. M. ANWAR: Anti-God too.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: They were against anti-religious and anti-God groups, whether they called themselves Communists or X or any other. They were doing it from their religious point of view. For them it was a question of a struggle for existence, I mean their life's mission is to propagate religion. They exist to preach to people about religion. To them names do not matter. Whether it was Communists or others of that view, their attitude would be the same. They simply advised their followers not to join those who had no belief in religion, who had no belief in God. What is the wrong there? I do not understand. And when they, being a religious group, had to face an anti-religious group, what else would anybody do? It was not politics for them. Politics was never their end. Religion is their end. Politics might have been the means. Religion was their end and will be their end as far as the Catholic Church goes. Even in a social welfare State which we talk of and at which we aim our methods are different from the hon. Member's though ultimately, from the idealistic point of view, we all may agree. Here their aim, their object and their end

463 RS.—5.

is religion. How they did it or how they do is a matter not of much importance, and in my calculation of things it does not come under political activity at all. My friend said so much about the secular character of the State. But actually he wants not a secular State or a State tolerating all religions and all faiths but only a materialistic State. That is all he wants. He is not bothered that in a secular State freedom is given to all religions and tolerance is shown to all. And the hon. mover of the Bill will be doing a fundamental wrong, if, admitting it a secular State, he prohibited the practice of different faiths. The aim of India's basic policy is to be tolerant. If they are there, it is because we are tolerant. My hon. friend was pleased to say indirectly that in his party there is no freedom to speak and if anybody dares to speak, he will not be there. But in our party, we believe in discussion, in persuasion and in allowing everybody the freedom to express himself. We are tolerant even in religious matters. But if the Government have done anything specially preferential or specially detrimental to any religion, it can be questioned—'You preach secularism and you have brought in religion'. Here we are true to our secular conception and he is preaching: "Do not have a secular complexion. Have the idea of atheism or materialism". We fundamentally differ from him there.

Sir, this Bill, if at all accepted, will be of an all-India character. You see, he has been prompted to bring forward this Bill only because of his experience in Kerala. And as I said, the Church did not interfere with political activities. It interfered with an anti-religious, anti-God movement. I can go a little further and say that they can say that they have been communal. It is not even communal. I am using a wrong word. They actually wanted that party to come to power where they could survive, where they could practise their faith, where they could have religion and the conception of God. After all, it is their mission. They will be failing in

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.]
 their duty if they did not do that while thinking of the church. I do not find any fault in their using their funds, their press and other things in furtherance of their mission. Their aim is religion. It was not the Communist Party that they opposed. It was not Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, it was an anti-religious group that they wanted to oppose. And that is all they did. Therefore, I feel that if this Bill is accepted, it will be something against the spirit of secularism.

First of all, his arguments about a secular State are not correct and then he discriminated against one section of a religion against all the other sections. I do not find that a necessity has come for the State to interfere and cripple the freedom of religious groups. In Kerala, in particular, I do not think the Church had anything to do with politics as such, but it was religion that they wanted to protect.

Sir, even if these people did take part in politics to some extent, I ask Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, does any law in our country prevent a man who happens to belong to a particular religion from being a citizen of India? He is a citizen of India first and anything else later. And when he is a citizen of India, he has his duties and he has his responsibilities and thereby he gets the right of voting, the right of canvassing. Of course, if they had taken to subversive methods or if they had instigated violence, you could bring them under any of these things. Conceding all the allegations made by my friend, viz., that it was a wrong thing for the Church to have done that, I feel there is enough provision in our law and the Constitution and the election manual to deal with them, and I feel it is utterly unnecessary to bring forward this Bill. I am sorry to say that he has wasted so much of our time.

SHRI T. SRINIVASAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I never thought that in democratic India, with our Fundamental Rights and the Constitution,

a small minority like us would be compelled or called upon to defend its rights, because remember that we are hardly 8 million in this country of whom clergymen will not amount to more than 10,000, and three-fourths of them are Indians born in India. They are all our own flesh of flesh and all our own blood of blood. Shall I tell you that my own son is a priest? If Catholic priests are not allowed to take part in politics, how shall it be proper for me to have been called to the highest council of the country?

Sir, we Christians and, above all, the Catholics have set a shining example of secularism. So, whatever came from the mouth of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta today was nothing else than a general asseveration. Please remember that at the Round Table Conference in London we went before Gandhiji and told him that we would give up our demand for separate representation and whatever rights we had of self-defence in this country, because we relied on his word, we relied on the good faith of the majority and we relied on our bright tradition which is as old as this country. Sir, the Catholics came to Kerala at the very beginning of Catholicism, nearly two thousand years ago, when Hindu Princes were ruling along the West Coast, and one of those princes received them, gave them a piece of land and gave them all privileges. We have been relying on the words of Gandhiji who sacrificed his life so that India might be a multi-religious State.

Sir, we are not impressed by the threats of Mr. Gupta. We know what will happen if the Communists, by force or by fluke, come into power in this country, but we are prepared. It is not for any secular interest, any vested interest, any party interest or any group interest. We stand or fall by the good people of this country with whom we are one in flesh and in blood. Please tell me how I am different from a Hindu. Am I not as much a Hindu as any of you because we

have been born and brought up in this country ever since the history of this land began, and why should anyone, discriminate against me on the score that I am a Catholic? Is it because my son has become a priest that you tell me not to take part in politics? Is there any moral turpitude of which you can blame him? Can you say that he is unpatriotic? Look at your record in Poland, in Hungary. Look at your record in Ireland. Who defended the freedom of those countries against the invading armies of reds? Did we not give our blood and our tears? We are prepared to do that again for this country because we came out of this earth and mean to return to this earth.

We are not going to learn a lesson in patriotism from men from whose mouth patriotism comes with a very bad grace today. Did we hear a word from Mr. Gupta's mouth against the intrusion of China on our borders on which they have entrenched themselves? Is it for him? With what grace does it come from him to read out a lesson in patriotism? To me, Sir, the Vatican is not my Moscow or my Peking. Delhi is both for me. I take my politics from Pandit Nehru, from you and from our rulers.

I joined the Congress because everywhere the Catholic Church has been the greatest exponent of patriotism, of nationalism, of decency, of social order and of social justice. It is not with a view to saving any little property that we have come here, that we joined the Congress. We have got more faith in this country and in the good sense of our people than in a Bill which smacks of class war. They would like to separate one community from another and rend this country with separation and class war.

Sir, we believe in the assurances, we believe in the traditions of our people, we believe in the innate sense of fairness and justice of our country. Sir, in the course of the past week we have been celebrating our national independence. The national flag of

our country, about which so much has been spoken during these celebrations, was adopted, let me recall to you, on the 22nd of June, 1947. One of the speeches which were made on that day in the Constituent Assembly was to this effect. The gentleman said: "Let us remember that this flag calls us to work for a society which will be fair, which will be compassionate, which will be democratic, which will be decent, in which every Christian—yes, every Christian—every Sikh, every Muslim, every Hindu, every Buddhist and every minority will find a safe and sure shelter." Sir, shall I recall to you that the man who spoke those eloquent words was no less than our Chairman. I never thought that in this House presided over by that great liberal statesman, Dr. Radhakrishnan, it will be necessary for a small minority like us to defend our right of existence because what is the use of existence in a free democratic society if we cannot take part in politics? What is the use of living in a democratic society if your children, your brothers, your sisters, your sons, your daughters, etc. are treated as second-class citizens and treated with suspicion? We, Catholic priests, in India deserve better.

I shall recall only one instance. One of the founding fathers, one of the leading lights in the Constituent Assembly, was Rev. Jerome De Souza, a priest, a Jesuit, today in the highest rung of that religious Order. What did he do? Was he not a faithful disciple of Gandhiji as much as any other man in India? I myself have been his disciple. Have we not been faithful to the tradition of patriotism, of enlightened service in the cause of the country? What have we done to deserve this castigation at the hands of a man whose patriotism itself is not above cavil? I say, in the name, in the fair name, of India, in the fair traditions of the people who have been ruling over this country for centuries, I exhort you to be fair and impartial. After all justice means justice to the small man, justice to the few, not justice to the brute majority, no, not, in our country. In our country the

[Shri T. Srinivasan.]

majority will do justice and we, minorities, shall behave with reason. In the name of that mutual good sense and our trust in you as our elder brothers—brothers, elder brothers—I call, I request, I pray that this House will throw out that Bill, cut the throat of that wretched Bill and throw it into the Bay of Bengal so that its pestilential presence will not pollute the pure atmosphere of this country.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, there does not appear to be any law in any democratic country of the world prohibiting religious institutions from taking part in politics or in elections, but there are a few instances whereby certain restrictions are placed regarding specific activities of the church and churchmen. For instance in the United Kingdom, there is no general law banning the political activities of the Church, either Catholic or Protestant. But certain restrictions have been placed regarding the role of the clergy in relation to elections which are held off and on. The priests in England can participate and address the religious congregations and give their counsel with regard to the merits or the demerits of various candidates who contest the elections and also the priests can serve as agents during the election time for candidates. In America there is no such law which prevents the church or any religious order from participating in political activities.

Now, the hon. Shri Bhupesh Gupta intends to bring about a sort of halt to the political activities of a section of the community, the Catholic section of the Christian community in India

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all. but only the political activities of the church.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: He wants to bring about an end of or prevent the malevolent domination of the church and the church-folk from directly interfering in political activi-

ties and I agree that politics and religion should not be mixed up. We want, that politics should not meddle with religion. At the same time religion also should not meddle with politics. This is a broad principle that we, or anybody in the House I hope, will accept but Mr. Gupta went on to point out that this particular community did not conduct itself well during the recent Kerala elections.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never mentioned the community. I have no quarrel with the community. I only mentioned certain people constituting the leadership of the church.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I stand corrected. According to him, the church and the religious order conducted a lot of political activities. Not only that but it directly interfered in the elections in Kerala. Sir, interference of religion, active or direct, is bad enough, I know. But in the past there were no such charges against the church. Perhaps according to my friend, there was no interference. If there was interference recently in the Kerala elections by the church or the ecclesiastic order, there was interference even before and if there was no interference at the recent Kerala elections, there were no interference before. So I take it that Mr. Gupta was provoked to draft this Bill because there was a big landslide to his political party in the Kerala elections. Sir, if we want to deal with this question straightway, the House would be ready to have a debate; but to bring in the Kerala elections in this way and to give a sort of a picture which, from our point of view, is not entirely dispassionate, is something which is wrong. Let us assume that there was religious interference in Kerala. If there was, what was the reason for it? Why was interference not there before, that is, in the elections held before? If there had been any interference at all, one of the reasons is that the church had felt that there was interference in religion by Government; that is invasion

of religion by politics. It is bad; religion should not be mixed up with politics, and it is equally wrong to mix up politics with religion. It is very bad for any government to interfere in the rights or the privileges of these religious institutions. It is indeed very reprehensible. What we have to consider, therefore is the situation prevailing at the time of the Kerala elections. I wish that religion does not play a part in political affairs; I also wish that politics, or any government for that matter, should not interfere in the affairs of religion. That is what happened in Kerala. According to our friends, perhaps Communism was in danger in Kerala, but according to the Catholic Church religion was in danger. As a consequence, Sir, there was some sort of keen interest taken by the church and the church-folk in the Kerala elections.

The Bill seeks to achieve two or three things. Firstly, as I said, it wants to prevent any ecclesiastical institution of the Catholic Christians from indulging in any activity in favour of or against any government. Secondly, activity in favour of or against any political party; and thirdly, the propagation of political views. These things have been put in a pretty loose way. If they are interpreted, it may mean forbidding completely any activity, social, civil or any non-political activity of the church. Here it says that no activity should be conducted in favour of or against any government for instance, Government brings forward a non-political measure on birth control—I know, Sir, the church has got definite views about family planning and birth control—then according to this Bill any views expressed on birth control should be prohibited. Take, for instance, prohibition or gambling or betting. There are various laws dealing with these issues. If this Bill is passed, the church will be prevented from expressing any opinion on any of these things.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For gambling?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: That may not be . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Only you will not be able to propagate political views.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: That may be the motive behind the Bill but it is not clear, it is not so expressed. That is not brought out in the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is quite clear.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: It is not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You read it.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I have read it many times and I would like the hon. Member to go through the Bill once again. Then, what is it that the author of the Bill wants to do? If the churches or priests participate in political activities, he wants them to be warned and their names to be published in the Gazette. After a warning is issued and after their names are published in the Gazette, what happens? Perhaps, the hon. Member may be thinking that this would offer a sufficient deterrent for those who indulge in political activities. Perhaps, he is very mild in awarding punishments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Very considerate!

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Very considerate and very sympathetic.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They will be gazetted politicians of the religious order.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: He cannot give any higher punishment.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: There are laws and laws in the country which can deal with political

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.] activities of religion. I am not a defender of the Christian faith. I really want to stop religion entering into politics; and I would say "Hands off religion"; at the same time, I do not want this to be made use of for political victimisation of a particular section. If Mr. Bhupesh Gupta fears that interference or intervention of the Church in elections would jeopardise their fate, surely there are other laws, as another Member pointed out. They could file election petitions for wrongful inducements and can have recourse to other laws to prevent this sort of activity. This Bill on the face of it tries to cleanse politics, or if I may say so, tries to bring about a sort of political deodorisation but I am afraid that if we pass this measure, we will be creating more tension because one community is isolated for a discriminatory treatment and the rest are not. The objective, according to this Bill, is to prevent them from participating in political activities, but we would create politics by passing this Bill, and we would encourage the Catholic Church, which would feel that it is victimised, to participate more and more in political activities. They will agitate and that may be constituted as political activity. That way, the very purpose of the Bill would be defeated, and I do not want any Bill to be passed which leads to discrimination and partial treatment of a section of the community, and its victimisation for things which are imaginary.

4 P.M.

Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said many things about patriotism which was not relevant. The question of patriotism is not relevant here. He even asked the House that there could be a debate on patriotism. I may not know what is patriotism but I know at least what is not patriotism. Ex-territorialism, or loyalty to a foreign power is no patriotism. Sir, blind obedience to the dictates of a foreign government or a foreign power is not patriotism. Changing

the policies consistently or inconsistently according to the mandates of others is not patriotism. And it is no patriotism, Sir, to defend the interests of other countries when our own interests are involved and it is no patriotism in any case to go against the real interests and aspirations of our country and to support our enemies. So, let us not be very vociferous about things about which various political parties have got definite opinions. I feel, Sir, that this was irrelevant. Anyway, that was brought in.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you have started giving a definition of what you think is patriotism.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Yes; I have done it because it was introduced. However, it was extraneous to the debate. Perhaps Mr. Bhupesh Gupta moved by his weakness for flamboyance brought in this question of patriotism which was outside the scope of the Bill. Finally, I wish to say that this measure will not secure the objective envisaged. I wish that religion should not enter politics because politics and religion are separate realms.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Gurupada Swamy's party is the chiefest beneficiary. They have a Chief Ministership with 19 seats; one cannot imagine.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta drags me to a discussion of other things.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a rope trick.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: My party might have played the rope trick but the party which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta represents has played a greater rope trick. Even today it is playing a rope trick. Perhaps, religion is opium to our friends now. Sir, there were instances in the past when it was never considered to be

opium. On the contrary religion was exploited by friends who belonged to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's party. Perhaps, he is aware of it much more than myself.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I agree that religion is opium, but they are completely drugged.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Perhaps, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and his friends have been too much intoxicated by that opium. Even today because of that intoxication he sees opium in others whereas he is himself very much opium-ated. That is what I feel. Anyway, this measure is very discriminatory and it will be very wrong . . .

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Kerala): Ask some of your supporters in Mangalore and other places. Ask them what their opinion is.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: At least my friend should concede that I know all the opinions of my party much better than him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He knows all the opinions. So many opinions are floating.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Our opinions are not so many as the opinions of the Communist Party and we do not change them often as they do. We do not believe in . . .

DR. A. SUBBA RAO: Perhaps, the hon. Member has forgotten the Mulki by-election, otherwise . . .

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Let me not dilate on these things, Sir. But let not the House be led away by the polemics of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and give its approval to the Bill, which does more harm than good, which has got elements of penalisation and which discriminates and isolates particular sections for purposes of punishment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do realise that Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai

is the biggest offspring of the marriage of religion and politics.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat): Are we to mention other names also?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Samuel.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Sir, I had not intended to take part in this debate because, in my opinion, this Bill is absurd—serves an absurd purpose—and ludicrous. It seems to me that the members who belong to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's party also believe in what I say, because they are enjoying it with smiles.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are a party that smiles; you are a party in tears.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Kerala showed who were in tears and who were in joy. And Kerala is at the back of this Bill.

Sir, it is both interesting and a pleasure to participate in the debate on a Bill sponsored by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in his usual provocative manner. Not that I am speaking now having been provoked by his speech, but the subject itself is provocative and the fact that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has sponsored it certainly makes it more provocative and interesting.

Before I say anything on this Bill, I would like to echo what Mr. Gurupada Swamy has said about the relationship between religion and politics. I am one of those who is strongly of the opinion that religion must be completely divorced from politics and politics must be completely alien to religion. Having said so, I want to emphasise that no person engaged in religious work is to be denied his fundamental right to take part in politics. It is very difficult for a person like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta perhaps—but it is very clear to me—to realise that and steer clear between a religious institution and a religious functionary. A cleric has got as much

[Shri M. H. Samuel.]
right to take part in politics as a layman has. He is as much a citizen of this country as anybody else is. If he is a religious functionary he exercises certain influence over others. He is kind of a local leader and people naturally look up to him for advice and guidance. That is not substituting a religious organisation in place of a religious functionary.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I request the hon. Member to clarify what he meant by his opening sentence that religion must be divorced from politics and politics must be alien to religion, in the light of what he said later on?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I shall presently explain the meaning, the implication.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please reply him.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I will do so, but let me proceed with the pattern of my speech. After all, even clarifications cannot be made to order. They will come in due course.

Now, it has been clear during this debate so far that for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta sponsoring this Bill, there is a pathological background. I would like to warn the House not to take this Bill in a lighthearted manner or localise its importance to Kerala. It is much more than that. It has got ideological background as well. I will come to the ideological background a little later.

First, let me deal with what I call the pathological background to this Bill. Now, everyone knows that the Roman Catholics—I am very particular about those words 'Roman Catholics'—not the Roman Catholic Church, in my opinion, played a major part in the agitation and overthrow of the Communist regime in Kerala, to which party our friend belongs. The Roman Catholics were the spearhead of this agitation. Every Roman Catholic, whether he is a

cleric or a layman, is a political entity there. He is a citizen of India. He looked at the political situation in the State as he is used to and in his own light, just as the Communists look at it in their own light. Now, before the Communist regime was overthrown, everybody knew what was the situation in Kerala. Life and work in Kerala were being corrupted to a large extent by the missionary zeal of Communism and its workers. They were setting son against father, father against son, brother against brother, sister against sister. It was a state in which, if I may say so, man was wolf to man.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member sounds like a poet.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I could give him a better composition outside, if he prefers. But I am trying to make as clear to you as possible the havoc they wrought in Kerala and if my language is hyperbolic, it is for you to take it or leave it.

But in that agitation, let me make it very clear, not merely Roman Catholics, but Protestants, Hindus, Muslims, Buddhists, everybody joined in the fight. They rejected the ideology of Communism.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He means Assembly seats.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: They have got hardly any. That does not matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Twelve lakh votes we added, we got from that. Maybe, history will tell later.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: How much will they still maintain out of that?

Now, therefore, naturally Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is not able to forget Kerala. He cannot forget the Vimo-chan Samiti processions, he cannot forget the Christophers' processions, he cannot forget the amount of anger that was roused by the maladministration of the Communist regime . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And cannot also forget the Congressmen hiding behind the pulpit.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: He must see that this sort of thing does not happen again. Therefore, he must see that the Catholics, who were the spearhead of this agitation in Kerala, are put down, are decimated, lest at any time when he should have a remote chance or possibility of coming back to power, these Catholics are not there to fight him again. Therefore, Catholics or the Catholic Church must pay the price.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why don't you make some clergyman the Chief Minister? Some bishop was available.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: That is Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's conscience with a style, if I may say so.

As I said, this may be an attack on the Catholic Church now, but let nobody be complacent. He may next launch his attack on the other religious communities, because he believes in no religion and in his opinion, Communism is itself a religious creed. Therefore, you may as well say that it is the Communist ideology to destroy religion completely, wherever it is found, whether it is Christianity, Hinduism or Islam, that is at the back of this Bill. Communism is itself a religion. He believes in the historic inevitability of Communism. In other words, in sponsoring this Bill, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is running true to the Communist ideology. And thus he is advancing atheist propaganda, dialectical materialism, helping to uproot what he may call the last remnants of Capitalism and all those heroic abstractions.

Now, therefore, it is unnecessary for me to explain further the background to this Bill, but in order to bring home to the House a little more about the ideological background to this Bill, I would like to

go a little deeper into what Communist ideology thinks about religion or how it regards religion. Sir, I would like to quote an editorial article published in "Pravda", about the 21st of August 1959, that is exactly a year ago, entitled "Against Religious Prejudices".

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am glad that I at least provoked the hon. Member to read "Pravda".

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I have been reading it much before your provocation. It is good to know you inside out. It said:

"Religion is hostile to the interests of the workers with its anti-scientific assertions" . . .

This is "Pravda". Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may be laughing at it, but if "Pravda" comes to know about it, he will be in danger. It goes on—

"with its antiscientific assertions, its morality and distorted representations of the world; it hinders the building of Communism, distracts part of the people from active participation in our great cause. Remnants of religion are a hindrance in the work of strengthening friendship between peoples and encourage the preservation of bourgeois-nationalist views. The holding of religious ceremonies in numerous cases entails the violation of labour and state discipline, causes losses in the national economy, cripples people spiritually."

Sir, this quotation represents almost the official standpoint in the campaign against religion in the Soviet Union.

Now, Sir, you might have had the impression, many people in our country might have had the impression, that Russia is becoming a little more liberal as regards religion, much more liberal than it was during the time of Stalin. Yes, perhaps so. But since then, I think, after some time, just as the Chinese rulers have

[Shri M. H. Samuel.]
 discovered the unanticipated results of their "hundred flowers blooming" and so on, the Russians also may have discovered that the kind of liberalism that they tried to evince towards religion had certain undesirable results.

Sir, I was there in Russia in August 1958. On a Sunday morning I thought of going out to a church, and so I did. I found the church was full, and to my considerable surprise I found our Ambassador also in the same church. He had come to that church with his wife and he was quite surprised at the large attendance in the church. It was a problem that the Soviet Government had to face in this religious revivalism in the State.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Religion has complete freedom there.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I see. I will presently show you what the party is doing. I have got a docket prepared about the entire developments and party activities against religion from January, 1960.

Having been perturbed about this religious revivalism in the country and yet not wanting to come out openly against religion in the country, the State asked the Communist Party in the Soviet Russia and all its party cadres to start a fresh "ideological education"—that is the term that they use—in order to suppress all religious revivalism in the country.

In the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia, Prime Minister Khrushchev of course made no direct reference to religion or to the present official attitude towards religion, but there were enough indications in his speech concerning anti-religious measures that should be taken in the country. Mr. Khrushchev emphasized—I am quoting his speech:

"the realisation of the magnificent plan for Communist construction demands decisive improvement

in work in the education of the Soviet people, the uprooting of the survivals of capitalism in the consciousness of the people, the development of the struggle against hostile bourgeois ideology" etc.

He also recommended increased propaganda among the masses as one of the best measures for the realisation of these aims.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How does this come in?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Your voice is too muffled or, shall I say, choked for me to hear.

Now, shortly after the publication of Mr. Khrushchev's thesis, the Communist Party mounted a very strong attack against religion and all believers. There were lots of articles and notes on the activities of the church published, and everybody in the party cadres were warned about the lack of atheist propaganda. At first, it developed in accordance with the party rules, but later on it began to include some administrative measures also against believers which marked the campaign against religion early after the Revolution—in the 1920's and 1930's. I do not blame my friend, he is just following the same pattern. So, as I mentioned a little while ago, your normal approach is to present religion as a force hostile to the workers. So, you would not like any religion to function or thrive because, in your opinion, it would certainly go against you.

Now, these articles in the Soviet Union by party cadres against all religious communities, Catholics, etc. indulged in a lot of abuse of the religious functionaries. Monks were accused of "fleecing" the workers. They were called "idle elements" and "living on charity". They were called "anti-Soviet" or "Gestapo" agents, "money-grabbers", "libertines", "sexual perverts". All these words were used by Soviet propaganda against the religious functionaries. Students

in seminaries were described as not being honest men to go to a theological school.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to hear the hon. Member on the Bill a little.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I am coming to that. But I must first get the inside out of you as to why you are bringing this Bill, what your object is. You have cleverly hidden in your speech the ideological object of this Bill, and I am here to expose the ideological object. It is not merely confined to Kerala. By this Bill you are going to affect the entire country. I quite realise your anger at being so exposed. Sir, though he is angry, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta looks at me and smiles very disarmingly. In this Bill he particularly refers to the Catholic Church and I would like to give you a quotation from one of the pamphlets distributed about the Catholic Church so that you can see the similarity between Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's views about the Catholic Church in this country and Soviet Russia's views about the Catholic Church in their country. This is what one of the very leading newspapers in Russia said:

"The Vatican is the inspirer of obscurantism . . ."

The Vatican is the seat of the Roman Catholic Church.

"... of world reaction and of the struggle against the international Communist movement."

Mark these words—"against the international Communist movement." Therefore, it must be put down according to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. It goes on:

"This assertion is supported by a reference to the fact that one of the first directives of Pope John XXIII was to prohibit Catholics from voting for Communists and parties allied with them. The alleged 'common interests' of the

Church of Rome and United States government circles are expressed in the fact that three quarters of the Catholic Church's activities are financed by American capital. Anti-Soviet activity, the ending of anti-Soviet leaflets to U.S.S.R., is attributed to Catholic organizations in the United States. The Catholic Church is reproached for sympathizing with 'the revolt in Tibet' and accused of spreading 'false reports' about the violation of religious rights in China."

Now, this type of Russian propaganda does not rest there. It has got something to say about Islam as well. As I mentioned a little earlier, this propaganda, this campaign, this onslaught, is going to spread now from the Catholic Church to the Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and the rest later on, depending upon how strong Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is in the years to come. About Islam, it is said:

"Anti-religious articles are particularly found of discussing the role and significance of Islam in those Soviet republics with predominantly Moslem populations."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member seems to be reading out from something.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I have written it out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no; you are reading from some magazine.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I have written out then notes myself.

"Recently the attacks against Islam have been stepped up. The pressure exerted on Islam can be illustrated by an incident in the town of Osh, Kirgiz SSR. A petition was drawn up calling for the prohibition of the pilgrimage to Mount Suleiman. The petition was approved and the mausoleum on the summit was converted into a museum. In addition, there has been

[Shri M. H. Samuel.]
 agitation against the celebrations of
 Kurban-Bairam which distracts
 persons from their work."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did you
 go there?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I just told
 you that I went to Russia in 1958. I
 did not go to Mount Suleiman any-
 way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where
 did you get it from?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: There are a
 lot of pamphlets.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You
 have got so many things from Cali-
 fornia.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I read Soviet
 literature much more than my friend
 does perhaps, and therefore . . . (*In-
 terruption.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order,
 order. Let him go on.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: So, I have
 now given you an account of the
 state of religion in Soviet Russia,
 and I have also mentioned that they
 are quite perturbed about the revi-
 valism in religion. They have faith
 in their campaign, in their ideologi-
 cal education and anti-religious pro-
 paganda. And since about the end
 of last year they have launched upon
 a feverish activity among all their
 cadres to discourage the practice of
 religion or the rituals of religion.

"At congresses . . ."

I am again reading from my notes.

"held by the Communist parties
 of the various Union republics of
 the U.S.S.R. during the first three
 months of this year, the problem
 of 'ideological education in present-
 day conditions' occupied a promi-
 nent place."

I am quoting these words from the
 "Partiinaya zhizn."

"In speeches delivered at these
 congresses, the first secretaries of
 all the Party central committees
 concerned stressed what they con-
 sidered to be important defects in
 ideological work and the congresses
 discussed measures for improve-
 ment. The attitude of the Soviet
 leadership in this matter is quite
 outspoken."

It says:

"The successful realization . . ."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want
 to make a submission. The hon.
 Member said that my speech provok-
 ed him to speak but he seems to have
 come ready beforehand with all these
 things.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He
 anticipated your argument.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Your provo-
 cation . . .

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Just
 as you anticipated.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Are you
 unhappy at this research that I have
 made?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are
 game for this. This is democracy,
 Sir.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: This says:

"The successful realization of the
 programme of Communist con-
 struction, the creation of a material
 and technical basis for Communism,
 the further consolidation of the
 U.S.S.R.'s economic strength and
 the securing of an abundance of
 material wealth depend directly
 upon an improvement in the level
 of consciousness of the workers
 who can be weaned away from
 religion."

Also, the ineffectiveness of their
 propaganda, their anti-religious work
 in Kirghizia was admitted by the
 First Secretary of the Kirghiz Party
 Central Committee, Razzakov. He

said this—and this is quoted in the "Sovetskaya Kirgizia" dated the February 26, 1960:

"One of the harmful survivals of the past is religious ideology. Party organizations are not taking the necessary measures for developing an aggressive scientific-atheistic propaganda . . ."

This is a hyphenated word, this 'scientific-atheistic'. That means the two words are closely allied.

" . . . and the work that is being done in this field does not reach the faithful, does not draw them away from religion."

It is an admission of failure and also an admission of the strength of religious revivalism in the country.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: What is the point in emphasizing all these things because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta admits that they are anti-religious and that they want to destroy religion?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: He never said so. He cleverly hid it, concealed it from us.

Similar is the situation in Turkmenistan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to save religion from the clutches of the Congress. There is no doubt about it.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): You are the only person from whose clutch it must be saved.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are saying so many things. Do not drag religion also.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Sir, the Second Secretary of the Turkmen Party Central Committee also had to admit the failure of the party.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with what is prevailing there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is the ideology. If the hon. Member had spent the time in reading the Communist manifesto, by now he would have been a Communist. So much time is spent on that.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: No. Since the Deputy Chairman said that you might as well be convinced by now, in deference to his wishes, I will stop quoting any further.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is giving you the background.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I think the Deputy Chairman is still a little kind to you. He wants to spare you from further exposure. Now therefore, as I said, . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It only exposes the fact that you have never applied your mind to the Bill at all.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: You will know presently; I am coming to it. As I said before, this Bill is apiece with what is being done in Soviet Russia.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is the name of my Bill? He has at least to say this, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on in his own way.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I am now coming to your Bill. That is why I have taken it in my hand.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How many clauses has it got?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta attended the Bucharest Congress of the Communist Party, and he is trying to do here what is being done in Soviet Russia. Probably, he has taken his tips from Bucharest, and he is trying to do in this country some kind of anti-religious or atheistic propaganda or scientific-atheistic propaganda that is being practised there.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): Do you know when this Bill was introduced?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I gave notice of this Bill about a year ago.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Now, I come to the provisions of the Bill. Somebody has already thanked Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in respect of the very mild and lenient punishment he wants to impose . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No punishment.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Reward, shall I say? You want to impose a punishment on all those persons who violate the provisions of this Bill. He has included cemeteries . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It will be easy if I put all the names in the Gazette so that you may look at them and find who are your election agents.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: He has included in his definition of "church premises" cemeteries also. I do not know whether he is afraid of the ghosts in the cemetery. What have cemeteries to do in these matters? They are usually far away. Still he has included cemetery also in "church premises", which shows that he is even afraid of the dead.

Then, very unreasonably, he includes residences and offices of the Vicars, the Mother-Superiors and so on. I can understand public places or open spaces being included in this Bill. But he goes even to the residences of not only the Vicars but also the Mother-Superiors.

He has included convents also on it. In one of the articles that I read on the subject I find that the latest anti-religious propaganda in the Soviet Union calls those persons who go to schools in convents as "incarceration" in convents. I suppose Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has "incarceration" in mind when he includes convents also. And who would be the persons in

those convents? They will be girls below the age of fourteen or fifteen.

Then sub-clause (2) of clause 3 says:

"No Cardinal, Archbishop, Bishop, Vicar, Mother-Superior nun brother or other dignitary, functionary or officer of the Catholic Church shall, in his or her capacity as a functionary of the Catholic Church or by using his or her ecclesiastic position or title, take part in, or encourage, any political activity."

Now, this seems to lump all and everything together without even pausing to think how you can separate one from the other. All these persons, I presume, would be Indian nationals. When you have given the fundamental right to every citizen of India to take part in politics, you cannot prevent a person from doing so because he is connected with the Catholic Church. You cannot say that he should have nothing to do with the Catholic Church if he wants to take part in politics. How can he disrobe or divest himself of his position in the Catholic Church when he is taking part in the Catholic Church. As Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has himself said, it may be one and the same thing to him, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and the Communist Party put together. But others are not of the same kind. Other political ideologies are not as complete and as steam-rolling as Communism is or would be. And if a Communist Government comes to power in this country it would be disastrous for communities professing different religions to exist with their belief in God.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I only want to disrobe the Congress when it wants to appear in the Catholic robe.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: So, you have got a political objective in trying to introduce this Bill—that is against the Congress, not against the Catholic Church so much. I am very happy to hear that comment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is to save religion from your hands.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Then I come to the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill. He says:

"Appeals to religious susceptibilities and sentiments of the Catholics are frequently made by the ecclesiastical personnel and the resources of the Church are used for furthering political agitation or for achieving certain political ends. This is contrary to the concepts of a secular State whose very foundation is liable to be undermined by such introduction of religion into the politics or into secular matters affecting the State."

I do not know how a Catholic Church, with Indians working there as functionaries, or its activities would undermine the secular character of the State? In the Soviet Union which, according to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, is a secular State and where, according to him, there is freedom of religion, what is done there is sheer propaganda and propaganda to discourage religious or ritualistic activities. Is it not undermining the secular character of the State or secular purpose of the State or the secular functions of the State?

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I was amazed indeed and even amused when I heard such an intelligent Member as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should bring forward a Bill so disastrous to the very interests of his own party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then you support it; you want disaster for our party.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: Please hold your soul in patience. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should know that he is living in India.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Not in China.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I can very well imagine from the speeches that have been delivered on the floor of this House that there has been a perpetual conflict between the Communist Party and the Roman Catholic Church. and we know, happily enough for us, that there is the revival of religion in almost every country where the Communist Party has been trying to suppress it. But in this country Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should know, as any man of ordinary intelligence will realise, that this is a land of religions. Here we have got ever so many religions and that is to the glory of our country. And that is exactly the reason why we have taken the greatest care to see that ours is a secular State and the secular State depends upon the goodwill that you enjoy from ever so many communities. Believe me, Sir, that by bringing forward this Bill, first aiming at the Roman Catholic Church, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has only alienated the sympathies of the entire community of the Roman Catholics in India. I have got to congratulate him on rendering that much service.

I know that he is suffering from the psychopathology of his Communist regime in Kerala. But that is of his own making. Sir, why are so many communities, not necessarily the Roman Catholics but almost every religion in this country, trying to run away from the Communist Party? I think the reason must be obvious. (Turning to Shri Bhupesh Gupta) You have brought politics into the domain of religion. By your anti-God movement, by your anti-religious propaganda, you have not only alienated the sympathies of ever so many communities that have faith in God, but you thank God that they have spared you to live in this country, particularly at a time when the Communist China has committed aggression on our borders. We have got to think that there are people here who are devoted to God, who are out to give their life for this country when you

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]

are trying to fiddle and sing the glories of Communist ideologies still in this country. We are beholden to the Roman Catholic Church as we are beholden to ever so many minority communities. And after all, a certificate of good conduct for a majority community has got to come from the minority communities if a democratic government is to be considered successful. The majority community cannot give unto itself a good conduct certificate. I am very happy that in Kerala at least for once in our lifetime so many communities have got together and sounded the death-knell for the Communist Party in this country.

Sir, here is a Bill which suggests a remedy which is worse than the disease.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member should remember if he goes on like that with his misplaced oration, the ghost of John, the Baptist, will turn in his grave.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: It is not exactly that he will turn in his grave but we have already provided a graveyard for you in this country.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: But here Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will not turn a hair.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I am really happy and grateful to you, Mr Deputy Chairman, for giving me this opportunity now to speak because I am one of those who have witnessed how wonderfully that election was held in Kerala. Thanks to the Communist Party, all the religious minorities got together so wonderfully well in order to defend the secular character of the State. Where is secularism if so many minority communities feel short of the confidence of a secular government? After all, a secular government should not only be practised but must appear to be practised, and must be believed by the minority communities to be practised. That is

exactly why we in Kerala have felt so happy that the Communist Party should have come in for such a crash. And even if after that experience the hon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should bring in this measure, well, the country will take stock of the situation.

Now, Sir, does it lie in his mouth to preach patriotism to us? When Communist China has committed aggression on our borders, our friends of the Communist Party are fiddling here. They imagine that by bringing forward this measure they are going to secure a certificate of patriotism. The communities which have vitally come round and tried to safeguard the ideals of the secular Constitution have at least come to realise where our public enemy number one lies. That public enemy number one is the Communist Party on which there can be no two opinions. And when it comes to it—and I am sure a day will come when the Communist China will decide to penetrate further—we know where our friends, who are preaching patriotism today will be. Now, since this Bill has been brought forward, I must give them one advice that even in madness there is a method and the Communist Party the world over seems to be actuated by the same considerations of madness. They have got a world ideology to root out religion, and that is the reason why all religions have come together. Not that we try to preach hatred against your leaders. Absolutely none, but we know that the Communist Party is going to destroy the roots of religion. Let me tell him and let Mr. Bhupesh Gupta at least learn for future that in this country where there is the highest devotion to God—maybe that he is a Hindu and I am a Muslim and another is a Roman Catholic and still third a Sikh or Parsi or a Buddhist—and where it comes to the question of religion, your communism is going to shipwreck against the rock of religion. In no other country religion has struck deeper roots than in our country. That is exactly the reason why here in this country even such of us

who have visited ever so many countries overseas realise and see how wonderfully beautiful our country is, a beautiful garden of so many flowers where you have ever so many cultures, so many religions and communities flourishing together under a secular Constitution, and it becomes as much our birth-right as it is our duty to defend this Constitution, come what may, and we know where our enemy lies and we are not going to spare him.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am here to oppose the Bill, The Catholic Church Premises and Ecclesiastic Order (Restriction of Political Activity) Bill, which has been presented on the floor of this House by my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, after a very long, eloquent and interesting speech.

Sir, I wish to make it clear that I have got fundamental objections against this Bill, because this Bill, I strongly feel, seeks to paralyse a certain section of the Indian population by prohibiting any political activity on their behalf. This Bill seeks to take away the fundamental right of a particular section in this country to express their political views through pamphlets, handbills, statements etc. This Bill attempts to put a ban on certain persons belonging to this country, on their right to oppose or criticise the Government. This particular section of population is as has been mentioned in this Bill, The Catholic Church and the Ecclesiastic Order. The fault for which it is

sought to penalise them is that they belong to certain religious Order and nothing else. I believe, Sir, that this religious Order is definitely not anti-national or anti-democratic but really is a patriotic and loyal section of our country. The Constitution of India, Part III, Article 19(1), lays down:—

“All citizens shall have the right—

(a) to freedom of speech and expression;

(b) to assemble peaceably and without arms;

(c) to form associations or unions;

(d) to practise any profession, or to carry on any occupation, trade or business.”

Now, as per this article 19, because of their profession that they belong to the Catholic Ecclesiastical Order, if they are debarred from taking part in politics, that, I maintain, is against the Constitution. Therefore I say that this Bill hits at the very foundation of our Constitution and the very basis of our democratic and secular set-up.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue on the next non-official business day.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 22nd August, 1960.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 22nd August, 1960.