

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The House will now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. The question is :

“That clause 2 stand part of the Bill”

The motion was adopted

Clause 2 was added to the Bill

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

“That Clause 1, The Enacting Formula and the Long Title Stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adspctd

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill

SHRI SHIVRAJ PATIL : I beg to move :

“That the Bill be Passed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

“That the Bill be passed”

The motion was adopted

15.27 hr.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE :  
DISAPPROVAL OF ARMS (AMEND-  
MENT) ORDINANCE, 1988

AND

ARMS (AMENDMENT) BILL

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The House will now take up items 12 and 13 together. Now, Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE  
(Panskura) : I beg to move the following Resolution :

“That this House disapproves of the Arms (Amendment) Ordinance, 1988 (Ordinance No. 5 of 1988)

promulgated by the President on the 27th May 1988.”

Sir, actually this Government has passed 36 ordinances in its lifetime, six in the last session. The interesting thing is that the last budget session ended on the 13th of May and this ordinance was issued on the 27th of May. Why was this ordinance passed ? It was reported that the terrorists and anti-national elements, particularly in Punjab, have, in the recent past, acquired automatic fire-arms, rockets and rocket-launchers and other sophisticated weapons and ammunition. Is it between the 16th and 27th they understood that the ammunition, automatic weapons, etc., have been collected ? If not, why wasn't this thing brought forward in the budget session itself ? Why was there an ordinance ?

Sir, everybody know in Punjab that automatic weapons were being used by the terrorists for a very very long time. Therefore, it is the habit with the Government to go on with ordinances. This could have been easily by a normal Bill. I may come on Mondy but probably, I will not be there. Therefore, Mr. Indrajit Gupta will continue on my behalf because his name is also there. Regarding the ordinance, I challenge and I say that there is no necessity for this Ordinance. This could have been a law much before and could have been given much better opportunity to use this law, if they want to use, against the terrorist activities about which I want to say many more things. It is already 3.30 P.M. I would finish with these words now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You may continue on Monday. Now we will pass on to the next item.

15.31 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEM-  
BERS BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

[Translation]

Fifty-Fourth Report

SHRI CHANDRA KISHORE PATHAK  
(Saharsa) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I big to move :