

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

addressed to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, has been received from the District Magistrate, Patna, today :—

“Today (9.8.83) Shri Ramavatar Shastri, Member of Parliament, has been arrested at Patna under section 151 Cr. P.C. during the ‘Bihar Bund’ call given by opposition parties. At present he has been kept at Kotwali Police Station (Patna Town)”.

SHRI ERA MOHAN (Coimbatore) :
What about the information about those MPs who were arrested in Delhi ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am told that they have got some information. It will come before the House.

18.51 hrs

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE :
ARMS (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE—Contd.

AND

ARMS (AMENDMENT) BILL —Contd.

SHRI SHIVENDRA BAHADUR SINGH (Rajnandgaon) : Sir, while welcoming the move to strengthen the arms licence issuing machinery, this Bill also seeks to limit the number of licensed arms to an individual to three only. The object of this exercise seems to be to check the rising incidence of crime. But limiting the number of arms is not going to solve this problem. The danger to law and order is not from licensed arms but from unlicensed and illegal arms. There is no rationale behind the arbitrary limitation of those sought to be enforced in the said Bill. This clause on the limit of arms has caused serious concern to bonafide law-abiding citizens who are genuine sportsmen or collectors. The main object of the Bill is achieved by strengthening the arms licence issuing machinery and by ensuring that only fit and proper persons obtain arms licences.

The growing danger of violence and crime by fire-arms causes great concern

to all of us. To meet this danger, a practical step is needed. To bring forth a Bill which limits the number of arms is not the solution. If a free and a rational view of reviewing this situation is taken and statistics are collected, it would be conclusively seen that what little licensed arms are involved in crime, come from such persons who have less than three arms.

Even in today's paper it was mentioned that there was an attack on such and such person with the revolver and hammer. Does it mean that hammer has also become a weapon from today ? What will happen to sickle later on ?

The person who possesses more than three arms, is not a person who indulges in feuds, dacoities, etc., etc. You know it very well. He is well-known to the authorities, at the District or State level for this. The very aim and purpose of this Bill is defeated when one realises that howsoever a law is made harsh and stringent, any person with an undesirable background or a criminal bent of mind can and will indulge in crime and dacoity.

What is therefore needed is stricter surveillance and effective control in the matter of issuing arms licences to bonafide persons only. Arms licences granted despite the missing of the District Authorities should stop. This would greatly help in controlling the evil of crime. The District Magistrate with the help of the police should be the sole issuing authority. It is said that they get orders from the top. What is that top we do not know about it.

If in reality things are taken it will be seen that crimes are more in Punjab, Haryana, Delhi, U. P. and Bihar. It is surprising to note that every one is travelling with a machine-gun, carbines, self loading rifles. One fails to understand doing. Are you able to stop them from carrying ? If a person who travels with a licence, whether he is carrying a revolver or whether it is a .12 bore, is harassed by the local authorities but those without any licence can be seen moving around anywhere during day.

time and night time. That is why I insist that the Government should be very very strict and arrest any person who has got unlicensed weapon with him.

On limitation and possession of arms, I would very clearly say that those who today possess more than 3 arms and have been allowed to retain them by the authorities, are all well known sportsmen or collectors. Their bonafides are unquestioned. They mainly indulge in the normal sport of Target shooting—or in game shooting—as allowed by law in this country. Specialised weapons are needed by the shooters for effectively pursuing this sport. To subject them to an irrational limit of only three arms would be unfair and uncalled for. We have achieved good results in shooting in the recent Asiad and other tournaments, I fail to understand whether a person who only goes round with .22, does he expect more golds in the shooting competitions. In the event of imposing restrictions on Target Shooting of other bores besides .22, then I am afraid the Shooting arena that has been built in Delhi, will be a sheer waste of money.

You may have a muzzle loader, pistol, automatic weapon, SLR or Bazooka ; it should be very precise whether it is 12 bore, rifle or pistol.

The time limit for deposit of arms should be extended by at least six months, so that the common man living in the remote corners of the State knows about it. Therefore, justice demands that the period should be extended by at least six months for all those people who have got licensed arms to dispose of them, unless of course you want them to sell it to the armoury people, who will then sell these valuable pieces, Hollands and Purdeys, which cost lakhs of rupees, to the foreigners. For them there is no ban. The foreigners come from abroad, they pick up these prized weapons from any of these armouries, take them abroad and sell them at fantastic prices.

In the end, I would submit that it has always been the State or District

level authority, which has granted the arms licence. If this authority is sought to be eroded in a mandatory manner, as envisaged in the Bill, it will simply lead to chaos and confusion. The authority at the lower level of the district is best suited for this work, as it is well acquainted with the *bona fide* or otherwise of a person seeking a new arms licence, or one who already has arms licence in his name. This system could not be tampered with ; on the other hand, it should be strengthened by having better information and cross references available when issuing arms licences. In the case of those who have got no weapons, let there be discretion vested with the authorities to transfer weapons in their name. Supposing a person is having a Holland and a Purdey, or two pairs or three pairs of Holland, if they are allowed to keep only one or two, what happens to the rest ?

Then, certain arms have become obsolete and are today only of historic value. There should be some provision in the Bill to enable a person to keep them as decorative pieces.

In short, I would say that a blanket limit should not be imposed, as this has no connection with control of crimes. The Arms Licensing Authority and the process for issue of licences should be strengthened so that only deserving persons get the licences. The possession of illegal weapons should be severely penalised. The genuine needs of collectors, target sportsmen and the development of talent in the country should be kept in view, while framing amendments to this Act. The person for depositing the excluded weapons should be reasonable. Laws must be enforced because passing laws which cannot be enforced is not wise.

Then, what about boys of 16 or 18 years of age who want to do target shooting ? In the various competitions generally boys of 17 or 18 participate. If they are deprived of these facilities, I do not think you will have any person from India who can be represented in the Asiad or Olympics.

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI (Contai) : Sir, the object of this Bill is to ensure greater vigilance on the issue of licences for fire arms and the sale and transfer of those arms. The issue of a licence implies a restriction on the possession of arms. Under such circumstances, only a few in the society can be in possession of arms and a vast majority of our society remains without any arms.

When the original Act was passed in 1959, the object was sought to be the protection of crop. For the purpose of protecting crop, arms should be issued under licence but the use of arms should be restricted only to those people who have big chunks of land, who can produce crop in the field. That was the purpose in the original Bill.

In this connection I would like to mention that in our society the vast masses of people were ignorant, indifferent to their own rights. They did not know how to realise their right. But after independence and after various people's movements, the level of consciousness of the general public has been aroused and they are now trying to realise their rights. That is why a few people of evil society who are dominating our society are exploiting the down-trodden, are getting arms to fight them. Here is the contradiction—that the Government is trying to restrict the arms for use to those few landlords who own a large chunk of land by depriving vast majority of the people. Are they not anti-social? Still what is the reason that they have been given licence for using the arms? (Interruptions)

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA (Calcutta North-East) : Your landlords are killing the agricultural labourers.

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI : Why should a few people be given this opportunity? By opportunity I mean, licence for using arms. The stern fact is that the poor cannot afford to purchase such arms. Even if they make an attempt to purchase, they will not get it.

In the socialist countries there is no

such restriction. Why? It is because there are less crimes. Our Government is very much concerned about the increasing threats of crime. But why are such crimes rising?

SHRI ANAND SINGH (Gonda) : Does he mean to say that in USSR there is no restriction to have fire arms?

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI : There is no getting arms.

SHRI ANAND SINGH : I request the member to clarify. You enter the shop and purchase it?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You can put a question only if he yields. But he is not yielding. So, you cannot put the question.

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI : In Bihar gangs of upper caste people attack the harijans and kill them. They attack the villagers. They kill them ruthlessly. Had the harijans arms, then those people belonging to the upper caste, upper class or upper strata of society, would not have killed them. In this way Government is restricting the licence for use of arms to a few. My point is that the Government should not restrict the issue of licence in this way. Not only in Bihar, in U.P., in Gujarat, the harijans, the down-trodden, the poor have been killed by the upper class people. It is because of the advantages of having arms in their possession. The Government has referred to the tension in the society. Why is this tension? The tension prevails because the people are not in a position to satisfy their demands. They are suffering from hunger, no-shelter and propertylessness. Their level of consciousness is growing and they become restless. Now they are conscious of their own right and the dominant people in the society are not conceding to their demands. Therefore, this creates tension. Now, without going into the root cause of the tension prevailing in our country, the Government is trying to restrict the use of arms. But this will not bear the fruit because by restricting the use of arms or by restricting the issue of licence, the Govern-

ment will not be in a position to control those people who are using illegal arms. Various people who can afford to purchase such arms are controlling the society in many parts.

Therefore, I urge upon the Government to see that the downtrodden and the poor who are ignorant and indifferent to their rights should be protected from the upper class and caste people.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : By providing them arms also

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI : Yes, Sir. I would like to know from the Government what are the criteria of issuing licences for manufacturing small arms ? There are many firms who applied for the licence to manufacture small arms but they have been refused. Some friends in the ruling party bosses have been given the licence. What are the reasons?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When you say the ruling party, you must be careful because you are also the ruling party in West Bengal. Therefore, you say, the ruling party at the Centre. It would be straight.

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI : I am speaking here in Parliament. It means, ruling party at the Centre.

श्री कृष्णदत्त सुलतानपुरी (शिमला) : आप बंगाल गवर्नमेन्ट की बात भी किया करो।

SHRI RAM SINGH YADAV (Alwar) : CPM people are possessing the arms.

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI : What I mean is this sort of favouritism in issuing licence should be discontinued.

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to one more point. The problem of illegal arms has become so tremendous in various parts of the country. The Government must give serious consideration and serious thought

to tackle these problems. Because the use of illegal arms has endangered the life of so many poor people and Harijan people in the country. If the Government do not take any suitable step at the appropriate time, there will be total chaos.

श्री शिव प्रसाद साहू (रांची) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी आयुध अधिनियम 1959 के संशोधन पर विचार हो रहा है।

इस बिल में प्रावधान किया गया है कि एक व्यक्ति 3 हथियार से ज्यादा नहीं रख सकता। अगर वह रायफल क्लब का मेंबर है तो 22 बोर के लिए छूट दी गई है। इस कानून को बनाने वालों ने इस बारे में ठीक तरह से सोचा नहीं है, ऐसा मुझे लगता है। इस बारे में मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। हमारे यहां नेशनल रायफल एसोसिएशन आफ इंडिया है और अभी लास एंजल्स में कंपीटीशन होगा और हमारी टीम उसमें जाएगी। वहां पर क्या डंडा लेकर भाग लिया जाएगा? स्केट शूटिंग की प्रैक्टिस कैसे की जाएगी? स्पोर्ट्स जो बंदूक से संबंधित है वह हिन्दुस्तान से समाप्त हो जाएगा। इसलिए इस प्रतिबंध को समाप्त कीजिए। अगर प्रतिबंध करना ही है तो ऐसे लोगों पर रोक लगाइए जो बिना लाइसेंस हथियार यूज करते हैं। सबसे बड़े डकैत मोहर सिंह जिस पर डेढ़ लाख रुपए का इनाम था वह इंडियन आर्डिनेंस फैक्ट्री की एस० एल० आर० रायफल के साथ, 15 हजार गोलियों के साथ जय प्रकाश नारायण के सामने सरेण्डर किया था। यह सरकारी रिपोर्ट है। माधव सिंह के पास भी मिलटरी की एस० एल० आर० रायफल थी। उस पर भी एक लाख रुपये का इनाम था और 10 हजार गोलियों के साथ उसने सरेण्डर किया था। फूलनदेवी के पास भी मिलटरी

(श्री शिवप्रसाद साहू)

के हथियार थे। मलखान सिंह के पास भी एस०एल०आर०और सारे मिलिटरी के हथियार थे। आज कल जो डकैतियां हो रही हैं वे पाइप गन से हो रही हैं। इससे क्राइम नहीं रुकेगा। आप अवैध हथियारों पर रोक लगाइए। धार्मिक स्थानों और सार्वजनिक स्थानों पर हथियार ले जाने पर रोक लगाइए, यह अच्छी बात है। लेकिन इस तरह की बाइंडिंग लगाने से इससे संबंधित स्पोर्ट्स पर बुरा असर पड़ेगा। स्केट शूटिंग, क्लेपीजन शूटिंग के लिए अलग-अलग बंदूकें होती हैं। रिवाल्वर शूटिंग, पिस्टल शूटिंग, हैवी बोर रायफल .22 बोर शूटिंग, इस तरह से कई तरह के कंपीटीशन होते हैं। भूतपूर्व हमारे संसद सदस्य राजा कर्ण सिंह थे जिन्होंने इस क्षेत्र में हिन्दुस्तान का नाम रोशन किया। इसी तरह से कुमारी राजश्री ने भी हिन्दुस्तान का नाम रोशन किया है।

इस तरह से अगर आप खेलों को बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं तो इस बाइंडिंग को हटाइए। अगर यह बाइंडिंग रहेगी तो डकैतियों को और बढ़ावा मिलेगा। आज उस गांव में डकैत नहीं जाते जहां पर 4-5 हथियार होते हैं। उस घर में, उस मुहल्ले में फलां आदमी के पास पांच-छः हथियार हैं, वह मुकाबला करेगा, इसकी वजह से, डकैत डरते हैं। अगर हथियार वहां नहीं होते हैं तो वह लूट ले जाएगा। डकैतियां डालने की डकैतों को खुली छूट मिल जाएगी।

पुलिस वालों के लिए आपने इसमें एक रास्ता खोल दिया है। पचास-पचास हजार रुपये वाली बन्दूक को वे पचास-पचास रुपये में ले लेंगे, बाप-दादा के समय का हथियार उनका लुट जाएगा। उन लोगों ने क्या कसूर किया है जो आप उनके

हथियार इस तरह से लूट रहे हैं? मेरा निवेदन है कि इसमें तीन के बजाय आप छः रखें। छः से अधिक न दें। हमारा जो अधिकार है उनका इसके जरिये से हनन किया जा रहा है। जबर्दस्ती हमारे हथियारों को लूटा जा रहा है। पिता-दादा के वक्त के हथियारों की लूट हो रही है।

आप इसको पास तो करवा हीलेंगे लेकिन मेरा निवेदन है कि मानवता की दृष्टि से आप इसको देखें। आप देखें कि अवैध हथियार कौन बेचते हैं? आपकी एम्पुनिशन फ़ैक्ट्री का जो अधिकारी है, कर्मचारी है या मिलिटरी का कोई भगोड़ा है वह 303 की बोर राइफल ला कर तीस-चालीस हजार में बेचना है। लेकिन हम लोगों में से सौ में से एक भी मुश्किल से आपको मिलेगा जो इस तरह से बाहर बेज देता हो। कोई ऐसा तत्व हां भी सकता है क्योंकि सभी उंगलियां बराबर नहीं हैं। क्राइम करना हो तो दो या तीन से क्या, एक से ही किया जा सकता है। इस वास्ते आपका मकसद अगर तीन की आपने लिमिट रखी तो उससे हल नहीं होगा। आपको ऐसे काय करने चाहिए जिनसे डाकुओं और लुटेरों में घबराहट पैदा हो। जिनके पास गांवों में हथियार हैं उनसे चोर-डकैत भी डरते हैं। लेकिन आपने यह लिमिट लगा दी तो उनका डर दूर हो जाएगा और डकैत आएंगे और डकैतियां डालेंगे। मैं यही कहना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक राइफल क्लबज का ताल्लुक है—बाइंडिंग को आप हटा दें। जो इनके मेम्बर नहीं हैं उनको कम से कम छः रखने की आप छूट दें। बाप-दादा के वक्त के जिनके पास हथियार हैं, उनको उनके पास रहने दिया जाए, उनको न लूटा जाए। ऐसा आपने किया तो अपराधों में रुकावट पैदा होगी। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि गए थे हरि

भजन को, ओटन लगे कपास'। गए थे चीरियां और डकैतियां कम करने और वे ज्यादा होने लग गईं। धार्मिक स्थानों पर, सार्वजनिक स्थानों पर अनलाफुल हथियारों पर आप पाबन्दी लगाएं, मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है लेकिन बाप-दादा की जायदाद वो आप न लूटें। जिन्होंने इस बिल को बनाया है उनको पता नहीं है कौन-सी गोली बननी बन्द हो गई है। न तो राइफल और बन्दूक का ज्ञान उन्हें है, कम्पीटीशन जो राइफल एसोसिएशन करती हैं, 22 बोर, एस्केट शूटिंग, बारह बोर से, प्ले विजन शूटिंग, हेवी बोर राइफल शूटिंग, पिस्टल, रायफल शूटिंग, उनका उनको पता नहीं है। यह बन्दिश आत्मघाती होगा। इस वास्ते जो बातें मैंने कही हैं उन पर आप गम्भीरता से सोचें और बिल वापस ले लें।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Era Mohan? We are going to complete the Bill today. There are not many speakers now. Only one or two from this side and then the Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER : Allow more time, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am prepared to sit till this Bill is Passed.

*SHRI ERA MOHAN (Coimbatore) : Hon. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to make a few suggestions on the Arms (Amendment) Bill, 1983. Sir, this is a very important Bill as has been indicated by the Hon. Minister Shri P.C. Sethi in the Statement of Objections and Reasons of this Bill. The imminent danger of extensive disturbance of public peace and tranquility in certain areas of the country has hastened the introduction of this Bill. I will refer to another important sentence in the Statement of Objects and Reasons which reads :

"Apart from unlicensed firearms, the involvement of licenced firearms in crime has also been on the increase." I need not go further to emphasise the urgency of this Bill. But unfortunately this Bill was introduced on 24th August 1981 and was passed by that House on 8th September 1981. That is still Pending in Lok Sabha. I am sorry to say that this delay sounds contrary to the professions of the Government mentioned above.

[SHRI N.K. SHEJWALKAR *in the Chair*]

SHRI A. K. ROY (Dhanbad) : Sir, it is a very important Bill and should not be hurried through in this way. After a long time some fundamental changes are being contemplated and we would like to discuss this in a very thorough way. I think, we would not be doing justice to such an important Bill because of its very wide implications. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not put me in an awkward position. It has been announced by the Deputy-Speaker in the House that we have to sit upto the time we finish this Bill.

SHRI A. K. ROY : I would like to save you from this situation by raising the point of quorum. There is no quorum in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The bell is being rung.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I make a submission ?

You are well aware. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : I go by the rules.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : The rules are there. And it is always for the Chair to decide. In to-day's Business Advisory Committee meeting it has been decided

[Shri Buta Singh]

that the House will sit beyond 6 O'clock. This morning also the Chair observed and almost ruled that this House will sit beyond 6 p.m. It will be just fair to the proceedings of the House.

I will request the Hon. Member not to press for the quorum. Most of the Members had the impression that this is the first day that we are sitting beyond 6 O'clock. I would request the Hon. Member not to press for the quorum.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think this is not a matter to be debated.

SHRI A. K. ROY : I have already pressed for the quorum. We press for the quorum because we are to do justice to the Bill and not to the convenience of this Bill.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South) : How was this decision to sit beyond 6 O'clock taken ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think the B.A.C. has taken the decision. You were also there. The understanding was that we were going to sit beyond Six. It was not by a specific time. It can be extended upto 7, 8 and so on from time to time. It is ultimately the duty of all of us to be present here. Now the quorum has been raised.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : I am not questioning this. The point is the Business Advisory Committee said in fact afternoon. You said that the Speaker almost ruled. When was that ruling given ?

SHRI BUTA SINGH : I did not say 'the Speaker ruled it'. I said the Chair almost ruled it.

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND) : Sir, this has been the convention that when the House sits after 6 O'clock, the question of quorum is never raised. It is understood that the House will be sitting

after Six. When the Chair has already ruled that this Bill will be considered and the consideration of it will take it beyond six, I think, the Hon. Members should respect the convention and the quorum should not have been raised.

SHRI A. K. ROY : The question here is : We feel that this Bill should not be hurried through. This is why we have pressed for the quorum. We say that the rule of law should prevail in the House if not outside.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am totally in the hands of the Hon. Members. I am not going beyond the rules.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : You are very well aware of the rules. This is something in which we should go jointly. I have an appeal to the Hon. Members. But he was persuading those who are present to leave the House. This is not fair to the rules of the game if not to the rules of the House. Let us be like sportsmen. This has been the convention of this House. The sitting beyond the normal hours has been always respected and the Members will not raise the question of quorum. There are conventions—they are healthy conventions in this House. This convention you also observe as we observe the rules.

18.55 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

AN HON. MEMBER : Sir, I went out of the House, but I did not ask anybody to go out of the House.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : Not you. I am not referring to you.

SHRI A.K. ROY : If we are here, we could at least personally go out. That was just to highlight the position.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : I just want to recapture what has happened in the House, Sir.

In the day also the Chair observed that we will sit beyond 6 O'Clock

because some business is to be transacted. In the day also when the Business Advisory Committee sat, they formally gave O.K. that we will sit beyond 6 O'Clock or even 7 O'Clock. But now the Hon. Member has raised the question of quorum. And today being the first day, naturally we could not inform all the Members of the House to remain beyond 6 O'Clock. I just made an appeal knowing that he is insisting on it. But since he wants to follow the rules, there are rules of the House and rules of the game also. So, I am just trying to carry him with me that if he kindly does not insist on the quorum, we could finish this job.

MR. SPEAKER : I can throw some light on it, Mr. Roy. The problem is that we decide on certain things that four hours are to be taken for a particular bill, and three hours for a particular Bill, but we find in our day today business that we extend it to 7 to 8 hours for the same Bill. So, it takes time and the work was lagging behind. So, we decided to carry on the business and finish it off. I think in that spirit it will be better if we catch up with the amount of the work we are lagging behind. Mr. Satyasadhan was there and everybody was there, and you know it was decided that way. I think in a cooperative spirit we better finish it off, otherwise tomorrow we will have to sit 9 O'Clock or 10 O'Clock.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDAR (Durgapur) : You see we are here, but if an Independent Member sits on the rules and insists, then you have to go by the Rules. What can we do ?

MR. SPEAKER : We cannot break it. We don't have to go outside the Rule. It is a question of mutual adjustment. If you do it, it is all right, otherwise tomorrow you have to sit upto 9 O'clock. That is all.

SHRI A.K. ROY : We have given due consideration.

MR. SPEAKER : You are always allowed five or ten minutes according to

the time, but you take more time. Where does the rule go ?

SHRI A.K. ROY : That is another point. We have given due consideration to it, but we have seen that this Bill is a very important Bill. We should debate it in a proper way, not like this and Members must be here and more people should participate in it here.

AN HON. MEMBER : What do you mean by proper ?

SHRI A.K. ROY : Proper means people should participate here, they should remain here.

AN HON. MEMBER : Are we not people, who are participating here ?

SHRI A.K. ROY : I mean more people should be here.

AN HON. MEMBER : Who is stopping them from coming ?

MR. SPEAKER : Let us not get heated up. It is a question of give and take. It is a question of cooperation among the Members. Well, I am to enforce the Rules and if you don't cooperate then tomorrow these people will not cooperate with you.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN (Madras North) : Sir, there is a convention that when the House sits during Lunch Hour and also after 6 O'Clock, generally the Hon. Members do not raise the question of quorum and that practice is there. Therefore, we may request Mr. Roy in view of this thing that he may not press for it. He is a good friend.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : I don't want to belittle the importance of this Bill which is being discussed by the Hon. Members, but every piece of legislation, rather as a matter of fact, everything that is discussed in this House, is important. That is why we discuss it. If the things are not very important, we will not waste our time on them.

SHRI A.K. ROY : Instead of

[Shri A.K. Roy]

convincing us about the importance of the Bill, you should have convinced your Members.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : Let me have my say. Afterwards you can reply. We are not here to score points. I made this appeal purely in the spirit that we will try to cooperate with each other. Sir, as you know today being the first day, when this decision was taken formally also in the Business Advisory Committee that we will sit beyond the regular Hours of the House, therefore, Sir, it is a little difficult for the Hon. Members to be present even after 6 O'Clock. Sir, we will definitely ensure on behalf of our Party and we have always been ensuring that there is quorum in the House, but I seek the cooperation of the Hon. Members sitting on the other side also to lend their support so that this important piece of business is transacted in the House in the spirit of cooperation and mutual give and take a convention which has been a very healthy convention in this House.

19. hrs.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : Let me make the position of my Party very clear. We were a party to this decision. If you so decide, and even if you so decide in the House that the House should continue, we have absolutely no objection. But an Independent Member, not subject to anyone's discipline, has called for quorum. But we are helpless in the matter.

SHRI A.K. ROY : The rule must be respected.

MR. SPEAKER : Okay. We will respect the rule. Rules will be enforced—we will act as per the rules. Tomorrow we will see that rules are enforced properly, and to the letter and spirit. And if the Members break the rules, then I am not to blame for that, if I enforce the rules. We adjourn the House...

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : While

giving your ruling, please keep my submission in view. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I am thankful to him. He has done it for all.

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND) : Sir, before you adjourn the House...the House is not yet adjourned, perhaps.

AN HON. MEMBER : The House has adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER : I was just going to adjourn. After listening to him, I will adjourn.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : (Mavelikara) : Once the question of quorum has been raised, and the quorum bell has rung, and it has been found that there is no quorum, what is the validity of continuing the House ?

MR. SPEAKER : We are not continuing. We are just...

SHRI BUTA SINGH : Let me inform the Hon. Members that we are not objecting to the quorum being raised. (*Interruptions*) Also, I am not contesting why quorum issue has been raised.

MR. SPEAKER : There is nothing. If you do not agree, I cannot carry on the business of the House. I will not allow.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN : Once it has been raised...

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, that is what I say. After this quorum bell has been rung, and this has been raised, unless there is a consensus in the House, I will not allow it.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : Even after moving an amendment, if you can permit the Hon. Member, the mover of the amendment to withdraw the amendment, what is wrong if I made an appeal to him to withdraw this ?

MR. SPEAKER : If he does it, it is all right. But I cannot force Mr. Roy to do it.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : No, Sir. We are not forcing. I just appeal. You have very kindly given them to Mr. Shankaranand. Let me make his submission.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : Mr. Roy is a very senior Member of this House; and I do not say that he is not aware of the convention that has been built in the House. He is not a new Member to this House. He knows everything.

MR. SPEAKER : He knows; that is why he is pressing.

SHRI A. K. ROY : I have sympathy for the Minister and everybody; Still, I am unable to accept the position that I should withdraw this.

MR. SPEAKER : Why should he do it ?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : Let him not mistake that we are craving for sympathy. We request the Members to cooperate, so that we finish the Bill in time; and tomorrow we will have some other pressing business. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : We did not fix any time, and unless...

SHRI BANSI LAL (Bhiwani) : People who were interested in the Bill are present. Others who are not interested in it, are not present.

MR. SPEAKER : He wants others to listen.

SHRI BANSI LAL : I think the Hon. Member will agree that we go through the business.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : I am not asking.

SHRI BANSI LAL : I hope ultimately he will agree.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : Is there not a convention in this House that after 6 O'clock when a particular decision of the Chair has ruled that this business should be over, Members do not press the question of quorum ? This is the question I have.

(*Interruptions*)

ARREST OF MEMBERS

MR. SPEAKER : I have to make an announcement before we adjourn. I have to inform the House that the following communication dated 9 August, 1983, from the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Parliament Street, New Delhi, addressed to the Speaker, Lok Sabha has been received today :—

“I have the honour to inform you that Sarvashri R. N. Rakesh, Gotte Bhoopathy, Harikesh Bahadur, R. L. P. Verma, R. P. Yadav, J. S. Patil, Ajit Kumar Mehta, Daya Ram Shakya, Nihal Singh, George Fernandes, Madhu Dandavate, Ram Vilas Paswan, Dhanik Lal Mandal, Suraj Bhan, Multan Singh, Raghunath Singh Verma, Ashfaq Husain, A. Neelalohithadasan Nadar, Motibhai R. Chaudhari, Chandrajit Yadav, C.T. Dhandapani, K. Mayathevar, S. Murugain, N. Selvaraju, N. E. Horo and Kalapnath Sonkar, Members of Lok Sabha, along with other Party workers violated prohibitory orders promulgated under Section 144 Cr. P. C. at Rafi Marg, Raj Path Crossing, New Delhi, voluntarily today 9.8.1983 at about 2 P. M. They were arrested in case FIR No. 395, dated 9.8.1983, under Section 188, IPC, Police Station, Parliament Street, New Delhi, and are being produced before Area Judicial Magistrate.”

The House stands adjourned to re-assemble tomorrow at 11 A.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, August 10, 1983/Sravana 19, 1905, (Saka).