

[श्री बेना राम चौहान]

परन्तु राजस्थान के सिंचाई मंत्री सिंचाई के सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं जानते हैं। श्री बरनाला से मेरा निवेदन है कि वह राजस्थान में सिंचाई के काम को जल्दी से जल्दी पूरा करें।

श्री सुचेन्द्र सिंह (सतना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कृषि मंत्री ने कृषि मन्त्रालय के सम्बन्ध में जो अनुदान प्रस्तुत किये हैं, मैं उन का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं जनता पार्टी की सरकार को विशेषकर कृषि मंत्री जी को बधाई देता हूँ कि जनता पार्टी ने चुनाव के समय जो वादा किया था कि सत्ता में आने के बाद वह कृषि को सर्वोच्च प्राथमिकता देगी, उन्होंने उस वायदे को पूरा किया है।

पिछले तीस वर्षों के दौरान पिछली सरकार ने अनेक प्रकार की बातें की—उस ने हरित क्रांति का नाग दिया और गरीबों को दूर करने का नाग दिया, लेकिन उस का परिणाम कुछ भी नहीं निकला।

जहा तक भूमि सुधार का सवाल है, जिस इलाके से मैं आता हूँ, वह मध्य प्रदेश का सब से उपेक्षित इलाका है—विन्ध्य प्रदेश। वह इलाका छोटी छोटी 36 स्टेट्स को मिला कर बनाया गया है। आज भी वहा वही पुराना लगान कायम है और आज भी वहा का बेचारा किसान परेशान है। जब जनता सरकार ने अपनी घोषणा के अनुसार कृषि को सर्वोच्च प्राथमिकता दी है, तो सब से बड़ी आवश्यकता यह है कि कृषि की तरक्की के लिए सब जरूरी काम किये जायें।

मध्य प्रदेश के उस इलाके में सिंचाई नाम की कोई चीज नहीं है। मैं अपने जिले की बात करता हूँ। वहा सोन नदी है। सरकार ने घोषणा की है कि उस पर बाणसागर बांध बनाया जायेगा, जिस से सतना और सिंदी जिलों के साथ साथ उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के जेजों की भी सिंचाई होगी। किन्तु इससे उस जेज की जनता में बहुत

असंतोष है। इस बांध के कारण सतना जिले की भूमि सूखेगी, परन्तु उस का लाभ दूसरे जेजों को होगा आज जब हम वहां जाते हैं, तो कहा जाता है कि हमारे जेज में कोई विकास या निर्माण कार्य नहीं होगा, क्योंकि सारे गांव डूबने वाले हैं। हम इस बांध का विरोध नहीं करते हैं लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ—प्रधान मंत्री जी इस समय सदन में उपस्थित हैं—कि यह निश्चित कर दिया जाये कि वहा के कितने गांव डूबने वाले हैं और इन गांवों की जनता को मुआवजा दे कर उसे बसाने की व्यवस्था की जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कल जारी रखूंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप कल बोले।

19.00 hrs.

MOTION RE LAW AND ORDER
SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY—
Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri C. M. Stephen on the 20th April, 1978, namely:—

“That this House do consider the law and order situation prevailing at present in different parts of the country which is causing concern”

along with the substitute motions moved.

The Home Minister is not well; therefore, as a special case, I have consented to Prime Minister continuing the speech. But, this will not be taken as a precedent

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrack-pore): We wish the Home Minister speedy recovery.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very sorry that my colleague has been taken suddenly ill and he is

in the hospital. It is, necessary, therefore, that I should say on this resolution what he wanted to say.

What he had said earlier, I am sure, the hon. Members must have heard with attention. The question of law and order is bound to be the concern of everybody, more so the concern of Government because Government has a responsibility. I do grant that. But is it because of the fault of Government that this is happening? That also has got to be considered. Government would be worthy of blame if Government has done something to encourage violence or for failure to take action where violence takes place. The extent of responsibility of the Central Government in this matter has also to be understood. Law and order is the responsibility of the States and the Government of India's responsibility is to help the States, but the help has to be taken. Of course, in Union Territories, the responsibility will be of the Centre; I do recognise that. Therefore, in Delhi, it will be the Government of India's responsibility. It was said by my hon. friend that the motion reflects the national consensus, as Members of all parties have sponsored it. I myself say that it is the concern of everybody. But does concern mean that the blame should be laid squarely at the doors of Government? This is what has to be carefully considered. There is an air of violence in certain areas. There are several incidents where Government did nothing to fan them, encourage them or failed not to deal with them. Take the case of what happened near Amritsar between the Nirankaris and some Akalis and Sikhs. Trouble broke out between two groups of people suddenly; it was not expected and the Government has dealt with it and is trying to deal with it further so that this trouble does not recur. Cases are coming up which will disclose whose fault it is so that action can be taken against those who are responsible for it. There can be no justification for violence, in my view. If Nirankaris want to follow

their faith, they have a right to follow it, but they have no right to abuse and insult other people. No faith has a right to run down any other faith. That is the meaning of equal respect for all religions and that is the policy which government has been following for the last 30 years. I do not see why some of them should have done this which was resented by others. This is how all this trouble arose. It will be dealt with properly by the State Government.

Take the case of Sambhal. What had Government to do with it? Did the government create it? It was a local thing and then it took a communal turn and it led to a communal riot where the majority living in that area attacked the minority living in that area. But the way the government has dealt with it, has stopped it from spreading to other places. There was no question of any retaliation coming from other areas as a result of the steps taken by Government. Otherwise, that would have happened. Does that not show that the government is anxious to deal with such law and order situation in a proper manner? The State Government has set up an inquiry to go into the causes of the trouble.

What happened in Pantnagar is very unfortunate. But if people assault policemen and do not carry out the requirements of law and when the Police try to see that they do it, they assault the policemen, what is to happen? I would not like to say more about it because there is a judicial inquiry set up....

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: But it was a mini Jalianwala Bagh. It is very unfortunate.... (Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It is the height of irresponsibility to call it a mini Jalianwala Bagh, if I may say so. My friends may say anything they like, but I cannot support this wild statement.... (Interruptions) It is a wild statement. What has Jalianwala Bagh got to do with it? In Jalianwala

[Shri Morarji Desai]

Bagh people were in a compound with only one exit to go out. They were not armed but they were pounced upon by armed policemen. It was quite a different proposition here. It was not a case of students being confined in a yard and being pounced upon by policemen.

MR. SPEAKER: You may not go into further details as there is a judicial inquiry.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Therefore, I am not doing that. What I am saying is that there can be no comparison between the two....

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): You have already prejudiced the judicial inquiry by your remark that they attacked the police. It was nobody's case.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: What else can I do? By mentioning Jalianwala Bagh you are provoking me to refer to it. I cannot help it. I cannot allow such statements to go unchallenged. This is what the Policemen have said. I am not passing a final judgment on it.

My hon. friends want that I must endorse all that they say. If they want that I must endorse all that they say, then I am sorry I cannot accept that kind of dictation.... (Interruptions) I wish my hon. friends learn to practise non-violence; then things will turn out better. We do not want any agitation or protest which is done non-violently and in a real spirit of satyagraha to be crushed by violence on any account. These are the instructions. But if instances where they are not carried out or where anybody has defaulted are pointed out to us, we will take action against them.

Then the manifesto was quoted about Satyagraha. We mean it. It was my friends' government which had said, 'in a democracy there can be no Satyagraha.'

Well, if people wish to protest against any injustice, protest has to be allowed in a democracy. I cannot deny the right of either labour or any other sections of people to make protest against what they think is an injustice but the protest must be based on Satya, and must be conducted in the manner of a Satyagraha as Gandhiji taught us. If that is so, the Police will not interfere with them in any violent manner. I can guarantee that. Will my hon. friends help us in doing it? This is what I want.

There are labour troubles. I have personal knowledge of two or three labour troubles where violence by the strikers took place. Strikers have every right to strike if they want to strike. But that must be peaceful and in accordance with law; and even if it is not in accordance with law but if they do it peacefully, I will not disturb them. But if they take to violence, then, what is to be done? Then the Police have a duty to interfere and see that that violence is put down with minimum force and not maximum. It is not a licence that the Police wants. I agree here entirely.

Now, all these disturbances have to be regulated properly. I can quite understand the anxiety of my friends or the anxiety of others.

I do not think we should, in matters like these, make any political capital out of any particular incident. If we have erred, I am prepared to make amends for it. This is not a matter in which I would like to defend an error or if Government have failed in their duty. We are not interested in carrying on Government anyhow or in an inefficient manner.

But we have to see the conditions which obtain in this country and if people go and create trouble in courts what is the Police to do? And you must have seen that the Police are taking impartial action. If two groups clash against each other, both are picked up and both are dealt

with properly. It is not a question of picking up one and not the other; that is not being done.

But we must try to see that if some people lose their head, others do not. Then it can be met very squarely and properly.

Now, to achieve this objective, it is necessary that we should sit together and find out the best methods. And we want to do that. In the matter of Harijans, or in the matter of minorities, I do want to have a conference of leaders of all sides, to find out what best we can do to see that this scourge disappears for ever. I call this scourge. All violent action is scourge. And I would like to see that such incidents do not take place.

But, it is necessary to see that we sit together not to apportion blame. But I would certainly be interested to see that none of us approves of any violent action by anybody. And if we do that and if Police act in a wanton manner, we will dismiss those policemen, wherever they do it. I can assure my hon. friends on that score. But will my hon. friends there and all my friends here on this side be ready to condemn acts of violence of any people, to get their disputes resolved? They must not use violence. They must create an atmosphere for peaceful solution of disputes. We have got to see that our people follow this policy. But, many times, they receive encouragement from some people who act in an irresponsible manner; they are not even responsible people who do not wish to restrain but encourage these people. I do not think any responsible person can encourage violence because that does not help anybody, nor does it help their cause.

But, there are people who act irresponsibly everywhere and we have got to control them. It is, therefore, necessary that we must find out ways and means to do it. And, as I said, I have decided to do that. But, we must have some time when we can sit down coolly and

discuss the matters so that we come to some effective conclusions. I hope my hon. friends will help us in doing that. I do not want to enter into an argument that cases of violence are now less than before or more than before. That does not help us in any way. I do not want any violent incidents; I do not want crimes to take place though we must all be very conscious that all crimes are not going to disappear. Whatever we may do, human society is not going to be perfect as we expect it. It must be reduced to a minimum and to reduce it to a minimum, it is necessary to see that prompt action is taken wherever peace is disturbed and those who are responsible for breach of peace are found out and punished adequately.

This is the task on which we are engaged, and, if there, all of us, put our heads together and find out ways and means to do it, I am quite sure, we will be able to change the whole atmosphere as everybody wants it to be changed. I am quite sure my hon. friends also do not want violence. But, when they get angry, sometimes such things happen. We will therefore have to eschew anger. That is not so very easy.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI (Anantnag): The Home Minister also gets angry.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I know he is also human. Why do you want to make him a saint and you want to remain what you are? Is this fair?

If anybody wants to become saint he should become one and not wait for others to become saints; it is not an easy thing to do. I know how difficult it is to eschew anger. Some of my friends in the other House said that 'you are very calm and you have no anger; you are complacent and you do not take notice of it'. This was what I was told. I said that 'even this won't make me angry.' Please understand this. If I am not angry with you, you cannot be angry with me.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: The Prime Minister should not be complacent.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I can never be complacent. If I am complacent, then I do not succeed in what I aim to do for myself and for the country. Complacency is criminal, in my view. But, let my hon. friends not be complacent merely in pointing out things and not finding out remedies. This is what I would ask them to do.

Let us, therefore, talk to-day calmly and find out ways and means to do it. I hope my hon. friends will be ready not to apportion blame here or there but assist us in devising a code of conduct which we can enforce by our joint efforts. It cannot be enforced by police also and that is where I seek their help.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry, the Home Minister has not been able to conclude his speech. I join with my hon. friend, Shri Saugata Roy, in wishing him a very speedy recovery.

I rise, in fact, as a disappointed man, sag man, to reply to this debate. I had started on this exercise with an anticipation that here at last is an issue on which there will be an approach and an effort to find a solution to a national problem. I had that anticipation from the fact that, without mutual consultation, without one Member talking to another Member, over a period of time, many Members of this House gave notice of the same motion in the same terms which meant that there was a feeling all round that things were going bad. And this is a fact which the President's Address to the joint sitting of the two Houses in toto—taking a resume of what happened in the last one year—took note of the fact of agitations, protests, violence, intimidation and sabotage. This the President's Address took note of. Only they said certain reasons which I do not

want to go into, which reasons stand belied. After this House began sitting what has happened! As a friend of mine told me, this month of April could be described as a cruel month. So many things have happened one after the other. We have got before us the picture of the Harijan atrocities in Vishrampur, the clash in Amritsar, the clash in Sambhal, Pant Nagar, Tamil Nadu, Hyderabad and Bailadilla. At all these places incidents took place after we started sitting. Now, this is the most significant and a very harrowing aspect of this summer.

In my speech I analysed and showed that there are three classes. One: the individual attacking the individual—dacoities, murders, rapes, crimes, etc. They are increasing in a very big way. I expected the Home Minister to acknowledge the real fact of life of this increase and try to take the House into confidence or arguing with the House that this must be done or that this can be done. Unfortunately, that was not forthcoming. Now, he is not here. So, I do not want to go into that. Would any Member of Parliament from Delhi city contend as a proposition that the crimes in the city are coming down? Is there any Member of Parliament from Delhi city who would not say it is coming on to a very very alarming scale? Large number of cases there are. They are individual cases.

Then a class attacking another class. In the individual cases the individuals do not get protection. That is the complaint we are hearing all around. Now, a class attacking another class, viz., the atrocities on the Harijans and the communal clashes. What happened in Amritsar! These are one class attacking another class. There what you find is depending on the character and authority of the officers concerned and in regard to the particular class which is attacked the police force is either inactive or over-active. In Amritsar the Prime Minister made

mention about the Nirankari situation. I do not want to take sides about it. There are two versions about it. I do not want to go into that because there are two versions about it. But there is one version just because, I said, Sir, meeting takes place, somebody goes there and there attack takes place. Circumstances are there. What did the government do? Was the protection forthcoming? When the bona fides of the Government are attacked by a religious sect and the Government is put in the dock by saying that they are taking sides, is it not necessary that the doubts must be dispelled? Is it not necessary that there must be an enquiry—a high-level judicial enquiry—which they are asking for? Should it be denied to them? Why should it be denied to them? Now, therefore, there that happened.

About Sambhal people went there. The main accusation is that the police was inactive. Therefore, one section was attacked by the other section. People suffered. Shops were gutted. These things happened there. We had three occasions to discuss atrocities on Harijans after we started sitting. This shows the gruesomeness of the situation. What do we hear as a defence! This is the most crucial part of it. The Harijans feel they are helpless. Their helplessness is voiced in this House—not only from one section but from different sections. An absolute utter feeling of utter helplessness. Why? Because we are told this is a gang of confirmed criminals attacking another gang of confirmed criminals—no casteism, nothing of the sort. That picture is given with the result that the persons who are murdered and killed feel desperate about it.

The third type of cases are the cases of agitations and protests coming in and that is what happened in Balladilla, that is what happened in Pantnagar. Many people went to Pantnagar and came back. Not one party only went there. I am hearing for the first time that the workers had started

violence. This is the first time that I hear about it. I do not know the details about it. People from different parties including Janata Party themselves have gone there and seen the atrocious things that have taken place there. And there are attempts to defend it. Now this is the situation and the Government have no responsibility about the crimes increasing? Government have no responsibility about the weaker sections of the people being attacked and the attack increasing? The Government have no responsibility when communal clashes are taking place and death toll is being taken and finally when the labour trouble starts—labour trouble is there—my respected Prime Minister has said “I will not be against any labour struggle going on, satyagraha and all that”. But there is a new trend developing. The trend is wherever there is a strike, there comes the position; withdraw the strike, then alone we will talk. But if it is a private employer he says that hell will be brought to that place. I heard that that position was taken up by Mr. Raj Narain, that position was taken by the Prime Minister himself, that position was taken by Mr. Biju Patnaik. Withdraw the strike then we will talk. Why do people go on strike? People go on strike not for the fun of it but for finding a solution to a particular position and before finding a solution should it be withdrawn? Unless it is withdrawn there will not be any talk at all. It makes the people desperate. Well, Sir, what I am saying is that it was the Janata Party's manifesto. The Prime Minister has said “we are not against satyagrah”. Let us not go into that aspect. What about your position? Two fundamental declarations were made. One is that the democracy will not be there unless the right of peaceful resistance is guaranteed and the second is the political charter that you gave guaranteeing the right of protest. These two things—resistance and protest both—you have guaranteed. The present position is if there is a real proposition that in

[Shri C M Stephen]

Pantnagar there was violence which justified this sort of a killing, if there is a real contention that in Bailadilla there was that much violence which justified this sort of killing, has there been a real case like that? Certainly some case will be put up by somebody. But was there anybody who reported that way? Many people went there. What motivated that sort of killing? That is what I am asking. And is the Government which has owned the position of peaceful resistance and protest entitled to ask you to withdraw your strike then alone we will talk about which means you do not want this sort of struggle and under the struggle you do not want to talk. Gone with the wind is your political declaration that right to strike is guaranteed, gone with the wind is your political declaration about Democracy. The right of resistance is a primary concern and a primary guarantee. You have now become completely intolerant about the whole thing and the moment it happens you start shooting and it takes place. Well from the Janata party side there were four approaches a very visible one was the common man's approach if I may say so the socialist approach which was represented by Smt. Minnal Gore. She acknowledged the fact of existence of this. She put up the case, come what may. Nobody has got any business to shoot and kill anybody and if you are to shoot it must be justified—absolutely justified. And you tackle the problem. She made that remark. The second approach of my friend Shri Dutt was the Jan Sangh approach or the RSS approach which is so clear in putting the blame on the Congress. Then he made a wonderful analysis. He said we handed 'o them a police who were trained in the art or in the duty of obeying their superiors and pleasing their superiors and whatever the superiors wanted I ask, my friend. Does he understand the logical corollary of it? We have handed them over. What are those people? They must please their superiors.

Who are their superiors? Certainly, we are not. They have been taught one lesson by their superiors: please the superiors, which means their present superiors wanted this to be done, mechanically they had done this. This is what it comes to, clearly, logically it follows. This is a callous approach.

The third is the bureaucratic approach. Mr. Charan Singh is not here. The bureaucratic approach is to juggle with statistics. The more the statistics, the more it will come. My friend Mr. Govindan Nair said he must resign. I do not want him to resign. Let him be there with all his statistics because the Janata party government must stew in its own juice of statistics. Let him carry on with statistics. Persons have been shot at, hundreds had been killed brutally, their dead bodies had been dragged about and they had been burnt. Yet there is this callousness, there is no remorse or feeling that our brethren had been killed. Here comes he with statistics. I remember you have talked about emergency and the crimes that were committed. What were the motivations? Was it humanism? If it was humanism how can this approach be justified? Humanism must motivate you to reproach and protest against it. What would Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia have done if these things had happened? He would have brought the ceiling down if he were alive and if these things had happened. You should know what true humanism is. You are absolutely unaffected.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS
(PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE) You are admiring Lohia after his death.

SHRI C M STEPHEN Not like you, detracting Pandit Nehru after his death. If you do not want me I will not do that. I was on the question of humanism. Therefore, what happened? There was something very satisfying. There was no allegation that it was all motivated by political parties. In

respect of Pantnagar fortunately, Congress (I) was not mentioned; Congress was not mentioned. Marxist communist party was mentioned and they have repudiated it. Bailadilla—none of us were mentioned about Bailadilla; none of us were involved. What happened there? As the President himself said, these things are coming up because of certain developments in this country; it is not political activity.

The fourth is the philosophical approach of the Prime Minister. I said there were four approaches. The bureaucratic approach of Shri Charan Singh is not going to save anyone; it is not going to help solve any problem. You can have your jugglery of statistics. Suffering people look to the government how they are reacting to a situation; it will not end up here. The families of persons who were killed know the circumstances in which they had been killed. People who had visited those places know the circumstances under which those things had happened. When they listen to these heartless, brutal, cruel reaction, what will be the reaction of those people? It will make them more desperate and the situation will become worse.

The philosophical approach of the Prime Minister will not solve any problem at all. Mere philosophical approach cannot take you anywhere. There should be no violence—all right. You were speaking about emergency. What was happening before that? Total revolution and all that. What happened? In Bihar and Gujarat what happened? It was not a spontaneous outburst; it was engineered. As against that today nobody engineers anything at all; it happened spontaneously... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No disturbance, please.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: These are spontaneous happenings. Why is it happening spontaneously, is the question. Everybody will have to answer.

Let us remember, whether the Prime Minister speaks or the Home Minister speaks when he speaks, let us remember that these events have taken place differently in different areas.

When Bailadilla was discussed here, I saw in my friend, Mr. Biju Patnaik, when his employees were killed, when his workers were killed, murdered, shot down, shot dead I saw in him the picture of a 'shikhari', coming up and putting his gun and his boot on the killed and priding that this has been done, putting the whole blame on the workers. Is this the attitude to be taken? Was there any remorse anywhere about the things that have happened? If this is the position, things will become much more desperate. That is all I have got to say.

"Let nobody make political capital out of it" somebody said. Well, Sir, there is no guarantee like that. Political results will follow and it is the political parties' business, even as it was their business to articulate the grievances of the people, to ventilate the grievances of the people and if they become desperate or if their demands are not met, to go on and to lead them in a democratic way on the path of struggle; that will have to be done. But that is not what we have done so far. What we are doing is, when the sugarcane growers of U.P. are raising their voice we give them support. That is all. We have not engineered. But the people are coming up, why? Let us stand up and think of the situation. As I said, there is an erosion of faith in the capacity of the administration, there is an erosion of the people's faith in the labour policy of the Government. There is an erosion of the faith of the people that the Government will stand by the weaker—outbursts are taking place and there is consolidation and strengthening of their pain and there is an erosion of faith of the oppressed people that they will have protection of the Government. So much so, they come out more openly and more strongly. That is what is taking place.

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

You are speaking about freedom and you say, "there is freedom". After the last discussion, two days back PAC again went on a trigger happy spree in Kharagpur; three people were shot and killed; when the train was moving, they were in the train, they came and asked for the opening of the door; immediately they took up the guns and shot them down. What is the justification? This was announced in the radio; this was reported everywhere. That is what is happening. Well, Sir, stoning is taking place. Mrs. Gandhi went to Cochin. What happened there? A gathering of about two hundred people threw stones and that is given all the importance and nothing else. My point is this. We are now facing a situation of very great importance and very great implications. If that is not solved, difficult positions will arise. (*Interruptions*) By shouting and arguing, the situation cannot be solved. Unless the fundamental problems are tackled, there is no answer to it. There is freedom today; there is freedom for the blackmarketeers and smugglers.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: If this is the attitude, I do not know what good will come out of a Conference?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Well, Sir, we do not ask for any Conference. It is all their business. Let not the Prime Minister expect that our business is only to facilitate the functioning of the Government.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I do not say that.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: We will not concentrate or create a situation as his party did. We will not. But if the people, if the working class come up and if the agriculturists come up, if the Harijans come up, we will be there to articulate their grievances and to lead their struggle. Let there be absolutely no doubt about it. That is what I have got to say. (*Interruptions*) What do these people expect of

me? Do they expect sweet things from me? What do they expect the Leader of the Opposition to speak? I am not here to speak what the Prime Minister wants me to speak. I am here to speak what I feel I should speak. I am not here to speak what my friends on the other side want me to speak. I am here to speak what I want to speak and I will speak. I shall be heard on the floor of the House. Let there be no doubt about it.

All I am saying is, there is no sense of freedom and security for the depressed people, for the Harijans and backward classes, for the workers and for the agriculturists. There is a sense of security for the criminals, for the dacoits, for the murderers, for the smugglers and for the blackmarketeers. The freedom is for them. The freedom is not for the common man. And, the result will be, the common man will have to rise to defend himself. That is the crux of the whole problem. This is what I want to say. The Government will do well to sit up and think and conduct a whole survey of the whole situation and to consider how this menacing situation can be handled. Otherwise, people will come up. Let no philosophy be trotted out to just dampen their forward march, because if nobody helps them, they will help themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: Even otherwise mend the motion. About pressing the motion, only one thing I want to say. The motion does not unfortunately fully spell out the seriousness of the situation. The motion which I had given notice of has not been allowed to be moved. This is the very shade of that and therefore, I do not want this motion to be accepted by this House. I do not press the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Even otherwise under the rules, it cannot be. Only the substitute motions can be put. Shri B. P. Mandal, Shri Vinayak Prasad Yadav, Shri Hukmdeo Narain

Yadav, Shri Pabitra Mohan Pradhan and Shri Ram Vilas Paswan have moved substitute motions on 20th April. Before I put the substitute motions to vote, I want to know if any member wants to withdraw his substitute motion.

SHRI B. P. MANDAL (Modhepura): I would like to withdraw my substitute motion No. 1 by the leave the House.

Substitute motion No 1 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Vinayak Prasad Yadav is not present here. I will have to put his substitute motion No. 2 to vote.

Substitute motion No. 2 was put and negatived.

श्री हुकम देव नारायण यादव (मधुवनी): सदन की राय हो तो मैं वापस लेता ।

Substitute motion No. 3 was, by leave, withdrawn.

SHRI PABITRA MOHAN PRADHAN: I withdraw my substitute motion.

Substitute motion No. 4 was, by leave, withdrawn.

श्री राम विलास पासवान (ह जीपुर) :
मैं वापस लेता हूँ ।

Substitute motion No. 5 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

19.44 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the clock on Tuesday, April 25, 1978/Vaisakha 5, 1900 (Saka).