

11.18 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. MAINTENANCE OF INTERNAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1975 AND MAINTENANCE OF INTERNAL SECURITY (SECOND AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1975

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY): I lay on the Table an explanatory statement (Hindi and English versions) giving reasons for immediate legislation by the Maintenance of Internal Security (Amendment) Ordinance, 1975 and the Maintenance of Internal Security (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1975, as required under rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-9824/75].

11.19 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: APPROVAL OF PROCLAMATION OF EMERGENCY—contd.

MR. SPEAKER: We shall now resume further discussion of the resolution approving the Proclamation of Emergency.

Shri Jagjivan Ram to continue his reply.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION (SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM): I was saying that the House has discussed this motion for more than 14 hours and a large number of members have participated in it. The Prime Minister intervened in the debate yesterday. She made an elaborate speech and covered a much wider spectrum than what was necessary to make it comprehensible by the Members. My task has become very light.

If I were to identify members who have spoken on the motion, there are three categories—those who have supported the motion, those who have

opposed it and those who have extended qualified support. Many of the arguments and objections raised by those who have not thought it wise to extend their support to this motion have been met by the members who have spoken in support of it. So, I would not cover those grounds.

Shri H. M. Patel who is a seasoned administrator does not require any enlightenment from me as to the distinction between prosecution and detention. He will certainly not require in what circumstances prosecutions should be launched and in what circumstances it will be prudent to take recourse to detention.

I would not again cover the grounds which I did while moving this motion as to the situation in the country prevailing at the time when it was thought necessary to have this proclamation. There is no doubt and it has been admitted by members directly and even those who opposed indirectly that all was not well in the country at the time this proclamation was made. Mr. Patel wondered why the country remained so calm, quite even after the proclamation. The reason is not very far to see. The people in India are generally peace loving and peaceful. Those who instigate had not the opportunity to mislead people, mislead the masses and instigate them for indiscipline and disobedience. That is a very simple reason. But the proclamation became necessary, because open incitements were being made by political leaders to the police and the armed forces as also the civilian employees of the Government to take to indiscipline and insubordination. Will Mr. Patel, as a seasoned administrator, advocate that should any Government tolerate such things? I am sure he will consult his conscience and get the direct reply that no Government would afford all this.

I would like to add one sentence that in such a situation when Government is convinced of the obvious thinking and action of some people, it may not be to the best interest of