

discussed here. Rajya Sabha has passed it. On that part, you discuss it here, Unless you want to bring a consolidated Bill on the whole aspect again, I can understand that is a different thing. By that time, why not discuss that Bill separately? The part of which you wanted to bring this Amendment as an Ordinance, we can do separately. This is my objection. I hope, the hon. Minister will satisfy the House on these points which I have raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Kishore Chandra Deo.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO (Parvathipuram) : I am opposing only the introduction.

SHRI N.K. SHEJWALKAR : I am opposing both. I have opposed both. My notice is for both the items, 10 and 11. Instead of making two separate statements, I have spoken now on both. I need not repeat again what I have said.

SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR : I do not understand exactly what my friend is telling. On the one hand he wants that this Bill should be discussed immediately and should be passed by the House as urgently as possible. On the other hand, he is also trying to say that it should not be withdrawn. What is the whole purpose? I am introducing a Bill exactly on the same method with certain more stringent measures because the suggestions have come to us from different sources and also from Members of this august House, they have suggested certain amendments. All these, we have included in this new Bill and this will be discussed. At that time you have the opportunity to discuss and say whatever you want to say. We are introducing the Bill today and most probably either tomorrow or the day after it will be discussed. We do not want to delay it. We want this Bill to be passed as early as possible.

14.57 Hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

“That leave be granted to withdraw the Bill further to amend the Arms Act, 1959, which was passed by Rajya Sabha on the 8th September, 1981, and laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on the 10th September, 1981.”

*The motion was adopted.*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : We are prepared to grant leave to withdraw the Government also.

SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR : Sir, I withdraw the Bill.

14.58 Hrs.

ARMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, \* 1983

SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR : Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Arms Act, 1959.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Arms Act, 1959.”

Mr. Kishore Chandra Deo.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO (Parthipuram) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the introduction of this Bill which the Government, in a very haphazard manner, has kept pending for the last two years. Now they are seeking to withdraw that and introduce another piece of legislation which, if enacted, will not serve the very purpose which is mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it has been stated that there have been recently incidents of violence and there has been lot of unrest. This is a fact. If this is to be controlled, amendment to the Arms Act will not help you to control unlicensed weapons and arms. In most of the insurgent activities that have been going on either in the north-eastern region or in other parts of the country and in communal riots, usually unlicensed arms and weapons are used. Today you can even buy a stengun if you can pay the price of that. In the next sentence you again mention that licensed arms have also been used in such riots.

If licensed arms have been used, then you should withdraw the licence of such people who have used the arms for this kind of purpose. By restricting the number of arms that a person can hold, in what way are you going to achieve this purpose? If a person is entitled to hold one weapon, logically he is entitled to hold three or five or half a dozen weapons. One weapon itself is enough for a person to make a nuisance of himself with that weapon if he so desires, and therefore, I do not think number is going to make any difference as far as this is concerned. By asking the weapons-holders, those who are holding in excess of three weapons, to deposit the rest in *malkhava*, you are only making a provision for your bureaucrats and others who are interested to take these weapons at a cheaper cost. Therefore, there is no logic behind this at all. I still maintain that a person who is considered safe enough to hold one weapon can also hold more than three weapons, and a person who is not fit to hold any weapon should not be given

15.00 Hrs.

any licence at all. Now, how will you control, as said over here, the use of licensed arms as their use in crime has also been on the increase? Now, why restrict the man to possess 3 weapons only instead of 5 or 6? How are you going to eliminate this sort of involvement of licensed arms for use in criminal purposes? So, unless this Government realises the spirit behind this kind of an amendment, there is no point in just haphazardly bringing a legislation like this.

Secondly, it is also contravening Art, 14 of the Constitution. Art. 14 of the Constitution states that the State shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India. Here are you giving unguided discretion to the Magistrate to give weapons to any citizen of the country. We know how these things are done. Therefore, I urge upon the hon. Minister to either withdraw this Bill or at least send it to a Select Committee and let the Committee go into the various amendments which the Government is seeking to move. I think that stage has not come, but I am just suggesting as a sort of forewarning.

SHRI N.K. SHEJWALKAR (Gwalior): I am not saying anything. I have said that at this stage also I am opposing the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You opposed only the withdrawal. You oppose introduction also? Both. All right.

SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR: In fact what Mr. Kishore Chandra Deo was telling is that he was discussing the entire gamut of this Bill. At this stage, I do not think that is necessary. This House also knows very well as to on what points you can oppose introduction—that is whether we have the legislative competence. That is the only point to be discussed. But he is discussing the entire gamut of the Bill. This is not the time. When the Bill is discussed, he can say all these things. There is no ground at all.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Arms Act, 1959.”

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR: I introduce the Bill.

15.05 Hrs

#### MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

(i) Need to give appropriate status to the youth of the country.

SHRI KAMAL NATH (Chhindwara): It is unfortunate that though a large number of communities are granted special rights to represent their constituencies under the Constitution of India, the youth as a group has no such right. This is despite the fact that all those who had laid the foundation of independent India—Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad—had repeatedly emphasized the special status of the youth and the role it was destined to play in the country's effort at modernisation.

A large percentage of our work-force in the organised sector—about 40 per cent—comprise men and women below 35 years. In the unorganised sector the figures would be even larger. Clearly, therefore, the youth in