

DISPLACED PERSONS (CLAIMS) SUPPLEMENTARY BILL

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the continuance of certain proceedings pending under the Displaced Persons (Claims) Act, 1950, and for matters connected therewith.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the continuance of certain proceedings pending under the Displaced Persons (Claims) Act, 1950, and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

Shri A. P. Jain: I introduce the Bill

MOTION RE: WORKING OF THE PREVENTIVE DETENTION ACT—(contd.)

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Dr. Katju on the 21st December 1953:

"That the report on the working of the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, during the period 30th September, 1952 to 30th September, 1953, be taken into consideration."

The House will also further consider the amendments moved by Shri Raghubir Sahai and Shri M. S. Guruswamy on the 21st December, 1953.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): Mr. Speaker Sir, I had just begun yesterday when the House rose for the day. I do not want to take much time of the House, and leaving aside or ignoring the very kind references which have been made to me by almost all my hon. friends, and particularly by Shri Frank Anthony, on the opposite side, and which require no answer at all, I should like to deal with the few constructive points that have been raised

There was a complaint made in a very innocent and childlike manner, what is the existing situation, we do not know it, the Home Minister has said nothing. I refuse to believe this sort of professions of ignorance. The newspapers are full of what is happening day after day. The latest and the new device that was adopted was called in Calcutta by the euphemistic phrase 'ghirao'. The 'ghirao' was not a sort of stay-in strike, but it was a strike for the purpose of preventing people from coming out. The result of that strike was one only, that members of the Calcutta Corporation were compelled to remain in their room till 2 o'clock at night; and the same thing happened in numerous mills and factories.

When I went to Travancore, the other day, I was told that the students had, in connection with their Union, resolved to picket the colleges, and were marching in numbers to prevent classes being held. My hon. friend Shrimati Renu Chakravartty had very innocently said, well, I find from your statement that this Act is being used for suppressing labour, strikes, demand for wages and bonuses. I say with confidence that this was really not a very fair way of dealing with me. There have been no such cases.

I told you the case in which it should have been used, but owing to the moderation of the State Government, was not used. I have got before me here the judgment of the High Court in that case. There was some sort of a quarrel or a dispute about wages or something like that. The secretary of a colliery union in the Manbhum district went to the house of the poor wife of the manager, and according to the High Court Judgment, this is what he told that lady. Mrs. Pratima Banerjee. He told her that he was thinking of having her husband killed. This is violence, this is not embracing.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): Is the hon. Minister referring to a case.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Dr. Katju: I am reading from the High Court judgment. If the hon. Member and the House so desire, I shall place a copy of this judgment on the Table of the House. This is dated August 1953. It is a very recent affair.

"He had told her that he was thinking of having her husband killed, but out of sympathy for her he was desisted from so doing, and he further said that as she was young and her vermilion would be washed off, he was taking pity on her. He also added that she should warn her husband to yield to his dictates and that if her husband would not act according to his wishes and directions, he would have him killed wherever and whenever he would find him."

I would not take up the time of the House by reading the next page. The prosecution case, after some such things, extended over a period of about twelve months; this gentleman held a meeting of the workers, because he thought that the workers were being tortured and that they could not suffer these tortures any longer. He held a meeting of the workers at midnight, and he told them, that they should go and kill the manager the next day. The State Government either had no intelligence or were moderate. The next morning, at 10 o'clock, while this poor young man—he was 35, not a ripe age, because Shrimati Renu Chakravartty referred to other cases also—had gone down a mine, had come up and was walking on the road, fifty of the workers fell upon him, and cut him to pieces. There is the judgment of the High Court. The sessions judge tried.....

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I interrupt the hon. Minister.....

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let there be no interference.

Shri S. S. More: It is a case under the Indian Penal Code.....(Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Minister is making out a case according to his lines. Let there be no interruptions, and let him be heard patiently.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Dr. Katju stated that it took place three years back. What is the use of distorting the facts? If he has got the guts, let him say.....(Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Dr. Katju: This incident is of the date 28th April 1952. The Sessions Judge tried the case and gave his judgment on the 22nd April 1953—this year. The High Court decided the case on the 26th August 1953. All these facts were proved and the High Court sentenced.....

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): Is that an argument for preventive detention?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Dr. Katju: What I am saying is this, that the Preventive Detention Act is intended for such cases. If this man, the man who incited, if in his case preventive detention had been put into force and he had been detained, then this murder would not have happened and there would not have been a widow and there would not have been three fatherless children. Please remember, the High Court has sentenced this man to imprisonment for life—the inciter. The High Court has sentenced many others to life imprisonment and three men to death. (Interruptions). What is this preventive detention for? It is for the purpose of preventing crime..

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You have failed to administer your criminal law. Is that what you admit?

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no questions and cross questions. I think the purpose will be better served by not interfering and not having a running

reply and comment. If they really have a case, their case will be supported better by hearing patiently what the hon. Minister has to say and then find out whatever reply they have to give on proper occasion, not now.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): He is also provoking, Sir.

Dr. Katju: Mr. Speaker, I am sometimes interrupted by gentlemen who are not familiar with these things.

Now, as I said, it is not the intention of the State Governments, nor of the Central Government, that this Act should be used lightly or should be used as a matter of course. The very number of cases in which it was utilised would show that it has been used with extreme moderation. I only refer to this case because I thought Shrimati Renu Chakravartty said that all the labour workers were angels, they were all very very soft-hearted men and they were engaged in all their normal activities, and when we put somebody in jail or detention, they were there.

The second case was this. Oh, there was the usual argument, the copy-book argument, about the shamefulfulness of detention without trial, and all that. I do not understand this. I am talking now as a lawyer. What is detention without trial? I go to the jails on inspection visits. I have been doing it for the last five years. In every jail I find 500 undertrials, under detention awaiting trial. Now, here I say with confidence that this Preventive Detention Act under the wisdom of Parliament has provided a method of trial. You remember all that. The moment a man is arrested, the State Government is bound to hand him over the grounds of detention. He is given the legal advice to submit his answer. There is the Advisory Board and that Advisory Board judges, sits, sends for him, sends for anybody whom he may mention, looks into all the papers and gives a decision.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): What about cross-examination?

Dr. Katju: The case lasts less than two months. Ordinarily, if you go into other cases where the police takes cognisance, arrests, no bail is given. The case may be a case of dacoity, may be of murder, may be cheating. The man remains in custody for 8 months, 6 months, 12 months, awaiting trial. Which is better? This one or that one? (*Interruptions*). I would ask my hon. friends to consider this. This is not a matter of joking. I would rather prefer it. (*Interruption*.)

The very fact that the Advisory Boards have been responsible, very seriously, is shown by the number of cases in which they had intervened. My hon. friend said this: well, let us say, the total number of cases were 800. They said the Advisory Boards have intervened in about 300. And the argument was: Oh, all this was *zabardasthi*, and the poor Advisory Boards had to come to their rescue! But I would ask them to consider the ordinary law courts. A man is arrested, put up on a charge of murder, remains in detention for about 12 months, comes before the Sessions Judge and is acquitted. Very well—12 months. Or the Sessions Judge convicts. I have got these figures. In Uttar Pradesh, out of 100 appeals, 33 per cent. are allowed in full. Now, please remember what happens. That is a case in which the man has been, as an undertrial, under detention for nearly 12 months or 8 months, till the sessions trial opens. He is an undertrial after the Sessions Judge's judgment. It is the High Court which comes to his rescue, because it is in human nature to err. The State Government get some information in their possession; they think it is reliable. In the interests of public safety, they take action under the Preventive Detention Act and the matter immediately comes before the Advisory Board. If the Advisory Board thinks that it is not

[Dr. Katju]

substantial or it is not sufficiently grave, they say: 'Release him'. If they think that it is sufficiently grave, then the man goes to jail and remains, for what period? One year. This is simply raising up a bogey of detention without trial and something being done in contravention of the fundamental rights of India and so on and so forth. I can go on in that manner—being a lawyer—for three days. But let us look at the facts. The facts are, I suggest to you, that last year.....

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): You were put in jail. You know it.

Dr. Katju: It is very difficult to restrain you.

I say last year, Parliament in its wisdom, thought of all possible devices to secure two objects: one, to take measures so that safety and order in India might not be jeopardized; on the other hand, they took steps to see that the person detained—his case—was examined at the earliest possible moment by a judicial tribunal, which had all the materials before it. What more do you want? Just as in a police case or a complaint matter, the matter goes before the Magistrate. He says there is a *prima facie* case. He commits the man. The Sessions Judge tries the case after 8 months, 6 months or 5 months and either acquits or releases him, or not. You are not so much concerned with the fact of detention as you are concerned as to whether the detenu has or has not got a speedy remedy and an early occasion to put forward his view of the case. I do submit, Sir, that that has been provided under the existing Act.

Then I was rather hauled over the court—they are becoming very fashionable—saying: 'Oh, look at the Home Minister. He was guilty of almost contempt of court. He referred to the Supreme Court in terms of levity'. As I said, I have spent most of my life in the law courts. There is no one in this Parliament more

anxious and, I tell you, more punctilious, in his references, his esteem, his respect, his reverence for the judiciary in India—be it the court of a Munsif or be it the highest court, the Supreme Court of India—than myself. But there is another fundamental principle and that fundamental principle is that when a judgment is once delivered, it is open to public criticism. You must criticise it, in a respectful manner. No Judge can say, be he a Munsif or a Magistrate or be he a Judge of the Supreme Court. 'My judgment is sacrosanct. Do not mention it. If you mention it, mention it in Biblical terms—entitled to no error'. And what did I say? I said I have got the judgment.—I do not want to take your time. The Supreme Court has said: 'Our jurisdiction is very limited. We can only see into the charge, what is called the ground for detention'. 'And, if we come to the conclusion, that out of 12 grounds enumerated, there is one ground which is somewhat obscure, somewhat hazy, somewhat vague, then we are not going to consider the 11 grounds at all; we concentrate on the 12th ground and we will give the detenu the benefit of holding that his detention was under that vague and obscure ground and we will release him.' Now, if this matter comes under criticism—it is not my criticism,—I make no comment on it—the learned Judges themselves have said that. So far as I am told this is not a unanimous judgment. There is, I understand, a minority judgment and a learned Judge said in the Supreme Court, 'we are really going too far'. Mr. Frank Anthony with great zeal said—he read a passage from the judgment—that.....

2 P.M.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Here is the Judgment.

Dr. Katju: I have got it here also. He said that the Chief Justice of India is reported to have said that he was greatly distressed. What did

happen in that case? There was a charge-sheet. Many grounds of detention were enumerated. The detenu was put under arrest on the 10th March. There was something flowing from the previous events which continued and there was a meeting held on the 11th March. I believe, by a mistake, in enumerating the grounds, the meeting of the 11th March, in which objectionable speeches were delivered, the incident about the 11th March was also made. Please listen to me. When it was argued before the Supreme Court, the Attorney-General said that it was more a historical narrative and it was not of any importance. The Chief Justice agreed with the Attorney-General. My hon. friend did not read the following lines; he only read the distressing portion.

Shri Frank Anthony: On a point of personal explanation Sir, I did not try to mislead the House at all. I only quoted a categorical statement by the Chief Justice that, in spite of repeated admonitions by the Supreme Court with regard to the liberty of the individual, it is distressing to find that such matters are dealt with in a casual and careless manner.

Dr. Katju: My hon. friend read this statement. It is there. But, I do not understand why he did not read what followed, namely, this was the ground to which the Chief Justice objected. But, I say, what is the ground. It is not that the charge is obscure. In the various States there are people who are not very clever draftsmen.

I have not really much to say now. My hon. colleague the Deputy Minister has said all that could be said and other Members here also have said. I say in conclusion one sentence. So far as the principles of the Bill are concerned, this Parliament is committed to them. So far as the other fundamental thing is concerned, namely, whether there should be detention without trial or not, the Constitution is committed to it. When the Constitution was framed—please remember that it does not go back to

half a century or a century, it was framed only in 1949—everybody knew what the state of affairs in India was and therefore the constitution makers, in spite of their anxiety for the freedom of the individual and the various rights and privileges and the four fundamental freedoms, deliberately inserted this and Parliament has been year after year passing this Act. And, the only thing that the House has got to see now is, has this Act been worked well, has it been worked in a *bona fide* manner and is there any necessity for continuing it for another year; and.....

Shri Nambiar: No, no.

Dr. Katju: You may say, 'No'; but I say that it is our point of view that the Preventive Detention Act should continue for at least one year more. I hinted that next year you may have to consider whether it should be extended.

An Hon. Member: Chew it down.

Dr. Katju: If you behave in this manner, I do not know what Parliament will have to do.

Sir, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. Speaker: I shall first put to the vote of the House the amendments. There are two amendments.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Sir, I think, it would appear, that the Opposition would like to divide on the amendment of Mr. Gurupadaswamy.

Mr. Speaker: After I put it to the vote, the occasion for division may arise. If one of the amendments is carried, I am inclined to think that the other will automatically fall through and the occasion for division will be on the main motion.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Sir, it is a well known convention that the Opposition's substantive amendment is first taken up; we don't want to record our votes on the general motion.

Mr. Speaker: Then I shall put to vote first the amendment of Shri Gurupadaswamy.

The question is:

That in the motion, the following be added at the end:—

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that there is no sufficient justification for continuing the Act upto the specified period."

House divided: Ayes, 90; Noes, 285.

AYES

Division No. 5

[2-11 P.M.]

Achalu, Shri
Ajit Singh, Shri
Amin, Dr.
Amjad Ali, Shri
Anthony, Shri Frank
Bagdi, Shri Magan Lal
Bahadur Singh, Shri
Barrow, Shri
Basu, Shri K. K.
Bhawani Singh, Shri
Boovaraghasamy, Shri
Buchhikotaiiah, Shri
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu
Chatterjee, Shri Tushar
Chattopadhyaya, Shri
Chaudhuri, Shri T. K.
Chowdary, Shri C. R.
Chowdhury, Shri N. B.
Damodaran, Shri N. P.
Das, Shri B. C.
Das, Shri Sarangadhar
Deo, Shri R. N. S.
Deogam, Shri
Deshpande, Shri V. G.
Gam Malludora, Shri
Gidwani, Shri
Giridhari Bhoi, Shri
Gowd, Shri Y. Gadilingana
Gupta, Shri S. C.
Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
Hukam Singh, Sardar

Jayaraman, Shri
Jena, Shri Lakshmidhar
Kachiroyar, Shri
Kandasamy, Shri
Kelappan, Shri
Khardekar, Shri
Khare, Dr. N. B.
Kripalani, Shri J. B.
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Krishnaswami, Dr.
Lal Singh, Sardar
Mahata, Shri B.
Majhi, Shri Chaitan
Mascarene, Kumari Annie
Mehta, Shri J. R.
Menon, Shri Damodara
Missir, Shri V.
More, Shri S. S.
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Muniswamy, Shri
Naidu, Shri N. R.
Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
Nambiar, Shri
Nanadas, Shri
Narasimham, Shri S. V. L.
Nayar, Shri V. P.
Pandey, Dr. Natabar
Patnaik, Shri U. C.
Punnoose, Shri
Raghavachari, Shri

Raghavaiah, Shri
Ramaswami, Shri M. D.
Rammnarayan Singh, Babu
Randaman Singh, Shri
Rao, Shri P. Subba
Rao, Shri Vittal
Razmi, Shri S. K.
Reddi, Shri Madhao
Reddy, Shri Bewara
Rishang Keishing, Shri
Saha, Shri Meghnad
Sen, Shri R. C.
Shah, Shrimati Kamalendu Mati
Shakuntala, Shrimati
Shastri, Shri B. D.
Singh, Shri G. S.
Singh, Shri R. N.
Sinha, Thakur J. K.
Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
Subrahmanyam, Shri T.
Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
Swamy, Shri N. R. M.
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
**
Vallatharas, Shri
Veeraswamy, Shri
Velayudhan, Shri
Verma, Shri Ramji
Waghmare, Shri

NOES

Abdullahai, Mulla
Abdus Sattar, Shri
Achal Singh, Seth
Achint Ram, Lala
Achuthan, Shri
Agarawal, Shri H. L.
Agarwal, Shri M. L.
Agarwal, Shri S. N.
Akarपुरi, Sardar
Alagesan, Shri
Altekar, Shri
Alva, Shri Joachim
Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari
Ansari, Dr.
Asthana, Shri
Ayyangar, Shri M. A.
Asad, Maulana
Belmiki, Shri

Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basappa, Shri
Basu, Shri A. K.
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakta Darshan, Shri
Bhandari, Shri
Bherati, Shri G. S.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhatt, Shri C.
Bhawanji, Shri
Bheekha Bhai, Shri
Bhonsle, Shri J. K.
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Bogawat, Shri
Bose, Shri P. C.

Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brohmo-Choudhury, Shri
Chandak, Shri
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Charak, Shri
Chatterjee, Dr. Susilranjan
Chaturvedi, Shri
Chavda, Shri
Chinaria, Shri
Choudhri, Shri M. Shafice
Dabhi, Shri
Damar, Shri
Das, Dr. M. M.
Das, Shri B.
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri Beli Ram
Das, Shri K. K.
Das, Shri N. T.

**The name of Shri Tulsidas Kilachand has been excluded from the Division Lists under the orders of the Speaker as the member subsequently intimated that he wanted to remain neutral.

Das, Shri Ramananda
 Das, Shri S. N.
 Deb, Shri S. C.
 Deshmukh, Shri C. D.
 Deshmukh Shri, K. G.
 Deshpande, Shri G. H.
 Dholakia, Shri
 Dhusiya, Shri
 Diwan, Shri R. S.
 Dube, Shri Mulchand
 Dube, Shri U. S.
 Dubey, Shri R. G.
 Dutta, Shri S. K.
 Dwivedi, Shri D. P.
 Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
 Ebenezzer, Dr.
 Elayaperumal, Shri
 Fotedar, Pandit
 Gadgil, Shri
 Gandhi, Shri Feroze
 Gandhi, Shri M. M.
 Gandhi, Shri V. B.
 Ganpati Ram, Shri
 Garg, Shri R. P.
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Ghose, Shri S. M.
 Gulam Qader, Shri
 Giri, Shri V. V.
 Gohain, Shri
 Gopi Ram, Shri
 Gounder, Shri K. P.
 Gounder, Shri K. S.
 Govind Das, Seth
 Gupta, Shri Badshah
 Hari Mohan, Dr.
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Heda, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Hembrom, Shri
 Hyder Husein, Ch.
 Ibrahim, Shri
 Islamuddin, Shri M.
 Jyyani, Shri E.
 Jyyunni, Shri C. R.
 Jain, Shri A. P.
 Jaiware, Shri
 Jangde, Shri
 Jayashri, Shrimati
 Jena, Shri Niranjan
 Jha, Shri Bhagwat
 Jogendra Singh, Sardar
 Joshi, Shri Jethalal
 Joshi, Shri Krishnacharya
 Joshi, Shri Liladhar
 Joshi, Shri M. D.
 Joshi, Shri N. L.
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
 Jwala Prashad, Shri
 Kajrolkar, Shri
 Kakkan, Shri
 Kale, Shrimati A.
 Karmarkar, Shri
 Kasturba, Shri

Katham, Shri
 Katju, Dr.
 Keshavaingar, Shri
 Khan, Shri Sadath Ali
 Khedkar, Shri G. B.
 Khongmen, Shrimati
 Khauda Baksh, Shri M.
 Kirolikar, Shri
 Krishna Chandra, Shri
 Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
 Kothikapellil, Shri T.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Kureel, Shri P. L.
 Lakshmayya, Shri
 Lal, Shri R. S.
 Lallanji, Shri
 Laskar, P. Shri
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Madiah Gowda, Shri
 Mahodaya, Shri
 Majhi, Shri R. C.
 Malvia, Shri B. N.
 Malviya, Pandit C. N.
 Malviya, Shri Motilal
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Masuodi, Maulana
 Mathew, Shri C. P.
 Matthen, Shri
 Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha
 Mehta, Shri B. G.
 Minimata, Shrimati
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Misra, Shri M. P.
 Misra, Pandit Lingaraj
 Misra, Shri R. D.
 Misra, Shri S. P.
 Mohd. Akbar, Sofi
 Mohiuddin, Shri
 Morarka, Shri
 More, Shri K. L.
 Mudaliar, Shri C. R.
 Muthukrishnan, Shri
 Nair, Shri C. K.
 Nanda, Shri
 Narasimhan, Shri C. R.
 Naskar, Shri P. S.
 Nitawadkar, Shri
 Natesan, Shri
 Nathwani, Shri N. P.
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
 Nehru, Shrimati Uma
 Neswi, Shri
 Nevatia, Shri
 Nijalingappa, Shri
 Palchoudhuri, Shrimati Ila
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pannalal, Shri
 Paragi Lal, Ch.
 Parikh, Shri S. G.
 Parmar, Shri R. B.
 Patel, Shri B. K.

Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Pateria, Shri
 Pathrikar, Dr. D. N.
 Patil, Shri Kanavade
 Patil, Shri Shankargauda
 Pawar, Shri V. P.
 Pillai, Shri Thanu
 Prebhakar, Shri N.
 Rachiah, Shri N.
 Radha Ramen, Shri
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Raghuramaiah, Shri
 Raghubir Sahai, Shri
 Raghubir Singh, Ch.
 Ram Dass, Shri
 Ram Saran, Prof.
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramaswamy, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
 Ramchandrar, Dr. D.
 Ranbir Singh, Ch.
 Rane, Shri
 Rao, Shri Sashagiri
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Reddy, Shri Janardhan
 Reddy, Shri Viswanatha
 Rup Narain, Shri
 Sahu, Shri Bhagabat
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Saigal, Sardar A. S.
 Saksena, Shri Mohanlal
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sanganna, Shri
 Sankarapandian, Shri
 Sarmah, Shri
 Satyawadi, Dr.
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sen, Shrimati Sushama
 Sewal, Shri A. R.
 Shah, Shri C. C.
 Shah, Shri R. B.
 Shah Nawaz Khan, Shri
 Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
 Sharma, Pandit K. C.
 Sharma, Shri D. C.
 Sharma, Shri K. R.
 Sharma, Shri R. C.
 Shastri, Shri Algu Rai
 Shivananjappa, Shri
 Siddananjappa, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri Babunath
 Singh, Shri H. P.
 Singh, Shri L. J.
 Singh, Shri M. N.
 Singh, Shri T. N.
 Singhal, Shri S. C.
 Sinha, Dr. S. N.
 Sinha, Shri A. P.
 Sinha, Shri Anirudha
 Sinha, Shri B. P.
 Sinha, Shri G. P.
 Sinha, Shri Jhulan

[Mr. Speaker]

Sinha, Shri N. P.
Sinha, Shri S.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan
Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
Sinha, Shri
Siva, Dr. Gangadharu
Snatak, Shri
Sodhia, Shri K. C.
Soman, Shri N.
Sundar Lal, Shri
Suresh Chandra, Dr.
Swaminadhan, Shrimati Amnu
Syed Ahmed, Shri
Syed Mahmud, Dr.

Telikar, Shri
Tewari, Sardar R. B. S.
Thimmaiah, Shri
Thirani, Shri
Thomas, Shri A. M.
Tivary, Shri V. N.
Tiware, Pandit B. L.
Tiware, Shri R. S.
Tiware, Pandit D. N.
Tripathi, Shri H. V.
Tripathi, Shri K. P.
Tripathi, Shri V. D.
**
Uikey, Shri
Upadhyay, Pandit Munishwar Datt

Upadhyay, Shri Shiva Dyal
Upadhyay, Shri S. D.
Vaishnav, Shri H. G.
Vaishya, Shri M. B.
Varma, Shri B. B.
Varma, Shri B. R.
Varma, Shri M. L.
Venkataraman, Shri
Vijaya Lakshmi, Shrimati
Vishwanath Prasad, Shri
Vyas, Shri Radhelal
Wilson, Shri J. N.
Wodeyar, Shri

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I put to the House the other amendment by Mr. Raghubir Sahai.

The question is:

Then in the motion, the following be added at the end:

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that there is ample justification for continuing the Act upto the specified period."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I put to the House the amended motion.

The question is:

"That the report on the working of the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, during the period 30th September, 1952 to 30th September, 1953, be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that there is ample justification for continuing the Act upto the specified period."

The motion was adopted

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed to the next item.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Defence (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

It has become almost the convention of this House to have a discussion on foreign affairs during every session. I welcome this because we live in troubled times when difficult problems have to be faced. Hence a consideration of this House on these matters is of the greatest assistance to those who have the responsibility to deal with those problems. Formerly, I had moved some such motion as I have done today, and as it is worded, it covers the world—every question that might arise in relation to foreign affairs—and there are a multitude of such questions. But I venture to suggest to this House that we might perhaps concentrate, whenever we have such a discussion, on one or two important matters rather than discuss every subject that afflicts humanity. That would make our debate and our discussion a little more realistic and bring those particular points before all hon. Members here as well as before others who may listen to us outside. I propose, therefore, to confine my remarks to two, or

**The name of Shri Tulsidas Kilachand has been excluded from the Division Lists under the orders of the Speaker as the member subsequently intimated that he wanted to remain neutral.