

Gazettes & Documents Section
Parliament Library Building
Room No. PB-025

Block 12
Acc. No. 25059
Dated 19.11.2014

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

5155

5156

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Saturday, 2nd August, 1952

The House met at a Quarter Past
Eight of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

8-20 A.M.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

ANTI-HINDI AGITATION IN THE SOUTH

Mr. Speaker: I know the hon. Member, Shri V. Veeraswamy has sent a notice of an adjournment motion and I have already informed him that I cannot give my consent to the motion. If he is very keen, I might tell him why I am unable to give my consent. In the first place, it is vague. It does not refer to any specific incident. It merely says that a serious situation has been developing, because of some posters in Hindi being destroyed on the Railway Stations and Post Offices by some persons, who want to carry on an Anti-Hindi agitation. If anything, 'by a serious situation' he means the peace and tranquillity situation then that is the province entirely of the Madras State with which the Central Government have nothing to do.

RESIGNATION OF SHRI RASIKLAL
U. PARIKH

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the Members that Shri Rasiklal U. Parikh has resigned his seat in the House of the People with effect from the 28th July, 1952.

155 P.S.D.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION (SECOND
AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion:

"That the Bill further to amend the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram):

When the House rose last evening I was in the midst of an argument relating to the rights to be given to detenus by the State. On this question there has been considerable heat generated because we have not been able to distinguish between the security of the State and justice being done to the detenu. Only last evening I pointed out that if the State wished to claim privilege, it could do so in any case and that it was not necessary to insert a specific provision in the Preventive Detention Act to the effect that it could claim grounds of privilege and withhold grounds as well as particulars from the detenu. What can a detenu do if he is not given the grounds and particulars for making representations to the Advisory Board? So I think it will be recognized on all hands that since the detenu is under a cloud of suspicion there is a duty cast on the Advisory Board to give him all facilities and on the part of the Government also to extend to him all facilities, so that he might clear himself and take his place as an honest member of society.

There was another point which came up for discussion on which we had differences of opinion with the majority of our colleagues. That point related to materials being furnished to the Advisory Board. We wanted a mandatory duty to be cast on the Government to furnish all materials to the Advisory Board and the Advisory Board in its turn to have