

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

5295

5296

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Monday, 4th August, 1952

State Electricity Board for  
the years 1951-52 and 1952-53;  
and

(ii) Supplementary Statement in  
respect of the year 1951.

[Placed in Library. See No. P-48/52]

The House met at a Quarter Past  
Eight of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(No Questions: Part I not published)

ADMINISTRATION OF EVACUEE  
PROPERTY (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri  
A. P. Jain): I beg to move for leave  
to introduce a Bill further to amend  
the Administration of Evacuee Prop-  
erty Act, 1950.

8-15 A.M.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

ACCIDENT IN CHAMPION REEFS MINE

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Member,  
Mr. Vittal Rao, given notice to the  
Minister of Labour?

Shri Vittal Rao (Khammam): I  
have sent it, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to intro-  
duce a Bill further to amend the  
Administration of Evacuee Prop-  
erty Act, 1950."

The motion was adopted.

Shri A. P. Jain: I introduce the Bill

Mr. Speaker: I think we shall have  
to wait till the hon. Minister of  
Labour comes here and then I will  
take up the matter. Presumably he  
does not remember that there is no  
question hour today; that is why, I  
believe, he is not present just now.  
We will now proceed with the busi-  
ness before the House.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION (SECOND  
AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed  
with discussion of the following  
motion moved by Dr. Katju:

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ESTIMATED CAPITAL AND REVENUE  
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE OF  
DELHI STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD  
AND SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT  
FOR 1951

The Minister of Planning and Irriga-  
tion and Power (Shri Nanda): I  
beg to lay on the Table a copy of each  
of the following statements under  
sub-sections (3) and (5) of section 61  
of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948:

(i) Statement of estimated capital  
and revenue receipts and  
expenditure of the Delhi

Shri Raghobachari (Penukonda):  
On Saturday evening I was mention-  
ing in connection with this matter  
that the material disclosed or placed  
before the House was hardly suffi-  
cient to convince and make out a case  
for the continuance of this obnoxious  
measure. I was also stating in the  
same connection that the scope of  
the Bill was so wide that almost all

220 PSD.

[Shri Raghobachari]

the activities of any individual or citizen could easily be brought under one or other of the clauses of section 3. I was also stating that past experience as well as present experience, related by members in their individual cases showed that there were more cases of abuse or misuse of these powers and hardly any safeguards were provided. Therefore there was great need to examine elaborately safeguards to prevent such wrong use or abuse of these powers.

As regards the first point I wish to add one or two circumstances. It was stressed that the responsibility to maintain order and peace was of the Government, that there were murders being committed here and there and that there were groups of people with their arms not yet surrendered and asking for terms and, therefore, there was need for this legislation. Certainly, so far as Madras is concerned, you know that food control is entirely out of the field and therefore, it cannot be said that the food situation will worsen if such powers are not there. And further of all the places in India the most disturbed was the Telengana area or the Madras portion of it adjoining those parts. There were special police stations and all precautions maintained there. The Madras State Government, as I read from the *Hindu* of the 1st, had issued instructions to close all the police stations in those districts as for the last ten months there prevailed peace and public tranquillity in those parts.

There was no need for these special police stations at all and, therefore, all the police stations have been withdrawn. It will thus be seen that the so-called or much-advertised disturbance in the country or the disturbance of tranquillity is not to be found there at all. And then the past experience, as I said, is—I do not know how the Members on the side of the Congress party have so soon forgotten the experience that everyone of us had at the hands of subordinate officials—the misuse of similar provisions of the then Detention Act. The most unfortunate thing, is that when admittedly there are abuses and misuses, the Government is not found to have taken action against any one individual or against any one officer who has really misused those provisions. In the absence of such satisfying action restoring the confidence of the public, is it not under-

standable that the public are really anxious that safeguards are necessary to prevent such misuse? Government must really be in a position to understand the anxiety of the Opposition Members of this House, on this side who really want safeguards to be introduced. Well to my mind it looks the matter appears to be more deep. The Government has been possessed of a weapon which is very handy; they need not explain to anybody; they can use it and sometimes probably it is more effective and quick, and having been used to the kind of weapon which is handy and effective, they wish to forget, the existence of all the ordinary laws under which all Governments have always maintained peace and security. It is not the peculiar province or privilege, or duty of this particular Government; it is the duty of all Governments throughout the world that they maintain peace and public tranquillity not always by detention orders. Therefore, when that has been their practice with this weapon in use, they would naturally be unwilling to part with that weapon and so they come, and strangely enough, now when the situation is practically calm in the country, they want to have it for a period of 27 months. Therefore, it is a most ununderstandable, and I might say, unreasonable, method of asking this Parliament to authorise them to pass or extend this law.

Then I referred to the absence of any 'confidence action', I mean action which restores public confidence in the shape of disciplinary action against people who have not properly used it, and our experienced friend, Mr. Gade, was suggesting the other day that District Magistrates were people who were very much alive to the political conditions and influences in the country and because of that they knew that there was Opposition and therefore they would use it properly. My submission is, that this is precisely the very reason why safeguards must be provided. It is true, and he has in his experience told us a truth, that officers are mostly, though not guided, influenced, by political considerations, and it is human nature, when a subordinate officer finds a particular Government in power he would stretch a point in favour of the party in power and you know when a party is in power, as it often times happens, in all parts of the country it is supported by many individuals and often times these officers go on stretching points and in this stretching hardly any point is left for the poor man who has to suffer.

That is one element of human psychology which the Government must take note of and must be anxious to come forward to put safeguards and not complain if we ask for safeguards.

As regards the safeguards I only wish to say a few points. The first thing is that we want that the order should not be initiated by officials, that is by the District Magistrate. The matter may be handled by the State Ministers. I should have expected that it is perfectly practicable and very feasible for the Home Minister to have assured the House that he would issue instructions in that behalf. Particularly now when the country is calm such powers must be exercised only by the State Ministers. And if only the State Minister takes the precaution of consulting his legal advisers who are conversant with law the chances of misuse practically entirely disappears. There is no use consulting an Under-Secretary or somebody who is in the office of the Secretariat, but the legal advisers who give them legal opinion would certainly know whether there is justification or not in particular cases, forwarded for their opinion. That is a thing which could easily be done.

Then, I seriously wish to suggest that if my hon. friend feels that law and order cannot be maintained without these or similar extraordinary powers then the proper course for him is to take steps to add a chapter to the Criminal Procedure Code analogous to the security proceedings, which could give him powers for such emergent use. To this suggestion an hon. Member replied by saying, "Then you will come and object saying, 'You have been trying to put a permanent provision in the statute.'" Now, what is the reason for the objection? The reason is that the executive acts and there are no safeguards under this law and that the procedure of ordinary law is not available to the citizen; therefore, you make this part of the permanent statute. Then the matter must go before a court of law which will look into it: There there is legal advice available, full information is available, and if an order is passed nobody has any complaint against the justice of it. Therefore that would be a more realistic way of approaching and managing the situation.

The other thing on which we wish to have a safeguard provided is that the entire material on which a detenu is ordered to be kept behind the bars must be given to him. You know under the provisions it is open to the Government to withhold whatever

information it wants—all the material connected with the detenu must be reported to the officers, but not necessarily given to the detenu. When the detenu has not got all the material it will be difficult for him to defend himself. Therefore, that is another matter on which safeguard should be provided.

As regards legal advice it was stated that it is inconvenient, it offends secrecy, and the Home Minister had his own impression about it and said that lawyers are a nuisance and need not come in here. Apart from personal opinions, the rights of citizens cannot be taken away and Government should at least provide facilities, in administering this branch of law, for legal advice to the detenu to make his representation. There would be hardly any difficulty in that.

The other thing on which provision of a safeguard is asked for is this. As the law now stands the entire material against the detenu may not be made available even to the Advisory Board. No doubt there is a provision that the Board may call for it, but there is no obligation to furnish it. It may be said that it will be a very extraordinary Government which will refuse to send the information called for, but when the law does not lay down an obligation and, in fact, when a subsection provides that Government can withhold some part of the material information it is difficult to expect that the entire information would be made available.

Then there is the question of the statutory obligation of affording some allowances to the people who are taken away from their dependents. That has been asked for but it has not been provided here.

There is also need for frequent and periodical examination of these provisions.

It would have been very helpful if Government had given us figures as to how many cases were sent up to the Advisory Boards, in how many cases Government itself did not confirm or approve, or cancelled the orders issued by their subordinate officers. If some idea of that was given to the House it would have assured the House that Government is really exercising some precaution and care in the matter. But we have not got any figures about that. It is admitted that in about 28 per cent. of the cases the Boards have found that there was no need to detain the persons concerned. In those cases naturally the conclusion to be arrived at would be that the poor man concerned has suffered unnece-

[Shri Raghachari]

sarily for those three or four months. What is the compensation, what is the relief provided for him? These are matters in which there is no use simply arguing for or against on high principles or, as somebody said, academically. As practical and realistic men we should see that proper safeguards are provided for against a power which you have seen misused in the past and is being misused in the present, also.

I am not able to understand how the life of a piece of legislation of this kind can be asked to be extended by another twenty-seven months at a stretch. I oppose the continuance of this Act for any period beyond a year, and even that only after having provided for all the necessary safeguards which have been urged above.

**Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang):** I have been listening with interest to the debate on this Bill, and to the points made by the Opposition. The most important point which seems to be in controversy is whether there should be provision to lead evidence and permit cross-examination at any stage. So far as my own State is concerned, I feel that with all the goodwill in the world it would not be possible for us to agree to this proposition. During the last few years we have had to face difficulties in our State, particularly from a political party known as the Revolutionary Communist Party of India. Unfortunately, this Party has taken to terrorist methods. It did not take part in the general elections which were held all over the country recently. It has organised itself all over Assam and particularly in the tribal areas. In the District Shibsagar it organised itself in such a way that it was not possible for the police to arrest any person. In the beginning the police did not seem to be aware of it, but later on it was found that even the loyalty of the police was influenced to such an extent that a warrant of arrest sent out would be known to the Party before it was known to the officers of the Police Department even. The result was that none of the wanted persons could be arrested. In that district, they set up an organisation so vigorous that it became a menace to the whole State. But the Police Department of Assam said that there was no danger and as a matter of fact until the Central C.I.D. said that there was danger, the Assam Police did not seem to know it. Only afterwards, the Assam Government took steps. But they

took steps after shootings and murders had happened, because only then their eyes opened. By this time the spell of terror had been cast so much on the people that they could not come forward and report. There were cases in which the daughters of some persons were taken away for the purpose of indoctrination, and yet the people dare not come forward to report. This was the most unfortunate thing. The result was that the Government could not get any evidence whatsoever. Ultimately, the situation went out of control and the district had to be given over to the Military and when the Military came, there were very unfortunate things—things such as were described by Dr. Jaisoorya as having taken place in Hyderabad. The rule of the Military is always very dangerous. Many atrocities took place, and until the R.C.I.P. leaders were combed out of that place it was not possible for people to move out fearlessly. These girls who had been taken away were so much indoctrinated that they were also made use of for tampering with the loyalty of the police. As an instance of the extent of indoctrination—a few girls were arrested, and when being taken across a fordable river by the soldiers, instead of lifting their skirts only as high as the water demanded, they lifted it too high, and the soldiers winked at them and were surprised. Thus, you will see that when a whole district is under the spell of a party, it is impossible to produce evidence. As a matter of fact, the Assam Government was completely in the dark. Had it not been for the Central C.I.D., they would not have known anything at all until murders took place.

A great attempt at comparison has been made between England and India. I shall tell you the position in Assam. There are parts in Assam where there is no road at all. The other day I calculated the figures and I drew up a map showing 29,000 sq. miles of territory where there were no roads fit for vehicular traffic. I have been to Europe and its different parts and I have found that even in the remotest villages there are roads fit for motor traffic. But in India, particularly in the tribal areas of Assam, there is no road worth the name and the result is that the police does not go there for the whole of the year and actually there is no police there. The only officers who are known in these villages are the village headman and the collector of revenue—not the Collector who is the district magistrate but merely a

contractor who collects revenue for the Government.

Recently during the elections I went to a place where I held meetings. It was a marketplace where the meeting was held. The night before the R.C.P.I. leaders had committed a dacoity there and they had killed a man. The dead body was lying inside the house and the moveables had been removed. On the one side, we were holding the meeting and on the other side the R.C.P.I. people were holding the meeting forbidding people to vote. I enquired about the incident from the revenue contractor. With tears in his eyes, he said, "I cannot tell you. You will go away tomorrow and I will have to live with these people. They are all around us. Do you expect that I should tell you? Do you want me to meet the same fate as the man who is dead?" So, he did not tell me. You can imagine from this what a spell of fear and danger has been cast over the countryside in this part of the country. There is practically no Government there. My hon. friend has agreed to give five days notice or ten days notice. There are parts in Assam where you would require one month or more to travel from one corner to the district headquarter. You will have to walk the distance. In these circumstances, how are you going to protect these people? The point has been made that there is a conflict between the Government and the political parties. After all, when terrorism overtakes a country, as it did in Europe in the last decade of the nineteenth century, such things do happen. In Europe there was a pall of fear lying over the people. In such circumstances, evidence is impossible to obtain and marshall. If you ask a man to come and give evidence, his life will be put in danger. It may be that the culprit is in custody, but his friends outside will kill the man who gives evidence.

Recently, in another district the situation became so bad that it had to be taken over by the police. In large areas the R.C.P.I. had organised guerilla bands. They had forbidden the menfolk to come out of their homes. They had organised the guerillas with womenfolk. In one case, a man had been splitting wood inside his house for 12 days and the whole floor had been damaged. Why? Because he did not dare to come out, and the place was commanded entirely by the R.C.P.I. When the police came, the women alone came forward with country knives, but later they ran away. But they were again re-

organised and the same group was sent to attack the police. The police found that there were many places in which there had been no police at all before. The people had seen none. They were seen going about hunting mice in the countryside. Such is the condition there. When that is so, how are you going to marshall evidence? This party is in complete control. Meetings are addressed with stengun in hand. Recently, when the police carried out an expedition they found that these people had hidden not merely stenguns but also a machine-gun. They were hidden in the corners of the hills. The rifles stolen from the police were also recovered. In one case, when the R.C.P.I. leader was about to be caught, he managed to escape leaving behind girls who were euphemistically called "queens". These are places where even "queens" could be carried about without the police being able to catch. Therefore, if you bring in the question of marshalling evidence it would be impossible for the Government to protect the citizens. The conflict here is one between the terrorists and the people and Government's primary duty is to interfere and afford protection to the people. What Government is there worth its salt that cannot afford protection to its people? The Government must, therefore, afford protection to the people, and the Government has not been able to afford protection to the people.

Much has been said about the evidence machinery. I feel that the evidence machinery is also one of the machineries of justice. What is necessary for the country and its people is justice. Justice is the "Buried temple" of Maeterlink. If the machinery of justice is too much strained, namely, if the evidence machinery is too much strained, then the mode of dispensing through evidence and cross-examination would break down. In that case, the question before society arises: how shall society be afforded protection? There you have the case for preventive detention. My hon. friend Dr. S. P. Mookerjee and others quoted a large number of sections from the I.P.C. and C.P.C. saying that there was protection even against preparation for crime and therefore no necessity arises of preventive detention. I fully agree with him when he says this that whenever there is a case in which evidence is obtainable Government shall have no right to put a man under preventive detention. But when such a case arises in which evidence is unavailable or unobtainable or un-marshallable, then the question

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

arises: shall the Government sit mute and afford no protection to society? I say no for then Government would not have performed its duty.

Therefore, in a case where there is the possibility of marshalling evidence and evidence is available, Government or any authority shall have no right whatsoever to put a man under preventive detention. The necessity will arise only when such evidence is unavailable and unmarshallable. I feel that only if we look from this point of view, will we realise the necessity and the justice of preventive detention.

Now, it has been said that this measure is a mechanism directed against the political parties and their opinions. The Opposition has said that if the Government utilise this power against political parties, then in no time it will crumble from office. I fully agree with it. In the history of the world ever since Tamerlane and others who ravaged the earth, it has been seen that force when utilised unjustly brings down the party in power. Therefore, if Congress made the mistake of utilising its power against political opinion, it will crumble into dust. If on the other hand a necessity arose for protecting society and the Government utilised this power therefore and people understood that it was not utilising the power for keeping itself in office, then it shall not crumble. Therefore, I join my voice with the Opposition in saying that the authority shall never utilise this preventive detention for the purpose of keeping themselves in office or suppressing political opinion.

There have been cases I myself know, in which such a thing has been done. It has not been done by the Government, but by individuals, who had for the time being been in authority, and they have suffered for it. People have not pardoned them. Many of them have lost in the last elections because of this. Therefore, I feel that it is a very salutary principle, the principle of spontaneous natural retribution visiting all governments in all ages and times and therefore it is a protection in this way that whenever the political party in power tries to suppress political opinion there is a reaction in public mind which brings it down.

I feel that the political party in power will not utilise this power for the suppression of political opinion. The difference between the democratic countries of the West which have

fully developed economically and a country like India should be borne in mind. I feel that the entire East is in ferment today. The conditions obtaining in countries of the East, India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, etc., should be kept in mind when we think of putting such a piece of legislation on the Statute Book. The other day a point was made that even in war time certain privileges were granted to detenus in England which are not given to detenus in peace time in India. I think there is a fallacy in this argument. The House should realise what kind of cases came before the British courts or British detention authorities. The cases were mostly of conscientious objectors. In India we do not think of keeping any conscientious objectors in detention. There are so many conscientious objectors. In England because there was compulsory recruitment in war-time they had to keep in restraint even conscientious objectors. The population of India is so vast that we do not think of conscription; therefore the question of detaining conscientious objectors does not arise. If there had been terrorism, do you think that the British Government would have been able to utilise these provisions? They would not have been able to do it. Therefore, I feel that a comparison between the conditions obtaining in England and those obtaining in India does not brook comparison. Abstract comparison of England and America with India should not be made.

We are here to legislate for conditions existing in this country. Legislation is not a geometric theorem that it can be extended like a straight line from one country to another. If it were, then there would be no necessity for having so many parliaments in all the democratic countries of the world. It will be enough if there was a democratic parliament in England to extend the legislations passed there all over the world. But such is not the case. Legislators are practical men dealing with practical circumstances obtaining in different countries of the world.

Therefore, we are here to deal with this particular situation. How shall we deal with it? Let us look at the happenings in India. Take, for instance, the abolition of zamindari. It is a liquidation of the feudal order. In other countries of the world, where there has been necessity for liquidation of such feudal order, what has happened? Greatest crimes have been committed; but they were not called crimes. Whole classes had to be liquidated by being put beyond the

pale of law. Now, here, we are doing it through a democratic process. It was expected that because we had provided for compensation, the zamindars would not resist. But unfortunately it was found that the zamindars did resist. They resisted through the courts; when they failed they are resisting outside in the country by organising themselves. The jagirdars also are the bitterest enemies of this reform.

So I say that in a democratic way we are trying to change the order of society. It must not be forgotten that that order which you want to change is bound to resist. The resistance has begun in Saurashtra and other places. It is going to extend itself to Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Bengal and Madras. Even, in spite of compensation, there will be resistance. Therefore, I say that the State shall have to utilise this power for the purpose of abolition of zamindari. Otherwise the abolition may not be easily possible. Even from the economic point of view there is necessity for this measure.

Take for instance China. The other day we were told that there was one class which had been put beyond the pale of law—that was the bureaucratic capitalists. In the mass trials taking place in China, the masses have the right to decide and no evidence is marshalled or opportunity for cross-examination given. The provision for cross-examination of evidence in such cases is set aside. Therefore to say that this right of cross-examination is inviolable and at all times is not a correct proposition. If by a certain circumstance certain people constitute themselves into a political party bent upon violence, it may become necessary for the Government to utilise such a power. Therefore I have felt continuously all through the discussion that there was some unreality about the arguments advanced, particularly by the Communist Party.

In India the mind of Indians is made of a different stuff. The other day when I was passing through Calcutta I found that there was an altercation between one porter and another man who was coming down from the train and whose luggage the porter was carrying, with regard to the portorage he had to pay. Immediately there was a slap, the slap developed into a big quarrel, and the quarrel developed into a communal and provincial quarrel between Biharis and Bengalis, and some people were killed. Will you ever find such a case in England?

You will never find. Because in our mind it is there, and as soon as you put the poison of communalism into it, it conflagrates and spreads into vast areas. In my district alone when there was a conflict between Hindus and Muslims, the whole population split into two at once and became organised one against the other. When we moved from place to place trying to understand the position, the Hindus would not tell us the facts because they thought that we were Congressmen, and when we went to the Muslim camps they would not tell us the facts because they thought that we were Hindus. So, as soon as such communal tension arises it is impossible to get any evidence. You cannot get any evidence. People do not trust you. And the men who behave so are ordinary men. They have no stake, the quarrel perhaps has happened somewhere for which they are not responsible. But the whole population immediately gets organised on a communal basis. Such a thing is never possible in England or America, except in the Southern States of America where the Negro problem or Ku Klux Klan problem exists. When Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee went to my district he was to have addressed a meeting. There was a good *pandal* standing there, but the night before the meeting, it was set on fire. As soon as it was set on fire there was an electric atmosphere and the question of provincialism arose, and it was impossible to bring parties together. The two parties were so much apart that they could not be brought together, and it was impossible to keep order. It was impossible to get any evidence. Wherever in such cases the Preventive Detention Act has not been applied it has not been possible for the Government to bring any case or charge-sheet against anybody at all, either in Bengal or Assam or in other parts of India. Why is it? Because so long as our mind continues to think in terms of communalism, whenever communal poison is secreted the immediate result is the population gets organised on that basis. People who have no idea whatsoever of what has happened organise themselves immediately on that basis.

There was a case in which people went to set fire to a refugee colony. There was no earthly reason why they should have done so. But they did so because they were frenzied, and a frenzied mob knows no law. I tell you the conditions in India are such that they cannot be compared with the conditions in other countries called democratic. We are trying to have democracy. But we have not accepted this parliamentary system of government for all practical purposes.

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

We still think in terms of direct action. Now, England has no direct action. England has accepted the parliamentary system for the purpose of progress in that country. But today in India and in Eastern countries we think of direct action. We in India think of direct action, particularly in terms of non-violence taught by Gandhiji. But there are many parties in India who do not think in terms of non-violent direct action, and there are parties in the rest of Asia which do not think in terms of non-violent direct action at all. Therefore, if this parliamentary system of democracy is completely accepted for purposes of progress, what will happen? Individuals outside the Parliament will think that they have a right for taking direct action. And individual conceptions of progress are always of a higher order than the parliamentary conception of progress because parliamentary system of progress is slow affair. Then there will be a clash and conflict between these two methods. Therefore any government in power which is controlled by parliamentary democracy will, because it is slower than the individual conception of progress which is organising the direct action, come into conflict. Take for instance what is happening in the South today on the question of Hindi. A certain gentleman thinks that he must organise a revolt against this and he immediately goes about painting with tar and brush all the Hindi signboards. Now, what will happen? So much of expenditure will have to be incurred by the Government in vain. In no country of the world would this have happened. They would have come and tried to put the demand through Parliament. But in India the conception of direct action is there.

9 A.M.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Member has taken half an hour, and I am receiving constant requests that other Members should be given an opportunity. Today is the last day of this debate. I would like to know what time the hon. Minister would take. About an hour?

**The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju):** Yes, Sir. May be a little more or less.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am asking him because I must know the point when I must stop the discussion and call upon him.

**Dr. Katju:** About 12 o'clock will be all right, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** That means there will be three hours left. Though

what the hon. Member says is really important and thought-provoking, it is not very relevant to the present Bill before the House. He has already made the point that there is a necessity for having some law in which the ordinary canons of evidence cannot apply. That is his point and I think he has made it sufficiently clear. He may now conclude his remarks.

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** Sir, you may also consider the possibility of there being a division on this.

**Mr. Speaker:** That will be seen afterwards. I am not interested in curtailing any speech, but the point is if a larger number of Members have to be given an opportunity of speaking, then it is up to every Member just to state his points and not to go on speaking at an inordinate length. That is why I rang the bell twice, but it seems the hon. Member is not coming to a close. But as there is a break already here let him finish now so that we might take up the adjournment motion.

**Shri K. P. Tripathi:** Sir, I will close straightway. Let me have the luck of an unfinished sentence.

**Dr. Katju:** Sir, in order to meet the possibility or contingency of a division on this you may, if you think fit, be pleased to call upon me at half past eleven.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have no objection. Then it curtails the discussion further by half an hour.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

##### ACCIDENT IN CHAMPION REEFS MINE

**Mr. Speaker:** There is an adjournment motion by the hon. Member Mr. Vittal Rao to discuss the accident in the Champion Reefs Mine of Kolar Gold Fields, resulting in the death of one miner and serious injuries to five others due to rockbursts during the night of 1/2 August, 1952. I should first like to know the position from the hon. the Labour Minister.

**The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri):** Sir, I owe an unconditional apology to you and the House for being late and not being present at the time when the discussion started here. I may however be allowed to give a short explanation for what it is worth. This notice or letter was communicated to me at 8-10 this morning. Not only that. This letter is dated 4th July, unfortunately by some mistake perhaps. But that has also confused the matter.