

[Shri Datar]

Bill—in the first instance it should be for a period of 48 hours. Let him say that it should be for a period of seven days. Why should we have an outer limit of two months, which I am opposing? If it is to be extended beyond two days or, if he chooses, beyond seven days, then there must be sufficient reasons. If there are sufficient reasons, as I have already mentioned, like danger to human life, danger to property, if such things are there, then I concede there can be an extension. But if on the report of a police officer or a report of any other officer an *ex parte* order is to be issued, the matter is no longer in the hands of the executive and it must go to an impartial person. That is why I have suggested the State Government. I am not saying that every issue must come to the Central Government. If you see the wording of my clause carefully, I said the State Government must come into the picture and that the High Court, the judiciary, must come into the picture and then if they are satisfied, then and then only the order can be extended.

16 hrs.

That was the purpose. So, as I have stated, because these four sections have been used for suppressing legitimate and lawful agitations and for suppressing even political parties, modifications and safeguards are necessary. That is the limited purpose with which the Bill has been brought before the House.

I am really happy to see that five or six hon. Members who participated in this debate have welcomed it except the hon. Minister who chose to play some other tune.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put the motion to the vote of the House.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, at least when the motion is put to the vote of the House there must be quorum.

Mr. Chairman: There is quorum. Anyway, I am having the bell rung. Now there is quorum.

The question is:

“That the Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was negatived.

16.04 hrs.

ARREST OF MEMBER

Mr. Chairman: Before we proceed with the next item of business, I have a brief announcement to make.

I have to inform the House that at 1.50 P.M. today the Speaker received the following telegram from Bombay dated the 24th February, 1961 (the name of the sender not stated in the telegram):

“Shri Prabhu Narain Singh, Member, Lok Sabha, courted arrest defying Police Commissioner’s prohibitory orders banning processions and unlawful assemblies to Raj Bhavan on 23rd instant at 7.40. P.M. Details follow. Refused to go on bail on his personal bond.”

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): The name of the sender is not there?

Mr. Chairman: It has perhaps been mutilated in the course of transmission of the telegram. We will know when we receive the confirmation copy.

16.05 hrs.

HINDU MARRIAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL

(AMENDMENT OF SECTION 23)
by Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi:

Mr. Chairman: We shall now proceed with the next item on the Order Paper. Shri Subiman Ghose..Absent. Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi,

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi (Ludhiana): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:

That the Bill to amend the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 be taken into consideration.