

**RE: ADJOURNMENT MOTION
ABOUT LABOUR SITUATION IN
KANPUR**

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): May I submit, while respecting your decision about the adjournment motion about the labour situation in Kanpur and the closing down of three mills, I submit a Calling Attention notice has been moved by Shri Jagdish Awasthi. We do not get any opportunity to discuss the whole question at the time of the Calling Attention notice. I want to impress on you, Sir, if this adjournment motion is allowed, we will be given some time to discuss. This is a question of 14,000 labourers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is that all?

Shri Jagdish Awasthi (Bilhour): This is a very important matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In the first instance, the hon. Member began by saying that he respected my decision. But, in fact, he did not respect it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I do

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If I may judge, it is not submission to that decision of mine. It is having one's own way. It was not submission to my decision. I am sorry for that. Anyhow, if he wants that some discussion should take place, the Calling Attention matter is coming up and then we can decide. I have already said the other day that, if any hon. Member feels aggrieved by the decision, he can come into the Chamber and then have a discussion. We will discuss whether something could be done about that and I will also advise the hon. Member to follow the same path. Then, we will see what can be done. The Calling Attention Notice is there. Perhaps that would be coming up soon. Now, we might proceed with the further programme. The hon. Home Minister.

**PREVENTIVE DETENTION (CON-
TINUANCE) BILL**

The Minister of Home Affairs
(**Pandit G. B. Pant**): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to continue the Preventive Detention Act, 1950,

for a further period, be taken into consideration."
12.05 hrs.

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

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): On point of order,....

The Preventive Detention (Continuance) Bill is here. We have not been supplied with the original Act which is to be continued. In the margin of section 2 of this Bill, it is said, "Amendment of section 1, Act 4 of 1950". So, though it is said to be a Continuance Bill, it is in fact an Amendment Bill. If one section is to be amended or a part of it, are we not entitled to question the other sections or seek amendment to sections other than section 1?

Secondly, I would like to submit that consequential amendments are necessary. In the original Act, when the States Reorganisation had not taken place, there is mention of Part C States. I have not got a copy of the latest revision, unfortunately. Whether there was a revision of that nature regarding Part C States is not clear from this Bill. Therefore, my submission is that as the measure is before this House to amend that Act and continue it further for a period, we are entitled to revise or amend or oppose all other sections as they are. So, the original Act must be supplied before this Bill is taken into consideration.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not really understand the exact character of the objection. So far as the original Act is concerned, it has been in operation all these years and I should imagine that every hon. Member of this House is acquainted with its contents. It would be presumptuous on my part to assume that even one single Member in this House, after all the controversies, discussions and debates that we have had, still continues to be unacquainted with the contents of the Bill. Copies must be in the Library. If any one had any further desire to see a copy, one could have perhaps taken the trouble of going to the Library and seeing a copy. If the hon. Member had asked, I would have tried to furnish him with one, or if