

**APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN TO  
THE COMMITTEE OF  
PRIVILEGES**

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have one announcement to make, viz., that as Dr. Patabhi Sitaramayya has left the Council of States to take up the post of Governor in Madhya Pradesh, I have appointed Shri C. C. Biswas to be the Chairman of the Committee of Privileges.

**THE PREVENTIVE DETENTION  
(SECOND MENDMENT) BILL, 1952—  
concluded.**

MR. CHAIRMAN : Further consideration of the Bill to amend the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, as passed by the House of the People.

CLAUSE IO

The motion is :

That clause io stand part of the Bill.

There are a number of amendments to clause io.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : I move :

At page 2, line 49, for the word 'twelve' the word 'three' be substituted.

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travan-core-Cochin) : I move :

At page 2, in lines 49-50, for the words 'shall be twelve months' the words 'shall not be more than three months' be substituted.

Sir, in the course of the debate on this Bill, it has transpired th t the hon. Home Minister is not prepared to give certain concessions to those who will be detained according to ordinary legal process as he said. There might be many reasons for that. I do not contest that and in the way that he has been expressing, he has reached almost J

the last limits of boredom in the matter. He would like to conserve all the powers in his hands ; we do not mind that, but at the same time I do not understand how a man can be detained for one year. Why not detain him three months ? Then we need not have even this Advisory Board and all the other expenses. We could save the whole thing. In our place the police are very efficient. One week in the hands of the police is good enough. In certain cases one day is good enough. Why should a man be detained for all the twelve months ? The information that is received by the police is generally from some kind of informants. The Home Minister was talking of the District Magistrates and other big officers in the States writing the detention order. The detention order may be written by anybody but the information is received by the ordinary C. I. D. men from the ordinary informants and mostly condemning certain people. People who have got local differences might give prejudicial information against each other to the police which finally culminates in a detention order by a District Magistrate. I do not think the District Magistrate is asking anybody to fish out information. It is the ordinary policeman that brings up the information. This Act is actually giving all the rights and powers to the ordinary policeman and the informants who bring the information which the Government is not to test by any usual process of law. Why should you have one year for that and why not make it three months and give up the Advisory Board and everything ? We do not mind that. Let it be three months. What is wrong with that ? Even otherwise it will take about two months for the whole matter to be brought up before the Advisory Board. Add one more month and give up all the formalities about it. The Home Minister was telling us when we were discussing about the amendments to the Criminal Procedure Code that the present Evidence Act is very good and hearsay evidence will not be admitted. I said at that time that it would be impossible to prove any corruption with he amended Criminal Procedure Code.