

company or whether it was to be refined by a nationalist and so on. It seems to me that by these agreements we have a chance of learning the art in advance of finding deposits of crude oil. For the moment I think the oil that would be refined will suffice for our present purposes, but experience has shown that our oil consumption is going up by about five or ten per cent. every year, so that as new sources become available, then we shall be able to find out new means of exploiting them. That applies even to synthetic oil from coal. At the moment I am advised that the oil produced by synthesising coal is not as economic as oil that you get by refining crude oil. But it may be that that situation may not remain permanent. There may be inventions which would reduce the cost of producing synthetic oil, and there is nothing to stop us from establishing plants in order to exploit that particular source.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** The hon. Minister referred to synthetic oil. A full scheme and a project report were prepared for manufacture of synthetic oil from low-grade coal which was available in abundance in India. Has anything been done about it, or has the idea been dropped for the time being?

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** It came up several times before the Planning Commission, and it was finally discovered that it would cost us more to get the oil by synthesising coal than by other means. At one time—I do not know whether it was before the hon. Member left us—there was a question as to whether we should have the refineries or whether we should have a plant for synthesising oil. Then there was the other aspect also, that whereas it is easier to store crude oil, it is not so easy to store coal.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** You can have both.

**Shri C. D. Deshmukh:** What I mean is that there is this advantage in favour of crude oil. Anyway, that other scheme has not been set aside for ever. If the economics of it changed for the better, I have no doubt that we should be able to find out some room for it not in this plan, but perhaps in the next plan.

I am afraid I cannot make very useful observations in regard to the establishment of the Central Geo-physical Laboratory, because I have been taken by surprise. I am not prepared to answer the hon. Member. I can imagine, knowing his expertness, that there must be a great deal of advantage in establishing such a geo-physical laboratory to train our own people so that we should be able to stand pro-

gressively on our own legs. All I can undertake to do is to draw the attention of the Ministry concerned to these observations.

Lastly neither the Finance Minister nor the Government is as static as the hon. Member opposite imagines. Speaking for myself, I cannot see why we should be prepared to face a certain amount of gentlemanly revolution. It all depends on how you define revolution. We are well aware of the fact that we are living in changing times. When the Planning Commission makes a reference to mixed economy, it does not mean a mixed economy in which the proportions of the mixture are fixed. The proportions may keep changing also; in our country which is quite notoriously under-industrialised, there is such a vast field in which the State can take an increasing amount of interest, that I cannot see any conflict of interests between the private and public sectors. It is not as if we are wedded to having recourse to capitalism for every further industrial venture.

With these observations, I commend my motion to the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

—————  
INDIAN PORTS (AMENDMENT)  
BILL

**The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas):** I beg to move:

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Ports Act, 1908, be taken into consideration.”

This is a very simple measure which seeks to amend two Sections of the Indian Ports Act 1908, section 14 and section 31.

12 NOON

The first one relates to the question of recovery of actual expenses incurred by the port authorities in salvaging property from a vessel which may be sunk or wrecked or stranded in the port. The present provision is that in such a case, the Port Authorities are empowered to sell the salvaged articles by public auction, and to recover the cost out of the sale proceeds. But there is no provision as to what will happen if the sale proceeds are not sufficient to cover the costs incurred. Power is now being taken in that behalf. The amendment now seeks to provide that in such a case, the outstanding difference will be recoverable from the owner of the vessel, and it is very necessary to do so. No such

[Shri Biswas]

case has arisen so far, in which the costs of recovery have exceeded the sale proceeds; but it is just likely that such cases may occur in the future. Therefore an amendment is now being made to provide that the liability for the deficiency shall fall on the owner of the vessel. When I said 'recovery charges', I should have added also a 20 per cent. surcharge. The amount to be recovered is not merely the actual expenses incurred, but is something exceeding that by 20 per cent. of the expenses.

The other amendment to section 14 is this. It is provided in the section as it stands now, that if the property is of a perishable nature, it shall be sold forthwith, but if it is not of a perishable nature then it must not be sold not less than six months after. It is now proposed to replace six months by one month. If one month is not sufficient, the time limit can be extended, as there is nothing in the Act to prevent such extension. One or two amendments have been tabled suggesting two months, or three months etc. I am prepared to accept as a compromise two months. It is always understood that if two months are not sufficient, then the time may well be extended by the Port Authorities.

Section 31 refers to the condition that any vessel coming within the port area, not below a certain tonnage or exceeding a certain tonnage, will require to have a pilot to be provided by the port authorities on board, so that the pilot may be able to safely guide the vessel along the channel. Take for instance, the river Hooghly; we know what dangerous shoals are there. Unless there is a pilot, it is unsafe to allow any navigation. The master of the vessel may not be familiar with all the difficulties. Therefore it has been provided that a pilot will be provided on board the vessel. The existing provision is that if the tonnage is 200 or more, a vessel would be required to have a pilot. If the tonnage is less than 200 but more than 100, then pilot may be dispensed with only with the authority of the port authorities. Now, the same provision is going to be made applicable to mechanically propelled vessels, steam vessels and so on. It is now suggested by means of the amendment that that provision will be applicable to mechanically propelled vessels of less than 100 tons also.

That is all that this Bill seeks to provide. I hope the Bill will be accepted without any further discussion. I shall accept the amendment to Clause 2 (a), seeking to substitute

'two months' in place of the words 'six months' in sub-section (2) of section 14 of the Act.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Ports Act, 1908, be taken into consideration."

**Shri Raghabachari (Penukonda):** I rise to speak not as a person who is acquainted with the international law of ports and salvage operations and the liability of the owner, but more to find information in respect of one or two points. I am sure the Minister in charge will be able to enlighten us and clear the little doubt that I have. One such is this. In so far as the intention of this Bill is concerned, namely when an act of God or some accident has overtaken a vessel and the person loses the vessel and its contents.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. The loudspeakers are such that they catch even the slightest whisper.

**Shri B. Das (Jaipur-Keonjhar):** They are not loudspeakers, Sir. They are mikes. In the other House, the mikes are working much better.

**Shri Raghabachari:** I was mentioning the situation under which the liability under this Bill applies namely when an accident takes place and a vessel crashes, and then the owner loses the vessel and probably the contents of it also, except what can be salvaged in certain cases. So the point is that when an act of God or an accident really brings about this enormous loss to the owner, and because it happens to be your port you must clean it up for further use, you spend some money and then you want not only to pay yourself out of that which remains there, but you also want to hold him liable for the extra expenditure in case you cannot realise what you have spent. That means when he is visited by a misfortune you continue the misfortune to his home and then want him to be further subjected to the effects of this misfortune. Of course when we deal with the law we are not considering whether a man who has suffered must further suffer. But the question is, is it the international custom or is it the international law that the owner in spite of this accident or this misfortune should hold himself responsible to make good the additional expenditure you might have incurred in cleaning up the debris. In fact, in cleaning up the debris and in making the port free for further use, the bill might be enormous and over which he has no control. I am not likely to be an owner of a

vessel or a ship, but still the point appears to me to be important: Is it permissible or is it the usual international maritime law that such a thing should be done? That is one difficulty which I felt. I wish to be enlightened on that matter.

Then you have provided some time, six months, within which you can recover the thing over-spent. There are certain objections that this time or period is long. I personally feel, possibly when you have to recover the thing, not necessarily from a national and, it may be from a foreigner and so six months' period may not be long. That is a point on which I felt a little diffident and that is the only thing I wish to submit.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy** (Mysore): The amendment that has been proposed by the hon. Minister is, I feel, very harsh, harsh to the owner of a vessel which is wrecked or stranded or sunk near a port. My friend, Mr. Raghobachari drew your attention to a fact: suppose the owner of a vessel loses the vessel and if that owner is asked to pay the balance of the excess expenditure spent by the port authorities or the Conservator, then it would be very unreasonable, and I concur with this view. It will be very harsh on the owner of a vessel after having lost his vessel, if he is asked to pay the balance of expenditure, and there is also the possibility that the owner...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then who is to pay? The general tax-payer? Somebody has to pay.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** I do not want to express any opinion upon that. The expenditure involved may be more due to lack of care and insufficient control exercised by the Conservator or any officer there and for that the owner of a vessel cannot be expected to suffer. So it is a very arbitrary measure and I feel that it is not advisable to introduce this amendment. Suppose there are two parties owning one vessel and that vessel is wrecked or sunk near the port, who is the authority to decide the extent of cost to be borne between these parties. And these two parties may be innocent. They may not be responsible for the sinking of the ship or the wreckage of the ship. It may be due to some inadvertence or some inconvenience felt near the port. Naturally, as we all know, the owner does not want to see that his ship is sunk, and it may be entirely due to some other causes. For that if the owner of the ship is made to pay, it is rather very harsh and unjustifiable.

Another point is that the hon. the Minister has brought out an amendment to the period required for auction. He says 'one month' should be substituted for 'six months'. In this connection I have suggested an amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister has said that he is prepared to accept 'two months'.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Then it is all right. I only submit that the period is too short and more time is to be given to the parties concerned, to take some steps...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The more the time, the greater the cost.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Moreover there is a provision here that there may be a surcharge, so to say, of nearly 20 per cent. demanded from the owner of the vessel. I do not know the reason why this should be added... (Interruption).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has proposed that in the matter of recovery of loss this surcharge need not be added. It may be so with respect to deduction from the sale proceeds.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** In this connection, I may submit that after all, when the ship is insured—I think all ships are insured—why not the Insurance Company be made to pay this deficiency, if there is any. The owners of the ship should not be put into this trouble, and the Insurance Company may as well be asked to pay the difference or the balance.

My last submission is that there is some sort of doubt regarding the international law on this point. Suppose a foreign ship—a ship belonging to a foreign private individual or a foreign nation—comes to our port, and it is sunk or wrecked near the port, then I want to know whether the Indian Ports Act is applicable to the foreign owner. Are we not governed by international maritime laws in this matter in order to be able to demand the expenditure involved in salvaging the wreckage. I want a clarification from the hon. Minister on these points.

पंडित मुनीश्वर दत्त उपाध्याय (ज़िला प्रतापगढ़—पूर्व) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहाँ तक इस विषयक का सम्बन्ध इस प्रश्न से है कि अगर कोई जहाज़ पोर्ट (port) में आ कर खराब हो जाय या डूब जाय और उस को दुस्त करने में या साफ करने में

[पंजित मुनीश्वर दत्त उपाध्याय]

जो खर्चा हो वह खर्च नीलाम करने से न पूरा हो सके तो जितनी कमी पड़े उस कमी की बसूलयाबी का कोई प्रबन्ध होना चाहिये, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि ऐसा संशोधन लाया जाय। लेकिन यह एक बड़ी आपत्ति का समय होता है जबकि किसी का जहाज डूब जाय। इतना बड़ा नुकसान हो जाय और उस नुकसान को पूरा करने के लिये जहाज भी बिक जाय, नीलाम हो जाय और फिर भी पूरा खर्चा न बसूल हो और मालिक को अपने घर से देना पड़े तो इस में सन्देह नहीं कि और कोई उस का जिम्मेदार नहीं हो सकता। देना तो उस को ही है। जो जहाज का मालिक है उस ने उस जहाज से बहुत कुछ पैदा किया, उस को इस्तेमाल किया, अब उस को देना पड़ता है तो उस को देना ही चाहिये। अगर वह न दे तो खर्च तो होता ही है, वह खर्च किसी न किसी के जिम्मे तो लगेगा ही, ऐसी हालत में सिवा टैक्स-पेयर के और किस के जिम्मे वह लग सकता है। इस वास्ते उस की अदायगी की जिम्मेदारी टैक्स-पेयर (Tax payer) पर हो यह मुनासिब नहीं है। जहाज चलाने वाले बड़े बड़े मालदार लोग हुआ करते हैं और थोड़ा सा खर्च दे देना उन के लिये बहुत कठिन नहीं हो सकता है।

लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे केवल एक बात कहनी है और वह यह है कि उन को जो समय अदायगी के लिये दिया जा रहा है वह बहुत कम है। ऐसी आपत्ति के समय में यह कहना कि एक महीने के अन्दर वह सारा रुपया दे दे, नहीं तो और तरीकों से, जिन को कोर्सासिब मेज़र्स कहा जा सकता है, बसूल किया जाय यह मुनासिब नहीं है। अभी माननीय मंत्री जी ने फरमाया कि वह एक महीने के बजाय दो महीने कर सकते

हैं। अब जो मैं पेश करना चाहता था उस को सुन कर माननीय मंत्री जी कहेंगे "अरे भाई, फर्क ही क्या रह जाता है दो महीने में और तीन महीने में"। सम्भव है वह यही जवाब दें लेकिन मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि उन्होंने जो दो महीने की तजवीज की है उस को तीन महीने कर देने से कुछ थोड़ा सा सहारा हो जाता है। केवल थोड़ा समय मिल जाता है नहीं तो इस में कोई उसूल या सिद्धान्त की बात नहीं है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि एक महीने में कोई विपत्ति नहीं आ जाती है इस लिये जो समय है उस को एक महीने की बजाय तीन महीने कर दिया जाय।

दूसरी बात जो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता था वह यह है कि अगर किसी शल्स का जहाज खराब हो जाय, डूब जाय या ऐसी हालत में हो जाय और उस का कोई दावेदार न हो, और अगर दावेदार हो भी तो जो मुनासिब खर्च हो उस के देने के लिये तैयार न हो, समय के अन्दर, तो उस के लिये इस में यह संशोधन किया जा रहा है। अब तक यह होता था कि जो जायदाद जल्दी खराब होने वाली नहीं होती उस के लिये छः महीने का वक्त दिया जाता था कि उस के बाद वह नीलाम हो। उस की बजाय आप ने इस में एक महीना दिया है। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन यह है कि यह एक महीना का समय अपर्याप्त है। पहले तो इस के लिये छः महीने का वक्त रक्खा था और वह काफ़ी सोच समझ कर रखा था। जब कभी ऐसी कोई चीज हो जाती है तो थोड़ा समय लगता है और कई दावेदार खड़े हो सकते हैं, कभी कभी दावेदारों में भी झगड़ा पड़ जाता है। फिर आप ने मुनासिब खर्च, रीज़नेबल एक्स्पेंसेज (reasonable expenses) की बात

कही है इस को खर्च करने में भी समय लग सकता है। लेकिन इस में पूरा समय जो दिया जा रहा है वह एक महीने का है, अगर उस के अन्दर मुनासिब खर्च नहीं दिया जाता है तो जायदाद नीलाम कर दी जायगी। पहली बात तो यह है कि मुनासिब खर्च तय करने में समय लगेगा, दावेदारों के बीच झगड़ा पड़ सकता है कि यह आदमी सही दावेदार नहीं है या वह आदमी सही दावेदार नहीं है। ऐसी स्थिति में जो यह छः महीने का समय रखा गया था, मुझे ऐसा जान पड़ता है बहुत मुनासिब समझ कर रखा गया था। लेकिन अगर आप इतना समय न दे कर तीन महीने का भी रख दें तो यह मुनासिब समय होगा।

मैं चाहूंगा कि यह दो संशोधन इस बिल में कर दिये जायें। और जो चीजें इस में हैं वह बहुत अच्छी चीजें हैं, इस वास्ते इस के लिये प्रबन्ध हो जाय कि जहां खर्च की कमी पड़े तो उस को मालिक से वसूल किया जाय। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसे समय बहुत कम आयेंगे जब कि यह करना पड़े क्योंकि जहाज बहुत बड़ी चीज है और इतना सामान उस में से निकल सकता है कि नीलाब करने से खर्च की वसूलायी हो सके। मगर सम्भव है कि कोई ऐसा मौका आ जाय महज इस के लिये यह प्रबन्ध किया जा रहा है। मैं फिर कहूंगा कि जहां तक समय का सम्बन्ध है वह तीन महीने कर दिया जाय तभी उन लोगों को सहूलियत मिल सकती है और हमारा उद्देश्य भी पूरा हो सकता है।

**Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram):** There is a point which is rather ambiguous in the Bill as it has been presented by the Law Minister. There is a section in this Bill to which I should like to invite the attention of the House. The new sub-section (4) proposed to be added says:

“(4) Where the sale proceeds of the property are not sufficient to

meet the expenses and further sum aforesaid, the owner of the vessel at the time the vessel was wrecked, stranded or sunk shall be liable to pay the deficiency to the conservator on demand, and if the deficiency be not paid within one month of such demand the conservator may recover the deficiency from such owner in the manner laid down in sub-section (2) of section 57 for recovery of expenses and damages or in any other manner according as the deficiency does not or does exceed one thousand rupees.”

It is left to the unfettered judgment of the conservator to demand from the owner of the ship as to how much he should pay in excess of what has been incurred. Now this seems to be highly improper because the conservator is employed by the Port authority. His duty is to see to it that as far as possible the ports are not mulcated, are not impoverished as a result of the dredging operations. Whenever a ship is sunk it is an extremely difficult matter to salvage it and sometimes it has happened that men-of-war have been brought from Singapore and other places in order to salvage these ships. Whether it is due to the negligence of the owner or whether it is due to the negligence of the Port Trust authorities is not made clear here. But the most important point is that the conservator is constituted as the final judge of this matter and there is no procedure devised for having an investigation. One would have thought that at least there would be service of notice in writing and opportunity given to the owner to make clear his point of view before the sum is determined. Only after going into complicated questions of law, fault and neglect, the matter should be decided.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I think it is not in order for the hon. Member to proceed with these arguments. The port is a small place and all the wrecked ships are there. There is no place for new ships and I do not know in whose interest the hon. Members are speaking when they urge that the wrecked ships should continue to be there. Either the owner should remove the wreckage or the conservator should do so. If the wreckage is removed and the articles are salvaged by the conservator, the owner should remember that he himself would have had to incur similar expenditure had he attempted to do so. Now, it is the conservator who does it, and he does so because he has to make room for other vessels. If there is a profit, even then the owner can question the conservator and say that the articles have

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

not been sold at the highest price. If there is an agency in the Act for disputing the conservator's estimate, then that agency would look into the matter. If there is no agency for that, there cannot be any agency for this. I am afraid therefore that the hon. Member's arguments are out of order.

**Shri Biswas:** There is section 57(1) which expressly provides that if any dispute arises as to the amount to be paid in any case, then it shall be determined by a magistrate on an application made to him for the purpose by either of the disputant parties.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let us not create complications in an amending Bill.

**Dr. Krishnaswami:** If there is an ambiguity, we are entitled to obtain clarification. Here, the question of salvaging the ships arises only when there has been negligence on the part of the owner. Supposing due to no fault of his but due to the fault of the port authorities the ship has been sunk, who should bear the expenses?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All these things must have been considered when the original Act was passed.

**Dr. Krishnaswami:** But surely the owner of a ship should not be called upon to pay immediately within a month of such demand, because that would be highly arbitrary. Opportunity should be given to him to clarify his stand. After all, if the ships are heavily insured, then it follows that the Insurance Companies would be called upon to pay, but that by itself is no ground for suggesting that the conservator should alone be the judge in these matters. There is a lacuna which ought to be filled and if the hon. Minister has got something to say on this matter it would considerably help the House to arrive at a reasonable decision.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** The provisions appear to be rather stringent. So, will not our shipping industry be seriously affected?

**Shri Biswas:** I am rather surprised at the speeches which have been made on this simple Bill. I never expected it would take more than ten minutes to get it passed. That only shows that hon. Members who have spoken have not taken the trouble to read the original Act, wherein all the provisions they want are contained.

A good deal has been said about the hardship that would be caused to the owner in paying the charges. One

Member asked: why should not the Insurance Companies pay them? That is exactly my point. The owner will recover whatever he pays from the Insurance Company. If the vessel is insured, the charge will ultimately fall not on the owner but on the Insurance Company. The recovery of these charges should therefore be a matter between the owner and the Insurance Company. Section 14 provides that if any vessel is wrecked, stranded or sunk in any port so as to impede the navigation thereof, the conservator may cause the vessel to be raised, removed or destroyed in order to get the navigation free, and it shall indeed be the duty of the port authorities to clear the port of all such obstructions. Having provided for that, it goes on to say that if in the course of these operations any property is recovered, then if there is no claim laid to it within a definite period, it shall be put up for sale by public auction, and if out of the sale proceeds any excess over the expenses is left, that will be made over to the person claiming it, and if there be no claimant, then the money is to be held by the port authorities to the credit of the person who may establish a claim to it.

There is no provision as to what would happen if the sale proceeds are not sufficient to cover the whole of the expenses incurred, and there is therefore the need for this amendment. It may be asked why we want to introduce this provision when there has been no such case up to now. I may say that only two or three years ago there was a severe storm at Vishakapatnam and many ships were sunk. And we know that recently many vessels—second-hand ones—have been purchased from Disposals. Many owners may find it profitable to get these ships sunk or stranded, and then salvaged by the port authorities at much greater expense than what they would be liable for if they tried to salvage those vessels themselves. They would have to pay much more, and therefore they would much rather leave it to the port authorities. Is it suggested that in such cases the port authorities should be saddled with the charges?

Questions of international law have been raised, and I have been asked to state the legal position. I do not pretend to be an expert in international law in respect of shipping or any other matter, but I can say that this amendment is based on similar provisions found in the Shipping Acts of the United Kingdom, Australia etc.

In the U. K. Navigation Act, you find a section which says:

"If the money arising from such sale shall not be sufficient to defray the charges and expenses aforesaid, the excess thereof beyond the proceeds of such sale shall be chargeable to the owner of such vessel and if not paid within twenty days after having been demanded shall be recovered in a summary way as hereinafter mentioned."

Here, we have said that if the money is not paid by the owner in the manner mentioned in sub-section (2) of section 57, then it may be recovered in another manner. I may read section 57(2). It says that whenever a person is liable to pay any sum not exceeding Rs. 1000, then that amount may be recovered as if it were a fine; but where the sum exceeds Rs. 1,000, then it may be recovered in any other manner, i.e. by having recourse to a civil suit or the Public Demands Recovery Act, if that Act can be made applicable. The date of actual payment will not be one month or two months. He would pay long, long after.....

**Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior):** We are quite convinced. He can stop.

**Shri Biswas:** I wish my hon. friend speaks on behalf of the other sections in the House.

**Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour):** In the amendment it is proposed that no mechanically driven vessel of any description should be allowed to get into the harbour without a pilot. Then what is the necessity of putting "of less than 200 tons."

**Shri Biswas:** That provision is there in the original Act and we are only introducing a short amendment which is applicable to mechanically propelled vessels.

**Shri Nambiar (Mayuram):** I could not understand the implication of the last portion of the proposed sub-section (4) which reads: "for recovery of expenses and damages or in any other manner according as the deficiency does not or does exceed one thousand rupees."

**Shri Biswas:** If the hon. Member had heard my speech, he would have understood it. If it is less than Rs. 1,000 it would be recovered as fine; if it is more than Rs. 1,000 it would be recovered in some other manner.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Ports Act, 1908, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

**Clause 2.—(Amendment of section 14)**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister is prepared to accept Mr. Gurupadaswamy's amendment; he may move it.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** I beg to move:

In page 1, lines 6 and 7, for "one month" substitute "two months".

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

In page 1, lines 6 and 7, for "one month" substitute "two months".

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The other amendments are out of order. The question is:

"That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

**Shri Biswas:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

#### PREVENTIVE DETENTION (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

**The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju):** I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, be taken into consideration."

The procedure that was adopted the other day when I sought leave to introduce the Bill and the very large number of amendments that have been tabled indicates that the Bill has aroused some attention. I was under the impression that it was a very short Bill....

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East):** Innocuous!