

[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.

I would like to say a word or two about the subject-matter of this motion. These rockbursts are frequently occurring. There is no question about it. The Government of India is in charge of supervision of these mines during the last one year. The other day there was a question in the other House, the Council of States, about these rockbursts and I have stated on behalf of Government that in view of the frequency of these rockbursts the Government have decided on the appointment of a court of enquiry in which the representatives of the workers and the representatives of the employers will be associated.

In the course of two or three weeks the Court of Inquiry is meeting in Mysore. Apart from this the rock-burst occurred a day or two ago when I also read in the press about this. It will take some time before an inquiry can be held in the ordinary course according to the procedure. It may take 2 or 3 days before we get all the facts of the matter. Under these circumstances, since the Court of Inquiry is going into the matter fully, all the hon. Members who are interested in that matter can also go and give evidence and state their views before the Court of Inquiry, and I assure the House that when the report is ready, that will be placed on the Table of the House, if necessary, for discussion.

Shri Vittal Rao: No doubt a Court of Inquiry has been appointed. That is an official inquiry. . . .

Mr. Speaker: I may remind him of one thing. I am only concerned with the advisability of his motion at this stage and not with the merits of the proposition.

Shri Vittal Rao: Sir, the rockbursts have been occurring frequently and there is the danger that it is going to occur every day. These are the deepest mines in the world. Moreover, when recently the hon. Minister of Production visited that place, the workers represented to him that there is a likelihood of closing down the Champion Reef Mine. If the mine is allowed to work, there is the further danger of accidents occurring there. I suggest that at least until the results of the inquiry are made known, the mine may be closed for the present and the workers be paid some unemployment relief.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure this will be taken into consideration and some preventive measures, if possible, will be taken. I do not think that we can profitably discuss this matter any more in the absence of facts. So I do not think I can give consent.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): I may assure you that I will speak very briefly. I do not believe that this Bill requires any lengthy speech from me. Almost all the points,—its legal aspects and its history—have been thrashed out, so much so, I will confine myself to a limited sphere. It has been found from the report of the Select Committee that amendments after amendments had been moved by various Members of the Opposition to the Bill. Several attempts have been made to restrict the scope of the Bill, at least to limit the duration of the Bill, at least to give some sort of help to the man who falls a victim to this Act. But on every occasion, these amendments have been defeated consistently by the party in power. It is not surprising that they did it. For example take the speech of any hon. Member from the other side including the hon. Member who spoke last and the speech made by the hon. Prime Minister. You will find that there is a consistent and a uniform note that the Preventive Detention Act has given the blessing of security in this country. The Congress party, consciously or unconsciously from the smallest to the biggest spokesman have taken the stand in this House and they stated that "we are surviving because of the Preventive Detention Act." I can quote from the speeches, but there is no time. The party in power believes that it exists because of this and the safety and security of this country is assured because of this lawless Act, the Preventive Detention Act. Whatever we may say, they know that this Act is very necessary for maintaining law and order and security of the country. Therefore, there is no use of arguing at length upon it with them.

There is another aspect. You will find in all the speeches a certain chorus. The hon. Prime Minister very generously said that there must have been mistakes very frequent mistakes and he admitted all that but he said that fundamentally this law has been employed in a healthy way. That has been their contention in all their speeches. If that is so, if that contention is correct, I am not one of those who is troubled by theoretical definitions of democracy and all that. I fully agree with the hon. Prime Minister when he says that the 19th century concepts of democracy cannot trouble us today. The 20th century has its problems. We are not wedded to that kind of democracy or