

[Shri N. Kanungo.]

One remark was made that the Convention has been bodily incorporated in the Bill. It is true. This follows the structure of the earlier Act which this Bill proposes to replace and the Convention is part of the statute. Reciprocity is provided in the sense that the Central Government has provided in clause 2(b) of the Bill that until reciprocity is available and the Government of India is satisfied that such reciprocity is available and declares its decision in the Official Gazette, the provisions of this Bill will not apply. In other words, though the Convention has been agreed to by various countries, the application of the Act as far as awards in those countries or other countries are concerned, will depend on the assessment at a given time of the laws which are passed in the other countries and reciprocity being available to the Government of India along with those countries. When these conditions are satisfied, such countries will be included and notified in the Gazette and then only the provisions of the Bill will be enforced.

I certainly admit that the Bill does not go even as far as the Convention has gone, but the Convention is merely an intention of the countries which are parties to it. It will depend upon whether we go further or not. It will depend upon the conditions existing in other countries and in our country as well.

The distinction made between the physical person and legal person, which has been mentioned, applies to Article I only and not to Article III. The question of that distinction does not arise. Whatever doubt there was about corporations being governed under this Bill has been provided for by amending the Companies Act. Certain doubts were expressed by certain courts in India about the provisions in the Companies Act. I suppose it is section 389, which has been now amended, in the Companies Act which now makes the position clear, that is, whether it is a corporation or

an individual, they will be covered by an award which is covered by the present Bill when it is passed, and there will be no doubt about it.

Sir, I commend the Bill for the acceptance of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): The question is:

"That the Bill to enable effect to be given to the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, done at New York, on the tenth day of June, 1958, to which India is a party and for purposes connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There is no amendment to any of the clauses.

Clauses 2 to 11 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI N. KANUNGO: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION (CERTIFICATION MARKS) AMENDMENT BILL, 1961

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI N. KANUNGO): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952, be taken into consideration."

Sir, before I proceed to explain the provisions of the Amendment Bill, I

would like to indicate briefly the functions of the Indian Standards Institution, the work it has done so far and the main purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act.

The Indian Standards Institution was set up in the year 1947. The main objects of the Institution are to draw up and promote the adoption of standards for materials, commodities, structures, operations, practices, etc. and from time to time to revise, alter or amend them on the basis of developments in technology. The advantages of the establishment of such standards are on the one hand a certain amount of uniformity in material and processes resulting in economy in manufacture and on the other quality control which would make available to the consuming public goods possessing the basic minimum specifications. The total number of standards established by the Indian Standards Institution so far is 1485. During the period of the Third Five Year Plan the Institution proposes to establish another 1500 standards.

The Institution is managed by a General Council consisting of representatives of trade and industry and the various Departments of the Government of India and State Governments.

The Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks Scheme was introduced under the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952. Under the authority vested by the Act, the Indian Standards Institution grants licences to manufacturers to apply the Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks on their products in token of conformity of the products to the Indian Standards concerned. Before such a licence is granted, the Institution deputes a technically qualified inspecting officer for inspecting the factory of the applicant. He gathers first-hand information about the manufacturing processes and the controls which are

exercised during production, and also determines whether adequate testing facilities are available in the factory for checking the incoming raw materials and the outgoing product and for carrying out necessary tests at different levels of control during production to ensure compliance with the standard specifications concerned. He draws random samples from the production line, which are subsequently sent to approved laboratories for testing. Only after the inspector's report and test reports of samples are found fully satisfactory, the Institution grants the manufacturer a licence to which is annexed a Scheme of Testing and Inspection which the licensee has to follow rigidly. The scheme also prescribes the maintenance of adequate records about quality control during production.

In addition to the checks exercised by the licensees themselves, the Indian Standards Institution carries out periodical inspections of the factories of the licensees and of their production records to ascertain whether the scheme prescribed in the licence is being adhered to properly. The Indian Standards Institution also draws from time to time random samples of the products from the factories. These samples are tested in the factories as well as in independent laboratories. Surprise inspections are carried out and samples drawn during such inspections are tested. Samples of Indian Standards Institution Certificate Marked goods are obtained from the market and from parties to whom supplies are made by the licensees and these samples are subjected to tests. Thus, the Indian Standards Institution maintains a constant watch over the quality of the marked goods. In addition, the Institution rigidly examines each point regarding the performance of a licensee during the preceding operative periods of the licences, before renewing a licence for a further term.

To check any possible misuse or abuse of the Indian Standards Insti-

[Shri N. Kanungo.]

tution Certification Mark by licensees or others, the Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks Act and its Rules and Regulations extend powers to the Indian Standards Institution and to the Government of India to take suitable action against offenders. The Act prescribes fines up to Rs. 10,000 and forfeiture to Government of all goods, for improper use of the Indian Standards Institution Certification Mark. Furthermore, a licence can be suspended or cancelled by the Institution if it is satisfied that the licensee concerned has used the Standard Mark in respect of any article or process which does not conform to the relevant Indian Standards, or the licensee fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the licence.

As a further safeguard for the consumer, the Indian Standards Institution has made it obligatory for all licensees that if goods bearing the Indian Standards Institution Certification Mark do not conform to the Indian Standards concerned, the licensees will be required to replace them free of cost.

Because the Certification Mark is allowed to be applied only after proper inspection and ensuring continuous check of quality during the process of production, the Certification Marks Schemes are more economical, for they pay for themselves and more, by eliminating defectives, reducing wastages, bringing uniformity in production, etc. It has also been established that continuous check on production provides a better safeguard against defectives than batch sampling methods. To the buyer in particular, the Indian Standards Institution Mark indicates not only a third party guarantee for the conformity of the products to the Indian Standards concerned, but also an indication about the goods having been produced under a pre-planned system of control.

Since the Indian Standards Institution Marks Scheme ensures the elimi-

nation of chances of finished goods failing to conform to the Indian Standards concerned, the buyer can accept certified goods with a greater degree of confidence and without the need for any further inspection. The Scheme is also conducive to build up consumers' confidence in the producer and improvement of buyer-seller relationship.

Concerning the progress of the Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks Scheme, the following figures will bear out that though the Scheme is voluntary, it has been gaining in popularity:

Year	Number of Licences
1955-56	8
1956-57	18
1957-58	49
1958-59	45
1959-60	64
1960-61	105

Thus, up to 31st March, 1961, 289 licences were issued against 93 Indian Standards covering a diverse range of commodities.

I now come to the provisions of the Amendment Bill before the House. As the House will observe, it is a very short and simple Bill. Experience of working of the Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks Act for the last few years has shown that it is necessary to improve it in one or other respects. As the Act stands at present, having regard to the definition of Indian Standard given in section 2(c), only those standards which are established by the Indian Standards Institution itself (and not others) can be utilised for the purpose of Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks Scheme. Though the Indian Standards Institution has established quite a number of Indian Standards, standards for a large variety of products still remain to be formulated and finalised by it. Establishment of standards is a continuous process and the finalisation of a standard by the Indian Standards Institution takes time, having regard

to the fact that all persons and bodies concerned or interested in it are given an opportunity to give their comments on it. Briefly stated, the procedure is this. The Indian Standards Institution prepares a draft through its technical committees concerned and then sends it in wide circulation for a period of generally not less than three months for eliciting comments. Copies of the draft standards are also sent to many overseas countries and in particular to all the Commonwealth countries. After the comments are received, they are screened by the Technical Committees concerned and the draft is finalised in the light of the comments received from the various interests keeping in view in particular the present manufacturing practices and the consumers' needs. The draft is then sent for adoption to the Technical Division Council and it is only after such adoption that the standard is established and published by the Indian Standards Institution. Keeping in mind the purpose of establishing a standard, it is inevitable that it takes time. Pending the establishment of Indian standards for products not yet covered by the Indian Standards Institution, our industries and the trading community are following in respect of these products the standards adopted by other recognised bodies, e.g. the British Standards Institute. The Indian Standards Institution has been receiving numerous enquiries and requests for the application of the I.S.I. Certification Mark on products for which there are standards of other recognized organisations. Also, for the purpose of introducing quality control and for pre-shipment inspection in respect of products not still covered by Indian Standards, there is need for recognizing the standards of other bodies, particularly for our overseas buyers.

It is accordingly proposed that for the purpose of Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks Scheme, the I.S.I. should be able to recognise the standards framed by other bodies in respect of products for which there

are no Indian Standards. The procedure envisaged is that the I.S.I. for the purpose of the Scheme, will recognize through gazette notifications, standards established by other organizations for those products for which there may be an emergent need in the country. The first amendment seeks to enable the I.S.I. to do this.

The second amendment relates to the inspectors of the I.S.I. being declared as public servants within the meaning of the Indian Penal Code. The Indian Standards Institution was established through a resolution of the Government of India and is a registered society under the Registration of Societies Act XXI of 1860. Thus, the Institution's inspectors, as defined under the Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks Act and being employees of a non-governmental organisation, cannot be deemed to be public servants within the meaning of the Indian Penal Code. The inspectors are, however, required to carry out inspections of the factories with or without prior intimation and to draw samples of products, check records, demand information, test the samples within the factories, etc. It is, therefore, not unlikely that in the discharge of such duties, the inspectors will at some stage or other require legal protection. Fortunately, so far, no case has arisen in which such legal protection was required. But it is necessary that in the interests of efficiency and for providing adequate safeguard to the inspectors, a provision should be made for the inspectors being declared as public servants within the meaning of the Indian Penal Code. Such a provision exists in respect of the inspectors working under the Drugs Act, 1940, the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954, etc.

The third amendment seeks to extend the jurisdiction of the I.S.I. Certification Marks Act to the whole of India. At present, the jurisdiction of the Act, as provided under Section 1(2) of the Act, does not extend to the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

[Shri N. Kanungo.]

Many manufacturing concerns located in that State have expressed their keenness to avail themselves of the advantages of the Indian Standards Institution Certification Marks Scheme in the same manner as the concerns in the rest of the country are already enjoying. The State of Jammu and Kashmir have agreed to the Act being extended to that State.

With these words, I commend the motion for the acceptance of the House.

The question was proposed.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as the hon. Minister has informed the House, this Bill contains three amendments, the most important amendment being that the definition of "Indian Standard" in section 2 of the Act is extended so that standards which are not according to the standards of the Indian Standards Institution but which have been accepted as standards by other organizations may under certain conditions be also defined as Indian Standards. As far as the amendment is concerned, Sir, the real issue before the House is whether the work that has been done by the Indian Standards Institution so far has resulted in that confidence in the public in this country and abroad, that once this particular certificate is attached to a particular product, the quality of that product is dependable and could be freely used. The hon. Minister has given us a fairly lengthy account of the work which the Indian Standards Institution has been doing but there are some aspects of the functioning of this Institution which have not been touched upon by the hon. Minister, and I would like to take this opportunity of referring to those aspects of the work of the Indian Standards Institution to find out whether it is working satisfactorily or not.

The first question that comes to the mind is: After the certificate was

affixed to a particular standard and after a product was in the market, was there at any time any complaint to the effect that the product was not up to the specification and that something ought to be done in order to see that this specification was obtained? The hon. Minister has said that there is a procedure whereby this can be done; in case it is found that a particular product is not up to the specification, then the procedure is to replace that article by another produced according to the specification. Whether this particular provision was ever applied or whether as a result of that a certain product had to be replaced or not, that information has not been given by the Minister. If there is such information available, I would like to have it.

Secondly, the question of the quality of the Indian goods itself is involved in this, and we are all very much worried about it because of the fact that we want to develop our export trade as far as possible. There are reports in the press that so many times we are not able to develop our export trade because of the quality of our goods and that there are complaints from abroad that the products do not measure to the specifications as have been promised under the contract. Now, the Indian Standards Institution is one of the organs whereby it is to be seen that the specifications as contracted for are adhered to when the product is exported abroad. Now, if this is to be done the question arises whether this institution takes any special care to examine those products that are sent abroad, apart from the products that are consumed in this country, so that we may be sure that the specifications are adhered to and the products that go abroad are really of the quality which they claim to possess.

The third question which is of importance is whether, as far as the products that are sold in the market are concerned, any check is made to

see that these goods conform to the specifications which they claim to possess. So many times it happens that the product is not from the firm or the industry which the merchant claims it has come from. There are adulterations taking place elsewhere and these goods are sold in the market under a particular trade mark or a trade name. We would like to know whether any effort is made to see that whenever such adulterated goods are in the market, the Indian Standards Institution has got enough powers to find out whether the products did emanate from the manufacturers from whom the trader claims that he has received them or whether the prosecuting authority has only to depend upon the Adulteration Act in order to punish the people because, here again, it may be that this adulteration takes place with the connivance of the manufacturers. There is at least that possibility and the moment it is done with the connivance of the manufacturers, to my mind they directly fall within the purview of this particular Act because this Act has to see that the manufacturers produce all their goods according to certain specifications; not only that, they have to give their trade name and trade mark only to those goods which have been produced according to those specifications. And if it is found that because of their connivance or because of their active help certain adulterated goods go into the market in their trade name or trade mark without those specifications, then that also ought to fall within the purview of a law of this type.

These are some of the problems which arise because of the fact that in this country and abroad there is still a suspicion that the products which are on the market are not of the quality which they claim to be, and the largest number of complaints are made in reference to drugs and medicines. Here one is never sure of getting the right type of goods in spite of paying the right price.

Another simple instance is that of the inks that are now being produced over here. It has been found and it is my personal experience also, Sir, that the ink bottle that we buy by paying a particular price, which is for a particular standard and a particular specification, well, that ink bottle does not contain the ink which it should. From all outward appearances it looks as if it has not been tampered with at all. Then how does that happen? Does it happen then with the connivance and active assistance of the manufacturers, or are there certain other methods whereby this thing is being done? That also is a matter which, although not fully coming within the scope of this Bill or the parent Act, has to do with this law, and unless we are able to satisfy the consumers, and unless we are able to satisfy our outside customers in other countries, it will not be possible for us to establish that reputation which it is the responsibility and duty of this Institution to establish, and when these amendments are before the House, perhaps it would be a good thing to hear from the Minister if other amendments are considered necessary or are contemplated to be brought before this House, or whether he is satisfied that all these points are already covered by the Act. Are there statistics to show as to whether any complaints were made, whether any certificates were withdrawn and whether any products were replaced as a result of the work of this particular Institution? So far all that we have done is to establish a certain standard and to issue certificates, and I think we have not gone farther than this.

Sir I thank you

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras)
Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to make just one point, and I think it is rather an important point. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is stated

"It has been found desirable to allow Standard Marks being prescribed for articles or processes in

[Shri K. Santhanam.]

respect of which the Indian Standards Institution has not established its own Standards, but has recognised Standards established by others. It is proposed to achieve this object by appropriately amending the definition of 'Indian Standard'."

If the Bill does only this, I would not have risen, but it goes far beyond. Now the purpose of the original Act was to make the Indian Standards Institution solely responsible for standards, whether they had been evolved by themselves or whether they had been evolved by others and accepted by it. Now according to the Bill, as I read it, the power to recognise other institutions for the prescription of standards does not vest with the Indian Standards Institution alone; it also goes to the Government. So the responsibility gets divided; it is between the Institution and the Government, and the Government proposes to make rules. I think, Sir, it is a wrong thing to have this divided responsibility. I do not mind saying that the standards that are prescribed by others may be recognised, but they should be recognised by the Indian Standards Institution and it should be the sole and autonomous authority for recognising all standards as otherwise, once the responsibility becomes divided and part of the responsibility goes to the Government, and through the Government to all the Deputy Secretaries and finally to the Section Officers, I do not know what will happen. Anything may be recognised and nobody will know what happens. Anything in the name of standards may be recognised and nobody can be called to account, and therefore I think that the purpose of establishing the Indian Standards Institution will be defeated to the extent that this Bill goes far beyond the objects. I want the Minister to give us a categorical assurance that no standard will be recognised unless it is recommended by the Indian Standards Institution and that no other standards will be

prescribed unless they have been recommended by the Indian Standards Institution. If that assurance is given, I shall be satisfied.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Bill, as it has been presented, is a very simple Bill. The Minister has gone out of his way to explain to us the duties and functions of the Indian Standards Institution, and we are thankful to him for that.

Now coming to the Bill, I welcome the move to extend this Bill to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and it should be our policy to extend as many Bills as we possibly can to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. As far as possible the words, "except the State of Jammu and Kashmir", should not occur in any Bills to be presented in this House or the other House. Jammu and Kashmir is part of us and there is no reason why all the Bills should not be extended to that State.

Now my friend, Mr Santhanam, has raised a very fundamental point. I do not know how far the point is valid because, if we read what is in the original Act and what is being included now, most of his misgivings will vanish. I will read out the original sub-section (c) of section 2:

"'Indian Standard' means the standard (including any tentative or provisional standard) established and published by the Indian Standards Institution, in relation to any article or process, indicative of the quality and specification of such article or process:"

and now what is intended to be added is:

"and includes any standard recognised by the Institution under clause (aa) of section 3."

Now the onus of certification still lies with the Institution.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: My observations were chiefly directed to clause 4.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Now let me read clause 4:

"In section 3 of the principal Act, after clause (a), the following clause shall be inserted, namely.—

"(aa) recognise as an Indian Standard, in such manner as may be prescribed, any standard established by any other Institution in India or elsewhere, in relation to any article or process;"

And what is clause 3(a)? It is:

"established and published, in such manner as may be prescribed, the Indian Standard in relation to any article or process;"

and what is intended to be added is the one I read out from clause (aa). Still the onus lies with the Institution. They can check up any process finalised by any other institution.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: May I point out here that the word "prescribed" does not mean "prescribed by the Indian Standards Institution" but means "prescribed by the Government"?

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I am coming to that point also if you will just have a little patience with me. As I said, the onus still lies with the Institution.

Now there was some reference to the rules and divided responsibility as between the Institution and the Government. I see nothing inconsistent there. The rules cannot be framed beyond the scope of the Act. The rules will be framed to implement just what is contained in the Act or the Bill. Moreover, a healthy provision has been made in the amending Bill, and in this connection I invite attention to clause 6 where the provision has been made that any rules framed will come before both Houses of Parliament. This provision

was not there so far. This is a provision which is being introduced now. So, the final authority will vest with you, in this House and the other House. If you find that any rule is objectionable and it not consistent with the Act, you can drop it. That authority is with you. So, where is the question of Government having any authority? The authority is of Parliament, the authority is of the Institute and, therefore, I see nothing objectionable as far as the Bill is concerned.

As I said, it is a very simple Bill and there need not have been any remarks. But one thing worries me and that is whenever the Institute recognises any other institute's process or any method adopted by any other institute, ways and means must be found by the Institute to have a thorough check of its own before they agree to recognise the process finalised by any other institute. That is very important; otherwise the standards set by the Indian Standards Institution and the reputation gained by the Institute may be in jeopardy. They should not recognise processes of other institutes in haste or without making a full test about the processes which are recommended for recognition by other institutions. With these words I commend the Bill and hope it will receive the support of the House.

SHRI N. KANUNGO: Sir, I am very grateful to my hon friend, Mr. Bhargava, for the emphatic way in which he has supported the Bill and, for the matter of that, to all the preceding speakers who have supported the Bill by and large. At the outset I want to make clear one point made out by hon friend, Mr. Santhanam. It is that the recognition of a standard established by any institution other than the ISI will be primarily the responsibility of the ISI. The rule making power which has been provided is merely to prescribe the rules and procedures for giving the imprimature of the Government to that

[Shri N. Kanungo.]

recognition. Government is not competent and it does not take any powers to recognise any standards irrespective of the recommendation and acceptance of the I.S.I. The whole purpose, as I have tried to explain in my introductory remarks, is that the process of establishing a standard is a very long drawn-out process, and it is necessarily so because it requires a large amount of consultation and agreement between the parties concerned. With the limited means and resources of the I.S.I. it is not possible to provide Indian standards for all and every kind of product that are put in the market. Where all these preliminary processes have been carried out by any other institution and it is found by the I.S.I. that these procedures, before establishing a particular standard by a particular institution, have been adequate, I do not see any reason why we should not adopt it. For the time being, at least till the I.S.I. standards are established; it is quite possible that the I.S.I. may establish its own standards. It will be identical to other standards also, and in fact they will be. It is a matter for gratification that till the I.S.I. was inaugurated in India most of the manufacturers, who wanted to market their goods under the warranty of a particular standard, had to adopt the British Standards Specifications. In fact, in the Government purchasing organisations, which had a large amount of purchasing to do, they put a premium on goods which observed British Standards Specifications. Therefore, the purpose of the Act as it is, is adequately safeguarded and we have to remember that it is not the establishment of the standards but using a standard for the purpose of certification. The limited purpose of this Act is to use a particular standard for the purpose of certification

Now, certification means that the consumer gets the party's guarantee, in this case the label or the mark of the I.S.I. on the product, that the

product satisfies certain standards and the standards are known. It does not mean that all products will conform to standards. They do not claim to conform to any standard also. A particular case may be, as Mr. Dave mentioned, about inks or any other product. It is quite possible that standards having been established—and often standards had been established—a particular manufacturer, a particular producer, does not want to take advantage of the warranty of the I.S.I. mark for having a premium acceptance in the market for his products. I would submit to this House that the whole scheme of the I.S.I. standards and purchasing of the marks is a gradual process of building up a reputation by which the mark will carry certain warranties, psychologically in the minds of the consumers and of the producers themselves. When this idea sinks in the public mind in our country and in other countries also and goods bearing the certification marks—such a premium may be in price or possibly in acceptance—then naturally it will be followed by others and this process, I think, is more desirable than any compulsory process. In any case, as the House knows, while passing the original Act, the Government also has to come in for voluntary acceptance and not for any compulsion. I must say, Sir, as Mr. Dave has pointed out, the question of adulteration, the question of wrong specification, the question of conditions in the contract are not covered by this Act though it is necessarily desirable that there should be some sort of protection to the consumer about the genuineness or otherwise of the products which are available for sale. To that extent various other laws have been passed, particularly the Drugs Act and the Food Adulteration Act where procedures are laid down by which standards are laid, standards not in the sense of the I.S.I. standard but specifications are laid down and if they are infringed, penal actions are provided. The question of all products manufactured in the country and available to the trade or to the consumers to

conform to certain accepted standards is a very broad problem and has to be attacked and taken care of by various means of which this particular measure is only one. It does not claim to be expansive or to cover all eventualities. This merely provides that when a marking is allotted, certain conditions have to be fulfilled and the ISI has taken upon itself the responsibility to see by random checks of the processes and the products at the manufacturing end, in the process of manufacture, in the market, with the consumers and at various other stages, that standards are not lowered down. In course of time, this will no doubt enhance the prestige of the mark and will make it desirable for manufacturers to find it profitable for them to append the marks to their products. As for the question of whether there has been any infringement of the mark in the sense that the licensees have not observed the rules, etc., where penal action has to be taken, I am glad to say that penal action has not been necessary. There have been very few cases where during the course of inspection and checking by the ISI it has been found necessary to warn off the licensees to improve their methods of production and checking. In any case, the number of licensees is barely three hundred and the production is in thousands. Therefore, as far as the Act is concerned, it is merely one step in advancement for making the country aware of a third party which is competent to guarantee the products to the public and the consumers not only in our country but in other countries also. I commend the measure for acceptance of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN). The question is

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act 1952, be taken into consideration"

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 7 were added to the Bill

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

SHRI N KANUNGO. Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed"

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE MARKING OF HEAVY PACKAGES (AMENDMENTS) Bill, 1961

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND
COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJ
BAHADUR) Sir, I beg to move.

"That the Bill to amend the
Marking of Heavy Packages Act,
1951 as passed by the Lok Sabha,
be taken into consideration"

Sir, it was as far back as 1929 that the International Labour Conference, at its Twelfth Session, held in Geneva adopted a convention concerning the marking of heavy packages and it was as early as 1931 that India ratified that Convention. However, it was only after Independence that serious notice could be taken of this Convention and a law was put on the Statute Book which made it necessary for the consignors of heavy packages to mark plainly, durably and conspicuously such heavy packages and that law known as the Marking of Heavy Packages Act, 1951, was enacted in 1951. It was brought into force with effect from 1st November 1951. As I mentioned, section 3 of the parent Act of which the present Bill is an amending measure, makes it obligatory on the consignors of heavy packages to mark "plainly, durably