

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE RUBBER (PRODUCTION AND MARKETING) AMENDMENT BILL, 1954

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE (SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Bill as passed by the Lok Sabha is already with the hon. Members. The Select Committee, earlier, went exhaustively into the various provisions of the original Bill and also recorded evidence from some of the representatives of the industry. The various recommendations of the Select Committee have been incorporated in the Bill. In addition, the wishes expressed by some of the Members of the Lok Sabha that provision should be made—and I am quite sure that this suggestion would have come from this House also—for election of some of the representatives of growers and nomination of certain other representatives in whose case, due to lack of proper organisation, election is not the best means of choosing the representative, have been incorporated in the Bill. Then, this Bill, as it has emerged from the Lok Sabha, I hope, is of a non-controversial nature, relatively speaking.

I may be permitted to explain in brief the changes that have been made in the original Act. The difficulties of small growers have been appreciated and the major portion of the acreage of rubber cultivation is held by the

small growers. The small grower has been defined in the Bill as one whose estates do not exceed 50 acres in extent. Proper representation to these small producers of rubber will be given on the Board as directed by the Joint Select Committee. The labour representatives in the Board have been increased from three to four. The Houses of Parliament, as hon. Members might have noted, will be represented by three Members—two from the Lok Sabha and one from the Rajya Sabha. Membership of the Rubber Board will not disqualify a person from being a Member of Parliament. The Central Government will have no representative in the Board. However, Government officers can attend and take part in the proceedings of the Board though they will not be entitled to vote. With regard to the mode of selection of the members to the Board to represent the States of Madras and Travancore-Cochin, provision has been made for election or nomination, as may be prescribed in rules. The labour representatives will be selected from out of the panel of names submitted by the respective associations.

With regard to the Chairman of the Board, by and large, Members of the Select Committee and the Lok Sabha agree on the need for a nominated Chairman in order that there may be proper co-ordination between the Board and the Central Government. The Vice-Chairmanship of the Board will be an elective office.

An important provision has been made in the Bill to enable the Board to take steps to secure better working conditions for workers engaged in the rubber industry and to see that they are provided with amenities and incentives.

I should also like to tell the House that the present production of rubber is about 22,000 tons per year, while the demand is about 27,000 tons a year. The demand is increasing every year, while the supply is not keeping pace with the demand. It is proposed to fill up the gap over the short period

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]
by importing rubber, and over the long period by implementing the scheme for the development of the rubber industry. The Bill, when passed, would enable the Board to import rubber, and provision has been made as to how any profits that are made out of this import of rubber should be utilised. To increase the production of rubber, it is proposed to take up the development scheme, the details of which are being worked out. For this purpose, a provision has been made to enable the Government to increase the cess gradually from the present cess of 8 annas per 100 lbs. to one anna per lb.

It appears that at present the small grower is at a great disadvantage, as far as the marketing of his rubber is concerned. This problem is rather difficult to solve. Provision, however, has been made for the Rubber Board to take up marketing of rubber also. It is hoped that the new Board will be able to tackle the problem of the small grower successfully. It is hoped that the Board with such control and advice that Government can give, will be able to render useful service to the rubber industry.

I have given a skeleton, inviting the attention of the House to the salient features of this amending Bill. I have no doubt that critical observations will be made on the substance of the Bill, as also on its details, and it will be my duty to refer to them, and reply to them, in the course of the debate. Sir, I therefore, commend the Bill to the hon. Members of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is a Bill to amend another commodity

board, the Rubber Board. We are now having various boards for the development of tea, coffee, silk and now rubber. There are various others also like the Coir Board and things like that. You will find that all these boards are now completely under the thumb of the Commerce Ministry. The initiative has been taken away from private enterprise and has been passed on to the bureaucratic machine in Delhi. All this has been done for two purposes—of course, firstly, to develop the industry, in this case the rubber industry; and secondly, to eliminate the monopolistic stranglehold of the big planters or big interests, but the elimination of the big planters is not an end in itself. It is after all a means to an end. What is the end we have in view? It is the development of industry, and secondly, to help the small man. We must be very clear as to how we can achieve these two ends.

A short while ago, my friend, Mr. Kishen Chand, pleaded for fixing a ceiling on land holdings in the plantation industry. That has not been accepted by the hon. Minister. Sir, if you will look to the report of the Planning Commission, you will find that the Planning Commission has also suggested that ultimately we have got to have some sort of ceiling on land holdings in this country. We have eliminated the middlemen, the big landlords and the *zamindars*, but unless we radically change the system of our land holding, these measures will not lead us anywhere. I will beg of the hon. the Commerce Minister to look at the report of the Planning Commission itself and not deny categorically this principle which has already been accepted by the Planning Commission that a ceiling on land holdings will have to be fixed one day or the other. Do you know what is the biggest single estate of rubber? It is 20,000 odd acres belonging to the Malayalam Planters Ltd. Now, this estate is situated in Travancore, which, I am told, has got the highest density of population. As you know, all over India, and particularly in Travancore,

there is difficulty in developing industries where you can employ our men. We have got to provide land for the population there. Unless you accept this principle which has been enunciated by the Planning Commission, you cannot give them land and you cannot possibly solve the employment question. Therefore, I would have very much welcomed if the hon. Minister had not categorically denied the acceptance of this principle in respect of the plantation industry. It is quite another matter that we cannot enforce this principle today. If you look to the question of the development of Travancore-Cochin, you will find that the present Government there has introduced land legislation. Now, the Commerce Minister at the Centre has made certain assertions. Has he just thought, for a moment, what repercussions it is going to have on that legislation? There, they are trying to fix a ceiling for land holdings, and if the legislature there passed this measure, certainly these big plantations, whether rubber or coffee, will have to be broken up. The Rubber Board will have to co-operate there, and such categorical assertions on the part of the Minister here may create difficulties. I would like the hon. Minister to change his whole approach to this question. His whole thinking process must change. I will here refer to a very interesting book written by the *ex-Ambassador* of U.S.A. in this country, Mr. Chester Bowles, in which he has said that the Nehru Government is the most conservative Government in the whole of South East Asia, because they are not out to implement land reforms speedily, the same as has been done in other countries of South East Asia. He has suggested that the Government of India, if it wants to ward off communism, must implement land reform legislations immediately. Otherwise, there will be unrest and chaos. I hope my hon. friend, Mr. Karmarkar, for whom I have great regard, will not misunderstand me if I state all these things.

Sir, my friend has already said that there are already a large number of

small holders in the rubber plantation industry. For the benefit of the House, I will give some figures, which will show the importance of these small growers. I am giving these figures from the report of the Indian Tariff Board. On page 5 of the report, they say that the number of estates of and over 100 acres is 253, and they hold an acreage of 1,02,576 acres. This means that these 253 estates hold 60.5 per cent. of the acreage under rubber. The number of holdings between 50 and 100 acres is 198. They hold an acreage of 13,338, or 7.9 per cent. The small holders between one acre and 50 acres are 13,412 in number and they have an acreage of 53,512. This shows the importance of the small holdings in the rubber industry. You can, therefore, appreciate all that we have got to do for them.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA) in the Chair.]

We know that the yield from the small estates is terribly low—somewhere between 170 to 200 lbs. per acre whereas very large yield of 1,000 to 1,200 lbs. per acre has been obtained in the more prosperous and bigger estates. The first task is to increase the yield per acre of these small holdings. How can you do that? It can only be done if you encourage the initiative of the small man, and if you harness together his enterprise. How can you do that? The problems of this industry are slightly different from that of other plantations because if you know the process by which rubber is obtained, you will appreciate that the trees are tapped for getting rubber. These trees take a long time to mature before they can give yield. Now the small man, holding a few trees cannot possibly regulate the manner of taking away of rubber juice from these trees so that they can give a good yield and which can prolong the life of the trees. Therefore, I am told that they adopt a system of slaughter tapping, and by this method most of the trees have become more or less useless. Now

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]

the first thing to be done is to replant these trees and for that we must enlist the co-operation of the growers. Is it possible for them to replant these trees and wait for the income for another 8 years? It is physically impossible for them because they prefer to get even a few annas today, instead of having to wait for a few rupees after some years. Therefore, he is not willing to co-operate with you to replant his estate. So the first thing that we must do is to provide large amount of money so that we may either give them subsidy or loans to enable them to replant their rubber trees. This has been done in Ceylon where they have a Department of their own—a Small Holdings Development Department for rehabilitation of rubber estates. Now for 8 years we must give them some subsidy equivalent to what they were getting from their old trees. You might call it loan or subsidy or anything you like and you may even recover it later. Secondly, you provide them with tree grafts or seedlings. The Rubber Board failed to do all these since 1947 or earlier. Now we have a big gap. We have to fill up this leeway and for that we require funds. The Government of India must make up their mind to provide the necessary finance for this replanting work which is a very huge task by itself. Again I will give you figures to show the enormity of the work to be done. The best yield is obtained from the budgraft rubber and next to that comes the clonal seedling and then of course the ordinary plantation which is not a very good yielder. Now we find that upto 31st December 1953 the big estates had under ordinary plantation 70,578 acres and under the budgraft rubber, which is the best, 23,000 acres and against this the small growers had under budgraft rubber only 2,239 acres. Now as regards the clonal seedling, the big estates had put 8,647 acres under this variety. The small growers, had only 1,912 acres under clonal seedling. So he—the small man—is not able to replant with improved

high yielding strains because he has not the money to do this work. Now, therefore, the first thing to be done is, we must place enough funds at the disposal of the Board, and for that we have got a provision in this Bill to raise the cess to one anna per lb.

It is now left to the Government either to raise the cess or not. It is proposed to collect this cess from the rubber manufacturers. Why I am taking the time of this House now is that the Government must not feel shy to do this. As soon as this Bill is passed, they must realise the maximum amount of cess and I am told that probably they will get Rs. 30 lakhs from this. They must have this amount. Who is going to pay this? The manufacturers. I can tell you that I have very interesting data. I was looking into the Investors' Year Book and found that a huge amount of money is being made by rubber manufacturers which is a very important and forceful point for collecting the cess from them. The Government must immediately raise the cess and collect it from the manufacturers and this is very badly needed for the development of the rubber industry. Now you will find that only 3 big companies are rubber manufacturers and they are all foreign concerns who are using the bulk of our rubber produced in this country. I will read a quotation again from the Tariff Board report to illustrate this point:

"It will be seen from the above figures that out of the average total consumption of rubber of 18,882 tons, Dunlop account for 45 per cent., Firestone account for 21 per cent., and Bata account for 10 per cent."

Thus, these three firms together account for an average consumption of 14,283 tons per annum or about 76 per cent. of the total average consumption. The point I am making is this. It has not yet been decided, because it is not very clearly stated in the Bill, as to from where the cess will be collected. I want to insist that the Government

must make up its mind to collect this cess at the manufacturers' end and they must collect the whole amount—the maximum amount leviable under the Bill. They can do it and if they do not do it, we shall charge them for negligence and why I say this will be clear, if I refer you to the Investors' Year Book 1952. I will illustrate my point by referring to only one company, viz., Dunlop, the biggest rubber manufacturers. This company was floated in 1926. This has a share capital of Rs. 1,70,00,000 and in 24 years they have amassed huge amounts as reserve fund. After paying all taxes, they put in the reserve fund Rs. 1,14,00,000—practically equal to the share capital. I have never known of any other company making such huge profits. This they did at the cost of small rubber producers and Indian consumers and mostly they did it at the cost of the Indian tax-payers because most of these products were consumed by the Defence and other Departments of the Government of India. They built up this reserve fund after paying taxes and profits. In 1949 this company capitalized its reserve to the tune of Rs. 50 lakhs within 23 years of its existence.

Again, in 1951 they capitalised another Rs. 60 lakhs from the reserve fund. And then it will be very interesting to note the dividends that they have been declaring. In 1941 the dividend was 20 per cent., for 1942 it was 25 per cent., for 1943 it was 25 per cent., 1944—30 per cent., 1945—30 per cent., 1946—40 per cent., 1947—40 per cent., 1948—40 per cent., 1949—20 per cent. and for 1950 it was 20 per cent. Sir, I cannot imagine dividends of as much as 20 per cent. and 40 per cent. being given. I have heard of only dividends of 6 or 7 or 15 per cent. at the utmost. But here a dividend of as much as 40 per cent. is declared, all at the cost of the rubber grower and the consumer of rubber goods. And next, let us see the highest and lowest prices of their shares. I shall take only one—10 rupee share, an ordinary one. In 1941 the value of a

10 rupee share was maximum 54 and minimum 35. In 1942 they were 50 and 35, in 1943—58 and 46, in 1944—66 and 54, in 1945—80 and 59, in 1946 the maximum was 135 and the minimum 80—remember it is a 10 rupee share—in 1947 they were 107 and 76, 1948—100 and 71, 1949—93 and 40 and in 1950 they were 47 and 43. These were the values of their 10 rupee shares and I hope the hon. Minister will take note of it and he should immediately raise the cess and collect it from the manufacturers. I am only giving the House one example to show how these companies have been making money. You know there are other examples. You know how the Batas are flourishing. There are the Firestones who are also manufacturing tyres and tubes. They are also flourishing. You must collect the cess from them and it is easy, and the money should be given for the development of the small estates and with this money the replanting can be done easily. You should also have a separate department for this work, as in Ceylon, for the development of the small holdings and for replanting.

I would also like to bring it to the notice of the House that the small growers do not get even the price that is fixed for their rubber, for there is always a difference of about 4 as. or 6 as. between what they get and the price fixed, the controlled price. This is possible because the small grower has no staying capacity and the big firms manipulate things in such a manner that they can force the small growers to sell their rubber at a cheaper rate than the controlled price. And there is also the middleman who comes in. When the peak period of production comes in, they say the consumption goes down because of the Puja holidays! That is the kind of argument that is put forward. I have heard of no firm in Calcutta closing for more than a week or two for Puja. My friends from Bengal will correct me if I am mistaken. But they say for three months when there is this peak production the consumption goes down. These are funny arguments

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]
they give in order to extract the rubber at cheaper rates from the growers. The middlemen and the buyers do all these things. Therefore, I suggest that a proper marketing organisation should be established. Very interesting evidence was given before the Select Committee. Even Shri T. T. Krishnamachari tried his best to get some money to the small growers, to get them the controlled prices; but he also failed. Therefore, some organisation should be developed—some co-operative marketing organisation, just as in the case of coffee, whereby we could see that the growers get at least what is due to them. If you have it, then you can attract the growers towards your Board and they can form a co-operative body both for production and for marketing.

There is another point that I would like to place before the House. You have already seen from the statement of the hon. Minister that there is a very big gap between our production and our consumption and we are out now to import rubber—large quantities of rubber—in order to meet the internal demand. I have already stated a few minutes back that the development of the estates should take place on co-operative lines and by the small growers. I have no doubt that we can raise our production if we adopt the methods that I have just suggested and if there is replantation by the small estates and if we arrange for the financing of the same. There is, however, a school of thought which pleads that the small growers should be done away with because, they say, they can never give us the results and that they can never improve their production. They say that we cannot improve production unless we remove the large number of small holdings, and that has probably influenced the mind of the Minister and that is why he is against fixing a ceiling on the holdings. There is also a very big campaign going on in Travancore-Cochin where the biggest estates are situated, a campaign saying that the

production will go down and therefore, the Central Government should intervene in the passage of the necessary legislation for fixing ceiling of holdings. And this propaganda has probably influenced our friends here and I am sure that unless I refute this argument, unless I prove that the small growers can give, if not better at least equally good results as the big ones, probably my friends may not veer round to the correct view on the matter of fixation of ceilings.

I have to invite the attention of the House to the report of the Tariff Board. A thorough investigation was carried out in other countries as well, in Malaya and other places where the area under rubber is much more. There it has been found that the small grower could do even better than the big growers. Their yield was found to be much more than that of the others. You will find this from the report. It is stated:

“It will be seen from the above Table that in an important rubber producing country like Netherlands Indies (now Indonesia) the percentage of the area under rubber cultivated by small holders amounted to 67·1 per cent.”

And I have given this figure because in our country big estates hold about 60 per cent. of the rubber acreage. But in Indonesia, which is the biggest cultivator of rubber, as much as 67·1 per cent. of the area is held by small growers, that is to say, growers with one to five acres.

“Of the total area under rubber in that region, though the yield per acre in most of the small holdings in the above countries is low, it has been stated that in Malaya the small holder in contrast to his counterpart in other countries obtains better yield though this is stated to be due to close planting”. Now, if this can be achieved in Malaya, there is no reason why we should not achieve it here. We are very friendly with Indonesia; our Prime Minister is very friendly with

the Prime Minister of Indonesia. We could send our experts there to find out their methods of cultivation, their organisation and how they have been helping the small man to produce better than the big estates. If they can achieve that there, there is no reason why we should not achieve this here and I would emphasise that this is the first duty of the Government to see that we import the methods adopted there, that we import the organisations employed in Malaya etc., and to see that the small holders do better than the big estates. I again quote: "The small holder has his own place in the industry and it is necessary to improve his lot by affording all the technical help and protection required and an Indian small holder now needs protection as well as real technical help to come upto the limit of economic production, and unless both are forthcoming he may, before long, disappear from the scene." So, Sir, I have been emphasising that we must do all that we can in order to help the small grower.

I have also to make out another point. There is a very big danger of synthetic rubber developing in the world now. After the loss of all these South East Asian countries during the war, the allied nations, particularly United States of America, developed synthetic rubber. That industry was fostered and was worked by the State itself and I am told that now,—at the end of this year—probably in a few days' time, the industry is going to be handed over to private enterprise in America. There are conflicting reports; some say that the State has been subsidising privately this industry and that, therefore, synthetic rubber cannot compete ultimately with natural rubber but the claims of the protagonists of synthetic rubber is that they can manufacture synthetic rubber at very much cheaper rates and dump the market all over the world. We have, therefore, to be very careful. Naturally, rubber producers have studied this problem very well and they maintain that if we can raise the yield per acre and if we can dep-

ress the cost of production, then, we can successfully compete with synthetic rubber. That point has to be kept in view and, before it is too late, we must do something in order that we may not be in trouble when this industry develops.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, allowing for the elasticity and flexibility of the remarks of my hon. friend Mr. Sinha, I must admit that he made a fairly good study of this subject he spoke upon just now. I do not know when he cultivated this sort of love and passion for rubber; yet, I feel that his suggestions for the improvement and development of the rubber industry will be welcomed easily even by a strict and hard taskmaster like the hon. Minister for Commerce, Mr. Karmarkar. We should all bear in mind that each and every measure that this Government takes leads towards nationalisation of industry. This is evident everywhere; whether we appoint a Board with a nominated Chairman or whether we take a share in the development of any industry, it is obvious that it is done with one and one purpose only and it is that the industry should be brought into the hands of the Government as compared to its being in the hands of the exploiters as it happens to be today. Therefore, I am in full agreement with my hon. friends, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Mazumdar, that this industry of ours which has been in the hands of foreigners, has got to be snatched away, taken away from their unwilling hands as early as practicable.

Now, the two things that have been stressed in the speech of Mr. Sinha are the development of the rubber industry and the elimination of the big planters. With both of these objectives no one can have any manner of dispute. They are both very noble and laudable objectives and the sooner we achieve them the better. He went to the length of fixing a priority and he recommended that the raising of the cess from Re. 1 to Rs. 6 per cwt. should be undertaken forthwith, as

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

soon as this Bill becomes law. That may not sound very well for a Government to take such hasty action; still, it is a hint for the Government not to sleep over it and to be as speedy and expeditious as possible in the matter of the implementation of the provisions.

The other thing is about the development of the rubber industry. Now, this brings us to the process that should be adopted by the Government and the proposed Board for the development of the industry. Several measures have been suggested and one of them—in the case of coffee—was the suggestion by Mr. Kishen Chand for the fixation of ceilings. This naturally brings us to the question of fragmentation of land. There is a great difference of opinion with regard to the fixation of ceilings. This is possible only when there are well organised co-operative societies to integrate the work of these fragmented pieces of land; otherwise, there can be no question of fixation of ceilings. We are up against a Himalayan difficulty by all these industries being in the hands of big planters—Dunlop in the case of rubber and some other foreign Assam planters in the case of tea. These questions have got to be very seriously considered by the Government and some *via media* has got to be found out so that on the one hand these planters may be eliminated as expeditiously as possible and, on the other, the co-operative basis of ceilings on land holdings may be adopted for the people in the rubber industry. These are the measures which should engage the Government's immediate attention.

One thing that is not to my taste and which smacks of totalitarianism is the nomination of the Chairman by the Government. Nomination is after all nomination. It can never
4 P.M. be election and since we are wedded to democracy it does not sound well to have a nominated Chairman.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): Even democracy is nominated as in Andhra.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Even democracy is nominated as in Andhra! Now this is a matter between Mr. Gupta and Mr. Sinha to decide; I am not concerned with it because for one thing we have handed over a part of the territory of India to the care of my friend, Mr. Sinha, but we are not prepared to hand over the reins of the Government of Andhra to the care of my friend, Mr. B. Gupta. I have made it perfectly clear that we are not going to take that risk lest the unfortunate Telangana should be repeated and, therefore, we are not going to do it. (Interruption.) Now, Sir, I am not going to yield. I have repeatedly told him that so far as I am concerned I am incapable of being uprooted by him.

I was talking of the nominated Chairman. I do not know why we have fallen in love with nomination—nomination of the Chairman here. Is it only to have the control of the entire Board in the possession of Government? It is bad. I cannot quarrel with my own Government, but let there be an electorate and the Chairman elected by that electorate. It should not be a very difficult job. We have got the electors; that is to say, in the case of coffee, you know, Sir, we said that these were the regions in which coffee was grown and a few individuals from each coffee growing area would be there on the Board as representatives. Those very persons can form the electorate and elect their Chairman. I leave it at that and I have given you my personal impressions. In the interests of the Government, of course it may be more desirable to have a nominated Chairman.

Now coming to this Bill we find that our production of rubber is not equal to our requirements. There is a gap inasmuch as we produce 22,000 tons rubber whereas we require 27,000 tons for our consumption. Now this gap of 5,000 tons tells very heavily upon

our finances and, therefore, our first and foremost duty ought to be to increase our production. Now that can only be done when the production of the small grower increases and that again, Sir, I submit, can be done by means of co-operative planting.

Now another important point in this matter of rubber is marketing. It is very very correct that the big planters buy up the product of all the small planters at a nominal price, at a very, very small price, especially when they stand in need of money, and they hoard it, stock it and make huge and enormous profits, illegitimate profits out of the labour of those small planters. Now it is the Government's duty to look into this thing at the earliest possible moment.

SHRI B. GUPTA: But you run the 'illegal' house.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Abuse us to your heart's content, but that does not affect us.

AN HON. MEMBER: We don't want to uproot you.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Now, so far as the cess is concerned, I wonder whether this raising of the cess from one rupee to six rupees will not affect the prices, which again will affect the interests of the consumers. For one thing, I am first and foremost the greatest champion of the interests of the consumers and I cannot agree with any person who does not have the interests of the consumers at heart. So even in the case of rubber which is largely used by rich men and not by poor men this question.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I may correct my friend. Bata rubber shoes are used largely by the poor.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am referring to the vast majority of poor people who cannot afford shoes. Probably, my friend Mr. Sinha does not know. They have not the money to purchase shoes. Footwear is the

luxury of the middle-class people and the rich people. I know of countryside where people do not at all wear shoes except perhaps one in a thousand, what to say of Bata shoes. Even granting it to be what Mr. Sinha says, what I say is that this cess should not affect much adversely the interests of the consumers, that is, rubber-made things should not be priced very heavily so that it may bring another disaster to the door of the consumers.

Now, Mr. Sinha talked of subsidy. On principle I am not in agreement with this question of granting subsidies. Protection and subsidies make the industry weak. It is not advisable to keep an industry growing and flourishing just by granting a sort of subsidy. Now I know that so long as this differentiation exists, big planters on the one hand and small planters on the other, the latter need some sort of Governmental differential treatment, but that should not be done by means of subsidy. There are other ways and means by which this can be brought about and these the hon. Minister for Commerce will do well to please look into.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): Mr. Saksena, how long do you intend to take?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: If I have taken an abnormally long time I can simply say that I support the Bill and take my seat.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, from coffee we have now come to rubber, but I am afraid that we shall have to cover similar grounds if not the same grounds, because in this Bill also I find that there are a lot of pious intentions. Various things are interspersed here and there but the main issue in the mind of Government revolves around the constitution of the Rubber Board or reconstitution of the Rubber Board and having a nominated Chairman instead of having an elected Chairman, and so the same remarks I shall

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]
be compelled to make here also, the same grounds which I made in connection with the Coffee Bill. There I found the hon. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari in an indignation against the big British interests, but that indignation did not come up to the point of taking any concrete and effective steps to stop all their activities detrimental to our national interests.

Sir, Mr. Karmarkar tried to sidetrack the whole issue by posing the question as to whether foreign capital was required for the country's development or not. That is not the question. The question is that where we find that foreign capital dominates in fields in which it is not required and is working to the detriment of our national interests, whether the Government should take steps or not. I shall discuss the question of the tea industry again when we will come to that Resolution. But in the coffee industry we had an example and no less a person than Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari took up arms against the capitalist coffee estates, took up arms against the British vested interests, took up arms against their piling of profits at the cost of the small growers, at the cost of the labourers and at the cost of our national interests, but these arms are again sheathed when the question of taking any effective steps comes. So the point is that where it is admitted by no less a person than the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry that these foreign interests are working to the detriment of our national interests, why any effective step should not be taken. Is it the contention of the Government that by simply having a nominated Chairman and simply by reconstituting the Board, effective steps will be taken? I am not prepared to agree with that contention.

Then there are many other aspects in this Bill. I also find that one of the amendments says, "It is hereby declared that it is expedient in the public interest that the Union should take under its control the rubber industry." The word "development" is

missing here. The development of the rubber industry should be taken in hand and, therefore, control can be taken by the Government, if it exercises these powers properly and in the right direction. But what does development mean? There are various aspects of the rubber industry. What is the structure of the rubber industry has already been indicated by my friend Mr. Rajendra Pratap Sinha. Like the coffee industry here also we find at the top a few big estates having thousands of acres and at the bottom we find a large number of small holders having only a few acres in their hands. There are 253 rubber estates of 100 acres and above, covering an area of 1,02,576 acres which constitutes 60.5 per cent. of the total planted area, and 13,600 small holdings which account for 39.5 per cent. of the total area. The total yield of these small holdings is 28 per cent. of the total Indian rubber production. Out of these 13,600 small holdings, 8,249 units constitute 10.7 per cent. of the total area of rubber plantations and they have only one acre or below five acres each. The main problem of the development of the rubber industry is of the small growers and I have no indication here nor in the speech of the hon. Minister for Commerce as to what steps they are taking for the development of the rubber industry or for helping the small growers. It may be argued that there is the Rubber Board. But I have gone through the Report of the Rubber Board and though it mentions the steps that have been taken to help the small growers of rubber yet these steps are inadequate. The condition of the small growers has been described by Mr. Sinha. In their case their trees are mostly 30 years old or more than that. In their case the question of development can be divided into two—question of rehabilitation and the question of having new kinds of trees, of adopting more scientific and better method of planting and harvesting, increasing the quality and quantity of the output and also reducing the cost of production. But there also I find in the Report of the Tariff Commis-

sion that there is a hint that the cost of production is to be reduced at the cost of the labour. There is a paragraph there which says—though it does not say so in so many words—that in India where labour is cheap it will be easy to do such and such things. But that is a wrong line to take because I shall, some time in the course of my speech, refer to the conditions of workers in the rubber plantations. Their conditions are very miserable. Actually in order to help the small growers other steps should be taken than reducing the cost of labour which in reality forms only a very small percentage of the cost. They should get proper price for their rubber. That has been explained by my friend Mr. Sinha and Mr. Saksena has also repeated it. Whether they are given subsidy or they are given loan for anything, money ~~should~~ come from somewhere and I know that the Government will argue that they have no money. But money we can have, if the just indignation against foreign interests of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari is translated into action—if it is not all a mere eye-wash, but if it is translated into action. As I said yesterday, short of confiscating their property, let the Government say that they will take necessary action. My friend has suggested that the big estates should be broken up. The foreign-owned big estates can be nationalised. But has the Government said that they will nationalise these estates even by compensating them? No. Has the Government at least said that they will take effective steps to curb their profits or to check their profits from being exported abroad? No. These are really the steps which should be taken if we want to develop the rubber industry, and help the small growers. This question will again and again crop up—not as a theoretical question but as a most burning practical question that where it is found that a real all-round scheme of development of these industries has to be put through, where foreign capital is entrenched or where foreign capital is having a dominant position, it cannot be undertaken without encroaching upon their rights,

without encroaching upon their profits. Then the Government if it is true to its professions must take steps in that direction, otherwise all the talk of development and all that indignation will be mere eye-wash and mere bunkum.

I shall come to the labour conditions first, because we have found that whenever this question of development and reduction of cost comes up, then it is the labour which is affected. The burden is tried to be shifted on to the shoulders of the labour. Now, what is the condition of labour in rubber plantations? The Rege Committee when it investigated into their conditions found that they were very serious—eight annas wages a day, housing facilities worse, no medical benefits, no maternity benefits, not even the small amenities like providing them with blankets to cover themselves from rain and cold. The Rege Committee remarked that women who form about 25 per cent. of the plantation labour had nothing to cover their sarees with while working and it recommended that at least some length of jute hessian should be supplied to them otherwise the only cloth that they had got soiled by latex and with that soiled saree they had to work, they had to eat and they had to continue. This produces injurious effects on their health also. I could give many such instances about the conditions of labour in the rubber industry but I do not like to tire the House with such details but hon. Members who are interested in the subject, I should like to refer them to the Report of the Rege Committee which enquired into the conditions of plantation labour in India. Even now, what is the condition of labour? After the implementation of the Minimum Wages Act their wages have been fixed. For Travancore-Cochin it is Rs. 1/9 for men and Rs. 1/5 for women; for Malabar, it is Rs. 1/7 for men and Rs. 1/1 for women. But the minimum wage which has been fixed is really only on paper because the workers in the rubber plantations are paid according to piece rate and they are given work

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]

in such a manner that they cannot earn full wages. Not only that; wages are paid generally in the rubber plantations in the South on the basis of an average calculation—on their average output throughout a month. So in effect the workers get far less than the minimum wages which have been fixed by the Government. This is a travesty of justice and a mockery of the beneficial labour legislation about which our hon. spokesman of the Government was so eloquent. Before the minimum wages were fixed, they used to enjoy some canteen facilities but on the plea that minimum wages have been fixed these canteen facilities have been withdrawn. Only recently after the implementation of the Labour Act from April 1954 they are getting some benefit in the way of leave or maternity benefits or medical benefits. Before that there was no question of these benefits at all.

Then there is another pernicious feature in the rubber plantations. They have to work in all sorts of inclement weather in the *monsoon* period, in winter, and as a result of the poor pittance as wages, with intolerable housing conditions and with no other benefits, their health has deteriorated. If after medical examination it is found that a worker is unfit for work in the plantation any more, he is sacked. No gratuity is granted to him. He is sacked and left to his own fate. The labour in these rubber plantations mostly comes from other areas and that is why it was recommended in the Rege Committee Report that they should be paid fares both ways—while going to the plantations and while coming back. This was the condition then. Now, in addition to that we are finding this thing—that apart from the question of getting fares for coming and going back, they are not granted gratuity when they are sacked on grounds of ill-health, on grounds of being medically unfit for work. It has been provided in this Bill as an amendment that one of the functions of the Board will be securing better working conditions and the provisions

and improvement of amenities and incentives for workers. As it is, it is good. It is welcome. At the same time, as I said, these provisions are there in the functions of the Tea Board—in the functions of the Coffee Board—an amending Bill for which has just been passed in this House. It is good that this provision is sought to be introduced here, but what I really want to know is what steps will be taken to see that these provisions are really implemented. Because what will happen, I know, is this. After the Bill is passed, after we have been given an idea that the Rubber Board is there to see to the development of the rubber industry and also to see that better working conditions and living conditions and amenities for workers are secured, the Rubber Board will not pay any attention to this matter. Maybe they will set apart a sum for welfare and the welfare measures will be administered by the growers. It is true that in the small holdings, the conditions of the workers are still bad in the way of wages. But if the Government is really serious, let the Government put pressure on the big estates who hold thousands of acres or less—400 acres or 200 acres—they should immediately implement all the provisions of the Plantation Act and they should immediately see that the minimum wages which have been fixed by the Government in Travancore-Cochin and Malabar are given to them. Their tasks are fixed in such a manner that they are not cheated of the minimum wages to which they are legally entitled.

Then as regards the small growers, I wish to say—I do not know, but I assume that there are no representatives of small rubber growers as there are representatives of small coffee growers—that if there was a representative of the small rubber grower, he would have been vocal in connection with this Bill. However, I would like to say, as regards the small growers, that whenever they are faced with any difficulty, they take the line of putting the whole burden on the shoulders of the labourers. That is not only

anti-labour, it is anti-national, it is against their own interests. Really their main difficulty comes from the domination of the foreign and big planters. But as we have seen an exhibition of the psychology of the small growers yesterday—that they were all planters—they tried to accuse the Government, “Why do you try to stir up difference between planters and planters?”. And then they gave the analogy of divide and rule. But actually the difficulties of the small planters arise from the domination of the big planters. Therefore, it is my request to the small growers that they should look to the proper direction and they should not try to pass the burden on the shoulders of the labour—the labour which by its toil and by its blood gave them their profits, whatever they earned for all these years.

Now, there is another aspect of the rubber industry—namely the rubber producing industry, which has been entirely left out of the consideration of this Bill, that is, the rubber manufacturing industry. My hon. friend Mr. R. P. Sinha has rightly pointed out that aspect. We find that Indian rubber production has been consumed by the rubber manufacturing industry in India. So here is the question of increasing Indian production. As with the tea trade, the question is of export. As yet the structure of the tea trade and the trends of the tea trade are such that it is mainly dependent on export and whenever there is any loss of export market, there is a hue and cry of a crisis. But in the case of the rubber industry, all the rubber produced in India is consumed by the rubber manufacturing industry in India. Rubber is a very important commodity—a strategic material—and this industry should also be developed here. There is a deficit in Indian production. So the Government thinks of allowing import of rubber. If the production of rubber is increased by 27,000 tons a year, that will be consumed in India. That is all very true. So, my point is that in connection with the development of the rubber industry, we cannot leave the rubber manufac-

turing industry out of our consideration. These are closely connected with one another. Coming to the question of the rubber manufacturing industry, my friend Mr. R. P. Sinha has rightly pointed out that it is also dominated mainly by foreign companies. The rubber manufacturing industry in India produces various types of rubber goods from tyres to water-proofs and other rubber materials. They produce tyres and tubes, cables, general mechanical goods including roofing, footwear, and so on. But the predominant position in the rubber manufacturing industry is occupied by Messrs Dunlop Rubber Company, Messrs Firestone Tyre & Rubber Company, Bata Co., etc. and from the figures which have been given in the report of the Indian Tariff Board it is seen that the average total consumption of rubber is: Dunlop 45 per cent.; Firestone 21 per cent. and the remaining 34 per cent. is distributed among a large number of small industries. Here also the question that arises is this. How should we treat these concerns—these big, gigantic concerns? Sir, I have not studied the conditions of labour in these industries of Messrs Dunlop, Firestone and Goodyear Company. Therefore, just now I am not in a position to give you the picture of their condition, but the question is that from the price of rubber in India, in relation to the world price of rubber, these people are mostly benefiting. It is true that prices cannot be fixed in such a way that—at least under the present system—the big concerns will pay one price for the rubber and the small concerns will pay another price for rubber. Here also, the main question that comes is this. If we want to develop the small units—the small units, as you all know, are all Indians—the question arises of putting some check on the profits made. These big foreign concerns must go. It is they who are taking all the advantage of the present position in India. About that aspect I find that there has been no mention in the Bill and there was no indication in the speech of the hon. Minister for Commerce.

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]

Then, lastly, I would like to say that here also the Government has taken the power to appoint the Chairman and is going to reconstitute the Board. The same remarks which I made in connection with the Chairman of the Coffee Board are valid here, if it is the intention of the Government to break the domination of the foreign rubber growers or big rubber growers in the Rubber Board—if that is really the intention—then we have suggested a way to the Government in the amendments, of which we have given notice of just now—I think it will be circulated to hon. Members later on. Let there not be any foreign representation on the Board. If the Government is not prepared to accept that suggestion, then also, it can take certain other minimum steps. It can increase the representation of small growers, it can increase the representation of labour. The representation of small growers has been increased by one, but the representation of labour should be increased. I do not suggest the number now. In this manner, if the Government thinks that the reconstitution of the Rubber Board is essentially necessary in order to exercise its powers for the development of the rubber industry, then the reconstitution should be on proper lines, not simply by having a nominated Chairman, not simply by indulging in eyewash activities. The Government should do everything to check the big foreign interests and big growers. With these few words, Sir, I have done.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Vice-Chairman, as has been pointed out, we have a series of similar Bills. Rubber is a cash crop, and, therefore, I think, the Government should be very careful to see that in fixing the price of rubber the price of the manufactured articles is borne in mind. The hon. Member who preceded me has pointed out that the rubber manufacturers are mostly foreign firms, and the figures that he has given are really staggering. It has been pointed out that during the last ten or

twelve years the profits distributed are 350 per cent. That means the original one crore of rupees have received three and a half crores of rupees as profit. It has also been pointed out that one crore of rupees have become two crores of rupees by means of bonus shares, and the market price of the shares of two crores of rupees is nearly seven crores of rupees. That means that the original one crore of rupees become ten crores of rupees in our country. The foreigners are multiplying their profits at this tremendous rate in our country. They are expanding their industries and getting a stronghold on our economy. The hon. Members of this House give protection. They want Indian industries to develop, but the advantage of this protection is taken by the foreigners. They set up factories in our country, and if at all some money is brought from outside, it multiplies ten-fold. The result will be that in a few years' time, all the industries or concerns will be owned by foreigners, and we will have to pay huge sums of money to them. I submit that this Board should be very careful to so regulate the price of rubber that there is a fair distribution between the producer and the manufacturer. But so far all the profits are earned by the manufacturer, and the small grower or the small tapper gets very little profit.

Then, I come to another side of this question. It has been pointed out that there are a few big estates which have nearly 60 per cent. of the land acreage in their possession, while thousands of small plantations have two or three acres each only. This tapping of rubber juice is an ordinary process. Hon. Members will be aware that in the whole of South India, particularly in the States of Hyderabad and Madras, there are palm and toddy trees. The palm and the toddy trees are also tapped in a way similar to the tapping that is performed in the case of rubber. The Governments of these States have adopted a different policy in the case of the tapping of toddy and palm trees, irrespective of the fact whether the holding is a big holding

or a small holding. The Government have got control over all the trees, and the trees are auctioned. And it is the duty of the person who takes the trees to see that the tapping is performed in such a way that the tree does not die, and that it is not over-tapped. This policy has been adopted by the Excise Department of Hyderabad, and it used to be adopted by the Excise Department of the Madras State before prohibition came into effect. When we have thousands of trees, at least ten times the area which is under rubber trees, it should be quite possible for the Government of India to evolve, through this Board, a scheme by which there is a direct control of Government over the trees, and that the tapping of these trees is let out in very small numbers to small groups of persons formed under co-operative societies, and thereby controlling the big plantations. There may be certain difficulties involved in the case of coffee, because the coffee plant requires great care and attention; but in the case of these rubber trees there is no such difficulty. This is a well-known occupation in India—the tapping of toddy and palm trees. And similarly, that same principle can be applied. An hon. Member raised some objection and said that if the big plantations were reduced, then the production would go down. I have already answered that point in the discussion on the Coffee Bill. We cannot have two sets of laws to the effect that for ordinary agricultural produce there should be a ceiling on land holding, while in the case of rubber and coffee there should be no ceiling. We should not permit the foreigners to have big estates, to make huge profits, and to take them away outside the country.

Again, in the matter of Chairman I would like to know from the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill whether the appointments will be made by Government with the help of the U.P.S.C., or directly by Government. So many committees are being set up, and naturally, if Government is going to make appointments, the Government will

have good deal of offices for patronage. I do hope and I expect the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill to make it very clear that these appointments will be made only through the U.P.S.C. and it will be after fair competition that the appointments will be made, because if this procedure is not followed under the pretence that these are technical posts, it will be given to the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry the appointments of so many chairmanships as places of patronage by him.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): But this is not Government service.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: So, it seems that my remarks are quite justified that it is indirectly a way of giving certain places of patronage to the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: No justification for such a remark.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If there was no idea of patronage, why should not this matter be referred to the Public Service Commission? After all, the Government is collecting money as cess and it goes into the Consolidated Fund of India. It is only from the Consolidated Fund of India that money is given to the Board. When the money given to the Board comes out of the Consolidated Fund of India, whether in lumpsums or in bits, the Government of India should follow all the rules that are applicable to any other part of the Consolidated Fund of India. I do not see any distinction between this money collected in the form of a cess and any other tax collected in this country, and, therefore, I would end by saying that the hon. Minister should take note of all these points. The Bill is very welcome, and I do hope that it will lead to development of the rubber industry.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sir, in a sense I should acknowledge with gratitude that what I was going to say has been made rather easier than what I thought because of the observations of my friends here. Their observations have been more of a

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]
general nature and in the way of suggestions rather than about the structure of the measure, *viz.*, about the alterations of the structure of the Board and the like. I am glad that no discordant note was struck on the main objective of the Bill. I should like to dwell in brief on some of the points that were made. Regarding the observations of the friend who spoke first, *viz.*, about ceiling on holdings, I should like to say nothing on that matter. It is not an immediate problem. We shall have to think of all these matters and if the fixing of a ceiling is necessary in the interests of the industry, well, Government will come forward with legislation to that effect, but I am afraid that in this matter we are trying to devote attention to many more things than what is necessary for purposes of this particular measure or the formation of the Rubber Board. Whereas all the other points have their own relevancy—for instance this question of fixing a ceiling on holdings which is an important question from the point of view of the economic structure of the country as a whole, from the point of view of the question of providing employment to a larger number of persons, from the point of view of minimising the evils of capitalistic efforts in respect of landed property and the like,—and are very useful to be considered, we have in this particular measure, to rivet our attention on its own particular problems and in a larger measure upon its immediate problems. The other things may be considered and they deserve to be considered but only in their own proper perspective. Now take the question of labour about which my friend Mr. Mazumdar, spoke at length. It is an agreed principle with us that labour should have its own legitimate share in the prosperity of the country, that labour should have minimum amenities, etc., for which there are already labour laws in the country. It would be perfectly relevant for any hon. Member of this House or for the Government, when they consider it necessary as they have done in the

past, to introduce measures in respect of labour welfare, *viz.*, in respect of hours of work, minimum wages, maternity benefits and all that, but if anyone is mixing up all those things with the object of this measure in respect of the Rubber Board or Coffee Board, it becomes rather difficult.

SHRI S. N. MAZMUMDAR: Where is the difficulty in implementing existing laws?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I am coming to that. I was rather afraid that we were mixing up too many good things, though irrelevant to this Bill, with the structure of the Rubber Board. If we want to implement labour laws and make them effective, there are ways and methods of doing so. For every right, there is a remedy for the infringement of that right. Now, it is up to the Government and all those who are interested in labour welfare to see to it that the labour laws are implemented, but that is a larger question. I am trying to invite the attention of the House to the fact that sometimes all these questions are being pressed into service during debates like this. They are really important questions. If I were in my hon. friend's place, I would not miss a single opportunity of pressing for these things, but let us not mix up things. I would just take the present Bill for whatever it is worth, and if there is anything that can be done in that direction by way of benefiting labour, I would urge it, but I would not like to make this measure a substitute for all the laws relating to labour welfare. They are not things which can be carried through by simply smuggling them into an enactment like this. What we are principally concerned with here is that, consistently with the other necessary accompaniments that we have put in this Bill—of course, we have to look to the interests of labour, the interests of the consumers and above all to national interests—through the Rubber Board we should see to it that there is greater and greater production of rubber in the country, that the industry becomes

prosperous, and that all the natural sharers of the prosperity of industry do share in the benefits accruing from this industry.

SHRI B. GUPTA: That is not seen properly. That is the complaint that he is making.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: As if I could not understand what he was saying, unless Mr. Gupta's attempt is to divert my attention and make me forget his friend's points. There are so many things that can be urged and rightly urged also like ceiling on land holdings, labour welfare, etc. but we cannot have all these things put into a measure like this. We should at the present moment rivet our attention on one thing only and that is rubber production, and in so far as these other aspects are also relevant for the development of this industry, certainly they have to be looked into and it is only to that extent and in that sense that they have been incorporated in this measure. The point was made about providing necessary finances for replantation. The Rubber Board and the Government will have to consider this matter with due regard to the availability of finances; not only this question but also how to improve labour, seeds, how to help the smaller growers in this industry, because small growers are in a preponderating majority, whether we should try to amalgamate them into bigger estates, etc. We have to look after their interests also. Then my friend over there said that we should increase the cess and collect the whole amount immediately. Whenever we find it necessary to do so, we shall feel fortified by the fact that we have the full support of this House in doing so. We shall do so if and when it becomes necessary.

I understood my friend Mr. Sinha to say that we should send some people to Indonesia to learn the trade of rubber. That is a very harmless suggestion; in fact it is a good suggestion and if something useful could be learnt from Indonesia or Malaya or wherever rubber is tapped, it is good. That is a suggestion which the Gov-

ernment should certainly consider at the relevant time.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Gurkhas are already going to Malaya.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: That makes you afraid? Sir, then Mr. Mazumdar had a point to say about taking steps in the direction of nationalisation. I should not belittle that subject by making a brief cursory reply to that point because that is a serious issue which will deserve consideration as relevant time comes and let him be quite sure that if at any particular time nationalisation of any relevant sector is necessary.....

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: May I point out that my main issue was putting some check on the foreign interests where it is found that its working is detrimental to our national interests.....

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I would go one step further. Not only should steps be taken to ensure that foreign interests do not exploit but also indigenous interests do not exploit the national interests. That is an absolutely harmless suggestion.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Come with the first.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: If this grain of salt were not in the milk, I would very well pursue it. If my friend Mr. Gupta would not interrupt when it is not necessary, I am prepared to listen to his friend and then also answer his friend but what happens is when I am in the thread of replying to Mr. Mazumdar, what happens happens.

Then Mr. Mazumdar laid emphasis on serving better the workers' cause and improving the working conditions. I think it takes away much of a novelty either from the attack or defence when we speak of workers' condition. I think no one is having any difference of opinion about the fact that the working conditions should be improved to the optimum measure. I do not

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]
think anybody disputes that. When and how it should be done may give rise to differences. But in any case it is as well that he emphasised that point lest we forget that. He mentioned something about the rubber manufacturing industry. I thought the implication which he had in mind was that he emphasised the fact that there was much of foreign element in it. I can easily tell him that I am reminded about the fact that the rubber manufacturing industry has much of foreign element and then regarding that matter, the question arises if at all they try to exploit the rubber growers in respect of prices and the rest. My hon. friend knows that.....

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Not only rubber growers but the question is also of the indigenous units. I mean Indian units in the rubber manufacturing industry.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I should not like to reply vaguely to a vague question but I shall appreciate it very much if my friend could elaborate his point a little further—not during the course of the discussion of this Bill. It is a more serious matter than to be a matter of criticism. If he has any points to discuss, I shall be very happy to study the question with him and think about ways in which no one will be exploited and I say that I naturally appreciate his point of the Indian indigenous industry *vis-a-vis* the foreign interests. Of course, it is hardly necessary for me to assure the House that we would not allow one section to be exploited by another section but if there are any particular points and he would like to discuss the same with me, I shall be only too happy to do so—not over a glass of rubber but over a glass of coffee. So I think I have finished the notes that I had made for myself but as you might have noted, and I am happy to note, this Bill, though it is on the same lines as the Coffee Bill, has not evoked that warmth about either the structure of the Rubber Board or its functions and the rest. I am very

grateful to the House for the unanimity it has expressed by not referring to the provisions of the Bill at all, about the desirability of the provisions, etc., and I do hope that this will....

SHRI B. GUPTA: That will come later.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: So, is there some more powder waiting? I hope to take care of that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): The question is:

“That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. Clauses 2 to 5. There is no amendment to them.

Clauses 2 to 5 were added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): Clause 6.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, I move:

“That at page 2,—

(i) in line 21, for the word ‘seven’ the word ‘nine’ be substituted;

(ii) in line 22, for the word ‘five’ the word ‘seven’ be substituted; and
(iii) in lines 23-24, for the words ‘two of such five’ the words ‘four of such seven’ be substituted.

I also move:

“That at page 4,—

(i) in line 25, for the word ‘ten’ the word ‘twelve’ be substituted; and

(ii) in line 27, for the word ‘four’ the word ‘six’ be substituted.

I also move:

"That at page 2, lines 33-34, the words 'or nominated as may be prescribed' be deleted."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): The clause and the amendments are open for discussion.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: The first amendment seeks to increase the number of members to represent the State of Travancore-Cochin. The main reasons why myself and Mr. Sekhar have given notice of this amendment are as follows. As you know, as regards the rubber growing areas, it is seen from the figures supplied by the Tariff Board, that Travancore accounts for 72.3 per cent. of the total acreage under rubber and from the point of view of the acreage and labour employed in the industry rubber is rather important in their rural economy. The main area under rubber is distributed as follows:—

In Cochin	8.13 per cent.
Malabar	15.73 per cent.
Mysore	0.23 per cent.
Rest of India	3.61 per cent.

Out of the total number of labourers engaged in the rubber industry the majority is also in Travancore. As I have already quoted, it is a very important part. As regards the composition of the Board, when we are fixing the number of representatives from the different States, in my opinion Travancore-Cochin should be given more representation. In that connection comes my second amendment. When it will be seven, then out of it the proportion of labour representation also should be increased. The effect of my amendment is this that instead of seven members, there should be nine to represent Travancore. Then where there is "five of whom shall be persons representing rubber producing interests" there should be "seven representing the rubber producing interests" and then where there is "two of such five being persons representing the small growers" if my amendment is accepted, it will be like this

that out of this seven, four will be representing the small growers. The line of my argument is also similar to that which I advanced in connection with the first reading of the Bill that the number of the representatives of small growers and labourers should be increased in the Board.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): Will you take more time?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): There is a message which the Secretary will read out.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

ANDHRA STATE LEGISLATURE (DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL, 1954

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 132 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Lok Sabha. I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Andhra State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, 1954, as passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 2nd December, 1954."

I lay the Bill on the Table.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE BUSINESS ON 3rd DECEMBER

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. C. GUPTA): I have to inform Members that the Andhra State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, 1954, as passed by the Lok Sabha, will be taken up tomorrow after Private Members' Bills. Notices of amendments to the Bill will be received upto 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on the 3rd December, 1954.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 3rd December, 1954.