

section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951:—

I. (i) Report of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Button Industry.

(ii) Government Resolution No. 45(1)-T.B./53, dated the 28th November 1953.

(iii) Government Notification No. 45(1)-T.B./53, dated the 28th November 1953.

[Placed in Library. For (i) to (iii) see No. S-181/53.]

II. (i) Report of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Ferro-silicon Industry.

(ii) Government Resolution No. 17(1)-T.B./53, dated the 28th November, 1953.

[Placed in Library. For (i) and (ii) see No. S-181/53.]

III. (i) Report of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Pencil Industry.

(ii) Government Resolution No. 44(2)-T.B./53, dated the 21st November 1953.

(iii) Statement under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents referred to at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid within the period mentioned in that sub-section.

[Placed in Library. For (i) to (iii) see No. S-180/53.]

THE COIR INDUSTRY BILL, 1953—continued

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now proceed to take up the Coir Industry Bill.

Mr. K. B. Lall was speaking yesterday. He will continue.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar):

श्री के० बी० लाल (बिहार) : चेयर-मैन साहब, कल मैं इस बिल पर बोलते वक्त बता रहा था कि ऐसी ऐसी चीजें हैं जिनके बारे में लोगों का ध्यान नहीं गया है और इसलिये वे बरबाद होती हैं। मैं कह रहा था कि हमारे बिहार में कौयर (coir) की कोई इन्डस्ट्री (industry) नहीं है, लेकिन वहां लोग नारियल का बहुत इस्तेमाल करते हैं पर वे नहीं जानते हैं कि इनके छिलकों का किस तरह से उपयोग करना चाहिये और ज्यादातर वे फेंके जाते हैं, बरबाद होते हैं। ऐसे लोगों की संख्या थोड़ी है जो इनका इस्तेमाल गद्दा बनाने में, कुशन (cushion) बनाने में या रस्सी वगैरा तैयार करने में करते हैं। अब कौयर बोर्ड (Coir Board) के बनने से यह आशा हो गई है कि जिन प्रान्तों में यह बहुतायत से पैदा नहीं होता है या छिलके का कोई व्यापार नहीं होता है, तो उसके ऊपर भी यह बोर्ड ध्यान देगा। ऐसा कोई प्रान्त नहीं है जहां कि नारियल का सेवन नहीं होता है, और यह सही है कि नारियल पैदा होता है मी कोस्ट (sea-coast) में, उन प्रान्तों में जैसे तामिलनाडु है या मलबार है या ट्रावनकोर कोचीन है, इस तरह की जगहों में यह पैदा होता है, लेकिन इसका सेवन हर जगह होता है, और ज्यादातर इसका दुरुपयोग होता है। मेरा ख्याल है कि यह बोर्ड उसकी उपयोगिता पर ध्यान देगा।

कबल इसके कि मैं कौयर बोर्ड के ऊपर अपनी राय दूं, मैं अपने उन मित्रों से, जो यह जानने की कोशिश में रहते हैं कि हम बिल का सपोर्ट (support) कर रहे या विरोध कर रहे हैं, यह अर्ज कर देना चाहता हूं कि जब हम उसको सपोर्ट करने हैं तब हम अपनी राय जरूर देते हैं, और वह राय हो सकता

[Shri K. B. Lall.]

है, सोलह आने बिलकुल एक न हो। लेकिन यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है कि यहां बिल पर डिस्कशन (discussion) के समय गवर्नमेंट को अपनी राय से मदद करें जिसमें वह फायदा उठाये और जब हम ऐसा करने हैं तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम विरोध कर रहे हैं जैसा कि वे मित्र जो कि विरोध करने में ज्यादा दिलचस्पी लेते हैं, समझते हैं। हम इस बिल के मन्तव्य को अच्छा मानते हैं और उसका समर्थन करने हैं इसलिये कि उसके अन्दर ऐसी तिजारत को आगे बढ़ाने की बहुत गुंजायश है जिसमें हम अपने मुल्क में बहुत धन पैदा कर सकते हैं। इस दृष्टिकोण से जो भी सुधार जनता को फायदा पहुंचाने के लिये जरूरी होंगे में यहां अर्ज करूंगा ताकि मेरी बातें गवर्नमेंट तक पहुंचें।

अब मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि पहले तो इस बिल की टाइटिल (title) में जो यह लिखा हुआ है कि :

"A Bill to provide for the control by the Union of the coir industry and for that purpose to establish a Coir Board"

उसमें "कंट्रोल (control)" की जगह "development" रख देते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता क्योंकि "कंट्रोल" शब्द से ऐसा लगता है कि हम इस तरीके से इस इन्डस्ट्री पर कब्जा जमाना चाहते हैं जिस कब्जे से कि फायदा शायद हम को होवे और इन्डस्ट्री को होवे या न होवे। अगर इसमें से ऐसी बू आवे तो यह ठीक नहीं है क्योंकि यह बात भी सही है कि जहां बिल (Bill) के क्लॉज १० (clause 10) में यह साफ कर दिया है कि :

"It shall be the duty of the Board to promote by such measures as it thinks fit the development under the control of the Central Government of the coir industry".

तो फिर प्रियम्बल (preamble) में भी यह चीज क्यों नहीं स्पष्ट की गई कि इसलिये बिल को पेश कर रहे हैं कि हम कौयर इन्डस्ट्री के विकास में उन्नति चाहते हैं।

अब, मैं कौयर बोर्ड के बारे में कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं। बिल में यह बिया हुआ है कि बोर्ड में एक चेयरमैन (chairman) और एक वाइस चेयरमैन (vice-chairman) होंगे और कई एक इंटरिस्ट्स (interests) के लोग इसमें रिप्रेजेंट (represent) करेंगे और उनको मेम्बर की हैसियत से लिया जायेगा। लेकिन असल बात यह है कि इसके प्रोविजन (provisions) के अनुसार मालूम होता है कि ये लोग नामिनेशन (nomination) के जरिये से लिये जायेंगे। अगर यह सही है तो एक सवाल उठ सकता है कि आज डिमोक्रेसी (democracy) के जमाने में जब हम आगे बढ़ते हैं तो जिन लोगों को हम फायदा पहुंचाने जा रहे हैं उनको क्यों न हम शामिल करें बजाय इसके कि हम नामिनेशन करे। मेरा ख्याल है इससे विरोधी दल के सदस्यों को यह जान कर खुशी होती होगी कि गवर्नमेंट उनकी राय की तरफ ज्यादा बढ़ती जा रही है। शायद जमाने का रुख ऐसा है और इसलिये हमारी गवर्नमेंट भी उसी रुख को अख्तियार करने जा रही है जो कि अभी अपोजिशन (opposition) वाले आ कर बतला रहे हैं। बिल के क्लॉज ४ के सब क्लॉज (३) में लिखा है :

"The Board shall consist of a Chairman and such number of other members not exceeding forty as the Central Government may think expedient, to be appointed by that Government by notification in the Official Gazette from among persons who are in its opinion capable of representing—

(a) growers of coconuts and producers of husks and coir yarn;

(b) persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn and in the manufacture of coir products;

(c) manufacturers of coir products;

(d) dealers in coir, coir yarn and coir products, including both exporters and internal traders;

(e) Parliament;

(f) the Governments of the principal coconut growing States;

(g) such other persons or class of persons who, in the opinion of the Central Government ought to be represented on the Board."

अगर हमें आदमी लेना है तो क्यों नहीं हम डिमोक्रेसी के सिद्धान्त के आधार पर उन लोगों के ही एसोसियेशन्स (associations) को मदद दें और प्रोत्साहित करें ताकि उनमें जागृति पैदा हो और वे तिजारत को बढ़ावें। सब काम गवर्नमेंट ही पका पकाया तैयार करके रख दे तो यह तो कौयर इंडस्ट्री के हक में ज्यादा अच्छा मालूम नहीं देता है। यह दृष्टिकोण तो उन लोगों को शोभा दे सकता है जो कहते हैं कि सारा हक हमारा है, चाहे हम तलवार की नोक से लें या बन्दूक के निशाने से। हमें चाहिये कि हम ग्रोअर्स एसोसियेशन (growers association) बनायें, कौयर प्रोडक्ट्स मैन्युफैक्चरर्स (coir products manufacturers) का एस.सियेशन बनायें और उनसे कहें कि अपने अपने प्रतिनिधियों को इस बोर्ड में भेजें, जिससे कि जनता के अन्दर और जो लोग इन वस्तुओं की तिजारत करते हैं उनके अन्दर तरक्की करने की जागृति पैदा हो। इस तरह से डिमोक्रेसी के उसूल को भी तरक्की मिलेगी।

इसमें कोई शक नहीं, जैसा कि कम्यूनिस्ट (Communist) भाइयों का

विचार है, कि जनता उतना अच्छा सोच और समझ नहीं सकती जितना कि हम, आप या गवर्नमेंट। लेकिन यह सिद्धान्त गलत है और इसे मैं मिनिस्टर साहब की नजर में लाना चाहता था। फिर जब हम बिल के आठवें क्लॉज को देखते हैं, तो उसमें भी यह लिखा हुआ है कि एक्जीक्यूटिव एंड अदर कमीटीज (executive and other committees) में चेयरमैन, वाइस चेयरमैन और पांच इलेक्टेड मेम्बर्स (elected members) होंगे तो इन पांच इलेक्टेड मेम्बर्स के बारे में आगे लिखा है कि :

"not more than two shall be Government officials".

इसके मानी यह हुये कि इसमें दो गवर्नमेंट आफिशियल होंगे और चेयरमैन और वाइस चेयरमैन ये दो गवर्नमेंट आफिशियल मिलाकर चार हो गये जब कि कुल संख्या सात है। इस प्रकार सात मेम्बर्स में से चार तो गवर्नमेंट के लोग हो गये, तीन बाकी रहे, उन तीन में से भी एक मेम्बर वह होगा जो रिप्रेजेंट करेगा :

".....one shall be from among the members representing persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn and in the manufacture of coir products".

तो इसमें भी ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि हम किफायतसारी से जनता पर विश्वास करते हैं क्योंकि हम उनके प्रतिनिधियों को उचित स्थान नहीं देते और अधिकांश लोग गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से रखते हैं। इतना होने पर भी यह मालूम नहीं है कि बोर्ड की क्या हैसियत है, यह आफिशियल (official) कही जायेगी या नौन आफिशियल (non-official) आखिर इस के जो चेयरमैन, वाइस चेयरमैन, सेक्रेटरी (secretary) जो पैदा होंगे वह गवर्नमेंट सर्वेन्ट

[Shri K. B. Lall.]

(government servant) कहलायेंगे या नान गवर्नमेंट (non-government) अथवा सेमी गवर्नमेंट (semi-government) होंगे, यह स्पष्ट किया जाना चाहिये। अगर ये लोग गवर्नमेंट सर्वेन्ट माने गये तो फिर यह विचार करने योग्य बात है कि एग्जीक्यूटिव में ७ में से ४ आदमी तो गवर्नमेंट सर्वेन्ट हैं ही, बाकी तीन भी क्या उसी में शामिल समझे जायेंगे।

ये सब बातें मैं इसलिये नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि मैं गवर्नमेंट की नुक़्ताचीनी करना चाहता हूँ बल्कि मैं उसको यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम जनता की डिमोक्रेसी को मानते हैं तो हमारा दृष्टिकोण उनके प्रति सदैव उदार होना चाहिये ताकि हम उन की जरूरतों को अपने सामने रखें और उसे आगे बढ़ायें। इसलिये यह बहुत जरूरी है कि जिन लोगों के फायदे के लिये हम यह बोर्ड कानून द्वारा बना रहे हैं, उसमें वही लोग रहेंगे जो कि इंडस्ट्री में लगे हुये हैं या उससे सम्बन्धित हैं।

अगर बोर्ड में इस तरह का वातावरण रहा कि जिससे यह मालूम हो कि उसका सब कार्य सरकार के अधीन ही चलने वाला है, मेजोरिटी (majority) भी उनकी ही रहेगी तो इससे उसका सुचारु रूप से चलना कठिन हो जायेगा। उसमें जो भी मेम्बर होंगे वह सरकार द्वारा नोमिनेटेड होंगे और उनका रुझान यह होगा कि खुशामद के जरिये काम बना लिया जाये। इस तरह से वे लोग अपने ही हित में खुशामद का ज्यादा सहारा लेंगे चाहे देश और जनता का काम बने या न बने, चाहे इंडस्ट्री इन जनरल (industry in general) का काम बने या न बने। इस तरह का जो

बोर्ड बनाया जायेगा उसमें ज्यादातर नामी-नेटेड मेम्बर ही होंगे और वे लोग वहां पर खुशामद से ही अपना काम बनाना चाहेंगे। वहां पर इस तरह का वातावरण पैदा हो जायेगा जो इस उद्योग और जनता के लिये अच्छा नहीं होगा। इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि इसमें कमेटी होगी, स्टैंडिंग कमेटी (standing committee) होगी, एड होक कमेटी (ad hoc committee) होगी, बहुत सी चीज इनमें होगी, भविष्य में जब यह काम करेगी तब ही यह मालूम हो सकेगा कि किस तरह से यह कार्य करती है। मगर तजुर्बा यह बतलाता है कि जहां ज्यादा कमेटियां बनाई जाती हैं वहां पर लोगों की परवरिश ज्यादा होने लगती है और काम की ओर ध्यान कम जाता है। इन कमेटियों का क्या महत्व होगा यह तो काम होने से ही पता चलेगा। लेकिन मेरा ख्याल है कि जिन कमेटियों में जनता के प्रतिनिधि नहीं होते हैं उनका कार्य सुचारु रूप से नहीं चल सकता है। अक्सर यह देखा गया है इस तरह की कमेटियों से उन व्यापार को ही हानि होती है। क्योंकि तजुर्बे से यह पाया गया है और जहां आप लोगों ने सुना होगा कि इस सदन में और दूसरी जगहों पर भी, कि जिस चीज पर जब कभी कंट्रोल हुआ तो उस कंट्रोल में तरह-तरह की बुराई पैदा हो गई। यह भी देखा गया है कि कंट्रोल से जनता का फायदा कम हुआ है बल्कि जिन लोगों के हाथ में कंट्रोल बरतने की मशीनरी (machinery) होती है वे अन-कंट्रोलड (uncontrolled) हो गये हैं। इसलिये मेरा ख्याल है कि इन सब चीजों से कहीं इतना ज्यादा कंट्रोल न बढ़ जाय कि इस उद्योग में जो लोग लगे हुये हैं उनको नुक़सान हो जाय।

इसके बाद मैं इन "कौवर इंडस्ट्री बिल" के ९वें क्लॉज को लेता हूँ जो "सिक्रेटरी और स्टाफ" (secretary and staff)

से सम्बन्ध रखता है। इस ९वें क्लोज के सब क्लोज ३ में यह लिखा हुआ है कि :

"The Chairman, Secretary and other officers and employees of the Board shall not undertake any work unconnected with their duties under this Act except with the permission of the Central Government."

यह बात हमारी समझ में नहीं आती है कि "स्टाफ" का कोई कर्मचारी क्यों कोई ऐसा कार्य करेगा जो unconnected with their duties होगा और अगर करेगा तो उसको सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट की इजाजत लेनी होगी। यह एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण बात है कि जो अच्छी तरह से समझ में नहीं आती है। ऐसा कौन सा काम है जो स्टाफ से ताल्लुक नहीं रखता है जिसे वे न करे और अगर करे तो इजाजत लेकर करें। इस तरह की बात तो समझ में नहीं आती है और यह एक जला देने वाली बात है।

इसके बाद मे इस बिल के ११वें क्लोज में आता हूँ जो Dissolution of the Board से सम्बन्ध रखता है। ११वें क्लोज के सब क्लोज २ के भाग "डी" में यह दिया हुआ है कि :

"(d) as soon as the period of dissolution expires, the Board shall be reconstituted in accordance with the provisions of the Act."

यह 'period of dissolution' की बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई। मुस्लिम ला (Muslim Law) में तो 'period of divorce' रहता है

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lall, you have already taken 18 minutes today.

SHRI K. B. LALL: 'Period of dissolution' होने पर फिर कब बोर्ड बनाया जायेगा यह बात भी समझ में नहीं आती है।

100 C.S.D.

इस बिजु द्वारा एक "कोयर फंड" (Coir Fund) इकट्ठा किया जायेगा यह तो उचित ही है और मैं इस बारे में कोई सुझाव नहीं देना चाहता हूँ। इस तरह का जो भी फंड इकट्ठा किया जाता है वह डैमोक्रेसी के उमूल के मुताबिक ठीक है और वह जनता के हित में ही खर्च कर दिया जाता है। यही नीति हमारे इस फंड को भी होनी चाहिये। जो कुछ भी फंड इस उद्योग से इकट्ठा किया जायेगा वह इस उद्योग की भलाई के कार्यों में ही लगाया जाना चाहिये जिससे कि इस उद्योग से जो लोग बेकार हो गये हैं उनको फायदा पहुँच सके। मगर अक्सर यह देखा जाता है कि जब इस तरह का कोई टैक्स (tax) जनता से लिया जाता है तो वह जनता की भलाई में खर्च तो नहीं किया जाता है बल्कि इधर उधर ही व्यय हो जाता है। इसलिये सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है कि इस काम में होशियारी बरते।

आजादी के बाद जनता के ऊपर टैक्स लगाये गये हैं, इसमें कोई हर्ज नहीं है। मगर उन टैक्सों का अच्छी तरह से जनता की भलाई के लिये ही प्रयोग किया जायेगा तो जनता को भी टैक्स देने में किसी प्रकार की असुविधा नहीं होगी। कल हो मे ने अब्बार में पढ़ा था कि इंडियन चेम्बर आफ कामर्स (Indian Chamber of Commerce) ने अपनी यह राय प्रकट की है कि अगर सरकार इस तरह से टैक्स बढ़ाती चली गई और प्राइवेट इंडस्ट्रियलिस्टों (private industrialists) के ऊपर अपना हाथ रखे रही तो उन लोगों की हिम्मत किसी काम को हाथ में लेने की नहीं होगी। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि इस विषय में हमारी सरकार बहुत गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार कर रही है। इस समय देश में बेरोजगारी बहुत तेजी से बढ़ती चली जा रही है। इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट अपना रुपया किसी उद्योग में लगाने में डर

[Shri K. B. Lall.]

रहे हैं, वे लोग अपनी पूँजी को दबाये हुये हैं, उनको यह डर है कि अगर वे किसी उद्योग में रुपया लगा देंगे तो सरकार उस पर किसी न किसी रूप में अपना नियंत्रण कर लेगी। इस तरह की नीति का यह नतीजा होगा कि देश में उद्योग नहीं खुलेंगे और जनता में बेरोजगारी दिन प्रतिदिन बढ़ती ही चली जायेगी। इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि जो भी इन्डस्ट्री इस समय हमारे देश में है उनकी भी हालत खराब हो जायेगी और इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि देश में बेरोजगारी बढ़ जायेगी। मेरा कहना यह है कि जिस इन्डस्ट्री के लिये टैक्स लिया जाये वह रुपया उसी उद्योग की भलाई और जनता की भलाई के कार्यों में लगा दिया जाना चाहिये। इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि वह उद्योग भी उन्नति करेगा और जनता को भी और उस उद्योग को भी मदद मिलेगी।

इसके बाद में इस बिल के क्लॉज १७ पर आता हूँ। इसमें यह दिया हुआ है कि :

"The Board shall cause accounts to be kept of all moneys received and expended by it."

मगर इसी क्लॉज के भाग २ में यह दिया हुआ है :

"The accounts shall be audited every year by auditors appointed in this behalf by the Central Government and such auditors shall disallow every item, which in their opinion is not authorised by this Act or a rule made or direction issued thereunder."

यह बात तो ठीक मालूम होती है मगर इसी क्लॉज के भाग ३ में यह दिया हुआ है :

"The Board may, within three months from the date of communication to it of the disallowance of any item, as aforesaid, appeal

against such disallowance to the Central Government whose decision shall be final."

सब क्लॉज (३) में यह है :

"The Board may....., appeal against such disallowance to the Central Government whose decision shall be final."

अपील करने का हक है इसमें शक नहीं है लेकिन अपील करने के बाद क्या होगा यह बिल से मालूम नहीं होता। रुपया तो खर्च हो चुका होगा लेकिन अगर वह डिस-एलाऊ (disallow) हो गया तो वह किसके मल्ले पड़ेगा, कौन उसका चार्ज उठायेगा यह साफ नहीं है, मिनिस्टर साहब अपनी स्पीच में कृपा करके बतायेंगे कि डिसएलाऊ होने के बाद क्या होगा, डिसएलाऊ करने के क्या माने क्या होंगे। बोर्ड तो हमेशा यही मेन्टेन (maintain) करेगा कि हमने खर्चा जायज किया है और यह बोर्ड इंडेपेंडेंटली कांस्टीट्यूटेड (independently constituted) है और उसकी आजादी भी दी हुई है, वह बोर्ड रेजोल्यूशन (resolution) पास करके खर्च की मंजूरी देगा, जो बोर्ड के ४० मेम्बर हैं वे रेजोल्यूशन पास करके खर्च को करेंगे तो अगर आडिटर (auditor) ने कहा कि नहीं यह गलत खर्च है उस हालत में किसके ऊपर यह खर्च आयेगा। या तो चेयरमैन, वाइसचेयरमैन या एक्जीक्यूटिव कमेटी उस खर्च को अपने पास से देंगे या फिर जो ४० मेम्बर हैं उनके ऊपर वह खर्च आयेगा। इसका कुछ पता नहीं चलता।

(Interruption.)

I am pointing out and giving suggestions. I am pointing out to the Minister. Neither am I opposing or supporting. I am pointing out to the Minister that these are the things that appear to me and that they should be explained.

१९वें क्लॉज में यह है :

"The Board shall submit to the Central Government and such other authority as may be prescribed, a half-yearly report and an annual report on its activities....."

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): The discussion about clauses is coming up soon. The various clauses can be discussed at that time. I would most humbly suggest to the hon. Member.....

SHRI K. B. LALL:

श्री के० बी० लाल : अच्छी बात है, अगर समय हो गया है तो मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहूंगा और हमको क्वायर से ज्यादा सम्बन्ध भी नहीं है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Today you have taken 25 minutes.

SHRI K. B. LALL:

श्री के० बी० लाल : इसलिये इसके ऊपर मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि इसमें यह जो छमाही रिपोर्ट मांगी गई है वह ठीक नहीं है। हम लोगों का तजुर्बा है कि ऐसे मौकों पर गवर्नमेंट आफिस (offices) में लोग हमेशा रिपोर्ट तैयार करने में ही लगे रहते हैं और काम बहुत कम करके दिखाते हैं। इसलिये अगर छमाही रिपोर्ट की जगह सालाना रिपोर्ट का प्राविजन रहता तो कुछ ज्यादा काम होता। इस बिल से मालूम होता है कि सब काम गवर्नमेंट के हाथ में है और सब काम उनके कड़े सुपरविजन (supervision) में होगा। इसलिये अगर छमाही रिपोर्ट की जगह सालाना रिपोर्ट का प्राविजन कर दिया जाय तो काम ज्यादा होगा नहीं तो रिपोर्ट तैयार करने में ही लोग लगे रहेंगे और काम की ओर कम ध्यान देंगे।

इतनी बात ही मुझे कहनी है कुछ ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता क्योंकि कुछ माननीय सदस्यों का यह ख्याल है कि ये फालतू बातें

हैं। इतना कह कर मैं इस बिल को सपोर्ट करता हूं और जो बातें मैंने मिनिस्टर साहब से अर्ज की हैं उस पर वह रोशनी डालेंगे ऐसी मुझे आशा है।

[For English translation, see Appendix VI. Annexure No. 35]

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE

(SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR): Mr. Chairman, I should start with a frank admission, I think, and it is this that my task in replying to the debate has been rendered both light and heavy as it happened by the previous hon. Members' speeches. Sir, I must appreciate the contributions especially made by our hon. friend Mr. Madhavan Nair. He has rendered my task very light because he has taken care to touch all the points which I could not resist the temptation of otherwise replying in detail, points especially arising out of the contradiction made by my esteemed friend over there, Mr. Manjuran. I should also say that my other friends including Mr. C. G. K. Reddy have thrown out suggestions which are really useful. Having said that, Sir, I must now try to clear some ground. Firstly, Sir, this type of Board that we want to set up for this coir industry has not worked well in the past. Sir, our experience in the past with the Tea Board and the Coffee Board and with similar Boards that we have set up may have been that they have not functioned as well as they might have. But certainly it cannot be gainsaid the fact that they have served a very useful purpose indeed. Take the Coffee Board for example. The production of coffee has been encouraged. It is now in the neighbourhood of 21,000 or 22,000 tons. The Coffee Board especially has done its best to help the growers to increase their production of coffee. Recently we had some complaint about making coffee available to the internal consumer at a reasonable price. But that is not to say that they have not functioned usefully. Their contributions have been quite substantial. This is clear from the

[SHRI D P Karmarkar]

increased production, increased sales within the country itself and the increased demand for exports

Now, Sir, I think I should say that the criticism is levelled at this Bill on the ground that these Boards are rather in the nature of purely Government-nominated Boards and that they do not correctly represent the democratic principle. The Bill is being criticised because we have not given representation to the various interests on the Board on the ground of what they call democratic methods. In a way it represents a sort of dissatisfaction with the functioning of many of the activities, maybe of Government, maybe of the Boards. There is one view which looks upon at what we call inefficient working of the Government in the past. There is a non-appreciation of the influence which the Houses of Parliament can exercise. Now it is a basic fact that we as a Government are responsible to the two Houses of Parliament. We have far more powers as compared with the powers that we are giving to the Boards. Our power to appoint anyone to execute the will of the Government ultimately representing the will of the sovereign Parliament is unlimited. The hon. Members of the House do not object to that. We here by this Bill take upon ourselves the power to constitute a board and then we find that they have a very strong feeling that we are departing from the democratic principles.

2 P M

Ultimately, Sir, I think it will be of great advantage to have such Boards where there will be the growers' representatives, there will be the labour's representatives, there will be the representatives of the consumers, there will be Government representatives, etc. and a composite Board like that can discharge its responsibilities very successfully. Ultimately, however this Board has to operate within the four corners of the policy laid down by Parliament and as reflected in the policies of the Government, and

therefore it is that we reserve to ourselves the power of the dissolution of the Board, if necessary. I think that this Board can function only under one condition. That is to say, there has to be full co-operation in the work of this Board from all sides. As no Government can function effectively unless it is backed by the public opinion and the opinion in this House and the other House, so also no Board can be successful unless there is full co-operation from the public opinion inside the Board, and I also hasten to add that this Board will not function effectively, just as the Government cannot function effectively, unless there is eternal vigilance. I respectfully submit that the forum afforded by the platform of this House and the other House is very useful indeed. If the Board does not function properly, and if the Government does not function properly, then there are any number of opportunities to bring it to book, by interpellations, by way of resolutions, by way of Budget speeches, by way of amendments to this Bill, etc. We may ignore what appears in the papers, but we cannot afford to ignore what is being expressed on the floor of this House. I think one of the welcome features of this Bill is that we bring this Board, its activities, its expenditure, its programmes etc. directly within the purview of the discussions of this House. I think that is of very great advantage indeed. We do not want to shield the inefficiency of any Board nor shield our own inefficiency by simply saying, "This is an autonomous body. We cannot interfere with their decisions." This is precisely the reason why we are making this Board amenable to the will of this House, and we have so constituted the Board that its policies, its programmes, its expenditure, however small, indeed everything about it, will be subject to expressions of opinions in this House.

SHRI C G K REDDY: If I may interrupt for a minute. How does the legal or constitutional position change, just because the Government take upon itself the authority to nominate

the members of this Board? It does not change the position at all whether the members are nominated by Government or elected. So, that cannot be an argument.

SHRI D. P. KAKMARKAR: I am not replying to that aspect. I am on the point that simply because the Board happens to be a nominated Board in the sense that the Government takes upon itself powers of discretion of nominating the members, we do not place the Board beyond what we may call the expressions of opinions in this House. We are actually making the Board more controllable and more amenable to this House. To answer my hon. friend's point at this stage instead of a little later, he wanted election instead of nomination to this Board. We had, for instance, elections to the Import Advisory Council, but we were distressed to find that they were treating this election as any other election and there was canvassing going on. We did not want such sort of unhealthy canvassing within the organisations which will have to be represented. We did not want eight candidates for four seats or six candidates for one seat. While nominating the members of the Board, the Government will have to take into consideration all the organisations concerned and see that the nominations are to the satisfaction of those organisations. Now, to continue what I was saying, I respectfully submit that this Board, far from being against the concepts of democracy, will render itself more amenable to the scrutiny of this House, which, with regard to this Board or any other Board or for the matter of that the Government itself, has to be eternally vigilant, because, when we look upon things, Government activities are only canalised activities of the whole country, and we would indeed welcome the greatest amount of vigilance on the part of this House as also on the part of the public regarding the activities of this Board.

Having said that much, I would like to devote a little attention to

what my hon. friend, Mr. Manjuran, was good enough to say about this Bill. If I may say so, he digressed from the essential merits of this Bill and made the suggestion that the Travancore-Cochin State should be given more autonomy in this respect and that we should not arrogate to ourselves the power of establishing this Board. He said towards the end of his speech that this Bill has been brought forward with an eye on what is going to happen in Travancore-Cochin in January or February and that the Government wanted to show to the people at the time what they had done for the coir industry. I am glad that we have been able to bring forward this Bill. No doubt, those who have a right to say that, will say that. There is no doubt about that, but that is not very relevant to my purpose here. The fact is that Government have awakened to the situation and have constituted this Board with the full knowledge and with the full hope that this Board will function for the betterment of the coir industry. What perhaps was worrying my hon. friend, Mr. Manjuran, was the likely immediate effect of this Bill in Travancore-Cochin. People are far more intelligent than he seems to think. They will not be taken in by merely the passing of this Bill. Therefore it need not be taken that votes will be cast on this side or that side. I do not think that our voters are as ignorant as some of us are apt to think sometimes. I am afraid that my esteemed friend who normally devotes himself to the merits of the Bills before us, this time addressed himself to something outside the merits of this Bill. Firstly, he said: Why is it that you intervene like trespassers on prohibited ground? I will explain. No doubt, Travancore-Cochin is responsible for 80 per cent. of our coir production, while Madras is responsible for the bulk of the balance. Coir is produced wherever coconut is grown. Mysore came in for attention. My hon. friend from Maharashtra mentioned Ratnagiri. Some friends referred to Bengal and Assam. No doubt, when we speak of the coir industry.

[Shri D P Karmarkar] we speak of the coir industry as a whole. No doubt the major portion of the production is concentrated in Travancore-Cochin but when we bring in a measure like this, we have to think of the industry as a whole, every region where coir is produced. Mysore comes in, Bombay comes in, Bengal and Assam come in. And also we may have to think of starting this industry in other places too to relieve unemployment. Therefore to say that the Government of India should not have anything to do with this but should leave it to the State Government is not right. Why is it that the Constitution provides that in respect of certain industries the Government of India may assume control? We have to assume control of this particular industry because, firstly, it is not concentrated in one particular State. There are other States concerned. Also, as I said, this may be started in other areas too. All these things are conceivable, and therefore it is that the Government of India thought it proper to take matters into its own hands and constitute a Board for the purpose.

Secondly, as my hon friend Mr Manjuran doubtless knows, this is an industry which is important for us particularly because it is a good exporting industry and we have been earning crores of rupees recently by exporting this commodity. That is an all-India question as my hon friend will note. The Travancore-Cochin Government naturally felt—in fact they have agreed in a conference in November last at which the idea of this Coir Board was thought of and finalized and it is with the full concurrence of the Travancore-Cochin Government that we have undertaken this legislation. The Government for whose autonomy my hon friend fought yesterday afternoon, they themselves agreed ...

SHRI M MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin) How did the Travancore-Cochin Government convey their concurrence?

SHRI D P KARMARKAR We sat across the table and they agreed—that is the normal way.

SHRI M MANJURAN Some individual might have concurred in

SHRI D P KARMARKAR The Government representatives were there and normally Governments are represented by their Ministers and officials and such representatives were there. The Travancore-Cochin Government may not have agreed with all the clauses of the Bill or they might have liked to have control over this or that but it was in a combined meeting of all concerned—industry, as also the Travancore-Cochin Government that this was agreed. We cannot proceed on a measure of this kind unless we had the consent of the Travancore-Cochin Government on a practical way because if they were against this Coir Board we know that the State can make it difficult to work and they agreed—I think they exercised their discretion rightly—because they know if an all-India Board is there, it will work towards the larger benefit of Travancore-Cochin and we are also thinking of locating the headquarters of this Board somewhere in the area where this industry is prospering today.

Now having said that I should deal in a very brief manner with the question of control. My hon friend Khwaja Inait Ullah said, "What about these controls? When are we going to do away with controls? We have had so many controls." He has cited good many examples. We have had production control, distribution control, movement control and we have had so many controls during the war and during the post-war. But one control we cannot do away with and that is the control of our economy. Post-war development throughout the world has revealed the fact and the importance of a controlled economy. Now we don't want to have control in these industries because as has been stated in the Objects and Reasons, maybe sometimes in this industry the raw

material is subject to speculative activities. It is likely. Many interests are there. One of the hon. Members referred to the foreign interests. I will not allow myself to be diverted from the main consideration of this discussion to give what we mean by foreign interests. As I said before, we have allowed foreign interests consciously. We don't want them to be militating against the interests of the country but we don't want to wipe them out all at once. Maybe, in the fullness of time there will be greater Indian participation even in this coir industry but apart from that I would like briefly to say this in respect of the point of Khwaja Inait Ullah about controls. I think in an industry like coir, in a commodity like coffee, in a commodity like tea, I think a controlled development is always a very safe development. We shall be in a position to say how much should be or should not be exported and where it should be exported and how it should be exported—the mechanic of export etc. can be done. My hon. friend Prof. Ranga is rather surprised because he is not in charge of this control but that is another matter. I am quite sure that if he were to be here, he would be a greater ardent advocate of controls than I am but at the moment he is rather surprised.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): I am rather surprised at your eloquence.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Because his previous experience had been otherwise. Coming back to this question, I think it is very obvious that we have to exercise a beneficent control in respect of the development of many of our industries and therefore Parliament recently approved of the Industrial Development Bill and that also gives us power to control to a larger extent than before. One point about which there could be no difference of opinion was about the Research Institute. I was very happy to see that

note struck about the Research in India. The question was how is your clause going to help. I agree that we are proceeding rather slowly. We will have this Board go into all aspects. First problems come first. They will try to find solution for the initial difficulty of the country but you cannot work wonders overnight. There is this broad pattern of this industry which is peculiar to itself. The coir industry, as the hon. House is aware, has to depend for its immediate prosperity on the nature of its exports. We know however that whenever the export market has been erratic, with its ups and downs, there have been ups and downs for the workers and to the organisers of this industry. As the House is aware, 75 per cent. of the production of this industry has to be exported abroad, and whenever there have been exports, the people connected with this industry have prospered. Whenever exports have slackened on account of stock-piling, there the industry has suffered. Our idea is that we have to take care of this problem because as has been observed today, the difficulty of this industry arises from the fact that the people concerned in this industry—the basic people have no other alternative occupation. This is rather something of a delicate problem. This industry is not organised in an area where if the coir industry is not there, the people could rely on agriculture as it happens in other trades like agriculture where if there is over-much of rain water or too little of rain, it may help other crops. We have to appreciate that these people rely for their livelihood mostly upon the coir industry. They have no other alternative occupation to go back upon and that renders our immediate task very urgent and the first thing we shall have to do is to see that the industry is so reorganised that improvements are effected in the production itself. Secondly to see to it that a steady export market is maintained. Something was said by hon. friends here that the Government have not made any effort. I think Government does and it need not publicise everything it does. In fact

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]

I was very happy to find that one article from the *Journal of Industry and Trade* was repeatedly quoted on the floor of the House. I am very happy about that because it shows the familiarity of Members with the publications of our Ministry and certainly it does happen that the amount of details that we give in them complicate matters. Sometimes we are faced with all sorts of embarrassing questions which we are happy to find are based upon such materials as have been supplied by the Government. Now the analysis given in that article indicates that immediately this crisis was on, when it came to our notice in an urgent manner, we circularised all our Foreign Missions to send us factual information as to how this industry stands. We did not keep back anything at all. We gave all the information that was available because we wanted the public to be aware of that. If in a particular country huge import duties are there, we might be able to negotiate them through GATT but we might not be able to do anything else but we do want the industry and the trade to get a correct idea of how the industry stood in the markets of the world so far as coir products are concerned. We did find that on account of slackness of demand in a particular area which had also stock-piled coir products, their demands fell and so there it is that in different countries different conditions prevail and we have requested our foreign representatives to take as deep an interest in respect of this industry as in respect of other handicrafts and I am happy to be able to say that the attention that we have been able to pay to this problem is slowly bearing fruit by way of greatly increased exports as it has happened in the coir products as also a little slowly in the case of other handicrafts.

I am sure this hon. House will be pleased to know of some figures. It is true that we are in 1937 which is the base here and that is a fact which we have to realise as a basic fact.

In 1938 the average was 57,000 tons per month.

In 1948 the average was 75,000 tons per month.

In 1949 the average was 116,000 tons per month.

In 1950 the average was 123,000 tons per month.

(That was the biggest)

In 1951 the average was 118,000 tons per month.

In 1952 it was, by and large continuing at 106,000 and in 1953 as I have worked out up till now it is 110,000. So these are not too dismal a set of figures, as far as the exports are concerned. But we cannot base ourselves on the export figures alone. What happens in this industry is that it is not only the quantum of export that affects the industry. The quantum may be satisfactory. But when there is sluggishness in the price it affects the whole industry and the workers in this industry. Where normally a spinner gets Re. 1-4-0 when there is this sluggishness in price, he gets only about 7 as. or 8 as. or 9 as. a day. That is dismal enough and this is due to conditions partly outside and partly inside the country. If I may trouble the House with a few more figures, for instance, for one type—Rakkal Alleppy, in 1950, the price was Rs. 320—I suppose it is for a cwt.—Rs. 328-8-0 to be exact. Then it rose to Rs. 350 per cwt. in November 1950. Then again the price slowly went up and it rose up to Rs. 530 in 1951. Compare this price to Rs. 328 that existed in 1950. Later the price came down, slowly to round about 500 in June and it went down still further to Rs. 410 in December. For 1952 the prices again came down from Rs. 400 in June 1952 to as low as Rs. 250—the lowest figure in December 1952. That was the time when the industry suffered the most. In 1953, we have made progressive improvement. Things were very bad in January 1953. The price then was Rs. 235 and slowly the price went up, and they showed an upward trend. From Rs. 235, it went up to 245, then 246 and then 251 and now 260 is the latest figure for October 1953. The price is now round about Rs. 265 So the price

shows an upward trend. I do not say that it is very satisfactory but I was merely showing that it is now better than what it was in the beginning of 1950 and it is no use taking a dismal view of the situation, because ultimately, it all depends upon the world speculation, on speculations in other parts of the world, whether they want to buy from us or from others. But by and large, owing to the efforts of the State Governments and the Government of India, and also in fairness, let me add, owing to the improvement in world conditions and in the demand from other countries, things are not quite as dismal as they were.

No doubt, the question has been raised—What have you done in the meantime? I shall not take up time by listing all that has been done. My hon. friend Mr. Madhavan Nair has explained it much better than I could do in an off-hand manner. I shall only invite attention to the railway project that was specially taken up, as the House already knows to ease the unemployment in that particular area. As I have said.....

SHRI M. MANJURAN: If I may correct the hon. Minister. The railway line which runs from Ernakulam to Quilon does not cross the place where coir is being manufactured. I think there is some misconception on his part that it.....

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Yes, I think both my hon. friend Mr. Manjuran and myself have the same geography book and I know, as a matter of fact, that this railway line does not exactly run through this particular spot. I know my hon. friend would have liked to take up a particular line at this place for this purpose and then later on dismantled, just for giving.....

SHRI M. MANJURAN: No, I was only saying that what the hon. Minister stated was not borne out by facts.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: That is all right. What I say is that project of a railway line was taken up with

a view to relieving unemployment. The line may not be exactly passing over that particular area, but it was undertaken to afford relief to the unemployment in the area.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is in the same State.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Yes, it is in the same State also.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: I would like to know if any man of this area worked in that railway project?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I think it would be more relevant and useful to confine ourselves to the question before us rather than find out if there were statistics as to where the workers came from, and if so, how many worked there etc. I was only pointing out that some effort was made—some substantial effort—to relieve unemployment so far as this State was concerned and that was done with a view to ease out the unemployment burden and it was in some measure relieved.

Having said that, I would like to invite the attention of the House to the fact that when we discuss measures of this kind—and my hon. friend Mr. Manjuran will be interested in the observations that I am going to make—we make a particular distinction and we see what is the policy. With that policy hon. friends opposite may agree, they may take the same view as we do, or they may take a different view. It is part of the game. We stand of a mixed economy for instance. Some of our friends there stand for the Communist ideology and some others for a socialised economy. It is a commonly known fact that in a democratic House like this, each side urges the views for which it stands. We have no quarrel about that. But may I respectfully submit that we have to divide the two things, Government has one platform and if that platform is not acceptable to the people, then some other platform or Government comes up. But there are certain solutions for certain problems and when such problems arise in such a specific area like Travancore-Cochin,

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]

they become very harmful problems and I think we will not serve the cause of the people in any manner by creating artificial doubts about a particular matter. I would address myself to the way in which my hon. friend Mr. Manjuran dealt with the question, because I fail to see myself at any great distance from him or from his views. I have never felt myself compelled to do so so far as his standpoint and his sobriety of views are concerned. Now, what is the problem before us? Apart from the general economy of the country, the particular problem here is this. Here is a State which, as we know, is overpopulated. The density of population is very high there and there are very few industries there—only about five or six. And if any one of these industries is affected, then it not only affects that particular industry, and the people connected with that particular industry, but it affects the whole area. And that area is precious for the whole of India because of its cultural elements and in many other ways also. In any case, the economic interest of that particular area deserves particular attention. Other areas in the country are in a more lucky position in the matter of having fertile lands or irrigation facilities and other things. But in this particular area, as we know the average holding per acre is as low as one acre, whereas the average for the whole of India is 3 acres. If the people of this area are thrown on agriculture alone, they starve. It is not like any other area. The normal density of population is some thing like 2,000 per sq. mile and in some areas it is as much as even 3,000 per sq. mile. That is the position in this area where we have to work. I think we have to work for an all round improvement. If we are inefficient, we on this side are open to correction. If the Board is found to be inefficient, well, scrap it and create another. But do not create artificial difficulties. Try to attack a particular set-up, improve it or change it. I particularly attach importance to what Mr. Manjuran says for whatever he

says naturally there is importance attached to it. Whatever work is done, I hope it will not be necessary for my hon. friend Mr. Madhavan Nair to go and tell the people that everything is all right and for my hon. friend Mr. Manjuran to go and tell them that everything is bad. If that happens, what will be the psychological effect on the people concerned? Let us try to relieve the condition of the people. Let us strive for that. Where they get 7 as. or 8 as. or 9 as. let them get at least 11 as. a day. Eleven annas a day may strike us in Delhi as an insignificant figure. But let us try to imagine the lot of the man who has to buy all his dire necessities and live on 8 as. or 9 as. a day. Other parts of India are more lucky; but here is a part where nature is abundant in its loveliness, but where owing to very unexpected circumstances the economic life is in great difficulty.

I think I should make an appeal to all my friends over here to whichever party they may belong to be most vigilant in the working of this Board day in and day out. Sir, I am very happy whenever there is an attack made so far as the working of Government is concerned because ultimately I do not hold any brief for whatever is wrong. We may, on this side, as Government be interested in something but that is not important. We may disappear but the people remain. In the difficult conditions which exist in Travancore-Cochin, I should like to make an appeal on behalf of the Government to every one, irrespective of their opinions, of their parties and the platforms and the rest that this is a problem which deserves our fullest moral sympathy. Let us not lose ourselves in other things. Let us fight with each other on the platform on every ground of ideologies and the rest of it but when it comes to the poor man in Travancore-Cochin who has no other alternative but to starve, if we could add one anna to his earnings, let us do that. Let us promise him that one anna.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Is there anything promised to him in this Bill?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sir, I do not know. I think nothing has been promised to me in this Bill nor to Mr. Manjuran. It may be that in the sense of a promise there is nothing but we certainly make some efforts at helping those who have been suffering under very difficult situations. Let us do our best. Government has got its own limitations. It may be that we are all sovereign, that the Parliament is a sovereign body but unless public opinion in the country could be rallied behind all the beneficent measures of Government, there is no hope; nor is it possible for any Government to absolve itself of the charge of the people.

Sir, I should not like to dilate nor sermonise but I thought it just as well, as I was reviewing the whole of yesterday's debate this morning in an attempt to answer, that I might make these observations, much more as thinking loud rather than advising anybody because advice, however, right when given, is likely to be resented.

Sir, then we come to the scheme of the Bill. The Bill is a very simple one. As this hon. House knows, all that we seek to do is that we want to create a Board. We have defined some of its functions. If you do not find the Board useful, we have taken powers to dissolve that, in a sense, it is a simple mechanism not that the mechanism itself is not very important. So far as its working is concerned, we have to see how the Board functions. Part of the success of the Board will be dependent on the type of nominations that we make, the personnel of the Board. Part of its efforts will also be dependent upon the vigilance which we exercise over their activities and part of its success will also be dependent upon whether there is co-operation from public opinion especially in the area or not. Sir, that much about the scheme of the Board and I do not think that this is a scheme which deserves to be thrown away. Let us try the Board. In any sense whatever we are doing we are sharing our burdens with the

people. We may just have said that there shall be a Director General for the Coir Industry stationed in Travancore-Cochin and he will have four Assistant Directors General and in those particular areas where it is grown there will be a sort of one Director, and that way we will carry on the business. We may have done that, but that is not a problem that has to be tackled in that way. This is a problem in which we have to associate public opinion in all its activity. In the Arecanut Committee, in the Coconut Committee, and in all these committees which I have mentioned, work is going on. They are doing, in so far as is possible in their limited spheres, we have no reason to believe that all that they have done is not good or that all that they have left undone is not to be done. But certainly they have performed a very useful function indeed. I should also not like to forget the fact that this is an industry which has to be taken much care of. As it has already been brought to the notice of this House, this particular industry is a cottage industry. Seventy per cent. or more of the workers engaged are in the weaving which is largely done by the factory and the spinning is done largely by what may be called the cottage section. Anything that we do to help this cottage industry with largely help in stabilising the economy of this industry.

Those were the broad points which I jotted down for myself in respect of the general aspects of the Bill raised during the course of the debate.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): What is the plan, Sir, for increasing the internal use and consumption of the coir?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I think we could, in the commencement, begin with a little more use of coir mats and I am quite sure the first thing that my friend can do is to go to the Cottage Industries Emporium where there are very lovely products of cottage industry available. I will go with him and both of us could, for our own use, buy some of the coir mats. That is how it begins.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: You mean at Lucknow or here in Delhi?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Delhi. I am very sorry that my hon. friend does not know. I shall have great pleasure in showing him round and I am quite sure he will purchase coir mats. Some of the cottage industry products are very good. Of course, that is nothing personal, but.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: You mean I could enjoy a motor drive?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I am not so very anxious about the ride, but if he thinks it is better to walk I shall do that.

My hon. friend Mr. Mazumdar complained about delays. He complained that owing to the absence of the Bill, prices had risen round about 1951 and that we are coming here in 1953 with a Bill. But much has happened before this. As I said earlier, we have had a Special Officer sent to Travancore-Cochin early in 1952. He went through the whole problem and submitted a report. One of the very important facts that he brought to our notice was that the industry should take to co-operative methods. Now, that is a difficult thing to achieve but then we have tried. Then, another suggestion was that a Coir Board should be set up. We had to have consultations with the Travancore-Cochin Government and after that we convened a conference. They finalised the matter and it came before the Government. It took three months to finalise the scheme and as my hon. friend might be knowing—or if he does not know it already, he might know it from me—that this Bill was introduced round about the last week of March. Now, there again, we will be charged with dilatoriness in that we tried to take away the item from the agenda. Nothing of that sort. We were very anxious to have this Bill passed as early as possible. We tried our best to have the Bill passed during the Budget Session. We could not as there were some other important measures. During the August Session also it could not be passed, but part

of the discussion in the House of the People took place in August, but much to our consternation, somehow or other, this Bill was relegated as some other important measures had to be passed. This explains the delay in taking measures to bring this Bill before the House.

Then, again, my hon. friend Mr. Manjuran was mentioning about the functions of the Board. One of the points made was—I think it was my hon. friend from Poona, Mr. Deogirikar, who made that point—about training. That is one of the cardinal points. He was not sure whether training would come under research. I went into that carefully myself and though I could not persuade myself that training was included in research, still we shall certainly consider that matter. In that institute it is not a case of fundamental research like that of our bigger laboratories. Certainly, it will involve training and we shall try to see whether we could not train some people in the research institute itself.

In regard to the functioning of the Board, as I said, we can say nice things about how they could function, but if the Board does not function, the nice words remain where they are. We have tried to include all types of things to see that progress in this industry is achieved. The functions of the Board are mentioned in the provisions of the Bill itself.

About propaganda, certainly we would have fairs and exhibitions. Wherever it is possible, some of the coir products are sent for these exhibitions and fairs. Our Trade Consuls are also trying to do whatever is possible, but coir is a big thing which cannot be carried and that makes it also difficult to carry these things overseas whenever exhibitions and fairs are held. It is not like the Banaras zaris and things like that which one could just pack and send on. But certainly I agree with Mr. Mazumdar when he said that considerable propaganda should be done. He also, in passing, referred to Anda-

mans. It is very interesting, Sir. Some of our best patriots have spent some time in Andamans and there is many an Andaman story which has inspired us when we were young. If there is a question of sending anyone from the Parliament to Andamans to explore the possibility of this industry, I am quite sure, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that Mr. Mazumdar will again have a sort of reminiscent pleasure to go and have a look at the place where some of us have stayed and where behind the bars some of the ideas which we are trying to put into practice were evolved. But that is just by the way. If he does not want it, he will not have to do it. When he referred to his stay in the Andamans, it rather thrilled me also.

My hon. friend Mr. Manjuran—I know that he will not agree with me but still I would try—said why should not the State be left to do the job? He also said that the Board is not necessary. There are other things which he said, but there is one point with which I substantially agree and that is that there should be as much propaganda as possible. I have already dealt with my hon. friend Khwaja Inait Ullah's criticism against control. He wondered whether Rs. 12 lakhs would be sufficient. As and when we work, funds which may be necessary, would be found. If necessary, Government would make funds available from the general exchequer. I am happy, Sir, that Prof. G. Ranga is nodding his head. All that we get ultimately comes from the people

Then I come to my hon. friend Mr. Reddy. Forgetting what he said about democratic principles—I am afraid I will not and could not agree with him there—I take up the question of the foreign firms which does deserve our attention. And then he spoke of laboratories. That was also a very interesting suggestion. If research is to be undertaken it will have its own small laboratory. I am very happy that there has been expressed round about this House a very keen interest in the research aspect of this industry. I have no doubt that our Ministry as

also the Board will take cognizance of the anxiety of this House to develop research in this industry.

Then I find nothing to answer in the speeches because I find my notes blank, but then I find there was one small point raised by our esteemed friend Mr. Rama Rao. He said, "Why not leave this to the Coconut Board?" It cannot be for the simple reason that a Coconut Board will deal with coconuts and a Coir Board will deal with coir. Sometimes it is difficult to put too many responsibilities on one Board. The Coconut Board is concerned with coconut production in the country and with its development to increase the quantity available. Where the trouble of the Coconut Board ends the work of the Coir Board begins, namely, after the coconut is shelled and after the kernel is consumed by my hon. friends like Mr. Rama Rao.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): We find that growers of coconuts are also eligible to be members of this Board.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: We thought it proper to have some sample representation for them also because they would be helping the Board by giving facts about the development of the coconut industry.

Then there was another point, I think, raised by Mr. Dave and equally by other Members also: Why not all the other areas also get the benefit? Wherever there is coconut growing or this coir industry, there also this Board will devote its attention and will also have to think in terms of increasing employment in the other areas also. But the first to receive attention will be Travancore-Cochin and that part of the Madras State, namely, Malabar and any other area there

PROF. G. RANGA: East Coast also?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: In fact all coasts which abound in coconuts and it is very difficult to forget Andhra without forgetting Prof. Ranga and the East Coast also will have to come in for attention.

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]

I think, Sir, another useful point was made, namely, that the number 40 comprising the Board is too large. I am very happy, Sir, about the anxiety of the House to make the Board as compact as possible and that is an indication that the House takes a serious view of the largeness of the Board. We shall try to see if in actual practice we could reduce the number from 40 to anywhere round about 30. This will lead to some economy also in expenditure. Everything would depend upon the experience gained and as a result of experience in respect of this Board we can find out whether we cannot have a smaller Board like the Village Industries Board with which my friend Prof. Ranga is so familiar, or the other standing committees. If this number is considered too large, we shall by experience limit it to smaller number. It will reduce expenses also. It will make the composition of the Board much more compact than it would otherwise be.

Then Mr. Lalchand referred to the question of finance that would be placed at the disposal of the Board and said that it was small. Well, if any difficulty arises we shall increase it.

Then he was asking about the control over the Board and asked whether the Board will be independent. The precise nature of this piece of legislation is such that the Board should not feel that it is absolutely independent. It is necessary that the Board should naturally be responsible to the Government and to the people at large. If the Board functions well discharging the duties set for it, it will have no interference. On the other hand, if it does not function well we shall have to interfere.

Then he also said that it is not advisable to make our own nominations of the members of the Board. I am not quite sure whether in all the concerns in which he is concerned he will give representations on an elective basis, say, in the matter of the election of the manager or some-

body else in a key post. But it does not matter to us what he does with his concerns and I think we could follow the example of efficient organizations and we thought that nomination in this case would be better than leaving these things to election.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI (Bombay): All our directors are elected.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: The directors are elected but what about others?

Then he asked: How is the amount to be utilised and he asked whether Rs. 6 lakhs would be sufficient. I am not quite sure whether that would be sufficient or not and, if not sufficient, out of sheer altruistic motives our rich people in this country who are otherwise profiting on the strength of their large-scale industries may be persuaded to make some donations to the Board and I am sure that the Board will be very happy to receive such donations and if that is not forthcoming and if the fund placed at the disposal of the Board proves to be insufficient then, I certainly think, we shall have to draw some money even from the general exchequer for the purpose.

Then he gave us salutary advice that we should reduce our interference to the minimum. I assure him that we would begin with the least interference, but if progressively more interference becomes necessary we shall not hesitate to interfere. Ordinarily we shall not interfere. We have sufficient headaches already and to add one more headache to them by having to interfere with the Coir Board, if it be properly functioning, is not the intention of Government.

Then my hon. friend Dr. Mitra and another friend of mine whom I find absent just now have made very useful suggestions. I should say that, subject to the reservation that I made at the commencement, I appreciated the debate very much and it was very nice. We look to a full measure of co-operation from everyone in giving

effect to the provisions of this Bill because only on such co-operation will depend the success of this measure as all other measures.

I find that there is a small amendment tabled here because the Bill, as it has come from the House of the People, makes it compulsory for the Government to lay the audited accounts of this Board on the Table of the House of the People. I think it is just a slip that the Council of States has been omitted from that provision. I do not know how it happened in the House of the People. What we really meant was that it should be laid before both Houses of Parliament and not before the House of the People alone. I do not know how it happened there, whether as a result of any amendment or how. But whatever it is, we do not stand on ceremony. We would like to place the audited accounts before the Houses of Parliament and for that purpose I am prepared to accept the amendment tabled in that behalf here. I do not want to take up the time of the House any more at this stage. Except the amendment I referred to that I would accept I regret very much that, after the most careful thought being given to the other amendments, we are not able to accept any other amendments. Sir, I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the control by the Union of the Coir Industry and for that purpose to establish a Coir Board and levy a customs duty on coir fibre, coir yarn and coir products exported from India be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. I find that to clause 2 there is an amendment by Mr. Manjuran. It is a negative amendment and so it is out of order.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: On a point of order, Sir. My stand is entirely

based on the Constitution of India, article 249, article 252 and the 2nd List of the Seventh Schedule. As long as it is not declared by a resolution of the Council of States under article 249, the subjects mentioned in the State List are within the exclusive legislative ambit of the State Legislature. This matter has not so far been declared by Parliament, namely, that it is expedient in the public interest that the Union should take under its control the coir industry. At this stage, Sir, this Bill should not have been brought forward before the matter was so declared by Parliament.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what Parliament is doing now.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: In the Constitution there is a provision under article 249 as to how this declaration has to be made. I would read out that article:

"Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Chapter, if the Council of States has declared by resolution supported by not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting that it is necessary or expedient in the national interest that Parliament should make laws with respect to any matter enumerated in the State List specified in the resolution, it shall be lawful for Parliament to make laws for the whole or any part of the territory of India with respect to that matter while the resolution remains in force."

And also in article 252 it is provided that if it has to be done otherwise, Legislatures of more than two States should pass a resolution to that effect. In this case, although the hon. Minister stated that the Travancore-Cochin Government conveyed their concurrence, they have not conveyed their concurrence in the manner prescribed in the Constitution. It should be done either according to the provisions of article 249 or according to those of 252. There is no other provision in the Constitution by which a declaration can be made by Parlia-

[Shri M. Manjuran.]
 ment. Either the Council of States should have debated the matter and passed a resolution by two-thirds majority, or according to 252, two or more State Legislatures should have debated a resolution and passed it. Before that is done this matter should not have been brought before Parliament. In other Constitutions—in Australia, America and Canada—also this matter is important. A Federal Constitution has to be construed as an arrangement or agreement between the Centre and the States. No unilateral action is permitted in any Federal Constitution. When I said that the State Government should have done it, I was always referring to the Constitution, and this is against the federal structure of the Constitution. That is what surprised me. This Constitution probably was brought into effect by those who are also bringing forth this Bill. Under the circumstances, although the amendment is negative, it should be considered and debated, because it stands on its constitutional merit. This Bill is against the Constitution.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I do not like to interrupt the hon. Member. He doubtless knows the provision in item 52 of the Seventh Schedule, "Industries, the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest." We are trying.....

SHRI M. MANJURAN: That is what I was referring to—item 52 List I of the Seventh Schedule. It prescribes that certain industries can be transferred to the control of the Union Government, but that is a Schedule, it is not the Constitution. The articles of the Constitution are governing the Schedule. It is not that the items of the Schedule that govern the articles of the Constitution. It will be a wrong conception of the Constitution if the Schedule should regulate the articles of the Constitution. The document before us is the Indian Constitution. The Schedule is a subsidiary item.

What overrides is the Constitution with its articles; not that the Schedule overrides the articles of the Constitution. A particular form has been prescribed in the Constitution for matters to be declared by Parliament to be of public importance. That is under article 249. If it is a matter affecting more than one State, it is regulated under the provisions of article 252. Now, I am surprised whether we are to act in accordance with an item of the Schedule or with the articles of the Constitution.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar):
 In item 52.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let him go on.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: I have noticed that item 52 of the Union List. It says that when Parliament has declared a certain industry to be of public importance it can transfer its control to the Union. But so far it has not been done in this case. That matter should have been separately brought up, that it is in the public interest. The extent of public interest is a matter that Parliament should have ascertained before such a Bill was brought before them. At no stage either in the Lower House or here when the Minister moved or replied laboriously about it did he make out a point about its public importance or its national importance. The intention of the Constitution-makers was that when in such matters where the States had exclusive legislative rights and they were encroached upon by Parliament, the Council of States, as representing the States particularly, should have debated thoroughly over a resolution like that and should have come to the conclusion that it was in public interest necessary that the control of the particular industry should be diverted from the State to the Union. It has not been done. Under the circumstances, this declaration here is not valid by itself; it should have been done apart from the Bill itself, whereas it is clause 2 of the Bill here. It should have preceded the Bill. It should have come much before; it

should have been debated whether it was necessary for the coir industry to be transferred from the Travancore-Cochin State Government to the Union Government and under what conditions. What national interest has suddenly crept in? These matters should have been debated. Hence it is not in accordance with the Constitution. It encroaches upon the provisions of the Constitution. All that appears is a phrase from an item in the Schedule that Parliament can do it, but the prescription of the Constitution under articles 249 or 252 which should have been made applicable has not been done. So long as that is not done, this Bill is out of order and should not be taken into further consideration. As you know, that omission of the second clause of the Bill naturally invalidates the Bill. It stands invalidated in the face of the Constitution which was so reasonably, cogently and thoughtfully brought out by the legislators, and I am only speaking in their name that this.....

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: Is the hon Member raising a point of order or.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, yes.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: And that also changes considerably the very structure of the Constitution because I find that even if such a matter is done on a resolution, it stands for one year and can only be extended by another year. Here is a particular subject and it is said that there is a temporary setback in the particular industry. That does not mean that the Central Government could come up and permanently encroach upon the rights of the State. This Act would not, if it is passed, at any time transfer this power back to the State. So, it is unconstitutional. Sir, I would only say that much.

(Shri Rajagopal Naidu rose.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you supporting his objection?

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: In a manner, Sir.

100 C.S.D.

4 P. M.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I feel personally that, excepting in one small matter, I have to respectfully differ from what Mr. Manjuran has raised. Industries, in general, find a place in the State List ..

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): Also in the Union List.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU:.....and such of the industries that are declared by law in the Union List as in the public interest, in the national interest that can be taken over by the Union. The only question would be whether Schedule VII, List I, item 52 "Industries, the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest", would mean whether the Parliament would have to pass a law first declaring that the following industries including the coir industry should be taken over by the Union, and then enact a legislation of this sort; or whether it is proper that both the declaration and enactment should be done at one and the same time, namely, the passing of the Coir Industries Bill of this sort and incorporating in that Bill a clause such as clause No. 2, namely, "It is hereby declared that it is expedient in the public interest that the Union should take under its control the coir industry". I feel personally that in strictly construing the wording of item 52 of the list I of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution strictly it would mean that the Parliament would have to pass a law to bring in this industry within the purview of the Union List and then come forward with a Bill of this sort by law

AN HON. MEMBER: Not by a resolution?

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: The wording is 'by law'.

Sir, Mr. Mathai Manjuran was submitting that Schedules will have no importance and that too much importance should not be attached to them.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: I did not say that.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU We feel that Schedules are very important. Article 246 of the Constitution will have to be read together with Schedule VII, because article 246 does not exist without the Schedule.

Shri Manjuran was saying that according to the provisions of article 249, a resolution has not been passed to declare that this industry should be taken over by the Union. He said that a resolution should be passed by the Council of States supported by not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting that it is necessary or expedient in the national interest to take over this industry. But there is a difference between item 52 and other items. We find in item 52: "Industries, the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest". It is only under this item that you find such a wording has been used, and it means that one need not refer to article 249 of the Constitution and the Parliament can by law bring in any of the industries from the State List to the Union List.

But, I personally feel that there is a democratic way of bringing all this in the Union List. By democratic method I mean that one need not resort to article 249, but one could resort to article 252. What article 252 says is: "If it appears to the Legislatures of two or more States to be desirable that any of the matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the States except as provided in articles 249 and 250 should be regulated in such States by Parliament by law, and if resolutions to that effect are passed by all the Houses of the Legislatures of those States, it shall be lawful for Parliament" to take over the whole thing. So, it is for the State Legislature to pass a resolution that the Centre should take over the particular industry. There is also another article, article 263, under which if an industry such as the coir industry in which not all the States in India are interested but only a few like Travancore and Cochin they can form a sort of 'Inter-State

Council' and recommend that to the Union in the interest of the few States in which this particular industry is common to that particular State or States; then they can pass a resolution in the respective Legislatures empowering the Centre to pass an Act to take this item from the State List to the Union List, instead of bringing a Bill of this kind and incorporating a section here. The only democratic method could be to allow the Legislatures of the State or States to pass resolutions empowering the Centre to take over a particular item, instead of incorporating everything in the same Bill—taking over the industry and also making various provisions as in clause 2 of the Bill declaring that it is expedient in the public interest to do so. So, my view is that Parliament should first pass the law taking over the item from the State List to the Union List and then pass a separate law with regard to that item.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, in supporting the point of view made by my hon. friend Mr. Rajagopal Naidu, I would like to point out and I am sure that the Government must have taken legal opinion in bringing forward this Bill. That is with regard to the technical position; but there is something which should be properly done apart from the technical position. The technical position may be in favour of the Government or not—I do not know. Item 52 of the Seventh Schedule—"Industries, the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest"—raises an issue which deserves serious consideration. In the Coir Industry Bill, we have been all along discussing the merits of the Bill but not as to whether it is expedient in the public interest that this subject should be taken over by the Union or be dealt with rather by the State itself. The attention is focussed on the merits of the Bill not on the fact as to whether it is proper for the Union to take over this subject. Therefore, I feel very strongly, although the Government may be technically right, that if an

occasion like this should arise in future Government should pass a law first for taking over the industry to be controlled by the Union so that that matter may be debated and discussed, and bring in the Bill afterwards

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Sir,.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am going to give a ruling; have you any further point to add?

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: When we referred to the fact that the Bill should not be taken into consideration and a point of order was raised by Mr. Manjuran, my friend Mr. Rajagopal Naidu referred to item 52 of the Seventh Schedule which reads: "Industries, the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest". I would like to point out that the procedure as to how a law has to be passed is laid down in the Constitution itself and that procedure is that a Bill will have to be brought before the House of the People and the Council of States and passed by them and assented to by the President and then it becomes a law. Here the words are "the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest". I feel that there has been no law declaring that the control of this industry is in the public interest. Mr. Ghose has brought out the question whether the public interest aspect of the matter has been considered. That has not been gone into. In supporting him I would further say that there has been no law in regard to the necessity or expediency of taking over this subject by the Union.

Besides, we will have to consider the Union List, the State List and the Concurrent List. You will find that the mention of the industry is not only in the Union List but it is also in the State List and also in the Concurrent List. The Concurrent List lays down: "Trade and commerce in and the production, supply and distribution of, the products of industries where the

control of such industries by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest." It becomes, therefore, necessary to see as to whether the item 'industries' is essentially meant for the States or for both the States and the Union. According to the wording of the Constitution quoted here, it becomes very clear that the item with regard to industries is so in the State List and not in any of the other two Lists. And that being the case, you will have to take into consideration the spirit which is behind article 249 or article 252. According to article 252 we should give the opportunity to the State Legislatures to be able to pass a resolution requesting the Union to pass legislation with regard to industries. If that is not done, then the only thing will be that a law will have to be passed and that law will have to be debated in this House. Therefore, Sir, I think that the Bill is out of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised by Mr. Manjuran that Parliament cannot pass this Bill without first passing a declaration that it is in the public interest to pass such a law as contained in this Bill. He refers to articles 249, 250 and 252 of the Constitution. Article 249 refers only when legislation is required in a matter contained in the State List. Article 250 refers when there is a proclamation of emergency. Article 252 refers when legislation has to be passed concerning two or more States. That would be relevant only if item 24 of the State List in the Seventh Schedule were to be considered. But the relevant article that refers to this Bill is, I think, article 246 of the Constitution and item 52 of the Union List. Item 52 of the Union List clearly mentions "industries," the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest". Article 246 reads as follows:

"246. (1) Notwithstanding anything in clauses (2) and (3) Parliament has exclusive power to make laws with respect to any of the

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]

matters enumerated in List I in the Seventh Schedule."

And item 52 is one of the items enumerated in List I in the Seventh Schedule. So I think it is article 246 and item 52 of the first part of the Seventh Schedule that apply to this Bill. Whether a separate declaration has to be made or whether it would be a part of the Bill itself. I think that is a technical objection only. I therefore rule out the point of order. Also the amendment sought to be moved by Mr. Manjuran which is a negative amendment is out of order.

The question is.

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we take up clause 4. There are five amendments. Mr. C. G. K. Reddy is absent.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Sir, I beg to move.

"That at page 2,—

(i) in line 21, for the word 'forty' the word 'fifteen' be substituted; and

(ii) for lines 24 to 33 the following be substituted, namely:

(a) growers of coconuts;

(b) manufacturers of coir yarn and coir products;

(c) dealers in coir yarn and coir products;

(d) workers engaged in coir industry;

(e) exporters of coir yarn and coir products;

(f) Governments of the principal coconut growing States; and

(g) Parliament."

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Sir, I beg to move:

"That at page 2, line 23, for the words 'among persons who are in its opinion capable of representing' the words 'persons representing' be substituted."

"That at page 2, for lines 24 to 33 the following be substituted,' namely:—

(a) manufacturers of coir products nominated by their organisations;

(b) workers of coir factories nominated by their Unions, their number being five;

(c) producers of coir yarn;

(d) workers engaged in production of coir yarn to be nominated by their Unions;

(e) three members to be elected by Parliament from among its members;

(f) the Governments of the principal coconut-growing States;

(g) two members to be elected by the Travancore-Cochin Assembly and one member to be elected by the Madras Assembly from among their members; and

(h) such other persons or class of persons, who, in the opinion of the Central Government, ought to be represented on the Board."

"That at page 2, line 32 before the words 'such other persons' the words 'persons employed by manufacturers of coir products, and' be inserted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, clause 4 and these amendments are open for discussion.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Sir, this clause is concerned with the establishment and constitution of the Coir Board. As was pointed out here, it would be very difficult to find out who exactly would fit in for the purpose

of the Coir Board. That was the objection I raised. Sir, by my amendment I am only making the clause more intelligible. It is at present said: "growers of coconuts and producers of husks and coir yarn; persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn and in the manufacture of coir products". It will be found that these sub-clauses are overlapping each other and they have been drafted by people who have never known what is the matter concerned. I am not trying to change it, but I am only putting it in a more intelligible manner.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But a producer of husks may not be a grower of coconut.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: That cannot be otherwise. There cannot be separate producers of husks and then persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn. That is a duplication, (a) of sub-clause (3) says: "growers of coconuts and producers of husks and coir yarn". (b) deals with persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn and in the manufacture of coir products. Where is the distinction between the producers of husks and persons engaged in the production of husks? What is the fun of saying that we are producers of husks and then persons engaged in the production of husks? So it is redundant. And that same spirit is kept up all through. I think my amendment is quite acceptable. It may be rejected because I am afraid that there is always a feeling that those who draft the law know everything about it. If that is the idea of the Government, then I yield to them. But I would like that this should be put in an intelligible way.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, I shall speak on all the three amendments together. As regards representation on the Board, in the Bill it is provided that the members will be appointed from among persons "who are in its opinion capable of representing" the various interests. My amendment seeks to make it "persons

representing". Sir, I am mainly concerned with the representation of the workers. I want that the workers' representatives should be nominated by their unions. It may be argued that there may be more than one union. That does not stand in the way of accepting my amendment, because in an industry it is not unnatural that there may be several unions of workers in the same centre and even in the same factory. Representation for the workers may be provided in two ways: one by direct elections by the workers, or by nomination as is generally the case after consultation with the unions of workers. On a previous occasion also in connection with the Tea Bill, we took the stand that the workers' representatives in the Board should be taken in consultation with the four Central Organisations. Here I have not put in that amendment because in the coir industry, there are, I think no unions affiliated to the four Central Trade Union Organisations. However, the unions in this industry may be asked to nominate their representatives on the Board and thereby real representation for the workers should be provided for. In this connection, I also think that representation for the growers of coconut will be superfluous, because so far as their interests are concerned, they are looked after by the Coconut Committee, and their representatives are there. Here only the persons engaged in the different sectors of the industry should find representation.

As regards the constitution of the Board, I have another observation to make. I want Indianisation of the Board, at least an Indian majority in the Board, workers' representatives and the representatives of Indian manufacturers put together. I have mentioned in my amendment that the representatives of the manufacturers should be nominated by their own organisations, because considering the nature of the Board, the right which I am asking for the workers should also be given to the manufacturers. It may be that there are large numbers of them who are not organised. As regards the

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]

organisation of manufacturers I am not posted with complete details. I know that most of the small manufacturers are not organised, but if this amendment is accepted and if they are given the right to nominate their representatives to the Board, then that will be an impetus to them to organise themselves.

Another thing that I want particularly to mention is that in the Bill there is no provision for the representation of the labourers in the coir factories. I think this strange because in the case of other Boards there is a provision of this nature. In the Bill, the provision is: "persons engaged in the production of husks, etc.". I want that the word 'workers' should be there, because I do not like to leave the representation of the workers to the mercies of interpretation of constitutional and legal pandits.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Unfortunately I had to be away before I moved my amendment, but I should like to emphasise the point that I had raised originally in the first reading and to which I expected an answer on behalf of the Government. First of all, I want to know why they have sought to recede from the principle of election for representation on the Board. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of course gave us a very interesting argument and tried to show that by nomination by the Government, it would become more amenable to popular will. I do not agree with that proposition.

First of all, the movement all over the world, so far as democracy is concerned, is to decentralise and diffuse power as much as possible and therefore such autonomous bodies are within the concept of democracy. We should give as much powers as possible and as widely as possible to the people who are very intimately connected with particular industries. I agree that the Government are going to give representation to all the sectional interests.

All that I object to is the Government's taking upon itself the responsibility of nominating such persons whom, they think, are capable of representing those interests. Now, I do not know the intention of the Government in receding from that very good principle. It may be that they think that by having their own nominated representatives those representations, in functioning within the Board, will be able to carry out the general policies of the Government. It may be a very good principle which they think they are going to have, but as I have already pointed out, there are so many clauses—there are at least two other clauses—which give powers to the Government to see that the Board functions within the general picture of any plan that the Government might adopt. Therefore, I do not see why they should insist on having nomination for the Board instead of election.

The hon. Minister wanted us to be more vigilant with regard to the working of this Board and he included attacks against the Government also in this because it seemed to serve as a sort of stimulant for him—and said that it would be within the jurisdiction of the Members of this House and the other House to take up this issue and ask the Government as to why the Board has not done such and such a thing or why it has done a particular thing.

That power is always there. Whether the representatives are elected or whether they are nominated, so far as the power of the Parliament is concerned or the power of the people exercised through the Parliament is concerned, it is always there. This clause does not increase or decrease that power. If you are going to resort to nomination and you expect only the Parliament to tackle anything that is happening inside the Board, I would most respectfully point out to the hon. Minister that he probably believes in some sort of remote control. Remote control may be more convenient or more comfortable for the Government but we are not here interested to make it as comfortable and as convenient

for the Government as they want. In routine matters, in very small matters with which the Board will be seized from time to time, he cannot expect Parliament to exercise the power which really should belong to the real representatives of those sections.

The Government may say, "We are elected by the people. We know the interests of the entire country. We know the interests of particular sections. We know the interests of labour. We know the interests of trade and commerce and everything within the general picture of the country. Therefore we will be in a better position to nominate those representatives who are the real representatives of those sections". Now, Sir, this argument, if accepted, will be a dangerous precedent.

I do not think that a Government even elected by 80 or 90 per cent. majority which this Government cannot claim because it was elected on a minority of the people of India—I cannot accept the argument that even a Government which is elected by a 90 per cent. majority could claim infallibility, and claim to do everything, everyday, every hour, every minute which is the right thing and in the interest of the people. After all, what will happen is, I know, as soon as this Bill is enacted, there will be many applications directly or indirectly forwarded to our hon. Minister asking him to nominate these particular individuals on the Board and we can always trace a connection of a particular individual, to a particular sectional interest and Government may satisfy itself in its omniscience and omnipotence that that particular person is capable of representing a particular section on that Board. The acceptance of this principle would only mean more canvassing, more lobbying and my friend the Whip of the Congress Party will be more busy because he will have to satisfy more people to be accommodated on the Board and to urge the cases of those applicants to the hon. Minister to say that so and so who is an hon. Member or an hon.

Member's friend or somebody else, is capable of representing such and such section on the Board. And the Government, as it is sustained by such forces who naturally want to invade the Board, whatever the Board may be and whatever the reason may be they have to be amenable to such pressures.

I am not able to understand the argument against the election. We had one argument only from an hon. Member who also happens to come from my own State. He said that he accepts it on principle but for the present the coir industry is so disorganised that it is not possible to conduct any election. But he seems to forget that this is a part of the general policy of the Government, that it is a piece of the general policy of the Government to see that there are no elections or nominated representatives by the sections themselves. In the Tea Board it has been done, in this it is going to be done, in the draft Bill that is there of the Coffee Board, it finds a place. So that argument does not arise in any case so far as the coir industry is concerned.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): If the hon. Member can excuse an interruption, may I know who will be the electors, among the growers. Is there any register of growers, is there a register of stockists? Can we know whether we have got 100 growers on the rolls etc.?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I agree that there are certain cases where there cannot be an electorate. Even if we pass it over to the Election Commission they may not be able to prepare a voters' list but such cases can be excepted. There are other cases. The trade is organized, the manufacturers are organised and the labour is also organised. The manufacturers are organised and they have given so many representations on this Bill. On other matters also, on the coir industry, there have been representations. The labour has an organisation, the trade has an organisation and if you do

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

allow elections the organisations will wake up and come up in their own interests.

The hon. Minister said that he wanted to eliminate the undesirable practice of elections whereby 4 or 7 or 8 candidates contest for one seat. What does it matter? We have come from an undesirable contest ourselves. We have also been the products of the undesirable principle of 5 or 8 or 12 people contesting for one seat in some constituencies. That is the evil or good of democracy where so many present themselves for being the representative of a particular constituency. It is not such an evil principle. It is a principle that will have to be accepted if you believe in democracy.

Therefore I am not able to see what exactly is the argument. It is not for the hon. Minister to turn round and say what is the difference. I have tried to point out with my limited capacity what the difference is but I am not able to understand what made the Government change the *status quo*. After all they have accepted the particular principle all these years and all the Boards or Commissions have been composed of people representing certain sections in a particular manner.

Why did they change? Did they think that these people will be more amenable. Certainly they will be more amenable. Perhaps the hon. Minister will also see to it that those who will become Members of this Coir Board will also pass a probationary test—of what we don't know—may be loyalty to a particular brand of politics, may be loyalty in a particular way, may be usefulness in other ways—why, I do not know but these are the dangers to which I want to save the hon. Minister from. I don't want him to be thrown to the temptation which the sponsors of the interests which are already in the industry may bring on him in so many ways. Therefore in the interests of the hon. Minister himself and in the interests of what I believe to be a very good princi-

ple, I should think that this going back on an accepted thing would be a dangerous precedent.

Before I sit down I should like to say that I was not able to understand why a Coir Board which is concerned with a very small sphere of our industrial activity, should have 40 Members on the Board. "Not exceeding 40 Members"—that is what the hon. Minister said but the temptation is, as he knows, when the Bill says "not exceeding 40 members", with the barrage of applications that he is going to get from this evening, he will have to make it 40 to please more people. *It is the function of democracy or of the hon. Ministers to please as many people as possible.*

In practice it is not going to be very much below 40 and I am not able to understand why in a small Board like this we should have 40 members. That would only mean out of the Rs. 12 lakhs, about Rs. 6 lakhs will be spent not on expenses of the administration, but on T. A. for members of the Board and Rs. 6 lakhs is a very big charge on an industry for doubtful results that may be got out of this Board, leaving only Rs. 6 lakhs for any development work or any real good work that may be done by the Board.

Therefore, on all these issues and as I think that it is a very fundamental principle. I should like to have a satisfying answer from the Government if they are capable of giving it on this question. With all the versatility and ingenuity of the hon. Minister who is unfortunately in charge of this Bill, I don't think that he will be able to give an answer which can satisfy the argument against the departure from a very good principle. If he does not do that, then we will have no alternative—in spite of the fact that my particular amendment has lapsed due to my unavoidable absence—but to oppose the clause as it is.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sir, these arguments in favour of elective principles and in respect of nominated

Board have already been fully discussed during the earlier stages. As I said, we are trying to create a mechanism by which we want to organise the coir industry and that mechanism has, as an essential part, a Board. The elective principle in this Board is something external to the functions of the Board itself. It is not a part of it. Ultimately it depends on how effective the Board is and what the personnel is. Supposing the man who is elected from these bodies is not effective and there is a nominated Member unconnected with any organisation who is effective, then the latter one will serve the purpose, much more than the earlier one and then again there is another aspect to which I referred. There are certain vested interests connected with organisations. We don't want any vested interests but I do not mean to decry all organisations. There being a number of organisations we had some difficulty in earlier Boards also. If I want to give, say in Import Control Organisation a representation to this body—and I am not prepared to give for other bodies—if there are more than one body, the question arises as to which of it is to be given the electing right. So we have suggested this in order to avoid that situation. Naturally we shall take the organisations also into consideration. We have done that in the Import Trade Control Organization. Formerly we gave representation to the Federation of Chamber of Commerce and Industry. We nominated the President and Secretary. But what we have done now is, we have not nominated the President; we have nominated the President in his personal capacity, we have nominated the Secretary in his personal capacity. He of course, naturally gives expression to the views of the Federation but to do that is one thing. Any organisation in the field of coir industry, if they are important, if they are representative, if they are a healthy body, will naturally come in for attention in respect of nomination. That is what I would like to say on this point.

Regarding amendments 4 and 15, I would like to say that as I said 40 has been put as the maximum. Opinions have been expressed in this House as also in the other regarding the desirability of limiting the number of the Board. We shall certainly take those views into consideration when we arrive at the final number.

Regarding the latter half of amendment No. 4, all the interests which the mover has in mind have already been detailed in the original clause.

Regarding amendment No. 5, this suggested amendment would really make for elected representatives, as I have already pointed out.

Regarding amendment No. 6, here again, my hon. friend wants to ensure that persons representing the coir manufacturers, the workers in the coir manufacturing concerns etc. should be nominated by the trade unions or other unions. That again affects the discretion of the Government and the discretion of Parliament to exercise effective control over the affairs of the industry and it is very necessary this discretion should not be limited in this manner. But the point indicated by the mover has already been covered except the suggestion for two Members of the Travancore-Cochin Assembly and one from the Madras Assembly. We have, however, provision to include representatives of the Governments of the principal coconut growing States of Travancore and Madras. So I say the amendment is not necessary. We think we may leave it to the good sense of the Central Government to nominate only such persons as representatives of certain coir interests as would be able to help the Board.

That is all that I have to say about these amendments. There are temptations and temptations and for a moment due to the eloquence of my hon. friend I had a great temptation to accept some of his amendments, but I prayed, "Oh, Lord, save me from temptations".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manjuran, do you want me to put your amendment to the House?

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Yes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And Mr. Mazumdar?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I want my amendment to be put to the vote of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is—

“That at page 2—

(i) in line 21 for the word ‘forty’ the word ‘fifteen’ be substituted; and

(ii) for lines 24 to 33 the following be substituted, namely:

‘(a) growers of coconuts;

(b) manufacturers of coir yarn and coir products;

(c) dealers in coir yarn and coir products;

(d) workers engaged in coir industry;

(e) exporters of coir yarn and coir products;

(f) Governments of the principal coconut growing States; and

(g) Parliament’.”

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That at page 2, line 23, for the words ‘among persons who are in its opinion capable of representing’ the words ‘persons representing’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That at page 2, for lines 24 to 33, the following be substituted,

namely:—

‘(a) manufacturers of coir products nominated by their organisations

(b) workers of coir factories nominated by their Unions, their number being five;

(c) producers of coir yarn;

(d) workers engaged in production of coir yarn to be nominated by their Unions;

(e) three members to be elected by Parliament from among its members;

(f) The Governments of the principal coconut-growing States;

(g) two members to be elected by the Travancore-Cochin Assembly and one member to be elected by the Madras Assembly from among their members; and

(h) such other persons or class of persons, who, in the opinion of the Central Government, ought to be represented on the Board’.”

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That at page 2, line 32 before the words ‘such other persons’ the words ‘persons employed by manufacturers of coir products, and’ be inserted.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That clause 4 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 5, 6 and 7 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is:

"That clause 8 stand part of the Bill."

There are two amendments. Mr. Manjuran, do you want to move them?

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Yes, Sir. I beg to move:

"That at page 3, line 16 for the word 'five' the word 'three' be substituted."

"That at page 3, lines 21 to 29 be deleted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Clause 8 and these two amendments are now before the House and open for discussion.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Sir, in moving the first amendment, my object is to reduce the number "five" to "three". In a previous amendment that was tabled, it was suggested that the whole Board should consist of not more than fifteen members and the hon. minister in charge of this Bill also was not very unfavourable to that suggestion, because he said the Bill prescribed only the top figure as forty. So the number can be less than that. I thought my hon. friend Mr. Madhavan Nair also supported the view that the number may be restricted. So if there is no objection to it, I see no reason why there should be a committee with a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman and five other members, making in all seven. Why have such a large number in the Executive Committee? Further, the functions of the Coir Board itself are considered to be not very deliberative. It has to do certain things. So, as far as possible, it should be a compact body and its committee also should be a compact one. Sir, I do not know how figures are arrived at for particular committees. To me, there is no particular reason for having five, seven or three. They all look alike. But the more compact they are, the more efficient they are likely to be. This may also considerably reduce the expenditure incurred in the working

of the committee and that is a very important point when we consider such a small industry confined to such a small place. I am afraid also that with a large number of people on a committee like this, the variety of interests that the members will be representing might only create frictions and troubles in the way of the efficient working of the body.

The next part of my amendment asks for the deletion of the lines 21 to 29. These deal with the standing committee and the *ad hoc* committee. The Board is conceived with a permanent secretariat and staff and standing committees have been abolished in Parliament. That being so, I do not see why there should be a standing committee for this Board. What is the function of this Standing Committee? There is the Executive Committee. That would mean that seven members are being made members of the Executive Committee and the rest of the Standing Committee and then you have an *ad hoc* committee? Why all this paraphernalia for a Board whose object is to look into certain matters connected with this industry? I am sure none of them is going to do any research or technological investigations regarding this industry.

Their entire function will be limited to the executive functions of the Coir Board. I think under the circumstances, the paraphernalia brought in here is too much when we take the exigencies of the situation into consideration. It is not necessary at all. An executive committee to act upon the decisions of the Board is all that is necessary. Under the circumstances the membership may be reduced in all to five consisting of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and three members, on which I would like the Government not to put in any official because that way if two officials are coming in, the Coir Board will have lot of officials in it. I do not know from where the officers suddenly cropped up in this. I think, when I said that there should be only three members, I really wanted the deletion of all the rest. It is not necessary that officials should be

[Shri M. Manjuran.] members of the Board. If these members of the Board are mostly coming from the Government and if two of them are to be represented on the Committee, I do not know what they are there for. Hence, I would feel that the whole thing may be confined to a small number, leaving all the verbosity about it. We should confine to the necessity of having an executive committee of five people. The standing and *ad hoc* committees are quite unnecessary. The use of the *ad hoc* committee is not understood by me. An *ad hoc* committee is a committee brought out for some purpose. So long as this Board is set up for the purpose of improving the coir industry, the purpose is served and no further *ad hoc* committee might be found necessary. If particular problems of the industry are to be considered they would be considered generally by the Board because, if the Board has to function effectively, it should meet quite frequently and I think, in the circumstances, the membership in the executive committee should be reduced and the other committees should be abolished altogether.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Sir, I rise to support the second amendment of Mr. Mathai Manjuran, that is amendment No. 9. I feel that there is absolutely no necessity for either the executive committee or even for any standing committee. What it all amounts ultimately is this: The Board forms the general body and it may delegate such of its powers that would be prescribed hereafter under the rules that would be framed and under such delegated authority to the executive committee. I cannot understand, Sir, for a moment, why there should be 40 persons that should constitute the bigger body, I mean the Board, and why that bigger body should delegate some of its functions to the smaller body, namely, the executive committee. Why should there not be only one smaller body, a body consisting of fifteen persons in all? It all means that this Board will meet probably once a year or perhaps

once in two years, as most of these Boards are doing and the entire control and management of this Board will be virtually in the hands of this executive committee which will be issuing periodical minutes of the proceedings of its meetings which may be held once a year in several parts of the country. I have been hearing complaints from several hon. Members of Parliament who have been either nominated or elected to some such similar committees, namely, the Silk Board and other such Boards, that for the last one and a half years they had not even attended one single meeting and I am sure the fate of this Coir Board is also going to be like this. The only solution would be, Sir, to reduce the number of members in the Board to a reasonable minimum, say 10 or 15, so that the entire Board will function as one body. There need not be any other smaller bodies than functioning under delegated powers of the bigger body.

Then, Sir, when there is an executive committee, I cannot understand why there should be a standing committee. We find that in the standing committee, like the executive committee, only members of the Board are nominated and no outsider can be a member of the standing committee. A deviation has been made with regard to the *ad hoc* committees.

In *ad hoc* committees even outsiders could be members. I do not have much of an objection for the *ad hoc* committees because it may be that in some cases we may have to get the help of some others who are not members of the Board. So, there is some justification for the *ad hoc* committees remaining but with regard to the executive committee I have every reason to oppose. I think, Sir, the membership of the Board should be reduced to a reasonable minimum so that we can have one body functioning very effectively to the interest of the coir manufacturers in our country.

Sir, with these few words, I support the second amendment of Mr. Manjuran to this clause.

SHRI D P KARMARKAR Sir I regret I am unable to accept either amendment No. 8 or No. 9.

Regarding amendment No. 8, as the House knows, the Bill provides for an executive committee of seven, including the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman. If we accept the amendment of Mr Manjuran, that would mean that apart from the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, there would be only three other members. If we accept the suggestion of the House to reducing the number of members of the Board from 40 to 30, probably 7 will not be too large for an executive committee. It may be the proper thing. In a committee of three—even though idically speaking it would be quite sufficient—it would be difficult to give representation to different interests and all that. So we feel on this side of the House that 7 would be entirely necessary.

There is no compulsion regarding the standing committees. If for research work we want a standing committee, we may have it. The executive committee will be in charge of the day to day functions of the work as a whole. Supposing you want to explore the possibilities of export you may want to set up a standing committee for that particular thing. For such types of work, you may create standing committees. On'y for that purpose we have envisaged the creation of more standing committees. The solitary executive committee will naturally be seized of the work in the absence of the Board's meetings. So, the idea is more functional than otherwise. We shall not have the luxury of too many standing committees. The Board will be in a better position to decide which of the subjects should be studied. One important thing may be the study of abour conditions how conditions should be improved and things like that. We cannot envisage at the moment what number of standing committees will be necessary. All that we have done is that we have provided for these small committees, for instance, one on export which could advise the general body with regard

to the particular aspect of the industry.

So Sir, I regret, I could not accept the amendments and I would request that they be rejected.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Do you want me to put them to the vote?

SHRI M MANJURAN Yes

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is:

'That at page 3 line 16 for the word "five" the word "three" be substituted'

The motion was negatived

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

"That at page 3 lines 21 to 29 be deleted"

The motion was negatived

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

'That clause 8 stand part of the Bill'

The motion was adopted

Clause 8 was added to the Bill

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN We come now to clause 9. There is no amendment.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU Sir, I want to speak on clause 9.

I shall be very brief, Sir. What strikes me on reading it is that the Board that is to be constituted is to be an autonomous body but, in the matter of appointment of the Secretary we find that the Central Government shall appoint the Secretary after consulting the Board. Sir in an autonomous body like this the appointment of the Secretary should be left in the hands of the body itself. On the other hand, we find that the Secretary is to be appointed only by the Government.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN) in the Chair]

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu]

It only means that the Government is trying to thrust some person of its own choice to be the Secretary of this Committee. I hear of Government dumping such Secretaries on some other corporate bodies like this and we have heard very bad tales also about the Secretaries of the other bodies. I find that certain individuals who are very much favoured by particular persons in the Government and who have no special qualifications to remain as Secretaries of such bodies are being dumped on the bodies.

5 P M

We hear so much scandal outside the House. I would only suggest, Sir, that the appointment of the Secretary should be entirely left in the hands of the Board itself if the Board should function as an efficient body and its individuality should remain. I would earnestly suggest Sir, that the appointment of the Secretary should be left completely in the hands of the Board itself and the Government should have nothing to do with it. I would have very much appreciated the wording in clause 9 of the Bill if it had been "The Central Government shall, after obtaining the opinion of the Board or with the concurrence of the Board appoint a Secretary to the Board" instead of the present wording as it appears in the Bill "The Central Government shall, after consulting the Board, appoint a Secretary to the Board", so that the Board could have selected a Secretary and if the Government do approve that appointment he could remain the Secretary. But here suppose the Board differs from the Government in the matter of the appointment of a Secretary it is only the opinion of the Government that will prevail ultimately because the wording is "after consulting the Board". On the other hand, in its place I would very much appreciate the wording "with the concurrence of the Board" because it is absolutely necessary in the matter of the appointment of a paid Secretary as otherwise the Government will have somebody in their view and may appoint him and that somebody may be a person who is not

very well acquainted with this industry at all. They will dump in anybody and everybody they like and that will only mean giving room to scandals as we hear such scandals about the Secretaries of other such committees in India. It is very logical for the precise fulfilment of the object which my hon friend has in view that there should be no pressure over the appointment of the Secretary.

SHRI D P KARMARKAR It is precisely for the object which my hon friend has in view, namely that there should be no pressure over the appointment of the Secretary that we have kept the power to ourselves. The Board consists of 40 members and all sorts of pressures and influences will be brought to bear on them in the matter of suggesting names for the post of the Secretary. Then the Board by a majority of 11 to 9 will suggest a candidate and another group by a majority of 19 to 21 will suggest another candidate for the post and ultimately the Government in their wisdom should take the best among them. When the Chairman is appointed by the Government it is desirable that the Secretary should also be appointed by the Government free from all influences. On the other hand if the Secretary is elected by the Board he may try to satisfy the wishes of the Board by doing what they ask him to do which may run counter to what the Chairman may ask him to do. It is very difficult for executives to work under that type of pressure and it is very wholesome for carrying out the objectives we have in view that the Secretary is appointed by the Government.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN) The question is:

'That clause 9 stand part of the Bill.'

The motion was adopted.

Clause 9 was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN). Now we come to clause 10. There are two amendments.

SHRI S N MAZUMDAR Sir I beg to move

"That at page 4, after line 22, the following be inserted, namely —

'(hh) ensuring full employment, proper working conditions and living wages to the workers employed in the coir industry,'"

SHRI M MANJURAN Sir I beg to move

"That at page 4 after line 27 the following be inserted, namely —

'(jj) safeguarding the interests of the workers in the industry,'"

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN) Amendments moved

"That at page 4, after line 22, the following be inserted, namely —

'(hh) ensuring full employment, proper working conditions and living wages to the workers employed in the coir industry,'"

"That at page 4 after line 27 the following be inserted, namely —

'(jj) safeguarding the interests of the workers in the industry,'"

The clause and the two amendments are open to discussion now

SHRI S N MAZUMDAR Mr Vice-Chairman while moving this amendment I am fully conscious of the fact that it is not at present possible for the coir industry today to provide full employment or living wages to the workers. Not to speak of the coir industry, the Five Year Plan of the Congress Government and the Congress Party has not visualized the provision of whole-time employment or living wages to the workers. But, Sir, this Board which is being constituted is not for a temporary purpose or for a short period. So I wanted to move this amendment in order to give a clear perspective to that Board. If it is the intention of the Board really to develop the coir industry then its aim should be to do all these things. Sir I was particularly moved to word my

amendment in this way because I find that in the functions of the Board there is no provision made or no thought given to the workers engaged in the coir industry. Ordinarily I would have been prepared to be satisfied with the amendment moved by my friend Mr Mathai Manjuran namely, asking the Board to safeguard the interests of the workers in this industry. But when I find that in drafting this Bill those who are responsible for drafting it had not the workers of the coir industry before their eyes, when they are left completely out of the picture it is natural to think, without going to other things that this safeguarding of the interests of the workers of the coir industry will be interpreted in a way or is likely to be interpreted in a way which will not really safeguard their interests but will betray their interests. Therefore I thought it proper to state all these things in clear terms so as to provide the Board with a clear perspective. As for the present, as you know Sir in my opening speech I have demanded for the workers that provision should be made to give them employment and in case of their involuntary unemployment they should be given compensation and unemployment relief should be provided to them. These are the most immediate demands which I wanted to press upon the Government. Sir I have not much more to say at this stage.

SHRI M MANJURAN Sir this Bill has been introduced because there was a collapse of the industry and the workers were put to infinite trouble. What the Bill does not bring within its scope is to do anything particularly to safeguard the interests of the workers in this industry. It is not appearing anywhere in the Bill. I am in full agreement with my hon friend Shri Mazumdar when he says that ensuring full employment proper working conditions and living wages to the workers employed in the coir industry should be guaranteed. It is the same thing when I say that the rights of the workers in the industry should be safeguarded. I did not intend any difference between my

[Shri M. Manjuran.]

amendment and his, but knowing full well the conditions of the industry and taking into consideration the argument that would be put forward that it is impracticable to give full employment in the industry at this stage I thought it safer to put it as "safeguarding the interests of the workers in the industry." And if I put it more modestly it was because I felt that in several cases the workers are represented by militant trade unions and it would not be possible to state that ensuring full employment and proper working conditions and living wages were all that mattered with regard to the workers' interests. But now I do not find any reason for this Bill to omit the important matter for which it has been introduced. It was not introduced because the prices of coir had fallen and therefore the industrialists had failed. Absolutely no case was brought forward like that. It was not because the producers were not getting enough. We cannot make out a case that the producers have lost much, but the people who are affected by the fall in prices are the workers and this Bill with so much tears that were shed by Shri Madhavan Nair and so much concern expressed by the Minister was brought about to alleviate the conditions of the workers, but it omits to mention that. That is the strangest part of the Bill. At every stage the Minister incharge of the Bill was saying that something was to be done, but for whom? Here in the item "functions of the Board" it is said that export business is to be promoted; so many regulations are to be made. Mention is made of promoting co-operative organisation, ensuring remunerative returns to producers of husks, coir fibre and coir yarn and manufacturers of coir products. Who are these people? If you imply that they are the workers engaged in the industry, we want that to be specifically mentioned. Producers do not mean in the present context anything. The capitalists are as much producers as the workers engaged in the industry. So if this Bill is worth anything, if the pretensions for which it has been brought forward are to be satisfied, you have to include in

the Bill that the workers' interests will be safeguarded. I would also like that to be expressed in a manner as suggested by my hon. friend, that is, by saying "ensuring full employment, proper working conditions and living wages to the workers employed in the coir industry." On this we would require your unequivocal opinion.

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Vice-Chairman. I have only a very few things to say. On the face of it, all these amendments are unexceptionable. The object which they wish to serve ought to be accepted by any civilised Government. And after all they do not ask that all these things should be achieved here and now. These should be placed before this Board as the ultimate objective towards which the Board should bend its energies and utilise its funds. This Board is at last coming into being, but the only difficulty is that very very meagre funds are being placed at its disposal, although the Minister had said that if need be some more funds would come to be placed at its disposal from out of the General Revenues, but I do not expect that sufficient funds, such funds as would be needed in order to serve these objectives, would ever come to be placed at the disposal of this Board at all, unless it be by raising this cess. In order to raise this cess my hon. friend the Minister gave us the impression—I was inclined to think it was a glib impression—that it could easily be done. I would like to know whether it would not be necessary to have an amending Bill in order to raise this cess and in that case it would be very difficult indeed, because legislation would mean so much delay. But anyhow since sufficient funds are not likely to be placed at the disposal of this Board, I think it would be best for us to explore other avenues by which we can try to help our workers—not to the extent that was sought to be indicated by these two amendments—at least to some extent. Now, take for instance the Minimum Wages Act. I would like the Government to give their thought to the possibility of extending the Minimum Wages Act to this industry so that the workers.

would be assured of the payment of at least minimum wages. Then there is the Payment of Wages Act. If that also comes to be extended to these people, then they could be assured of regular payment in time of the wages that they would be entitled to. Similarly, other legislation would have to be extended for the benefit of these people. Supposing all these things are done, we would have gone to some extent at least and I expect the hon. Minister to give us an assurance in regard to these things and also to use his good offices with the Labour Ministry as well as the local Ministries to see that all this legislation is extended and their benefit given to these workers. That way some help could be rendered to the workers. At the same time in view of the fact that the hon. Minister has anyhow to go back again to the House of the People to get the small amendment that he has offered to accept here accepted by that House.....

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: It is premature.

PROF. G. RANGA: Anyhow, the hon. Minister has given us that assurance. Why cannot he be good enough to extend the scope of the objectives of this Board by including, if not the more comprehensive amendment that has been given notice of by my hon. friend Mr. Mazumdar, but at least an amendment with a smaller compass.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Innocuous.

PROF. G. RANGA: Yes, absolutely innocuous. And what is more, it ought not to be objected to by anybody. After all, if this industry is to be benefited by proper protection and control, then certainly the workers should be the most important beneficiaries. And I think it would be best to incorporate that amendment in this Bill so that the Board would always be reminded of one of its primary duties—this duty to carry on its work in such a way that it would specifically go to the improvement and protection of the interests of the workers em-

ployed in this industry. Therefore I would like the hon. Minister to consider the possibility of accepting that amendment. It is quite possible that he would not be prepared to accept it, but I would like him to give an assurance to this House that the interests of the workers would be kept prominent before themselves and also before the Board. Just as he had promised in his closing speech on the motion for consideration that he would give necessary instructions to the Board in regard to various other matters for which provision has not been made in this Bill, he could also place this particular objective, limited as it is, innocuous as it is, and absolutely necessary too, before the Board in a prominent way so that the interests of the workers would be safeguarded.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, if you want to learn the art of applying brake to the wheel of progress of any machinery whatever, go to Mr. S. N. Mazumdar, M.P., and if you do not find him at his place, you can try the hon. Mr. Manjuran. That is what I inferred from the speeches delivered by these two hon. friends. I wonder what has led them to believe that this measure has been brought forward not in the interests of the workers, but in the interests of the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry, Mr. Karmarkar, and it is primarily, finally and in all intermediate stages meant for safeguarding the interests of everybody else excepting the workers and the labourers.

PROF. G. RANGA: There are employers also.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am certainly surprised to find that my old and experienced friend, Prof. Ranga, should be ensnared and taken in by the speeches that are delivered here, and stand up and support them. There is nothing in the amendments which requires to be supported. They are redundant, superfluous and unnecessary.

Sir, the interests of the labourers of the coir industry are safeguarded in

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

each and every line of the Bill that I have gone through carefully. The only fear that I entertained was in regard to the fact whether it was a taxation measure or a measure brought forward to help the industry. On that score, I got a solemn assurance from the hon. Minister yesterday that it was to help the industry. That necessarily means, not incidentally but necessarily, that the interests of the workers and the labourers are to be safeguarded first and foremost. So, I beg of these friends who apply the brake at each and every stage of the progress of this Government which they hate to have a little patience to see, to look at things in a sympathetic way, with more believing eyes rather than always looking at things with suspicion. I have made that appeal formerly also and I repeat it again. With these words, I oppose both the amendments, lock, stock and barrel.

SHRI RAMA RAO (Andhra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am in sympathy with the ideas underlying this amendment, in spite of the fact that, with regard to full employment, I believe, it would be next to impossible to achieve it, so far as this industry is concerned. We have already denied representation to the workers under its provisions. I am not satisfied with the Minister's sophisticated defence of that denial. It is, therefore, necessary that when we are extending some sort of protection to the industry we should do something to safeguard the rights of the workers to a decent existence. Solemn assurances are being given from time to time that development of this industry and that will be undertaken, and it is being done slowly, but not a word is mentioned about the lot of the worker. We owe a debt, therefore, to Mr. Mazumdar that he has drawn serious attention to this vital lacuna in this Bill. Sir, cottage industries are good, protecting them is excellent, but it does not mean that we should allow exploitation of the workers engaged in them. Go to any 'beedi' factory; it smells awfully; abominable lighting; awful conditions of work for men and women. Go to

any small press doing job work; go to any of these tailoring or weaving establishments.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Go to any barber's shop.

SHRI RAMA RAO: you will find that these poor workers are, in the name of cottage industries, being exploited. Now that Parliament is legislating on a particular industrial matter, would it not be right that it took serious thought about providing for better living conditions to the workers?

My friend, Mr. Saksena, has raised the fallacious question that in dealing with this industry we are dealing with the workers. I may say that we are not dealing with the workers but with small employers who are worse than the big capitalist.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: It is a matter of opinion.

SHRI RAMA RAO: It is not a matter of opinion; you have never seen any of the industries I have been mentioning. We are talking of a welfare State. It is distant, but let us remind ourselves at every step that something has got to be done for the poor workers. In regard to this measure we must remember that we are dealing with the small worker no less than the small employer.

SHRI S. P. DAVE (Bombay): Sir, this question is very important from the general point of view and I was almost tempted to be drawn into the discussion merely to make a few general observations without particular bearing to this piece of legislation. Sir, I think it ought to be noted as a State policy that in all cases where any particular industry is being given protection either by way of tariffs or certain other concessions, the first consideration that should weigh with the State is that the industry that is given the protection should be subject to the consideration that the industry behaves with its workers and employees in a fair manner. I entirely agree with Shri Rama Rao that the smaller capitalist is

the worst exploiter because he has raised himself from the position of a worker to that of a sub-contractor, to that of a contractor and has therefore all the petty-mindedness of a bad employer. The other type of employers are sometimes more generous than this set of employers, petty employers, whom I will not even call employers but exploiters of the worst type on earth. Therefore the workers certainly will not get any protection at their hands. My hon friend who moved the amendment may pardon me if I do not support the amendment for the very reason that I am a believer in reality. The words employed are 'living wages to the workers employed in the coir industry'. I wonder if the coir industry can give or afford to give a living wage to the workers. The mover was saying

SHRI B V KAKKILAYA (Madras)
Yes, they can

SHRI S P DAVE I had better speak rather on the amendment than on the hon Member, I am sorry. I wish that every worker in India, everyone including the agriculturist should be made to get a living wage, but today we have to face the actuality, he does not get a living wage, not even a fair wage but the minimum wage.

SHRI S N MAZUMDAR Don't you visualize it as a prospective thing?

SHRI S P DAVE I do, but the coir industry is of a different type. Where there is no big industry and when people do not get employment in a large-scale industry, then only they go to this coir industry. If in the same place a big industry rises tomorrow, all the people will immediately move there drawn by the offer of higher wage. Today we are in a backward industrial condition and therefore it is not possible for each one of the workers who chooses to be a factory worker to become a factory worker and it is because of that that he has to be satisfied with whatever work or wages are available to him in the neighbourhood. This is the saturation point beyond which factories, workshops and Government establishments

cannot afford any employment. You will have to fall back upon either agriculture or small scale industries. The wages there are not sufficient. Even this I would certainly urge upon the hon Minister that in any State endeavour, where the money of the State is being spent, where the State is responsible for the regulation of the industry, the living condition and the wages should be such that the State should not be ashamed of. Otherwise that industry needs to be given no protection. Let us not make the case worse than it is. This is the consideration in any industry and unless this consideration is fulfilled no tariff protection should be given at all. Sir, I am in spirit one with those who want to ameliorate the condition of the workers and in that sense support the amendment. Knowing the reality as I do, I request the hon Minister to try and ameliorate the condition of the workers more by way of wages and other amenities. So, I wholeheartedly support my friend. Then, Sir Prof Ranga began by saying that the Minimum Wages Act should be extended to this industry. I do not know if we have a minimum wage in the province.

SHRI M MANJURAN There is

SHRI S P DAVE I am glad to know that, but there is no use of the minimum wage remaining on paper and the workers having to work below the minimum wage. If they insist on the minimum wage, then there is nothing doing, sometimes the workshops are being closed. Things are in that condition. Their housing and other amenities should also be looked after. Therefore I urge upon the Minister to remember this while he is bringing this piece of legislation.

[MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI D P KARMARKAR Sir I need hardly say that so far as full employment and living wage are concerned these are not matters of controversy. But they should not be imposed as a condition. I appreciate very much what my esteemed colleague Mr. Dave has just now said and what Mr.

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]

Saksena said a little earlier about ensuring full employment, proper working conditions and living wage. That is something very good. But that should not be imposed as a condition in this enactment. There is no doubt that the one objective of the Government should be towards full employment and a living wage for the workers, as my friend Mr. Dave just now put it. In many sectors of industry and in all unorganised industries, workers are working at wages less than what they should get, except in a few advanced industries in big towns where there have been provisions for giving them a certain minimum wage. With very great respect, Sir, I say that it is not relevant for the purposes of this Bill. If we want to think in terms of giving a minimum wage to the workers, we should think in terms of improving our labour laws. That would be a proper forum for these matters. But, nevertheless, it should be our attempt, it should be the attempt of the Government to see to it that the workers get as fair a treatment as possible.

Now here is an industry in very great difficulties. The organisers are in difficulties; the workers are in still greater difficulties. So it is no use burdening the Boards with certain objectives which they may not be able to fulfil. But that does not mean that we have no sympathy with these objectives.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Then why don't you accept the amendment moved by Mr. Manjuran?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: If we accept that amendment, it becomes a statutory requirement. Knowing as we do the present conditions, it would not be very sincere on our part if we accept these conditions, namely, ensuring full employment.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Mr. Manjuran's amendment is for safeguarding the interests of the workers.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: My hon. friend will easily realise that it is no

use putting any vague things here. What is the meaning of safeguarding interests? Supposing we accept this amendment, it would be interpreted in different ways. The workers can say, "Our interests are not properly safeguarded." So, Sir, these things would certainly be relevant in labour laws and not here. Our sympathies are no doubt with both the amendments—Mr. Mazumdar's and Mr. Manjuran's—and we would like to safeguard the interests of the workers. There is no doubt about it. But it is no use putting these provisions vaguely like safeguarding the interests of the workers. I wish my hon. friends who are really interested in labour welfare to think in terms of definite and tangible measures. And it is really the Labour Ministry that must be asked to get on with such type of legislation. Sir, for these two reasons I oppose these two amendments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 4, after line 22, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(hh) ensuring full employment, proper working conditions and living wages to the workers employed in the coir industry;'

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 4, after line 27, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(jj) safeguarding the interests of the workers in the industry;'

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 10 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 10 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 11 and 12 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is:

"That clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

There is an amendment by Messrs. Kakkilaya and Mazumdar.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I am not moving the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 13 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is:

"That clause 14 stand part of the Bill."

There is one amendment to this.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: I am not moving it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 14 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 14 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 15 and 16 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is:

"That clause 17 stand part of the Bill."

There is one amendment to this by Mr. Doshi.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: Sir, I move:

"That at page 6, line 12, after the words 'the House of the People', the

words 'and the Council of States' be added."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Probably "both Houses of Parliament" will be a more appropriate amendment.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: I don't mind that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you accept the amendment?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: We shall do it, but if the House is not satisfied with that assurance, I will accept the amendment. I am entirely in the hands of the House. In that case, the amendment may be properly worded by the mover.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 6, line 12, for the words 'House of the People', the words 'both Houses of Parliament' be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 17, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 17, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 18 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is:

"That clause 19 stand part of the Bill."

There is one amendment to this, No. 14.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: I move:

"That at page 6, line 27, after the word 'respectively', the words 'with in three months after the end of the respective periods' be inserted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The clause and the amendment are now open to discussion.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: I think this is self-explanatory. There is no particular period stated in the clause within which the reports are to be submitted. I think they should be made within three months. The amendment is only to that effect.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I am advised that it is not necessary, but at the same time we should like to have a little more time to think about it, and if after considering it we think that this amendment is necessary, we shall incorporate it in the rules. We shall consider it seriously. Let not my hon. friend think that we will consider his amendment lightly because it comes from him.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Does this mean that other amendments are not considered seriously?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want to press this amendment?

SHRI M. MANJURAN: I withdraw the amendment.

The amendment* was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 19 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 19 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 20 to 27 were added to the Bill.

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is:

"That the long Title stand part of the Bill."

*for text of the amendment, see col. 942 *supra*.

There is one amendment to this by Mr. Mazumdar.

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

"That in the long Title of the Bill, after the word 'control' the words 'and development' be inserted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The long Title and the amendment are now open to discussion.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, after the speech which we have heard from Mr. Karmarkar on the amendment moved by me and my friend, Mr. Manjuran, to clause 10, I have not even the ghost of a hope of convincing him. But still as a matter of public duty, I have to say something in respect of my amendment. I have sought to add the word "development" along with "control" in the Title of the Bill because control is a very vague thing. My friend Shri Karmarkar has turned into a lover of precision and could not accept the most innocent amendment of ours but I may remind him that a similar provision having a similar wording, to that moved by my friend Mr. Manjuran, was incorporated in the functions of the Tea Board but I think there has been a case of lapse of memory on the part of my friend Shri Karmarkar. However, there are controls and controls. Some friends—perhaps Khwaja Inait Ullah—said that people are disgusted with controls but the real thing is the manner in which these controls were exercised by my friends opposite has led the people to be disgusted with those controls because, in the name of control, these were exercised to the detriment of the interests of the people and in the interests of only a minority of vested interests.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Do you think that food control has worked to the detriment of the people?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: The manner in which the food controls were exercised has led to the people to be disgusted. We are for control. We are yet for food control, but the manner in which the Congress Party,

the Congress Administration exercises those controls gives rise to various corruptions, various difficulties which create a bad impression on the people and taking advantage of that the black marketeers created a row in the country in favour of lifting the controls so that they may have a free field for exploitation. That is all not relevant to the present discussion. However, I have to bring in the question of control because I want control to be defined and for that I have brought in the word "development" so that the control may be exercised in a manner which will help the development of the coir industry. In order to exercise control in that manner, certain things should be done. As I suggested earlier, steps should be taken to release the industry from the grip of foreign capital. I don't expect that my friends there will take steps to release the industry from the grip of foreign capitalists. This morning Shri Karmarkar tried to steal the thunder of the Opposition by expressing sympathy for the people. I have sympathy for him; I don't doubt his personal motive.....

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I have no doubt about that.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: But he is a Minister of the Congress Party and the policy of the Congress Government is that it is eloquent in expressions of sympathy to the people but when it comes to the question of translating them into practice even by a bit, then we find the practices are quite contrary to the professions. That is why without doubting the sincerity or the motives of my friend there, I offer sympathy to him. However, as regards this question, i.e., taking steps to release the industry from the grip of foreign capitalists, I suggest to him that for the present steps should be taken to control them. In my opening speech I said that steps should be taken to restrict the export of yarn and fibre. By that I did not mean that it should be stopped altogether or we should lose the market immediately of yarn and fibre so that further crisis is produced in the industry but what I

wanted to make out was that the dominant British interests were acting in a manner which was detrimental to the interests of the industry and to our national interests. It was more interested in promoting a policy of more and more export of coir yarn and fibre and I want restriction to be put in there on that policy. I do not want to limit our markets. On the other hand, I want to expand our markets.

Another method of controlling these foreign interests is, as was suggested by me, by providing an Indian majority on the Board. It is no use saying that the foreigners started this industry. That is true of so many other industries. Ours was a colonial country and here all the industries were, in a way, started by foreigners. But that is no justification for leaving everything to them and for allowing them to loot the country for ever.

As regards the other suggestions, as I said previously also, if development is considered necessary, it is quite essential to find other markets for our products. We must find other export markets. I find that the hon. Minister, Shri Karmarkar has a tendency to lay stress on the internal market. I submit that that is not correct, because however much some of our friends here may wish that we must all buy these coir products, the market for such products inside the country is very limited. After all, let us remember that ours is a poor country and the common people cannot afford to buy these things. The ordinary people will, at the most, buy a small mattress or door-mat or a small length of rope. That is all. And that is not going to solve the problem of finding a market for the products. Therefore, the main stress or emphasis should be on the expansion of our export markets. And for that we should try and see whether other countries, countries other than those which are at present our customers, are prepared to buy these products from us.

As regards immediate steps to be taken for the purpose of exercising control, the suggestion which I made

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]

through my amendment was unfortunately rejected. Still at this stage I would suggest that immediately it is necessary to give relief and this immediate relief to the industry should not be left to the Board only. I do not know when this Board is going to be set up, because I have experience of the Central Tea Board which has not yet been set up. Therefore, without waiting for the setting up of this Board, Government should take immediately certain steps. Many of these steps I have already suggested. There is for instance the payment of unemployment relief to the labourers engaged in both the sections of the industry. Then you can give financial assistance to the small manufacturers. You should also provide them with more shipping facilities, because one of the hardships or handicaps from which they suffer is the want of proper shipping facilities. You should provide cheap yarn for those engaged in the cottage section of the industry, and they should be given financial assistance.

Lastly, before I take my seat, I would like to say one thing. I had accused the Government of dilly-dallying with this matter. The hon. Minister, Shri Karmarkar, said that he was struggling during the last two sessions to bring forward this Bill before this House, but he failed. Presumably, the struggle was with the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs. That, however, does not absolve the Government from its responsibility. The Government is responsible for a thing as a whole. It may absolve him from it, but it does not absolve the Government.

In this connection, Sir, I am tempted to express an apprehension. My hon. friend said that if there is any proposal to explore the possibilities of developing the coir industry in the Andamans, he would be suggesting me to be sent there. Sir, after the experience of the struggle between the Ministries, I fear that Dr. Katju of the Home Ministry will interpret his suggestion in another manner. I will be arrested under the Preventive Detention Act and sent to the Andamans.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: My hon. friend will have no chance even if he wants to go there.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sir, my esteemed friend has travelled over a wider ground; part of it has already been covered earlier in my reply. He made some suggestion by way of improvement of the industry. Coming to the precise content of the amendment, I find myself unable to accept it firstly because "control" has not that narrow meaning which he wants to put on it.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): But it does not mean development.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: It means regulation, development and all that. Control, these days, has come to be assigned a bad meaning because it has always been made restrictive. In this case the purpose is development. It is not restrictive in the sense of restriction of imports and things like that. In times of scarcity naturally the word control came to have a restricted meaning. In this particular Bill, it has an expansive meaning.

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK (Travancore-Cochin): Why not call a spade a spade?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Why not? That is the precise question. We cannot answer the question. We cannot go on adding. Why not? That is the difficulty. We cannot add, in the long Title, promotion of exports, better conditions for labour, providing full employment and all that. If you ask "why not?", I simply cannot answer the question. There will be so many such questions and so many such things. It will be innocuous. What is really innocuous is not always.....

SHRI ABDUL RAZAK: If control means just the same thing, why not better say, "development and all the rest" and call a spade a spade?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I cannot answer it. The precise content of this Bill is to provide for the control by the Union of the coir industry and for that purpose to establish a Coir Board.

This is expressed by the long Title. One is that the Union Government wants to control this industry. That is object one. Then, we want to establish a Coir Board and we want to levy a cess. These are the main purposes for which this measure is being enacted. Why do we want a Coir Board? With a view to see to it that the people engaged in that do find remunerative payments and things like that. So, Sir, on that ground, I should like to oppose that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister may also please see clause 10(1).

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Exactly. I am indebted to the Chair. "It shall be the duty of the Board to promote by such measures as it thinks fit the development under the control of the Central Government of the coir industry". It is already there. Then, again, my hon. friend will ask me, "If it is already there in clause 10(1) why not include it in the long Title?" It is a difficult question. "Why not" is very difficult to explain. In legal enactments we have to be precise. What is the objection? If you ask what is the function of this Board, then naturally it is development. Otherwise, we shall have to reproduce the summary of the whole Bill and put it in the long Title. The long Title may be spread over ten lines and even then there will be this "why not?". I mean it is very difficult to answer.

Coming back to my point, as I said, control is not restriction. There is no restriction envisaged. The purpose of the Board is to develop. We have not thought it fit to incorporate it in the long Title.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Now that the Bill goes to the other House, why not that be accepted?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Simply because it goes to the other House, it does not mean.....

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: As it is going back to the other House, it can

as well be incorporated as I find there is some sense in it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That in the long Title of the Bill, after the word 'control' the words 'and development' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the long Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The long Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sir, I beg to move:

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

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

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Coir Bill has evoked a lot of interest in this House and many criticisms and suggestions have been offered. I do hope that the Government will take note of them while implementing this measure.

Sir, at this stage I would like to make briefly a few observations. Sir, it is a well-known fact that the fortunes of this industry are entirely dependent upon its export trade. We also know, Sir, that most of the countries of the world are now faced with the economic crisis and they have adopted austerity measures. They all want, Sir, cheap products which are available from our competitors, the products which are not only cheap but more attractive and more durable. Now, Sir, if we want to compete in the world market we have got to make our coir products cheap enough. We have to improve their competitive capacity.

Sir, I have got to offer one submission in this connection for the consi-

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]
 deration of the Government. I would like that the coir industry be linked with the coconut oil industry. Sir, I would like that the husk should become a by-product of the principal industry, namely, the coconut oil industry in order that the husk may be made available at a negligible price to the coir industry, so that the price of the final products of husk, the coir and the coir goods, may constitute largely the labour cost put in the conversion of husk into coir and coir products. Sir, I am advocating a very well-known economic law of production, that is to say, that the principal industry should subsidise the subsidiary industry made out of its by-products. Such a method has been adopted in most of the highly industrialised countries in order to patronise their subsidiary industries, particularly their cottage industry products meant for export. In this country also, Sir, we are more or less subsidising the power alcohol and the spirit industry by making available the molasses at a very cheap rate, and the main burden is taken by the sugar industry and that is why, Sir, we are producing today the cheapest power alcohol in the world. That is why, Sir, I suggest that we could evolve some method of linking the price of the husk with the coconut oil so that the extra burden may be taken over by the coconut oil which enjoys a large protective market. In this respect, Sir, we are very fortunately placed. Our competitors in other countries are producing coconut oil and husk, but they do not have this advantage of a very large internal market for their coconut oil. Therefore, Sir, they are both exporters of coconut oil and husk products, coir and other things. We are at a great advantage because we are ourselves the consumers of very huge quantities of coconut oil. As a matter of fact, Sir, we are short of coconut oil by one lakh tons to meet which the Central Coconut Committee is trying to expand production of coconut. And

the best organisation for making this delicate adjustment between the prices of coconut and husk would have been the Central Coconut

Committee. Therefore, Sir, I was wondering—and so was my friend Shri Rama Rao—as to why the Indian Central Coconut Committee was not entrusted with the job of tackling the problems of the coir industry. Sir, I have found in the annual reports of the Indian Central Coconut Committee that

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not dilate on this question. That has been sufficiently discussed.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: They have made repeated requests to the Government that this industry should be placed under their control. Probably there were administrative difficulties. That industry was under the Food Ministry and coir is under Commerce. And perhaps therefore it could not be done. Since you want me to finish this point, I would only submit that now that we are going to have this Coir Board, the Board and the Central Coconut Committee should work in close co-operation and formulate some scheme of linking up the two prices as suggested by me.

The other point that I would like to make is this. Suggestions have been made from some quarters that we should curtail or discourage export of coir yarn. I am of the view that it should not be done. I hold the opposite view. We should maintain our exports of yarn. We are the largest exporters of coir yarn. We are exporting 11,50,000 cwts. of yarn and exporting about 5 lakh cwts. of coir yarn products. Now if we try to discourage the export of yarn, the countries which had been buying our yarn will not take it lying low. They will go in for coir yarn from other countries, because they will not permit their industry and their export trade to suffer simply because we have decided to curtail our export of coir yarn. They will go to other countries to get this coir yarn. I therefore submit that the Board while deciding upon its policy of exports should be very careful not to wound the susceptibilities of the export market and should continue to export yarn.

The other point which strikes me is that we should diversify our export market. I find that about two-thirds of our shipments of mats and mattings go to U.K. alone. Now this dependence upon one country for the fortune of this industry is very dangerous. We should therefore try to seek other markets for our products and for this purpose I would submit that we should appoint in each important country marketing-cum-liaison officers who can also handle and deal with other cottage industry products and handicraft products along with coir.

One more suggestion I would like to make. The Board should evolve some scheme of equalisation of prices. As my hon. friend, the Minister in charge of this Bill, has pointed out—he has given figures—there are wide fluctuations in the prices of the coir and coir products—very wide fluctuations. Such wide fluctuations in the prices is neither conducive to the health of the industry nor of the labour. That is why it results in wide fluctuations in the earnings of labour or their wages, as was reported to the House by our hon. friend Shri Mazumdar. Some scheme should be evolved by the Board for price equalisation, that is to say, in the boom period when the prices go up, they should be mopped off to equalise the prices when they fall, so that the labour do not have to suffer when the slump comes. When a slump comes it is the labour which is the worst sufferer and their wage earnings can be equalised to some extent by this method. With these words, I resume my seat.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to finish this Bill today. Please be brief.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I will be brief Sir, I rise to support this Bill. In the opening remarks the hon. the Commerce Minister said that this is the principal industry of Travancore-Cochin. We have to bear this in mind

that in assisting this industry the Government are taking a great responsibility of maintaining the present level of employment in Travancore-Cochin because there is no alternative employment open to the workers in that area. I wanted to emphasise this point and he has himself emphasised this point that full employment in this industry will be maintained or at least employment in this industry will not be curtailed owing to the operation of other factors. It is very well-known that this industry is spread on a cottage scale and the employment in Travancore and Cochin alone is more than six lakhs of persons. We have to see to the future of this industry when we are depending on this commodity for export markets to the extent of 75 per cent. We have to bear it in mind that these export markets are not and may not be permanent; therefore much reliance should not be placed on them; on the other hand, internal markets have to be developed. In doing this, the matter that will come in our way is the quality and cost of production both to cater to internal and external markets. As regards cost of production, technological and scientific improvement should be made and researches should be carried out. For this purpose the hon. the Minister has advocated a cess of one rupee. I am not in favour of it at all. With the amount of Rs. 6 lakhs, no scientific investigation and scientific researches can be carried on if we want to maintain this industry. Without adequate improvement on the technological and scientific side, it is impossible to compete in the external markets. It is also difficult to give employment continuously for the people in the industry. The technological aspect along with the financial side should also be looked into. This can be done by organising co-operative societies but not relying on them completely. Government will have to see that co-operative societies are established; they do not grow of themselves; and Government will have to pay the management cost of the co-operative societies till they are well-established. Then it is the duty of the co-operative societies to see that the

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

middlemen do not exploit the workers. This duty or cess of one rupee per hundredweight of fibre, yarn and coir products will affect those workers who are getting below Rs. 30 a month. The fund for carrying out the technological investigations and scientific researches will be not enough. Now the processes up to the husk stage take some 6 to 8 months, but by employing more improved technological methods, this six months period may considerably be reduced. By further scientific treatment of the husk, the product may be made softer. These things should be done by consistent and continued scientific investigation and researches. Again the extraction of fibre has also got to be improved. In this way only the cost of production can come down. I think the amount that is set aside is quite inadequate and if the Government is to look upon this industry in Travancore and Cochin I think they are under-estimating the requirements of this industry and the problem that is facing the industry. When this is borne in mind we have to look that scientific and technological investigations are not the results of a year or 2 or 3 months. We have to carry on for a long period and only if it is consistently pursued we can achieve any results—and for this purpose, Government should not levy the cess. This industry is unable to pay the cess. The cess will be only recovered from the labourer. These six lakhs of rupees will be paid by six lakhs of workers who are getting less than Rs. 300 a year. In my opinion, the cottage industries fund is ear-marked by the Planning Commission and they have recommended that it should be for researches and so on. There is I think a sum of Rs. 10 crores; that fund is not being sufficiently utilised during this period. There are no figures as to how much has been utilised, but it is a fact that the Cottage Industries Fund is not fully utilised. Therefore, Government should not levy this cess because the exporters have their own price and the internal price is governed by the cost of production. These people who are spinning the yarn, and doing such small jobs should not be exploited.

The Cottage Industries Fund should be properly utilised and no cess should be levied. More than Rs. 10 lakhs, according to me, will be necessary if we are to maintain the markets and expand them in the proper direction.

While speaking of foreign markets, remarks were made that the needs of foreigners should be taken into account. What are the importing countries; they are the U.K., Netherlands and Denmark. These are the three principal countries. When we have to sell these things in those countries, we will have to have foreigners to attend to this; in India, if Indians are engaged, it may be quite all right; but when we have to sell to foreign countries the firms that buy are also foreigners and they also give a preference to foreigners. All attempts should be made that export trade is in the hands of Indians when foreign markets are concerned. But it is a fond wish and a fond hope to have all Indians for this export business; when you are catering to Indian market it is possible but when you are exporting to foreigners unless it is in the hands of foreigners we cannot have much headway. Therefore, that aspect has to be realised.

With regard to the position of export of yarn, it is very desirable that coir products should be sent out in manufactured form. There are three principal buyers of this yarn. How can we compel them to buy, as Mr. Sinha has pointed out, our finished products? We have again to go into the researches, into the technical methods, in order that those things are manufactured in this country according to the processes which are existing in the other countries. And for that purpose, Sir, a set of people will have to go to those countries, study the conditions there and find out how we can manufacture those things in our country. For that, Sir, finance will be required. And I say, Sir, again that Rs. 6 lakhs is not sufficient. We have to see how we can manufacture various designs, etc., and for that purpose assistance will have to be given by

employing technicians at various places to give help to the co-operative societies at the expense of this Board. Now this Board is constituted very properly. I think, Sir, the hon Minister has made a very good thing in incorporating Members of Parliament on this Board. It is the responsibility of Members of Parliament also to see that this Board is successful. I know, Sir, many Boards existing where Members of Parliament are not there as is specifically provided here. And I might congratulate the Minister for Commerce for incorporating this provision about the Members of Parliament. If you really want to have an export market in foreign countries then, I think that Members of Parliament would be of great assistance in developing those markets. At present what happens is that delegations are sent out and they consist of persons who are interested in those products. It is well and good that they should be there. The Government Secretary is also there. All these persons form a delegation. But that is not the proper way to develop the export trade because when we want to develop the export trade, it has to be borne in mind that we have to establish political connections with the foreign countries, and without establishing political connections with the foreign countries we cannot make any headway in our exports. Only the political leaders of this country, Members of Parliament and other political leaders can impress on the Governments of those countries the need for increased trade connections with us. The failure of the present policy with regard to exports is due to the fact that vested interests predominate in such delegations. When vested interests go there they deal with only similar interests there in the foreign countries, but when political leaders go there they can go to the ministerial level and impress upon them the need for trade connections with this country. When the hon Minister is concerned with the problem of exports this fact has to be borne in mind.

Then, I come to the question of weeding out undesirable elements in ex-

ports. Quality control should be there. There must be a process devised for the examinations of the quality of the goods sent to foreign countries, but there should be no harassment in this process.

We should also fix an export target for this industry and if the private sector is unable to export to that target figure then Government should come into the field and push up exports, and also see to it that our production is absorbed within the country also. The present production should somehow be maintained and not curtailed. The hon Minister said in his opening remarks that civil works were started in the centres affected to relieve suffering. This is unproductive. What we should do is to fix export targets and push our sales abroad. We can do that if our Embassies abroad are also manned on a commercial basis. If those people who represent us abroad try to popularise our products abroad it will solve our export problem.

With regard to the interests of labour those interests are sacred to this Government. The interests of labour come next only to those of the consumers. This is the policy of this Government, as will be only too evident from the provisions contained in the Industrial Disputes Bill which is coming before this House very shortly, with its provision for 'lay-off' and 'retrenchment' benefits.

Now, a word about the Coconut Committee. It is very good that this matter is not left to the Coconut Committee. I will explain why. The Coconut Committee is dealing with coconuts, and this coir industry which is exporting to the extent of Rs 10 crores per annum, should have a separate body to look after its interests.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN That point has been sufficiently dealt with already. It is not relevant to the third reading stage.

SHRI C P PARIKH I will finish in a minute. In conclusion Sir, I will

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

submit that for every commodity, a Committee should exist to maximise production and push up exports. With these few words, I support the Bill.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I only want to say a few words about such Bills brought by the Government before Parliament. As a matter of public duty, we have to move many amendments, and the Government, as a matter of its duty, goes on negating those amendments. It is not that point that I want to make. In Travancore-Cochin lakhs of workers and their families are starving, starving because they have no employment because in the coir industry on which they live the market is falling, they are being retrenched and no wages are therefore being paid. This is the most important problem which the Government has to face. Now the Government comes with a Coir Board Bill of 27 clauses and we discuss on it. What is this? After digging the whole mountain the Government is even unable to catch the mouse. Here is the Coir Board which is intended to develop. That is exactly why I think the Deputy Minister for Commerce was not prepared to accept the word "development".....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is Minister for Commerce.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am sorry. There are so many portfolios and it is very difficult to remember.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At least Members of Parliament should remember.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: We are trying to memorise them. He was not prepared to accept the word "development" because in his heart of hearts he knows that the industry cannot be developed with the present method or with the present Coir Board and that is exactly why he said that the purpose is only to control and he is not prepared to accept the word "development". Of course one of the objects is development, he says—control also

means development. This Bill provides for Rs. 12 lakhs out of which Rs. 6 lakhs will go for administration—the setting up of the Board and its various other expenses and only Rs. 6 lakhs will be available for the various objects contained in the Bill and of course in those objects, even safeguarding the workers' interests does not become a major feature. I know the Government will argue, "Let the coir industry be developed, more is yet to be done so that better quality of coir can be produced, better way of utilising them could be developed which could be sold better and in that way ultimately in the long run the workers will benefit and it is the only way by which the workers' problem could be solved and in no other way". With this Rs. 6 lakhs I don't know how much research they are going to do, how much fine products they are going to produce, how much they are going to subsidise the exports and how much they are going to find internal markets. All these are a very big question mark. It is not only this, but the most important problem that stands before the Travancore people is the problem of the unemployed workers—the problem of those millions of people who are depending on the coir industry—about that the Government does not come with any concrete proposals to solve that. We have got a Coir Board, we have a Coffee Board, a Tea Board, a Coconut Board, an Oilseeds Board, a Tobacco Board and I think for every product that we produce, we may have Boards and Boards. In India there are no dearth of these Boards nor dearth of Commissions or Committees but unfortunately in spite of these Commissions, in spite of these Committees, in spite of these Boards, the misery of our people goes on increasing and not decreasing. It is from this angle that I want the Government to really think seriously. Yes, it is a good thing that you have brought this Bill so that some people connected with the industry and some Members of Parliament can be associated now and then to go into the problem. In this way how long are you going to tackle this problem? Is this the way to tackle this problem that is facing our people and

is this the way to tackle such urgent problems? Instead of spending its energies and asking Parliament also to discuss for 4 days—two days in the other House and 2 days here—on the Coir Bill for setting up this small body of Coir Board and providing funds of Rs 6 lakhs, why does not the Government come with concrete proposals for alleviating the distress that is there in the Travancore Cochin in this coir industry. If it had come with some proposal to give some relief to the people, of giving them permanent employment, with some concrete step, saying that whatever product was made by these workers in the coir industry would be taken by the Government, that Government would take full responsibility for the marketing of that product, or for storing it and finding out a market for them, that would have been something. That would have been better than having bogus Boards and bogus Committees and bogus Commissions. Sir, our people are getting fed up with these Boards and Committees and Commissions. When these Committees report, then further sub-committees are appointed to go through them. And then there will be sub-sub-committees and so on it goes. Once Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister, said that when Government did not want to do anything, the best way was to appoint a Committee. That was said, of course, when we were fighting British imperialism and in connection with the reports of Committees and Commissions then. But unfortunately he is today unable to check the growth of these Committees and Commissions and Boards and still more Boards. These Boards do not really help the people. What makes me sad is that in spite of our voicing these difficulties, in spite of Members on the other side also voicing them, the Government is not prepared to accept a single suggestion which might immediately give relief to the people engaged in this industry. This is the feeling that I wanted to express here. Of course, the Board will be set up, as this Bill will be passed. But as far as the worker is concerned, these Rs. 6 lakhs are not going to benefit him even to the extent of a single pie. To help

the people, you have to think of some other methods.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Sir,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have had a sufficient say on the matter, I thought, Mr. Manjuran.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: No, Sir. I have a little further to say about it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have two minutes only.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Even the hon. Minister may not be able to complete within two minutes. I have to say something, because

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to be very brief.

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Yes, Sir. I will be very brief.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No repetition of arguments

SHRI M. MANJURAN: No, Sir. Absolutely new arguments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you opposing the Bill?

SHRI M. MANJURAN: Yes, I am opposing the Bill entirely. I raised a point of order which you had to some extent held technically objectionable. I oppose this Bill because Shri Madhavan Nair stated that the Government had done so many things for this industry and so there is at present some improvement in the situation in the industry. And that was supported by the hon Minister also. If that is so, I do not know what further is to be done by this Bill. I stated that the Government had done nothing. Mr. Madhavan Nair stated that the Government had done everything and the Minister for Commerce has endorsed that view. If that is true, if these things could be done without the formation of this Board and without incurring the expenditure of Rs. 6 lakhs, why should any Board be formed now?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manjuran, we will continue tomorrow. There are two announcements.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

I. THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953

II. THE EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the Council the following messages received from the House of the People signed by the Secretary to the House:

I

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 115 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill, 1953, which has been passed as amended by the House at its sitting held on the 30th November, 1953."

II

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 148, of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, I am directed to inform you that the House of the People at its sitting on the 1st December 1953 agreed without any amendment to the Employees' Provident Funds (Amendment) Bill, 1953, which was passed by the Council of States at its sitting held on the 24th November, 1953."

I lay a copy of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill, 1953, as passed by the House of the People, on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 1-30 P.M. tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till half past one of the clock on Wednesday, the 2nd December 1953.