

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh.]
consider the matter with the utmost sympathy.

So far as the main amendments are concerned, Sir, no opposition of any sort has been exhibited in any section of the House and I therefore hope, Sir, that the Bill would be taken into consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill further to amend the Indian Oilseeds Act, 1946, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 4 were added to the Bill.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may move that the Bill be passed.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : Sir, I move:

That the Bill be passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill be passed.

The motion was adopted.

The Council then adjourned for lunch till halfpast two of the clock.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

THE INDIAN COCONUT COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : Sir, I beg to move :

That the Bill further to amend the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

In moving this Bill I need make only a few observations, for we have in this morning passed another Bill and the provisions of this present Bill are very similar to those which the House has already accepted. For instance, the definition of the

word "mill" is proposed to be changed in the same way as it was changed in the Oilseeds Committee (Amendment) Bill.

Then in clause 3, there is only a verbal change so far as the name of the Vice President of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research is concerned. He used to be called the Vice Chairman and this designation is now changed into Vice President, and this has necessitated this change. Then we propose to add only two members to the present strength of this Committee. One is the Agricultural Marketing Adviser with the Government of India and the other a representative of the State of Assam. The State of Assam is fairly important from the point of view of the cultivation of coconuts. There has also been a demand from that State Government and therefore we have given one representative to that State.

The next amendment is about section 4 (g) and it is consequential due to the changes that have occurred since 1944 when the Act was passed as well as to the formation of the United State of Travancore-Cochin. Formerly there used to be a separate representative for each of them but since they have been combined, the necessary change is sought to be incorporated by means of this amendment.

Coming next to section 7 (1) the provision in the 1944 Act confined the presidentship of the Committee to the Vice Chairman of the I.C.A.R. This amendment is intended to empower the Central Government to nominate any person as President of the Committee, either the Vice President of the I.C.A.R. or others. Suggestions have been made that the ex-officio chairmanship is not desirable and if there is amongst the members of the Committee or outside any capable person who is likely to do the duties better, the Government should be free to appoint him as President of the Committee.

Coming to section 9(1), the purpose of the proposed amendment is to give the Committee sufficient scope for widening its activities so as to cover other coconut products, except coir and coir products. This is intended merely to expand the activities of the Committee so as not to limit its utility.

In part (b) of sub-section (2) under the 1944 Act, the Committee could utilise funds to defray expenses involved in the supply of technical advice to growers. The purpose of the present amendment is to widen the scope of this provision to cocount growers as well as to other persons who may be engaged in the coconut industry.

Lastly, section 10 of the 1944 Act deals with the delivery of monthly returns by the owner of every mill with regard to the consumption of copra in the mill. It is possible that new mills might have come into being and the amendment proposes that in the case of every new mill set up, the owner will have to intimate to the Collector information connected with the mill within a fortnight of the commencement of the business.

On this Bill there was some discussion in the other House and very many points were made. There were many Members who were not satisfied with the working of the Committee and it was also suggested that a resume of the work of the Committee should be circulated to Members of the House. This is under preparation and since I have proposed to circulate it among Members of the House of the People I will do the same so far as this House is concerned also. Actually there are many Members who are familiar with the work of this Committee and I may repeat the assurance that I gave in the other House that I propose to look into the work of this Committee very thoroughly and if there are any defects in its working, we propose to rectify them. In fact, after the resume is prepared, I will also get the comments

made by the hon. Members of the House of the People copied out and copies of them would be circulated to those friends who take a lively interest in this matter, and I propose to call them for discussion so as to improve the working and the utility of this Committee.

I therefore, hope, Sir, that it will not be necessary to take much time in order to make the House accept the motion I have made. I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :
Motion moved :

That the Bill further to amend the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : Sir, this Bill which my friend the Minister Dr. Deshmukh, has introduced is a very undesirable Bill. First of all, this Coconut Committee which has been in existence now for so many years has not rendered a proper account of itself. Secondly, this Bill, according to the Statement of Objects and Reasons, seeks to impose the definition of "factory" to those employers who employ ten hands or even less. The purpose behind this is to bring these small employers under the orbit of this Bill so that a cess can be levied on them. Now, Sir, this coconut industry is a very ancient industry in our country, especially in Travancore and Cochin and Madras, and ^{North} Mysore. This is dispersed all over the coastal area and these people who are extracting oil out of this industry are distributed equally over an area of 200 to 300 miles on the coast. It is supposed to be a small cottage industry. The big mills like the Tata Oil Mills and other big capitalistic concerns to whom the cess applies are able to give the cess because their production is more and they are having a huge mill. Not only this, but to the detriment of the coconut growers of our own country, these big industrialists import what is called desiccate coconut from Ceylon on a large scale. Now, you know the slump in t

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

market at present is great. Coconut does not fetch the price which it was fetching before. These small traders who employ 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9 hands for extracting coconut oil are to be penalised by the move our friend is now making in this House. I will tell you how it will indirectly affect the consumer also. Coconut oil is an oil which is used for various purposes including soap making. Not only it is used for domestic consumption, but a bulk is also exported from this country. This oil which is extracted by these small industries, is having a consolidated market in certain particular areas. If this cess is imposed upon this small group of people, naturally their first anxiety will be to pass it on to the consumers. It is not possible for them to take the cess out of the profits of the small producers. Again, as I said with regard to another item, the donkey—the consumer—has to bear the burden. Again and again, the moves of this Government are only to burden the average citizens and not to help them in any way whatsoever. If they are really interested in coming to the rescue of the average citizens who are already groaning under heavy taxation on various fronts, I am sure this Minister—if he had considered the Bill in that aspect—would not come out with a Bill of this nature. They rarely think of the effect of such Bills on the consumers; they rarely think of the effect of such a cess and other taxation measures upon the general consumer. Coconut oil is just like mustard oil in Bengal. In West Bengal, mustard oil is the poor man's consumption; it is the food of the poor man. Coconut oil is the food of the poor man in Madras and, especially, in Malabar. Now, what will be the effect of this cess? It will directly add to the tax and to the price of the coconut oil consumed by the poor man. Any lady of Malabar will be glad just to anoint her hair with coconut oil, not only this, scientific thesis has proved that coconut oil has an excellent effect of making hair grow luxuriously. Now, the scientific perception of coconut oil should be taken into account when

you think of penalising the coconut oil and Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh is penalising the ladies who use coconut oil. That is exactly the position to which he is bringing us to. Therefore, Sir, the first statement of object with regard to the cess is a nauseating thing. It cannot be applied because the sweet odour of the coconut oil is sought to be removed by this.

Now, let us see how far the employment will be affected by this. They say, in their Bill, that they are going to bring all power-run mills under this scheme. If there is power available for a mill to run and if that employer employs 4 or 5 persons, the mischief of this Bill is there. If power is not available, even if 100 people are employed, I think they take shelter by the other process, namely, that any man who employs more than 10 people is running a factory and, it comes under the mischief of the Factories Act. In both ways, they want to scissor out the cloth that is worn by the employers. Have some consideration for the petty employer. You are a mighty Government; you have forgotten your Congress principles. The old man is dead and gone, but remember for a minute that you have something....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) :
Something?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH:.....to do with the people at large. Remember for a minute that the measures you bring should be measures which will really help the man, the average man in the street. Remember for a second that you are the custodians of their morals, their happiness, their economic prosperity. Remember for a minute that what you do must be in a long range basis and is not a short money grabbing proposition. Any proposition that emanates from the Treasury Bench is naturally a proposition to grab money from the average man: "What is the method by which I can put my hand into his pocket? What is the method by which I can extract something out of nothing?" These are the main guiding

principles of all the Bills that emanate from the Treasury Bench.

Now, Sir, why are you at the throat of these poor men? Leave them to themselves. The 1944 Act (Coconut Bill) was a very sanely conceived one. That had given some benefit for small coconut industrialists who used to extract oil out of the coconut. That left them alone. The Government was not in a position to give monopoly interest; it is a dispersed industry spread all over the area and it got the benefit of a Cottage industry. They knew that. Why do you want to tamper with a good Act and bring about a nauseating amendment? That is the main trouble with regard to the first amendment.

Now, Sir, the second point is this : coconut has suffered just like any other indigenous product of our country. I do not know whether our North Indian friends are using coconut as much as our South Indian people. If you go into any home, Sir, in South India, you will not get food without coconut being added to it. It is not only used as an article of food but it is a thing which every lady in the evening carries to a temple, gets it broken and brings it back. Now, that coconut is suffering on account of a slump. I ask these friends whether they are going to do anything with the cess that they collect to subsidise the coconut growers so that they will get out of the slump. I put again the question to the Treasury Bench whether they will ban the desiccated coconut that is imported into this country from Ceylon and other areas to be crushed into coconut oil so that our coconuts will have a better value and better prices. Thus our industrial magnates will go in for our internally grown coconuts for crushing them into oil which will make the industry stand on its own legs.

Therefore, so far as the first object is concerned, I have said that it is not correct at present to extend the cess and I do not know what the reaction will be with regard to this matter.

Now, I appeal to Dr. Deshmukh with all the power I can command to withdraw this measure as it will directly hit the poor man and he should consider twice before he presses this clause to be accepted by this House.

Now, coming to the constitution of the Coconut Board, this amendment seeks to bring in six more people into the Coconut Board. This Board will consist of three nominees of three Governments, namely, Travancore-Cochin, Madras and Mysore, and three Members of Parliament, two to be elected by the House of the People and one by this House. Now, this Committee must be given powers to go into every aspect of this industry. Not only that. This Committee should be given a sort of autonomous status so that they will consider, just like the Tariff Commission, various aspects of this industry and try to see that this industry, a very important industry, is developed in our country. The coconut tree is supposed to be a *kalpavriksha*. *Kalpavriksha* means *kamadhenu*, which means, again, that you can get everything out of that single tree. Not a single part of the coconut tree is wasted. If a man in Malabar owns ten coconut trees in a small bit of land, he is the happiest man. He can live happily. It is a supplement to what is called tapioca, in these days of food scarcity. Tapioca and coconut go hand in hand in South India. People there are able to live on those two. They can even forget rice. They can forget our worm-eaten and moth-eaten wheat. Yesterday I saw a photograph in a paper of some centrally controlled godowns where wheat is stored. When two bags of wheat were opened, there were found 20 million worms and no wheat at all. I saw the photograph. And I see the hon. Minister, Mr. Karmarkar, nodding, which means that he knows the condition which prevails in the Government godowns. Now, you do not find such bad qualities in the coconut. If you feel thirsty go to any coconut tree, remove one coconut, open it, and drink that sweet coconut water, which is going to give you exhilaration and happiness of life.

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

An hon. Member : And today also). Therefore, do not kill that industry. I appeal to you to try to preserve it and improve it by removing this cess.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA (Madras) : North Indians do not know what a coconut is.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : This is the new Indian Union ; this is Bharat. This is an integrated nation. Everybody must know what our products are. I was surprised, when the other day I was referring to the Malabar *nendrankai*, that many people asked what *nendrankai* meant. All these people know what an Australian apple is, what the so-called jam is that is sold everywhere. But to my utter shame and disgust, I found that my colleagues in this House did not know what a *nendrankai*, and especially a Malabar *nendrankai*, is. If you are hungry and you eat one *nendrankai*, it will keep you alive for 24 hours or even 48 hours. That is the potency of that fruit. Similarly, this sweet coconut, which is now adopted for sweet coconut toddy by our Madras Government which has embarked on prohibition, gives you all that you want to quench your thirst. Therefore, you should now be in a position to see that that trade is not killed and that the reconstituted Coconut Committee gives all benefit to the industry. You must make the Committee an autonomous body and give enough funds to them, not by levying a cess upon the small scale traders, but out of the general revenues. If all over India you plant coconut trees, this country will be better off.

SHRI B. RATH (Orissa) : Mr. Deputy Chairman ; I thank the hon. Minister for giving an opportunity to this House to discuss on a Bill which is going to amend an Act which was passed in the year 1944. The original Act provides for a committee whose function it is to see that the production of coconut is developed in this country. It also provides for a fund to be kept in the lands of the Committee, collected from a cess on mills which are re-

gistered. The Collector is to collect that cess. Now, this Bill wants to amend that Act. But it is high time that we considered whether the Act that was passed in 1944, when the war was on, is at all necessary at present, and whether it should not be removed from the Statute Book. Moreover, my hon. friend who spoke before me complained that Government has not been able to give much information about the activities of this Committee and that he has not enough literature in his hands as to what has been done by the Committee during the last eight years. I have no such complaint to make, because it is not the literature that makes one wise about the activities of the Committee, but it is the activity itself that gives us information about its activities. Sir, those of the hon. Members who have been on a pilgrimage to Puri in Orissa, or those who intend in future to go there, will find near the railway station of Sakhigopal a signboard "Coconut Research Centre", and they will find a huge area which is surrounded by barbed wire. And those who have been there previously will find that all the old paddy fields in that enclosed area are now barren. Coconut research is taking place in that barren land without any coconut tree. That has been the activity of this Committee.

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : No coconut tree planted ?

SHRI B. RATH : There is nothing except barren land. That has been the activity of the Committee. I do not know what has been the activity of this Committee in the big coconut growing areas in South India, but the only research centre that is there in Sakhigopal shows that there has been actually no research on coconut. Perhaps there has been coconut research—perhaps the Committee has been carrying on research work on barren soil, and searching for coconuts in that barren spot.

Now, with regard to the other activities of this Committee, let us see

how things have improved during the last eight years. Has the coconut that was growing in this country increased within the last eight years or has it decreased in quantity? Have the imports been reduced, or have they been increased? I believe the import of copra has increased. In spite of this Act, the production of coconut is going down. The cultivators who take to coconut growing have to face a market which is a very fluctuating market, and a reference to the Journal of Trade and Industry that was recently circulated will show that the price has been fluctuating over a wide range within the last few months.

3 P.M.

That shows that the purpose for which this Committee was set up has not been served.

Sir, with regard to the research works, I do not know what researches have been made and all that we know is that during the last 8 years of research no remedy has been found out to fight against the pests that attack the leaves and roots of coconut trees and thereby help in the deterioration of coconut, not only the growth of coconut tree, but also its fruit-bearing capacity. I think the Vice President of this Coconut Research Committee who is a Member of this House, should have been able to give us some light on this matter at the very beginning.

Now, with regard to the Committee, I do not understand the principle of formation of this Committee. Almost the whole committee is a nominated body; barring a few members who will be elected by the House of the People and the Council of States, all the other members are to be nominated by the State Governments. Now, Sir, my first submission is that during the last eight years these nominated committees have failed to serve their useful purpose because they are responsible to none but to the Government which nominates them and therefore they have no responsibility towards the grower, no responsibility towards the manufacturer of oil. Now if this process of nomination continues, I believe that

the fate of this Committee will be as it was before and there would be absolutely no improvement although the number might be increased. And secondly, Sir, I cannot understand the principle on which these nominations to the committees are being made. We find in section 4 (d) it is said:

"three persons representing, respectively, the State Government of Madras, the Government of the State of Mysore and the Government of the State of Travancore-Cochin...."

We find that Assam has not a place in spite of its plenty of growers. I do not understand why some State Governments have not been allowed to send their representatives although other State Governments have been allowed by this Amending Bill to send their representatives. Growers have not been allowed to send their own representatives. I have tried to understand why double representation has been provided in the case of some States but I could not understand that. I find in the Amending Bill it is said that the State Governments will send representatives. The following State Governments will send their representatives: Assam, Madras, Mysore and Travancore-Cochin. The State Governments will be represented. Producers are to be represented and consumers are to be represented. But here the question of consumers does not arise and only State Governments have been given double representation. It would have been much better if instead of asking the State Governments to nominate, under different clauses, their representatives, they had asked the State Legislatures to elect representatives of the consumers from those States and from the States in which there are coconut trees. That principle has never been followed and that is why we find double representation which I think is a very bad piece of legislation that has come before this House and under the circumstances I feel that I cannot support the amendments that have been given here because unless there is a provision for the representation of consumers or growers, nothing is going

[Shri B. Rath.]

to come out of this Bill. That is why I submit, the hon. Minister should take into consideration these facts and try to amend the Bill before he asks this House to pass the Bill.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, the criticism defeats its very purpose when it exceeds the limit and when it goes beyond the limits of decency. My friend Mr. Rajah depicted a very good picture. Obviously he was under the influence of the sweet thoughts of the coconut juice.

Now, so far as the Coconut Committee is concerned, undoubtedly it has not achieved the objective for which it has been constituted. It was not dynamic in its approach to the problems with which it was entrusted. I dare say that the Committee has not achieved the purpose for which it has been constituted. But it is one thing to say that the Committee has not achieved its purpose and exactly another thing to say that the Committee has achieved no purpose whatsoever at all. My hon. friend from Orissa depicted a picture of the research station in his State. I do not know whether coconut grows in that State at all or merely criticisms grow there. But I come from a State which grows a lot of coconut and I have in my district a research station. I invite him at my cost to my State. *(Interruption.)* I will take him to the research station which is known as Kudlu station and I would show him what exactly the Coconut Committee has done in my district.

SHRI B. RATH : The Committee is not functioning properly. Therefore it is giving more attention to certain places and not attending to other parts.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE : Obviously the Committee functions better where the response is better and where criticism is more and response less, it functions less. If my friend had diverted his energy and enthusiasm which he has in plenty from destructive criticism to constructive assistance to the Committee, perhaps he could have

achieved more for his State than by mere adverse criticism here. I can assure him that many persons in our district or in our State have tried to give their assistance to this Committee and the Committee has in its turn achieved remarkable success so far as our State is concerned. I would invite his attention to a number of experiments or researches that have been made and also to a number of results achieved. As an example I can tell him that they have been experimenting on what is called the Indian tall and Ceylon shorts and that has been a remarkable success both in the immediate yield as well as the number of nuts that are yielded. It would be entirely an irony of things to say that the Committee has achieved no purpose at all, nor is it advisable to scrap the Committee but certainly the Committee will have to be infused with more enthusiasm and I am sure our new Minister of Agriculture with his knowledge of agriculture and his enthusiasm and energy will be able to give better enthusiasm and better energy to this Committee. One thing is certain. Many of these cesses that have been collected, have added to the burden of the consumer. Ways and means must be devised to see that the consumer is not hard hit especially in the matter of coconut oil and coconuts which is everyman's food in the West coast but at the same time the bigger growers must be made to pay for the development of the agriculture and for further research thereof. It is no good saying that the general tax payer must pay for every aspect of the development of the country. Now it is a good feature in our economy if we plan it on a sectional basis i.e. coconut, arecanut as well as other agricultural products and try to develop them in different spheres and that is what is intended by having a Coconut Committee, Oilseeds Committee or different Committees for different purposes so that they could concentrate their attention to the progress of the particular aspect of agriculture and achieve results within a short time. I am sure the amendments that have been suggested are absolutely necessary—and they are more or less formal in character and intended for the

better working of the Committee. My hon. friend from Orissa had certain criticism about the composition of the Committee. It is all very well to say that the growers shall be represented by their own representatives elected by them. I am requesting him to point out one representative association of growers which would elect them. In fact self-appointed, self-nominated associations have sprung up here and there but they could never be called a representative association of the growers. Unlike the industrial spheres unfortunately we growers have not been able to create our own associations. In this respect as my hon. friend Mr. Ranga said in the morning, Government has also been lethargic. They have not given the necessary assistance to the growers and the kisans to form their own associations. I am sure at the hands of the new Minister the kisans will have better justice and they will be assisted to form their own associations so that in the time to come they could elect their own representatives. For the time being the only body that could select their representatives is the State Government. That is the only course open to Government and it will be foolish to run after imaginary associations which don't exist at all. I therefore commend the Bill to the House and would request the Members to pass it without any further waste of the time of the House.

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin): Sir, this Committee has not justified its existence at all as it has done nothing and as will be evident from the figures for the last so many years given in the annual published reports—to which I will refer. In 1947 they published a report where they say 15,34,537 acres were under cultivation whereas 33, 30,402 thousand nuts were produced. In the last year's report which they have published this average has been a bit reduced. It is 1.532 million acres and 3432.9 million nuts produced. So I don't know what improvement there has been. The acreage has come down whereas the

average production remains almost where it was when this Committee was constituted. In the meanwhile when I go through the figures of the intervening years it seems that there has been fluctuations in the acreage as well as in the production. In some of the years they have shown the figuresless and in some others a bit more. It is very strange that coconut, which is a perennial crop, has in 1952 remained the same as it was in 1947 and during the intervening period there should have been fluctuations with regard to the acreage. They have put up certain plans which they thought could be completed. They have enumerated them as follows :

"1. The undertaking of research—agricultural, economic and technological."

but the 1951 report starts with this astounding statement:

"There are two schools of thought regarding the original home of the coconut palm."

That is, I should say, the agricultural economic and technological research has led us on to this that:

"There are two schools of thought regarding the original home of the coconut palm. Some botanists consider that it is a native of tropical America, while others hold that its original habitat was the Eastern Archipelago near Java and Sumatra. But whether it originated in the eastern or the western hemisphere, there is hardly any doubt that it had been established on the sea coasts of tropical countries and on the islands in the tropics long before the dawn of modern history."

For this astounding piece of research they have taken 5 years. My grandfather used to tell us of these things. I am surprised that with all their labour for five years they have printed such nonsense in a book like this. They are concerned with agricultural, economic and technological research but this is the only research they were doing and they came to the dilemmatic conclusion as to whether it originated in the eastern or the western hemisphere. If the function of this Committee is to give this kind of report, then it is a shame on this country. Not only that. I was only instancing something to show that

[Shri M. Manjuran.]

it is not for the purposes for which they are there but for something else they have been working all the time because they could not tell us what is actually the requirement in that form of agricultural or economical or technological research that this nation should pursue with regard to the coconut industry. They have not thought that coconut forms husk as well as everything else together. According to them it was only copra and coconut oil. I am surprised at this. Recently the House might have been hearing about the downfall in the price of coir. Coir is something taken from the husk of coconuts. This Coconut Committee all these years never thought that the husk of coconut forms a part of coconut.

They are speaking of marketing coconut commodities. They are speaking of co-operative marketing of coconuts. There is no need of it where it is grown in plenty, especially in Travancore-Cochin and in Malabar, marketing has never been a problem. At least local marketing has never been a problem. This question does not arise, to my knowledge, I have been living under coconut trees. I know this trade. It was never a problem of marketing internally, that is, for the local producers that problem never arose. It is the external market, the international market, which created all these difficulties of marketing. The Coconut Committee thought that the market was the place where it was grown. That is the astonishing finding of the Committee. They never knew what uses coconut and coconut products were put to. I have talked to a number of cultivators in Kerala, where I come from, but they do not know of the existence of a Committee like this. But the Committee are saying we have been making research, we are finding resources. The resources are there but they are not spending. They say we need more money, we are going to levy a cess. They have got Rs. 2 lakhs in the Bank. This Committee is saving it. No further money is re-

quired. As a matter of fact, what is required is efforts not words. Words they have given in plenty in their various publications, but the most remarkable feature is that all the reports, if one has the patience to go through them, are the same as in the last five years. It is repetition, endless repetition of the same thing. If they started a research in 1947, for instance they thought of bringing under control, white ants by the spraying of DDT, in 1951, in their report, they still say that they are pursuing their efforts of controlling white ants by the spraying of DDT. The world has progressed very much, since then, with regard to the relation of DDT to white ants but the Committee has not still realised this. It is no use confining your research to the research station. You should go out wide and far, meet the cultivators who grow coconut. Has this Committee ever contacted coconut growers? It has got two research stations—one at Kasaragod and one at Kayankulam. It has got an officer, a propagandist officer. What has he done? They do not speak about it. I was talking about the activities of the Committee which Shri Madhavan Nair is going to extol after me.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : You are anticipating his speech.

SHRI M. MANJURAN : He has already issued a statement. So there is no anticipation. What it should do should be planned by the Committee. This Committee was there for so many years, about eight years. It had a lot of things to do but it has done nothing, absolutely nothing, except collecting some facts and keeping some accounts and spending a good part of the money in going up and down, but, never going to the producers, never doing anything for the consumers. It should have given some sort of stimulant to the coconut growers. None of these problems, none of the marketing problems, none of the research problems have really been faced by them, really confronted by them. They have evaded all these. But they are here

with their reports, which reports, I am sure might have been seen by only few people—as Mr. Rath said, they have no publications at all. Nobody knows these things, the existence of the Committee. One remarkable thing about the Indian Central Coconut Committee Amendment Bill is this: It has at least brought to the attention of this House the existence of such a Committee. By such an amendment the Bill has done very good service. Hailing as I do from Kerala, where coconut is grown in plenty, I would say, further marketability of coconut is very important. A steady price should be obtained for coconut for a happy economic condition. There should be more deeds than mere speeches. That is the condition now. Many good things can be said, but what is required is that we must increase the production. We have to find the remedy for the troubles and the diseases. They have given, they have found certain remedies, but they cannot be used by the common man because they are expensive. They might cater to the demands of some foreign chemical manufacturers rather than to the industries of the country. That is the position where we are. The overall production has to be made better by real efforts. The functions of these Committees are really to create that atmosphere in which the industry grows, in which the poor people of the land get and continue to get plenty. That is what they do not do. I would like to know how many growers have availed of the Committee's benefits. There is no use simply writing the reports year after year. It is clear that it has no reference to reality. It is good you are taking four annas per ton. Nobody will worry about it. Nor am I bothered, as Mr. Rajah said, about the cess demolishing the beauty of women's hair. I am not worried over these cosmetics etc. What we should have is economic activities. You have Rs. two lakh forty-seven thousand odd deposited in the Bank. Why do you want more money now? You are talking of co-operatives, and marketing societies, but as I have already said, this is not the problem. That is not the type of work that should

be conducted. Real research should have been conducted for production and also for the multifarious uses to which coconut products should be subjected. But these things they have never intimated to the nation, and they are not likely to do it—that is my greatest fear.

Then they have not exploited, nor explored rather, the international market for the benefit of the coconut producers. I am not sure of one thing, which Mr. Rajah was speaking about, that we are exporting a lot of coconut oil. I am not sure of that position at all. I feel that we are actually not doing so. We have not enough coconut oil even for the purposes of our own industries. Really speaking we have to import for many of our industries. That is the position. So, only production and more production can solve our problems. We have to import because for the development of many of our industries, these raw materials are quite necessary. In the absence of raw materials, a number of our industries using coconut oil, might collapse, and thus it will also add to the unemployment in the country and create a series of problems. I think the growers and the consumers have the right to help themselves in regard to all these matters in which the Committee has shirked its responsibility. And though there is the Act and the amendment, the time has come to raise the cry 'Do something to justify your existence or get out and leave it to the people who can do it', because the people have brought production to the level which this Committee has not been able to bring about. Where is the need for this Committee? Unless within one year this Committee is going to do something more by which the production could be increased it is better that a dissolution Bill is introduced in the Parliament for abolishing this Committee.

PRINCIPAL DEVA PRASAD GHOSH (West Bengal) : Sir, it appears that most of the hon. Members (if not all) who have taken part in this debate up till now and have taken up

[Principal Devaprasad Ghosh.] the cudgels on behalf of coconuts and coconut growers happen to come from South India. That is rather unfortunate. I think it is high time that some Member representing North India should stand up to champion the cause of the coconut, and hence I rise to speak. I come from Bengal and I suppose Bengal is still recognised as a part of North India and Bengalis are notoriously fond of coconuts in their various shapes and modifications. As to the origin of this precious fruit—I am not so great a Pandit as to be able to trace its origin whether it came from tropical America or Eastern Archipelago, Java or anywhere else, but it is well known that India has been its habitat for a pretty long time—at least for two thousand years,—so much so that it has found its way into our classical literature. I suppose that most of our friends are familiar with the famous Sanskrit simile so much in favour with our ancient poets, viz. 'नारिकेल फल सुमिन्नम् वच' (*Narikela phala sammitam vachub* meaning, words like the Narikela phala—coconut fruit, that is to say delicious to the taste and at the same time nutritious. And as to the virtues of the coconut fruit, well, of course I need hardly dilate upon it at any great length, for in that work I have no hopes of ever improving upon the very delectable performance of my hon. friend Mr. Rajah. Well, first, we have got the life-giving juice of the coconut fruit. It is very delicious. Then, there is the edible portion, the kernel. It is made use of, so far as the Bengalis are concerned, in making buns, pies, pastries, *laddoos* and *sandesh* as well as other sweets which simply bring water to our mouth. Then, we come to the shell. I do not know to what other uses it is put to. But in its unbroken shape or horn it is used for making the *hooka* (or the hubble-bubble) which is used for smoking purposes. I know that the *hookah* is getting a little out of fashion now-a-days, because of the importation of those cylindrical concoctions called cigarettes and cigars. But anyway, doctors say that the *hookah* is a good medium for smoking tobacco.

It renders tobacco more sedative and soothing. Then we come to what is called coir, the coconut's fibrous outer covering out of which ropes are made. Now ropes are very useful things. If any Member of the House is thinking of committing suicide by hanging, just to escape from the miseries of this sorrowful vale of tears, then I may tell him that the rope made of coconut fibre will come in very handy. To all these various uses of the coconut fruit, I think, as a North Indian, as a northerner, I would hasten to pay a tribute. If I go on dilating on its other virtues, I shall never come to an end.

I now come to the amendment Bill itself. Here, I feel mostly in sympathy with what has fallen from the lips of Mr. Rajah. The financial authorities of the Government of India seem to be extraordinarily keen upon extracting some money out of the poor coconut growers. That is not very generous. In the statement of Objects and Reasons on page 3, it is stated that the definition of the word 'mill' has been modified in this manner for this reason. The word 'mill' under the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944 is defined to be "a place in which copra is crushed for the extraction of oil, which is a factory as defined in section 2 of the Factories Act, 1934 and having regard to the definition of 'factory' no cess is leviable on the extraction of oil by a mill if the number of hands employed is less than ten". Evidently it refers to small concerns that seldom extract much oil. The statement goes on: "this enables certain employers to evade the cess by employing one or two hands less than the statutory limit."

Well, what is the harm? I do not see any. On the contrary, if the new definition comes into force, even the benefit that was so long given to the actual employer of a small concern is lost. I hope the Government will be more generous in this matter, because after all, it is a small industry, and one of the cardinal objectives, one of the principles of the present Government

of India, I suppose, is to encourage cottage industries and small-scale industries, and not to throttle them out of existence altogether.

I shall now come to another point. It strikes me now, and I have devoted only casual attention to this Bill. It appears that some clauses are intended to be changed. For instance, towards the end of the first page in clause 3 (ii) it is stated: "For clause (d), the following clauses shall be substituted, namely: (d) four persons representing respectively, the Governments of Assam, Madras, Mysore and Travancore-Cochin, appointed in each case by the State Government concerned." Then, in the last paragraph also we find the same thing: "(g) six other persons, of whom two shall be elected from among themselves by the Members of the House of the People, one shall be elected from among themselves by the Members of the Council of States, one shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Mysore and two shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Travancore-Cochin." I ask, why is Bengal omitted both from (d) and (g)? I am not speaking from a sense of inter-provincial jealousy or rivalry. I shall steer clear of that. I find Assam also included and I should think that so far as coconut production is concerned, Bengal is far ahead of Assam, but of course, in this matter the hon. Minister is in a better position to know than I am. I should suggest that it would be desirable that the lacuna be filled up either in (d) or (g) even at this stage.

I have little more to add. I should like to utter only a word of warning. Let not our dynamic approach to the coconut lead to tussle between the hon. Members of the North and the South. Dynamic approaches are always dangerous and when a coconut makes a dynamic approach towards hon. Members' heads, there is every chance of broken skulls being the result.

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR (Travancore-Cochin): Sir, Mr. Manjuran has made particular reference to me as Vice President of the Committee. He expected from me a lurid picture of the Committee. I shall not attempt that. I shall only give a correct picture of the working of the Committee. Sir, the main functions of the Committee are: (1) undertaking, assisting or encouraging agricultural, industrial and economic research; (2) improving the marketing of coconuts and coconut products; (3) supplying information regarding the coconut industry to the general public, giving technical advice to growers and carrying on propaganda in the interests of the coconut industry; and (4) tendering advice to the Central Government in respect of policy in matters connected with the development and improvement of the industry. I shall try to show how under each of these categories the Committee has functioned.

The expenses of the Committee are met by levying a cess at the rate of 4 annas per cwt. of copra crushed in power mills included under the Factories Act.

Now, with regard to the undertaking, assisting or encouraging agricultural and economic research, the Committee has got research stations at two places. One of these stations is doing fundamental research and the other is doing research on diseases. Without going into details I may give a few of the items in which research has been undertaken and work is carried on there. The fundamental research is being done at the station at Kasaragod and this comprises—

Introduction and study of exotic varieties of coconuts,

Hybridisation of coconuts, nursery studies, study of the problem of occurrence of barren nuts,

Study of button shedding which takes place on a virulent scale in diseased areas,

[Shri K. P. Madhavan Nair.]

Pollen germination studies and maintenance of individual tree records for the correct appraisal of the effect of cultural and other treatments on the yield of ash, etc., effect on yield on regular cultivation and manuring, proper spacing of trees in coconut plantations with a view to get the maximum yield of nuts, irrigation with sea water, growing of green manure crops, soil survey and survey of soil profiles, soil moisture studies, potash fixation experiments, copra kiln studies, etc. etc.

These are some of the main items of work undertaken in the research laboratory and the reports are being published from time to time. As hon. Members are doubtless aware, the results of research work may not be seen immediately; still in various directions the result of the work so far done has become evident. As a result of these there has been an increase in the crop. Reference was made by a friend here to the area under cultivation in 1947 and he said that today the area is less. For that the reason is that the area in 1947 was before partition of India, and as a result of the partition about 42,500 acres of coconut cultivation in East Bengal has been lost to us, and that area had an annual productive capacity of 6,67,45,000 nuts. That area has been lost to India and that is the reason why there is some reduction in the area under coconut today.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: And there has been nothing like an increase anywhere? No progress?

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR : Lot of progress.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: How much?

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR : The actual figures will show, it is a matter of arithmetic, the present figures compared to the original figure less what I stated now as having gone to Pakistan.

The experiments on diseases are being conducted at Kayankulam in Travancore-Cochin. That is the area where a virulent type of disease has been prevalent and therefore that place has been selected for experiments. The main work done there are plant pathological studies and entomological studies. There are different kinds of diseases and as a result of the experiments and researches carried on, certain diseases have been completely eradicated, in the case of certain other diseases there has been a sort of check or control over them and in the case of certain other diseases they are still under investigation.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE (Travancore-Cochin): May I know which are the diseases which have been completely stopped?

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR : I can give the example of the leaf disease. As a result of spraying by Bordeaux mixture this disease has been brought under control. The Committee's officers visited several coconut gardens and experimented first on select areas. Several thousands of trees were attended to. And now very many of the growers have taken to this method and they have reported wonderful improvement in the crop. I have already pointed out that we cannot always expect immediate results and especially in the case of coconuts which take many months to mature. So the results of the Committee's researches may not be seen so quickly, as one might wish. I don't say that the work of the Committee has not been dynamic, but the results may not be seen in that manner.

You cannot expect results in a day. The coconut tree takes at least 8 to 9 years for maturing and, as a result of that, it is too early to judge the work of the Committee as the Committee had its first meeting only in 1945, and it would be time enough for us to judge the result, after, say, a few more years. Now, with regard to.....

SHRI K. C. GEORGE : In how many years.....

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR: My hon. friend knows as much about it as myself.

SHRI M. MANJURAN : Then, we may not have any result at all.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH. But, not 10 years for maturing.

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR: I think it will. Now, with regard to the increased production, the first task, the Committee set itself to, was in the matter of finding out proper seedlings for distribution and even as early as 1946, the Committee was able to set up about 9 nurseries from where seedlings are distributed. It will be very interesting to know that year after year the Committee, through the different nurseries spread over the various parts of India has been able to distribute lakhs of seedlings to the cultivators. They have been able to distribute this at a subsidised rate and the very fact that there is increasing demand for these seedlings goes to show how the seedlings are good and how the growers appreciate the work done through these nurseries. Gradually the number of nurseries was increased and today the Committee runs directly one nursery at its research station at Kasaragod and through State Governments 29 nurseries with a total target output of about 5 lakhs of seedlings per year. Sir, as I said, these seedlings take time to mature and if so many seedlings have been purchased by the growers and year after year, the demand is increasing, it is a sure sign that very soon the number of trees and therefore, the crop also would be very much more than what they were when the Committee began its work.

With regard to research, I said that there are two research stations, one at Kayankulam and the other at Kasaragod. There are also regional research stations, and to one such a reference was made by my friend from Orissa. At present there are 4 regional research stations, 3 in Travancore and one in Orissa and 3 regional research stations

are being set up, one in Madras, one in Bombay and one in West Bengal. In this connection, Sir, I wish to draw the attention of the Members to one fact as to how the Committee is functioning. There seems to be a misunderstanding that the work of the Committee is undertaken directly in all States. This is not the fact and the work done by the Committee directly is very small compared to its very large field of activity which it gets done through the States.

Usually, the Committee meets twice a year and every time before the meeting, the different State Governments are requested to send schemes. These schemes are examined by the Committee and when these schemes are sanctioned, the Committee meets half the expenditure and the State has to share the other half and work is done in the States through the supervision and control of the States. The Committee has only to advise and examine the report every year, but the major portion of the work is done by the States. If this work has not been successful—I do not want to say the Committee is not responsible in the matter but—the main responsibility rests with the States and as my friend Mr. Hegde remarked, much more depends upon the co-operation extended to the Committee by the different States. If, therefore, in Orissa the station is not working properly, I wish to say that it is not the fault of the Committee alone. I do not want to say that the Committee has nothing to do with it, but to a very large extent, it must be due to want of proper attention on the part of the State Government.

Now, I refer to the popularisation of the manuring experiments carried on by the Committee. In various places, green manure crops are being grown to spot out those suitable and people are instructed the ways in which that can be done. Recently, as a result of collaboration with Messrs. Parry & Co., who are the biggest suppliers of manure in South India, they have agreed to supply manure to different farms on credit basis and many in the East and

[SHRI K. P. Madhavan Nair.] West Coast (in the South) are taking advantage of this scheme and the technical assistance of the Committee is placed at the disposal of the growers as well as that of the Company.

With regard to improved marketing of coconut and coconut products, what my hon. friend Mr. Manjuran said is a fact. There is at present not much need for propaganda for marketing coconuts in India because we have not enough to supply the real need of the country. My hon. friend Mr. Rajah referred to the export of coconut oil. He was referring to a period several years ago when we had to import all our soap requirements. The position has changed now. Our production is not sufficient and we really are in need of much more oil for our soap making, for instead of being importers of soap, as he must know, we are now exporting soap, and for that a lot of oil is necessary.

Really the question of marketing does not arise. Still, to assist the small cultivators in different areas, schemes were invited from the Governments, and both the Travancore Government and the Cochin Government submitted co-operative marketing schemes for the Committee to take up. The Committee agreed to finance the schemes, and of the two schemes, one scheme was entrusted to the then Travancore Government and the other to the then Cochin Government, and they were functioning for some time. I am making particular reference to this because of adverse criticism about the working of those schemes. As I said before, these schemes were not run directly by the Committee but through State Governments. The State Government had to look after the scheme; the Committee was to give only financial assistance. Of course, every half year the Government had to send a report of the working of the scheme and the Committee had to pass the grants. On the basis of the reports the Committee found that the schemes were not functioning in the way in which they were expected to function. Some time was given to the State Govern-

ments to see that they worked properly. Unfortunately, in spite of those directions the schemes did not prove successful and therefore they had to be stopped.

Now, with regard to grading, the Committee appointed a special officer and schemes for drawing up grade specifications for coconut oil and standard contract terms were put through, and the specifications, after consultation with the trade, were published. Similarly, as regards regulated markets, a special officer explored the possibility of setting up regulated markets and his reports were sent to the concerned State Governments; and Madras and Mysore have followed the suggestions and they have regulated markets, and Travancore say they are still considering the question.

With regard to supply of information on the coconut industry to the general public, there have been opposing views expressed here: one that there is no publication, and another that there is a lot of publication, but one finds nothing in it. A friend was reading from one publication, but he appeared to think that the report was of only one line, and he started with one line and he ended with that.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): That is the only line he has read! (Interruption.)

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR: There are many journals received in the Library of Parliament on this subject, and those who care to go through them will know what is being done in the way of publicity and information. There is a monthly bulletin which is published at three pies, so that everybody who wants can buy and read it. It was published in English and Malayalam, and it is now attempted to be translated into other languages also. There was also the "Coconut Journal" published once in three months. That is in English. There are some handbooks also on this subject in English

and Malayalam, and translations in Tamil, Telugu and Kannada are also in press.

With regard to propaganda, there is a full-time propaganda officer appointed by the Travancore State Government, half of whose salary and other expenses is met by the Committee. We are just watching the results of his work, so that similar propaganda officers may be appointed in other areas. He has been working for 12 months, and he has been contacting innumerable growers, and the report, as far as one can judge, is very encouraging. Similarly in the Committee's office there is a propaganda officer whose work it is to contact growers and also to attend exhibitions in the different parts of the country. He has been attending exhibitions in Bombay and in various parts of Travancore-Cochin, Malabar and South Kanara. There is a section also in the Committee which attends to inquiries from different growers, and wherever necessary technicians are sent to assist those who want assistance from them. Now one important matter has been referred to here but my hon. friend has not been good enough or careful enough to go through the reports of the Committee. My friend Mr. Manjuran was saying that the Coconut Committee dealt only with copra and that nothing was done with regard to coir husk. Now this is a very vexatious matter. Even as early as in 1946, within one year after the formation of the Committee some schemes with regard to coir husk were submitted to the Committee but the then Travancore Government pointed out that at the time of the formation of the Committee and when they agreed to join the Committee, there was a definite condition that coir will be kept outside the purview of this Committee. The Committee felt that it was an anomalous situation and that it should have something to do with coir also. Since then the Committee has been passing resolutions repeatedly and contacting the State Government for the purpose with no success. There was also a conference recently which was

attended by the representatives of the Coconut Committee at Trivandrum and they pressed for inclusion of coir within the purview of the Committee. But there again the odds were against the Committee and the opinion was that up to a certain stage coir may come to the Coconut Committee. Therefore I have to point out that in the amending Bill there is an unfortunate reference to this matter. At the time when we are considering the question whether coir should be included within the purview of the Committee and when the opinion is almost unanimous with regard to the inclusion of coir up to a certain stage, in this amendment there is a specific provision excluding coir and its products. I do not know whether it is too late now to amend that. Thus in amendment to section 9 it is stated :

"Coconut poonac and such other coconut products (excepting coir and its products) as the Committee may determine."

Now this matter is still under negotiation with the Travancore-Cochin Government. The final say has not been said. But unfortunately in this amendment it is said "excepting coir and its products". Therefore this specific exclusion by us will surely be detrimental and will hamper the work of the Committee. From 1946 the Committee has been making its protests in that respect.

The Committee has two development schemes for the development of coconut cultivation. The hon. Member who just preceded me will be interested to know that one such scheme is in West Bengal and the other in the Andamans. They have been sanctioned by the Committee and in West Bengal the scheme has already started functioning and necessary funds have been allotted. So far as Andamans is concerned, the whole scheme is ready. The officers also are waiting to leave or

have already left India.

4 P. M. That is, in short, a matter of fact report or resume of the activities of the Committee from its inception.

[Shri K. P. Madhavan Nair.]

I would now like to refer to a few points raised here. With regard to West Bengal, there is a representative of the growers in the Committee though there is no official representative there but it has always been the practice and the procedure in the Committee that whenever any question referring to a State is coming up before that Committee, the representative of the Government is invited and invariably the West Bengal Government has been sending its representative. So far as Assam is concerned, there has been no representative either representing the growers or the interests of the Government and therefore the claim of Assam has been conceded and that item has been brought in here. My friend from Orissa said that the amendment seeks to include six more representatives. It is not correct. We have at present 26 representatives and two more are now sought to be included. One is the Agricultural Marketing Adviser who has usually been attending the Committee as a new member and the Committee felt that his presence is absolutely essential and the other is the representative of Assam which was going completely unrepresented.

Now I should like to say a few things about the amendment regarding definition of the mill. With regard to my friend Mr. Rajah I am very thankful to him for championing the cause of coconut and the poor and rich consumer in the State but one small mistake he has committed and that is the way in which he said the burden of the cess will be borne. Now, as one who actually is in the line, I must say that the collection of the cess does not in any way pass on to the consumer. The collection of the cess is only at the mill, where copra is bought. When buying copra the cess is collected by the miller from the man selling copra, and the man selling copra or coconut collects it from the grower. So, if at all, the man who can properly complain is only the grower.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Funny economics, working backwards.

SHRI K. P. MADHAVAN NAIR:

I am not speaking about economics but I am stating facts now. The consumer has not to pay any share of the cess and it is only the grower who might suffer. Why there is necessity for alteration of the definition of the mill is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. I might say what has really happened at least in some parts of the country after the definition for the 'mill' was understood by the mill owners. One of the factors to be remembered is this. There are only two or three big mills—one or two in Bombay perhaps and one in the whole of the West Coast in the South. Most of the others who own mills are just called "mill owners"—they are people with no capital or sometimes with Rs. 10,000 or near about. When it was known that the definition of the 'mill' in the Act includes only a factory where more than 10 people work, the tendency was to split the slightly bigger units into smaller units. If there were 20 units or 'chucks' as they are called in our areas the tendency has been to split it into 4 or 5 units and all those were escaping this assessment. So there was a regular fall in the cess collected and it was felt that unless this anomaly was removed ultimately no cess could be collected except from very big mill owners who may not care to split it like that.

There has been some criticism with regard to the price that the Committee has not been doing anything to get a fair return to the cultivator. On the other hand I might say the criticism against the Committee was that it was looking to the interest of the grower only and there was opposition from soap makers. It was said that the Committee always stood against a reduction of price for coconut products. When coconut and coconut oil were included in the OGL, the Committee took note of that matter and said that it should not be and after a lot of correspondence with the Industries and Commerce Ministry in the last half year it was removed out of it. I can say from 1947 the Committee has been doing its best for a fair price to the grower. It said in

1947 that imports of coconut and coconut products should not be unrestricted. It took a census as it were of the requirements of oil in the country and to make up the deficit it suggested only a restricted import into India. Then it also recommended that the duties should be so fixed as to raise the price of imported copra to 10 per cent. above the price prevailing in the markets in India. The complaint was that from Ceylon and other countries coconut and copra were allowed to be brought into India with the result that the local prices went down. The Committee suggested that the duty should be so fixed as to raise the price of imported copra to ten per cent. above the prevailing market rate in India, and that the duty on coconut oil should be fixed at a proportionately higher level to encourage the import of copra in preference to coconut oil. At the fifth meeting the Committee also decided to recommend to the Government of India and the Provincial and State Governments concerned to decontrol the price of coconut oil, copra and coconut and remove all the restrictions on their free movement within India. At its eighth meeting in October 1948, the Committee reiterated the decisions regarding imports taken at the fifth meeting and decided that the Government of India be requested to associate the representatives of the Committee in their negotiations with Ceylon and other foreign countries for the import of coconuts and coconut products. In April 1949, the Government of India informed the Committee that in view of the acute global scarcity of oils and fats in general and of copra and coconut oil in particular, the import of coconuts and coconut products into India was not likely to exceed in the near future, the target of 100,000 tons of copra per annum recommended by the Committee and that the Committee's recommendations would be kept in view while entering into any long term agreements with foreign countries for the import of copra and coconut oil into India. At the eleventh meeting in April 1950, the Committee passed two resolutions, one requesting the Government not to reduce or to remove the then rates of import duty on coconut pro-

ducts and the other to regulate the imports of coconut products in such a manner that the legitimate interests of the grower were not sacrificed. At the 12th meeting in November 1950 a resolution moved by Mr. C. E. Bingham, a representative of the oil industry, for the reduction of import duty was, when put to vote, thrown out by a majority. In February 1951, the Government of India assured the Committee in response to the resolutions passed at the eleventh meeting that the legitimate interests of the growers would always be given due weight when Government's import policy was reconsidered. At the 15th meeting held in April 1952, while considering the fall in the prices of coconuts and coconut products, the Committee decided to request the Government of India to ensure that the import of copra and coconut oil was not allowed to the detriment of the legitimate interests of the indigenous industry and that in future, before any action on such matters was taken, the Indian Central Coconut Committee should be consulted. At the same meeting, the Committee resolved to recommend to the Government of India, that copra and coconut oil be removed from under the Open General Licence and that permits be issued to importers, particularly to consumers on a liberal scale up to an annual limit of 100,000 tons in terms of copra. Copra and coconut oil have been removed from the Open General Licence for the latter half of 1952. Now, Sir, I hope I have covered the main ground. I do not want to take more of the time of the House. All that I want to say is that there is a lot of uninformed criticism and that those who really want to know the working of the Committee, can easily go through the literature that it has published and is publishing from time to time and feel convinced that the Committee has done and is doing good work.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : Sir, I will just take a few minutes. Firstly, I did not want to say anything about this Bill. But I thought I could divert

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

this discussion from a lot of consequential and incidental matters with which we have been involved for many hours past. One of the reasons why I did not want to take any part in this Bill is because I do not believe that any of these Committees will do anything good. I think that the principle on which these Committees are appointed exhibit the patchy and hesitant policies of the Government whether in the economic or in any other field. For instance, what is happening today? In the morning we passed a Bill amending the Oilseeds Committee. In the afternoon we are about to pass a Bill amending the Coconut Committee. Now, I am sure the hon. Minister for Agriculture will agree with me when I say that at some stage there must be some conflict between the two Committees. It cannot be that these two Committees can work independently. After all, the oilseeds and coconuts produce a substance which is used more or less for a common purpose. It may be according to Mr. Rajah that the coconut oil may be very edible and tasty for some. It may be that oilseeds produce something more edible and delicious for me. So, there must be some conflict between the two. Why I draw the attention of the Government to the principle involved behind the appointment of these Committees is this. If the conflict arises, how does the Government intend to reconcile that? I am sure I can anticipate the hon. Minister for Agriculture's answer, that is, 'I am here'. Of course, I know that is going to be the answer. But, Sir, I do not expect the Government to be an arbiter; I do not believe that the State agency should merely do the work of arbitration and try to reconcile conflict. It should be their primary responsibility to see that no conflict arises. The principle of appointing committees without any co-ordination will be bad. Take, for instance, the growers. I think Mr. Rajah and, I am sure, many of the growers, if they have a voice to express in the Council or in the House of the People, would naturally complain about the slump through which the coconut

industry is passing. What is the Coconut Committee's answer to solve that slump? Is it possible for the Committee to solve it? It may be possible for the Minister for Agriculture to get some temporary relief. It might not be possible without co-ordinating agricultural production and industrial production which use these oilseeds. The principle should be that there should be planned crops, after which, these Committees may confine themselves to such things that do not go into conflict. But, today, we do not have any sort of a plan for our crops. Without planned cropping, if you merely amend Bills, it will serve no useful purpose. We see that even the National Planning Commission, whose draft report we have seen, and the final report of which is not going to be very different, does not intend to have planned crops in the country. Without such a plan we will not be able to solve the conflicts that arise in agriculture.

Now, Sir, with regard to the slump, when there is a rise in prices, in any capitalistic economy, naturally, the production increases. Every effort is made to increase production. Those of us who come from Mysore are aware that more and more land which used to be for growing rice and other food-grains is coming under coconut, especially in the Tiptur and adjoining parts. I am aware of the fact that this part grows one of the finest kinds of coconut. But, as you see, the natural tendency under this system is that a slump must come some time or other. Not even all the Coconut Committees, not even the competence with which Mr. Madhavan Nair spoke would be able to control the slump. The Commerce Minister and the Agriculture Minister may find some sort of a method or palliative and try to give some relief to the coconut grower. But the problem would continue. Therefore I say it is no use having these Committees if we are not going to have more or less planned cropping in the country.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : He is supporting Mr. Govinda Reddy's resolution on planned cropping.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I thought Sir, that I would be able to bring

this subject when the resolution comes up, but as you know, when that resolution comes up, we would be working against time, and I could get only 15 minutes and this is a matter which cannot be dealt with in such a short time, especially as our country has not thought on these lines as much as it should have. These Committees without a plan for our agriculture, without planned cropping.....

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : That is very far-fetched.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : This is not far-fetched. As soon as I say that your Committees are useless, I have to prove how they are useless.....

AN HON. MEMBER : It is irrelevant.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : The relevancy arises in this Sir, and I am sure you will uphold my contention that

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can speak on this subject when that other resolution comes up.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : My fault is that I have anticipated that resolution; but I am quite sure that I am perfectly relevant in what I am speaking. This Coconut Committee is useless so far as I can see. Mr. Madhavan Nair read out the functions of this Committee and they are really very imposing, for they appear to embrace everything that can come within this subject. But in what way has the Committee any authority or even power or remotest possibility of control over the conditions that go to make the coconuts what they are today ? What is the use of the Committee ? It may be that I am taking some time of the House. But I thought I would be able to stop wasting more time of the House hereafter in discussing inconsequential Bills of this type, because all this is not going to serve the coconut grower or the coconut consumer or anybody who is remotely connected with the coconut. Another thing I would say is that in case we come to some kind of a plan whereby

we will be able to effectively and continuously control the several conditions that go to make the coconut or sell it or eat it, then it would be necessary also to change the complexion and the structure of the Committee. Now, this morning my hon. friend Shri Gupta touched on it when he referred to regional Committees. The blight of this country and of the Government today is that we have too much of centralisation. Whatever Committees we have, we have them all at Delhi. It is all very well to collect everyone at the Secretariat so that the hon. Minister for Agriculture and his Secretariat may be able to have more contacts. But so far as the Committee itself is concerned, Sir, it has almost no contact whatever with the actual field of activity, with the actual conditions which they are trying to control. Of course, I am not saying that this Committee serves a useful purpose now. It can do so only after you have accepted after the Government have accepted the principle that there should be effective co-ordination and effective planned cropping in India. After that, this Committee has also to be organised on a regional basis with as much decentralisation as possible. Otherwise as my hon. friend Mr. Manjuran said—though to some extent Mr. Madhavan Nair refuted what he said—they will not be useful. I have not been connected for the last many years past in any way with coconut growing in any capacity, but I may say that all these Committees, the Cotton Committee, the Coconut Committee and the other Committees—the only exception that I know of is the Coffee Board—have no connection, have no effective and useful connection with the actual grower. The grower does not know what is happening in the Committee, though they decide on things that affect him. He comes to know of them only after he has been affected. This centralisation is bad. It is also in the interest of the actual grower not to have this centralisation. It is necessary that he should be able to reach the Committee as soon as possible and there should be as little distance between him and the Committee.

[Shri C. G. K. Reddy.]

Therefore, I would say that the Government should not bring forward such amendments and such consequential legislations, as these Committees will not be useful until they have planned cropping. These Committees can then become useful only if there is decentralisation of these Committees and they take their activities to the places where there is action to the coconut gardens and the groundnut fields.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE : Sir, even after the speech of the hon. Mr. Madhavan Nair, who is the Vice President of the Committee, I find that I am not in a position to support the amending Bill inasmuch as the real problem before us is how to make this Committee more efficient or, how to justify its own existence. I find, as a man who comes from the land of coconuts—of course, the same place as Mr. Madhavan Nair hails from—I should place my own experience before this House which, in fact, is a little at variance with that of Mr. Madhavan Nair. He has been telling the House that some pathological survey or research is being done in the Travancore research station and there was a report that people are actually being benefited by it. I do not know anything about any report that they have received but my experience is from what I have seen and what I have heard from the coconut cultivators, that practically no improvement has been made with regard to finding any remedy for the disease of the leaf, what we call *kattuveezhuga*. It is a most deplorable sight to see whole areas, particularly the coastal areas, being affected by this particular disease. In fact, it was a sort of consolation for the people of our land when they received the news that a Committee has been instituted, an All-India Committee has been instituted, because they hoped that some remedy would be found to cure this disease. As the hon. Mr. Rajah pointed out, coconut is in fact the life of our State. It is used for so many purposes. It is one of the major food materials in our country and to see vast areas of coconut completely being destroyed was a very sorry sight and it was at that time that this Committee came

into existence and it was quite natural for our people to hope that something is going to be done. But I am so sorry to say that the very same sight that we used to see in those days is even now there. I do not know how in view of that Mr. Madhavan Nair has been saying in Kayankulam—that is the place where this disease has spread and the research station is situated—they have done something effective. If it is true, it may be that some change has come in that particular area, but Kayankulam is only a small portion. It is only a small taluk. It is not Kayankulam that makes the total land. What do we actually see? In the whole area, not only in the coastal area, but in Shencotta where I had been recently, coconut has been badly affected, not in the old plantations, but in the new plantations. That clearly shows that the disease is not being checked: it is actually spreading. So, to say that some results have been achieved as a result of this research that is being conducted in Kayankulam centre is something which is very exaggerated—I do not want to say it is a lie—it is very much exaggerated, and they are seeing things in a particularly favourable perspective. All the same I do not deny that something has been done. My complaint is that in spite of your work for so many years things have not improved. If the purpose of this Bill is to make this Committee more efficient, I do not think this amendment will at all help to make this Committee any more efficient than it has been up till now.

My real complaint is against the isolation from which this Committee suffers, and against the lack of co-operation that exists. That according to me is the main reason why its work is not being carried on successfully. As we see from the constitution of the Committee itself, the Committee has nothing to do with people who actually are in the field, who actually know what the real problems of coconut cultivation are.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : That is absolutely wrong;

SHRI K. C. GEORGE: Let me differ in my opinion from the hon. Minister.

My feeling is that the people of the country, the people who actually know the real problems of coconut cultivation are not taken into consideration. Of course the members are taken from the people's representatives. But it so happens that a particular people's representative may be really knowing much more about rubber than about coconut, and on the Rubber Committee he may be useful when he is put on the Coconut Committee.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: The hon. Member has not read the names of the personnel of the Committee, otherwise he would not have made that statement. Deputy Director, retired Directors and other persons of knowledge and experience have been appointed.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE: I know the Deputy Director has experience. But my point is that the real cultivators of the soil, people who are really experienced are not there.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: They are there.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE: People who know what the real problems of the industry are—those people are not there.

Dr. P. S. DESHMUKH: The Committee is meant for them essentially.

SHRI K. C. GEORGE: But they are not taken into consideration. They are not consulted in this matter. Unless such people are really represented or consulted in this matter, unless their experience is made use of by this Committee, this Committee is not going to be successful. So also, the people who actually work, the workers and the peasants, should be represented there. The peasants' representative must be there. I am not very particular about having the actual representation of those people, but the Committee must find out

ways and means of utilising their experience. I do not exactly want to say what organisation the Committee should have but all the same this is one of the main difficulties of the Committee, and that is the reason why it has not been able to do more useful work.

From what I know of the research that has been carried on at Kayankulam, they have at last found out that it is some fungus or something that is eating away the leaf. Nothing more than that. After nine years of research work they have at last found out that a fungus is eating away the leaf. Just before I left for Delhi I had occasion to discuss this with one of the persons doing research in that centre. I asked him what actually they had found out in the way of a remedy for this disease. The same answer was given by him as my friend Mr. Madhavan Nair gave. He said, "We cannot expect all of a sudden to achieve any result with regard to research." How long are we to wait? It is true that scientific research takes some time. There is no guarantee and there is no time limit for it. But all the same, if our research workers go on doing research for months and years and it does not achieve any result, there is something wrong somewhere. If that be the case, we should investigate and find out what is wrong in the research work itself. Is any attempt being made to find out where our mistake lies? Our experience is that no useful results have been achieved during these nine long years which have passed. If all the coconut trees that have been affected by the disease had been cut down and new plantations had been grown, by this time they would have yielded fruit. I submit that this is the feeling of the people. Instead of waiting for 9 years they could have done something substantial, and as some hon. Members have pointed out, the yield has gone down. Though the purpose of this Committee is to encourage production, the production has gone down.

Then with regard to the prices and the marketing of the commodity. In this connection I have to say that this

[Shri K. C. George.]

question is a very important one. It is a question on which the whole economic life of the people depends. The people have to maintain themselves and it is the price of coconut that determines the economic life of the people to a very large extent. But the price of this commodity is very much fluctuating. For years together the yield of the coconut is most uncertain. The poor peasants cannot afford to spend anything to increase production. If there is less production, the prices go up. There is no economic stability in the sphere of coconut. So this is one of the problems that has to be tackled by the Committee. That has not been attended to so far.

The present amendment which does not in any way help to increase the efficiency of this Committee is going to be a further burden on the people. That is what I feel about it. Unless and until some ways are found out to make it more efficient, there will be not much use of it.

Then with regard to the constitution of the Committee itself I think I should say a word. My point is the Bill says that the President of the Committee has to be nominated. I do not know why is that so. What harm will there be if the President is also to be an elected member of the Committee? That will be a democratic method and he will have more confidence of the people and the Committee, with an elected President, will receive greater co-operation from the people. I wish the Committee should be given that character. So with these few observations I do not find my way to support the Bill as such although I appreciate the spirit in which it has been brought.

SHRI S. P. DAVE (Bombay): Sir, while supporting the Bill I have really to refer to one of the aspects which appears to me to be ignored and that is with regard to the scope and the functions of the Committee and whether the Committee appointed under the Act did properly function or did not properly function and as to what is to be expected of the Committee. I am

primarily concerned with clause 2 (e) of the amending Act and I commend it for the very best reason that in the absence of that Act, a large number of workers employed in that industry would escape any sanction of the law. It has been our experience on this side of the country that in the city of Surat, where there is a large trade of gold thread and about 10,000 workers or more are employed in that industry, there are only 2 or 3 big factories employing about 200 or 300 people but there are thousands of establishments employing a few people and they escape from the sanction of law. It was found out by our friends on the law. What they did was they put up wire hedges in between the area of the machine dividing thereby the premises and when the Factory Inspector comes to visit them they say "Well, there is not one factory only. This portion of loom A to A5 are owned by ABC, from 5 to 14 are owned by XYZ, from 11 to 17 by M & P." There were separate boards, mere cheap placards and a coil of wire was sufficient to divide the factory into a number of these to which no law was made applicable. There were series of litigations which went on for two years at the end of which the Minister for Labour with the help of his legal advisers just came to the only conclusion viz., to apply the Factories Act to those concerned with an amendment specially prepared for that purpose. When I read something similar here, I was naturally reminded of that proverb which says that 'Crows everywhere are black'. It is a matter of shame that unscrupulous owners try to get out of their legal obligations by quibbling at words and not fulfilling their duties. Unfortunately I was not present when a plea is supposed to have been made in favour of those who employ less than 10, and from speeches of other friends I heard that someone had a solicitude even for those people who had less employees. Let us decide ourselves whether we as a Welfare State are going to give amenities and facilities to workers irrespective of the fact whether the employer is a larger one or a smaller one. I have nothing then to say; even though I am a trade unionist, I do concede that there are certain things which can be

properly classified as home industries and they should not be made to compete with larger industries. But then it is certainly very unfair if the classes are such where the only competitive factor is legal obligation to be binding on one and not binding on the other; then certainly it is rather unfair to a man who is honest. So I commend whoever is responsible for having brought in this amendment.

With regard to the function and the scope and duties of the Committee, not having read the subject, I have nothing more to say. I may merely say that if as a result of experience of the Committee it is found that the Committee should be given more powers, I am for it. I have carefully listened to the observations made by our friend Shri Madhavan Nair. He has been on the Committee ever since 1945 and if his experience in the working of this Committee would suggest that the Committee has done what it was meant to do, and the only difficulty it felt was that the Committee wanted more powers with regard to coir etc., then it should be considered and granted if it is possible for the administration concerned to do so.

While making this plea, I have also to say that the Government of India should also try to find out similar other occupations and industries where by virtue of lack of definition the workers are not getting what is due to them under the law, it should be amended just as it is done in this case. Otherwise our Minimum Wages Act and other legislations that we pass to help these people would be null and void. I have nothing more to add.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : After the speech of my friend the Vice President of the Committee, I don't think I need go over the same ground. I was really sorry that after his speech, some of the hon. Members of this House were not convinced. A good deal of the criticism, I am sorry to say, arose out of non-familiarity with the working of

the Committee. Actually, there may be something to be said so far as the improvement of the working of the Committee is concerned. From the account given by the Vice President, I think we could convince anybody that it is not a useless Committee, that it has been applying its mind to the problems of the growers as well as the industry, because it should be borne in mind that this Committee like in fact all such Committees, is not an exclusive Committee of any particular section of people. There are various representatives. Along with the consumers' representatives, representatives of the industry are also there. Therefore, I must characterise my friend Mr. Reddy's speech as a pure figment of the imagination. He tried to start by saying that there are likely to be conflicts, there are likely to be quarrels, and one interest may be irreconcilable with another, etc. I have not so far discovered anything nor has any Member of the House referred to any point where there has been irreconcilable conflict not between the interests represented on the Committee, but not even between the Oilseeds and the Coconut Committees. It might have been a legitimate question to ask whether it was not possible to correlate the work of the two Committees. That argument might probably reasonably be advanced, but trying to suppose that there is likely to be a conflict, when as a matter of fact there has been none, is going too far. I do not think he was able to quote any instances. He was speaking more hypothetically than with regard to actual facts. I agree he is entitled to his own views but, from his speech, on the face of it, they have no bearing on the facts of the matter especially on the very innocuous amendments I have suggested. So far as the Coconut Committee is concerned, you could if you are so inclined, bring in the United Nations if you want. He could have brought even the relations between husband and wife, because there may be a wife who may insist on a particular scented coconut oil which the husband may not like and he may have blamed this Committee for the quarrel that may ensue.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: That point is there already.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : If you leave these points out of consideration, then I think that all the points that have been made by persons who thought the working of the Committee was unsatisfactory, have, in my opinion, been effectively answered. The working of the Committee has been useful and fairly efficient. It has been mentioned that they have not done any research at all. It must be confessed the research problems are very baffling. It may not be possible to control certain diseases for a considerable time in spite of research. Nobody can say when they will be successful. Because human capacity is after all limited and you can never lay down a time limit for making discoveries. Therefore, if my hon. friends had mentioned that research should be intensified, I would have understood it. If you say that there should be more people doing the research so that we do not lose time and the interest of the country does not suffer—we would have understood criticism of that nature. If I may say so the small modification of the definition of the word “mill” is really intended to increase slightly the income from those people who are evading payment. Actually so much stress and emphasis need not have been placed on this amendment as my friend Rajah has done, I think he has wasted his vehemence on a wrong subject.

I think he has wasted his vehemence especially in talking about the coconut growers and their distressing condition. The actual incidence is small and the total collection so meagre that I do not think that the way in which he spoke was really justifiable in this case.

AN HON. MEMBER : Then, why don't you give it up?

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : Because we can do some useful work. If you do not want it, it can be given up. I have no objection. The cess is four annas on every seventy rupees. You can imagine the extent of the incidence.

It is not a burdensome tax in any sense as the total derived is only Rs. 2,40,000 with a variation of a few thousands this way or that. Some of my friends referred to the fact that there was a balance of two lakhs, when speaking about expenditure. Of course, the Committee has not been extravagant. They have proceeded very carefully and economically and they have done some research which will be useful to all and help the progress of the industry itself. We should appreciate the saving and not quarrel with it. So, this expenditure of two lakh and odd rupees is not very much and I do not think it can be said that we are fleecing the growers or the consumers or anything of that sort.

Regarding representation to Bengal, I may say that West Bengal has a representative under sub-clause (b) and this does not figure here because that particular clause has not been amended. This Bill, Sir, was not brought forward for improving the efficiency of this Committee. There was only this lacuna in the definition of the word ‘mill’. That was to be cured. We also wanted more representatives and apart from that the Bill is not intended to alter anything so far as the Committee is concerned. Of course, the suggestions the hon. Members have made have been listened to and they are carefully noted. But the purpose of the Bill is not that as will be clear from the Statement of Objects and Reasons. I need not take more of the time of the House. But there is one question adverted to by my friend. That is, with regard to the coir problem. I do not think any damage will be done if ultimately the Committee and the Government can come to a conclusion as far as this is concerned. For the present there is a strong view, in fact, concerning the problems of coir industry not being brought into the Committee. It is held to be dangerous. In my view, there is a definite section of the people who think so. That is the view the Government have taken so far. So far as the complaint that area under coconut has diminished is concerned it has been replied to because the previous area was before the partition. Most

of the work, it has been rightly pointed out, is carried on by State Governments and if co-ordination was necessary, I think this function is very well performed by this Committee. Otherwise, it would have been difficult for the Government to know how the various State Governments are proceeding in this matter, that is, what research there is, what facilities they provide to improve the seedlings and make them available and so on. So, I submit that the motion that I moved may be accepted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

That the Bill further to amend the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944 as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

There is no amendment to clause 2.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are three amendments to clause 3, in the name of Shri Sundarayya.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I move :

(1) At page 1, line 30, for the word "six" the word "eight" be substituted.

(2) At page 1, lines 33—34, for the words "one shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Mysore" the words "one each shall be nominated by the Governments of the States of Mysore, Assam and Madras be substituted.

(3) At page 1, line 35, after the words "the State of Travancore-Cochin" the following be inserted, namely:—

"In consultation with coconut growers' associations in their respective States."

Clause 3, sub-clause (g) says, "six other persons of whom two shall be elected from among themselves by the Members of the House of the People, one shall be elected from among themselves by the Members of the Council of States, one shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Mysore and two shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Travancore-Cochin". Evidently, the fit persons who are to be nominated by these Governments are those who represent the consumer section of the coconut growers and not the Government, because Government have already been given representation on this Committee. If it is intended to give representation to the coconut growers as such, if you give representation to the Governments of Madras and Assam, I do not see the reason why you should not give representation at least to one man from Madras and Mysore as we have done in the Oilseeds Committee. This may have been an oversight on the part of the Government and so I have brought this to their notice. Therefore, instead of having six members, you may have eight so that one person may be nominated by the Government of Assam and another by the Government of Madras. I would also say that those five who have been nominated by the respective Governments should take steps in consultation with the coconut growers in the rest of the States. There is a similar proviso in the Oilseeds Committee and I see no reason why a similar proviso should not be introduced in the case of the Coconut Committee also.

Earlier in the morning the hon. Minister pointed out that he was prepared to accept or rather approved of the suggestion of my colleague Shri Bhupesh Gupta that somehow the people's voice should be heard in these Committees, and for that he was thinking of some kind of election in the case of the Oilseeds Committee by the oilseeds growers, so that the representatives of the growers may have some kind of a voice. Similarly I suggest that the eight representatives in the case of the Coconut Committee should be elected

[Shri P. Sundarayya.]

by coconut growers themselves. Since my knowledge of the coconut growers is very limited, and also because the numbers that are to be elected have to be elected from such a wide area—only one for each area—I thought it would be cumbersome to suggest the process of election. So, for the time being at least, one representative from Madras should be on behalf of the growers and I leave it to the Government to consult the coconut growers and nominate them. Therefore, my amendments are nothing radical or anything revolutionary for the Government to object. They just point out a certain lacuna so that it could be removed and I hope these three amendments which are for clause (g) will be acceptable to the Government so that the Committee may function a little better.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Clause 3 and the amendments are open for discussion.

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: Sir, I am sorry, I am not in a position to accept the amendments. First of all, Sir, as I had pointed out in my speech at the very outset, we are very reluctant to enlarge the membership of the Committee and, therefore, we wanted to keep it to the minimum and so, we suggested the addition of only two members. I am in sympathy with the objective which my friend opposite has in view, namely, larger representation so far as the growers are concerned. But, this can be done without any amendment of this clause or any other clause and instead of putting in words that he has suggested, I assure him that I have always held the view, in any Committee or in any organisation which has to do with agricultural products, that it is the interest of the grower and the producer which ought to dominate and from that point of view, I am prepared to give him an assurance that in the composition of the Committee, the growers' interests will receive adequate protection and adequate representation. If that will satisfy him, I would request him not to press these amendments. All that he is seeking to do is to add two more persons to the Committee and

he wants one more representative for Assam and one more for Madras and that too to be nominated by the respective Governments. It is for the first time that we have given representation to Assam and I think one representative, from the point of view of the number of acres on which coconuts are grown and the industry there, in a body of 26 should be quite adequate. So far as Madras and the South Coasts are concerned, they are very adequately represented on this Committee.

So, Sir I would very strongly submit that there is nothing much to be lost in not adding two more members to this Committee and also not insisting upon the addition of the words "in consultation with the coconut growers' associations in their respective States". Our difficulty, as had been pointed out by such a strong champion and great organiser like Prof. Ranga, is that all the non-official efforts have not been able to build up in the country any association of growers and producers of agricultural products, to speak of; and, if that is true with regard to agriculture in general, with regard to this Committee and the growers of coconut, that is truer still. That is our difficulty, and we cannot embark upon a system of elections and other things. Sometimes we have to work very hard before we bring into existence certain organisations which would be real and proper organisations and whose representatives will really have the confidence of the people whose representatives we want them to be. So, from that point of view, I suggest that not adding these words will not come in the way of my intention of seeing that the growers' interests are protected and people who would be nominated to represent growers are actual tillers and actual growers. From that point of view, I may refer to the speech made by Mr. George, when I had to contradict him that it is not really true that these Committees, this Committee or any other Committee connected with the growers, have nothing to do with the actual tillers. They may not have been able to give that help to them which some of us think they should receive,

but, nonetheless, I don't think the intention is wanting or the desire is not there.

So, I will again repeat that the purpose of the amendment would be more than fulfilled and I would, therefore, request him not to press them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want to press the amendments?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I don't see why Madras, which has got large coconut growing areas and population should not be given one representative from the growers' point of view, as Travancore-Cochin.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want to have the amendments put to the vote?

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA : Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

At page 1, line 30, for the word "six" the word "eight" be substituted.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

At page 1, lines 33-34, for the words "one shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Mysore" the words "one each shall be nominated by the Governments of the States of Mysore, Assam and Madras" be substituted.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

At page, I, line 35, after the words "the State of Travancore-Cochin" the following be inserted namely :—

" in consultation with coconut growers' associations in their respective States."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

That clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There are no amendments to clauses 4, 5 and 6.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 were added to the Bill.

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

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH : Sir, I move:

That the Bill be passed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

That the Bill be passed.

The motion was adopted.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter to eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 27th November 1952.