

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : I have discussed that point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is:

That the Bill to regulate the profession of notaries as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There are no amendments to this Bill.

Clauses 2 to 16 (both inclusive) were aided to the Bill.

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

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : Sir, I beg to move :
That the Bill be passed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill be passed.

The motion was adopted.

THE PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, I suggest that the House may adjourn now. We have transacted enough business today.

THE MINISTER FOR LAW (SHRI C. C. BISWAS) : But there is enough work still left. And there is to be the discussion at 12.30 also. And so, I beg to move :

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO (Orissa) : Sir, on a point of order. This Bill has not been duly circulated to most of the hon. Members of this House and

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which Bill does the hon. Member mean?

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO : The very Bill which is just about to be moved.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It has been sent to hon. Members on the 30th July.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal) : We received the notice, but probably copies of the Bill were not sent along with the notice to some of the hon. Members.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Anyway, this is not going to be completed today. The Bill can be introduced today and the hon. Member can speak on it tomorrow.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Madras) : On a point of order, Sir. What about amendments? Will they be admitted now?

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : Sir I suppose if the time is spent in raising points of order, my hon. friends there would be satisfied. Sir, I beg to move :

That the Bill further to amend the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

I have been bitten so many times that it makes me shy. This Bill also refers to some of the provisions of the Penal Code relating to the prevention of corruption. If hon. Members would refer to the Tek Chand Committee's Report—I do not know if they have been able to obtain copies of it—they will find that the Committee, had! made several recommendations and one of them was given effect to in the Criminal Law Amendment Bill—I think that is the title of the measure, though I do not exactly remember it now—which dealt with the bribe-giver and the bribe-taker. In that Bill effect was given to some of the recommendations of the Tek Chand Committee. Some other recommendations of that Committee, are dealt with in this Bill which seeks to amend the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947. As I informed the House the other day, this Act was passed shortly before the Indian Republic was ushered in. Government felt urgency of coping with the prevalence of corruption and bribery in the country amongst public officials and they wanted to tighten up the measures so that corruption and bribery could be reduced to a minimum. That was really the object, Sir. This Committee was appointed for that purpose, and they made several reports

m instalments. Effect was given to some interim reports, from time to time as they were received. Others were deferred till the final report was received. Now, Sir, the present Bill is in a sense consequential on the other Bill. By the other Bill the distinction between the bribe-giver and the bribe-taker was done away with, and the bribe-giver was placed in the same position as the bribetaker, as far as punishment was concerned. Both these offences have been placed in the same category, bribe-giving being made a substantive offence. In the Prevention of Corruption Act, reference is made to certain sections of the Indian Penal Code, sections 161 and 165, but the new section, 165A, making bribe-giving also a substantive offence, could not, naturally be included when this Act was passed. Now that section 165A is part of the Statute Book, it is necessary to include that in section 3 of this Act.

Then, there is another section of the prevention of Corruption Act, section 4. There also reference is made to offences under section 161 or section 165. Provision has got to be made now as regards the new section 165A. That has been done in the amendment to section 4. These are the main additions which it is proposed to introduce by this amending Bill. Sir, I shall deal with the details tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The debate will be continued on the next day.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

SOAP AND ELECTRIC LAMP INDUSTRIES

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: SHRI B. C. Ghose to raise a discussion on points arising out of the answer given on the 28th July 1952 to Starred Question No. 44 regarding investment of foreign capital in the soap and electric lamp industries in India.

12.30 p.m.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should first like to make one or two preliminary observations. My remarks today would apply only to the electric lamp industry, although what I will be saying would

possibly be equally applicable to some other indigenous industries also. Even in respect of the electrical lamp industry, the remarks would apply to what are known as G. L. S. Lamps, i.e. General Lighting Service Lamps, lamps used for household and street lighting purposes. They do not apply to miniature lamps like automobile lamps or to fluorescent lamps. Secondly, although I hope I shall prove to your satisfaction that in respect of this industry Government have ignored and flouted national interests and invited foreign capital in a sphere where indigenous capital and enterprise had already developed the industry and was in a position to meet fully the internal demand and where also, in pursuance of the policy laid down by Government and reiterated by the Planning Commission, foreign capital should not have been permitted to enter, yet, to shower condemnation—and I may say, just condemnation—on the Government for pursuing an anti-national policy is not my prime objective today. My main purpose is to apprise Government of the facts in this particular case so that they may be induced to take appropriate action for safeguarding the interests of indigenous industry. I believe there are also other industries, as I said, which suffer from the same or similar disabilities and where also governmental action in their favour is called for.

Now, Sir, a question that I put down on 28th July last elicited the reply that permission was given to certain foreign enterprise to invest capital in the electrical lamp industry. This permission was given in December 1950. Now, what were the conditions in which this permission was given? The electrical lamp industry was started in 1932—I need not go into its history from the earlier stages—and it has been developing itself. Production, let us say, in 1947 after independence was about seven million pieces, and in 1951 it had gone up to 14 million pieces. By 1950, from all indications, it was evident that that industry was suffering from excess capacity and overproduction. The Association, which represents practically all the lamp factories in India