

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Contingency Fund of India Act, 1950”

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI K. R. GANESHI : I introduce† the Bill.

STATEMENT *re* CONTINGENCY FUND OF INDIA (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE 1972

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH) : I beg to lay on the Table an explanatory statement (Hindi and English versions) giving reasons for immediate legislation by the Contingency Fund of India (Amendment) Ordinance 1972, as required under rule 71 (1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha [Placed in Library. Ser No. LT-1565/72]

INDIAN COPPER CORPORATION  
(TAKING OVER OF MANAGEMENT)  
BILL.\*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN) : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the taking over, in the public interest of the management of the undertaking of the Indian Copper Corporation Limited pending acquisition of that undertaking

MR. SPEAKER : The question is

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the taking over, in the public interest, of the management of the undertaking of the Indian Copper Corporation Limited, pending acquisition of that undertaking.”

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI SHAHNAWAZ KHAN : I introduce† the Bill.

STATEMENT *re* INDIAN COPPER CORPORATION (TAKING OVER OF MANAGEMENT) ORDINANCE 1972

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN) : On behalf of Shri Mohan Kumaramangalam, I beg to lay on the Table an explanatory statement (Hindi and English versions) giving reasons for immediate legislation of the Indian Copper Corporation (Taking over of Management) Ordinance 1972, as required under rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha [Placed in Library. Ser No. LT-1566/72]

DELHI CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES  
BILL.\*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE) : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to co-operative societies in the Union territory of Delhi

MR. SPEAKER : The question is

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to co-operative societies in the Union territory of Delhi”

*The motion was adopted*

SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE : I introduce† the Bill.

12.29 hrs.

MARINE PRODUCTS EXPORT DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BILL—Contd.

\*\*SHRI RAMACHANDRAN KADANNAPPALLI (Kasergod) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Marine Products Export Development Authority Bill. As far as Kerala is concerned, it is a very welcome measure. I believe that with the implementation of this

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

\*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II, Section 2, dated 29.3.72.

\*\*The original speech was delivered in Malayalam.

Bill more and more fishing facilities can be provided to Kerala which exports a major share of marine products. This Bill provides for financial and other assistance to the people who use mechanised boats and other equipment.

When you compare Kerala with other States you will find that Kerala has got a very long coastline. Therefore I request that the headquarters of this Authority that is going to be set up as provided in this Bill should be at Canannore in Kerala from where 20 per cent of the exports of marine products take place. Today, Sir, in the matter of getting mechanised boats Kerala is facing many difficulties. To improve the production of marine products which gives us a lot of foreign exchange it is very necessary that the poor fishermen should be given all assistance.

Sir, Kerala is a backward State. Port facilities are not available to the fishermen. Port facilities should be increased and the fishermen should be given more mechanised boats. If only this is done we can achieve development of export of marine products. With the passage of this Bill I am sure we will be able to export more marine products and earn more foreign exchange.

The small fishermen who use mechanised boats should be allowed to have their existing facilities. Bigger fishermen who run large-scale fishing industries should not be allowed to interfere with the working of the small fishermen.

As I have already mentioned, Kerala has a long coast line and from that point of view this Bill is a very welcome measure. Before I conclude, Sir, I have to bring to the notice of the Government that the small fishermen who go fishing into deep sea very often lose their lives due to bad weather. I request Government to make some provision for the welfare of the families of such fishermen. I suggest that the cess should be reduced to one per cent and the fund so collected should be used to improve the standard of living of the small fishermen.

With these words, Sir, I once again support the Bill.

\*SHRI S. D. SOMASUNDARAM (Thanjavur): Hon. Mr. Speaker, Sir, while introducing the Marine Products Export Development Authority Bill yesterday, the hon. Minister referred to the performance of the fisheries industry during the period 1961 to 1972 and also spoke in perspective about the industry upto 1979. He was adducing various reasons for establishing the central institution of the Marine products Export Development Authority Bill. He was justifying the action of the Central Government for taking over the development of the industry which is in the State sphere of activities.

As you know, Sir, the subject of fisheries is in the State List under item No. 21. Under item 31 of the Concurrent list of the Constitution, the Central Government have come forward with this legislative proposal for creating a central agency. Just because the doors of a house are kept ajar, can you rush in without even observing the elementary courtesy of knocking at the doors? I doubt whether the Central Government consulted at least the maritime States before bringing forward this measure. On the other hand, the Central Government are vigilant in increasing their revenue and solely guided by this motive, they have come forward with this Bill.

Sir, there is a declaration in the Bill that it is expedient in the public interest that the Union should take under its control the marine products industry. Let us see what the Central Government have done for the development of fisheries in public interest. There are so many developmental schemes which have been incorporated in the Fourth Five Years Plan which are to be implemented by the Central Government. Have they implemented anyone of them in full during the first two years of the Plan? The proof of the pudding is in eating. I am not saying this; the Planning Commission itself in its mid-term appraisal has drawn the attention of the Government to the many deficiencies and drawbacks in the implementation of schemes so far as fisheries development is concerned.

I will enumerate some figures to prove my contention. In the Fourth Five Year

\*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

[Shri S. D. Somasundaram]

Plan, 5100 mechanised boats are to be introduced in the industry. But so far during the two years of the Fourth Plan, only 1529 mechanised boats have been introduced. The Government of India are creating this agency for augmenting the exports. How can this agency achieve this laudable aim without increasing the productivity? If you want to export more, you have to catch more fish and for that purpose deep sea fishing is to be encouraged. For the success in deep sea fishing you have to provide trawlers. In the Fourth Plan 300 trawlers are to be supplied, but so far not even one has been made available to the industry. The Government has just placed an order for 40 fishing vessels with two firms and nobody knows when they will be manufactured. Similarly, with a view to providing berthing facilities for mechanised boats, there is a scheme for expanding the major harbours in the country. The allocation in the Fourth Plan for this purpose is 1350 lakhs of rupees, but only the paltry sum of Rs. 29 lakhs has been spent on the expansion of major harbours. For example, Madras harbour is the oldest harbour in Indian sub-continent and the scheme for its expansion was sanctioned in 1968. This is not a State scheme. This is a central scheme. But the progress is slower than snail's pace. I wonder whether the snail itself will be put to shame by the slow progress in implementing the central schemes. I do not know when the Madras harbour expansion project will be completed. Out of the allocation made during IV Plan for the development of minor ports, only 38% has been spent up till now. The Minister was talking about lack of marketing facilities so far as fishing industry is concerned. For expeditious and safe transportation of fish, 20 refrigerated rail wagons are to be built during the Fourth Plan period and a sum of Rs. 100 lakhs was the allocation. It is regrettable that not even one refrigerated wagon has so far been built and a sum of Rs. 12 lakhs has been spent on this. There are some worthwhile schemes for expanding and developing the Central Fisheries Research Stations, for which purpose the Fourth Plan allocation is Rs. 320 lakhs. Out of this only 29 lakhs have been spent. I would like to know whether the Research Stations will ever be expanded if this is going to be the progress. In the Fourth Plan period, 7 research projects are to be undertaken for effective utilisation of available resources to tackle the various important

problems facing the fishing industry. The Planning Commission has stated that the progress under these schemes is more or less nil. There are so many schemes on paper, but not even one scheme in full has been translated into a reality. My intention is not to blame the centre for all the ills of the industry. But the Central Government is a vast organisation comparable to Himalayas. Can you cover Himalayas with a blanket if the Himalayas catch cold? If the Central Government clothed with all powers and having enormous financial resources at their command fail to do what is expected of them, where does the remedy lie? If a single man catches cold, you can cover him with a blanket, but not the Himalayas. This only shows that the Central Government take over tasks beyond their physical capability and as a result fail miserably in fulfilling the objectives. If the Central Government had time to think it over objectively, they will realise that they should take over only those things which they can do successfully.

In comparison, let us see what the States have done for this industry. The Fourth Plan allocation for Tamil Nadu for fisheries is Rs. 750 lakhs. Out of Rs. 100 lakhs allocated in 1969-70, the Tamil Nadu Government spent 92 lakhs of rupees and out of Rs. 137 lakhs allocated in 1970-71, the Tamil Nadu Government had spent Rs. 174 lakhs, more than the allocation made by the Centre. Similarly, the Kerala Government had spent Rs. 121 lakhs out of the allocation of Rs. 160 lakhs in 1969-70 and Rs. 152 lakhs out of the allocation of Rs. 147 lakhs in 1970-71. Both these State Governments have spent more than the allocation in 1970-71. It is really regrettable that Centre has not spent even one-fourth of the allocation. During the Fourth Plan, the target of mechanised boats for Tamil Nadu is 1000. In just two years, the Tamil Nadu Government have given 395 mechanised boats to the industry. Out of the target of 1600 mechanised boats Kerala Government have introduced in two years 495 mechanised boats. The State Governments are determined to achieve the plan targets, but the Centre has failed miserably in this regard. For central and centrally sponsored schemes the Fourth Plan allocation is 34 crores of rupees, out of which the sum of Rs. 5 crores has so far been spent.

As I pointed out at the outset, the Centre is taking over tasks beyond its capacity. It would be in the interest of the whole nation that the Central Government realise this. For example, there are only eight maritime States in the Indian sub-continent. This Authority could as well be a joint venture of these 8 maritime States instead of the Centre Government creating this under its control. There will be better cooperation and co-ordination between the maritime States in the public and interest of fisheries industry. But, no, the Central Govt. should have everything in their hands. The Central Government professes day in and day out that it is the representative government of the poor people. Are the Government true to what they say? In this Authority, have they given representation to the fishermen's cooperatives so that they can ventilate the problems of fishermen so far as the development of industry is concerned? The answer is no. But it is specifically stated that there will be representative of the dealers on the Authority. If we raise this question, the hon. Minister may quote chapter and verse from the Bill and say that there is a provision under which the Central Government may nominate anyone they like, including the representatives of fishermen's cooperatives. My point is, when you have particularly made a mention of the dealers' representatives, why should you not mention that there will be representatives of fishermen's federation of cooperative societies also on this authority? I would, in conclusion, say that the gap between precept and practice should be narrowed so far as Central Government is concerned. The Central Government should be selective in undertaking responsibilities which they may not be able to discharge in full. If the Central Government realise their limitations and their capacity to implement the schemes undertaken by them, it will be good for the nation. With these words, I conclude my speech and I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to say a few words.

MR. SPEAKER : I would request hon. Members not to take more than five minutes each and just to make their suggestions so that we may keep to the time schedule. This Bill has taken longer than the Business Advisory Committee thought it would.

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a Bill which has been sponsored or piloted by the Ministry of

Foreign Trade and, therefore, I feel that, to a substantial extent concentrating upon the problems of fishermen, would not be very relevant here. Since it is for the purpose of earning more foreign exchange, naturally, I am not surprised when in the definitions, while everything else—Authority, Chairman, conveyance, dealer etc.—has been defined, there is no definition of the principal person to whom this should have the maximum amount of concern.

Sir, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons the purpose for which this Bill has been piloted has been stated and there is a clear admission that as yet the entire fishing trade or the fishing industry or the profession as such not been regulated. I see a substantial amount of neglect as far as fishermen are concerned. I come from an area where the number of fishermen will be about 50,000 to 80,000 spread over a coast-line of about 80 miles.

I also come from a coast to which the maximum number of mackerels in the urban sea are attracted. There is a research also going on as to the reason why the mackerels as fish are being attracted to this particular coastal tract of 10 miles in distance.

Yesterday, one of the Members of the Opposition was expressing a tremendous amount of concern that a certain variety of fish in Delhi market is sold at Rs. 4 per kg. and another variety of fish is sold at Rs. 8 per kg. and he was shocked that fish is such an expensive commodity as far as Delhi urban consuming centre is concerned. I may point out that in our district where fish trade has not been perfectly organised, sometimes fish happens to be one of the cheapest commodities and is sold at the rate of 12 to 15 Kgs. for a rupee. While I would like to sympathise very much with the consumers of Delhi...

AN HON. MEMBER : Where is that ?

SHRI B. V. NAIK : It is right in India, in my constituency, where 100 mackerels are sold for a rupee during a certain season, and that season will be in the month of May.

In this connection, I would like to say that while you have given predominance to fish like pomfret, Bombay duck, bream, crabs,

[Shri B. V. Naik]

etc., the mackerels should also, since it is a very tasty variety of fish, find itself as one of the items for the exploration of the export potentiality of that particular variety of fish.

Coming to the condition of fishermen, unfortunately, they have not got a sort of political power. One of the reasons is that fishermen are spread entirely throughout the coast and, therefore, their habitation is confined only to a distance of 1 or 2 miles from the sea-coast. All our Assemblies and constituencies do not spread out along the sea-coast line but they spread out horizontally. Naturally, they have turned out to be one of the most exploited sections of the Indian society. It is not necessary for us to find out why they are exploited. But they have been exploited by their own people.

We find, in the State of Mysore, the Department of Fisheries there has been giving about 150 to 200 motor boats. Whom do they give? They give to groups of fishermen, 4 or 5 of them, and these groups are not registered bodies. They are not firms; they are not legal entities; they are not corporate bodies. They are nothing. But still they are given the boats. Even though certain registration numbers are given for these motor boats, they are given to certain groups of people who are not at all registered. They quarrel between themselves. So, the first and foremost thing is that fishermen have to be registered as corporate bodies and, thereafter, these boats should be given to them. Otherwise, there will be a continuous quarrel between them.

The financial condition of these fishermen is very bad. They are the most exploited section of the society. As you know, big fish eat small fish, and there are sharks who eat big fish even. Much of the entire fishing trade, commerce and industry as well as its export to Bombay and other places, is entirely in the hands of those people who are neither the producers nor the consumers. These are the people who ought to be, by some means or other at least in the export trade, eliminated. Let us take the case of Mangalore. They are the men who purchase and export....

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member may please conclude.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: I will finish in three or four minutes. I am the only member speaking on behalf of Mysore State.

We have a population roughly of about two lakhs of people in the entire coast of 200 miles of the State of Mysore. I would point out here that almost all the Authorities that have been started by the Government of India have got their establishments in all other places except in the State of Mysore. The coastal line of the State of Mysore may not have been exploited adequately. But then it has tremendous potentialities. Yesterday, my hon. friend, Mr. Stephen, was suggesting that the location of this Authority could be somewhere even in the State of Tamil Nadu. While I would welcome Kerala or Tamil Nadu for this, I would also request that the district of North Kanara or South Kanara where there is potential for further development should be given a consideration by the hon. Minister for the location of the headquarters.

At this stage I would say that the entire trade of the Marine Products Export Development Authority will touch only a fringe of the people. Out of about 100 fisher-men-- I am subject to correction as far as the statistics are concerned--, it is not a very large number of people who are engaged in fishing trade, it is not a very large number of people who deal in tuna and other varieties of fish. In spite of the best of intentions, it will only touch a very small section, a fringe of the fishing population and that too fishermen of highly specialised nature. Under the circumstances, I would suggest that it would be proper, for the purposes of earning for our country adequate amount of foreign exchange, to enhance the funds—they are providing a recurring expenditure of Rs. 12 lakhs and a non-recurring expenditure of Rs. 2 lakhs. I would suggest that, if the hon. Minister intends to levy only one per cent, it will not be out of the way—since fishermen still happen to be the most neglected in our society, particularly in the coast—if you even recover at the rate of three per cent and then utilise it not only for the purpose of export but also for the purpose of regulating and directing the internal trade, the trade in the inland market; by this, a lot of service will have been done to the fishermen.

I welcome centralisation in this behalf

though centralisation may not be the immediate solution, yet I welcome it because some body would be regulating the fishing trade which has been completely neglected over the last many years. I, therefore, welcome this and support the Bill.

श्री शिवनाथ सिंह (झुझुन) . अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एम बिल का स्वागत करता हू लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैंने निवेदन किया है कि मिलैक्ट कमेटी की मागफ्त इसको जाच करवाई जाय और मिलैक्ट कमेटी उम के बारे में अपनी रिपोर्ट दे। यह मुझाव इम्पिये दिया गया है कि अब तक मैराइन प्राइक्टम के निये हमारे देश में बहुत कुछ नहीं किया गया है। यह पहली बार है कि गवर्नमेंट इस आर साच रहा है और इस सम्बन्ध में जो बिल बनाया गया है, उसमें इतने डिफेक्टम है कि इस स्टेज पर अगर उसमें सुधार करना चाहें तो वह सुधार नहीं करता।

अभी मुझ में पूर्व बालन वाल सदस्य ने बनलाया कि मछुआ परिवार को इस बिल में कोई मछूलियन नहीं मिलने वाली है। आप ने जिस प्रकार से अथारिटी का गठन किया है, उसमें तीन एम० पी० आ इलैक्शन रखा है, लेकिन बाकी सब सदस्य नोमिनेटेड हैं। यह सब व्यूरोक्रैमी का माइण्ड है, वह जिम हिमाब से चलना चाहते हैं, उमी तरह से इसमें रखा गया है, जिस जिम इन्टरमेस्ट को वे इसमें लाना चाहते हैं, उनके नोमिनेशन की व्यवस्था इसमें कर दी है, लेकिन जैसा कल स्टॉफन साहब ने कहा था और मेरी भी यही मान्यता है कि जो बहुत बड़ा परिवार—मछुआ परिवार—जो सदैव से मछुली पकड़ने में मलग्न है, उसको इसमें नोमिनेशन नहीं मिल पायेगा। इस दृष्टि में अगर हम इस बिल को देखें तो इसमें बहुत बड़े अण्डमेन्ट की गुजाइश है।

इसमें आप ने प्रावधान किया है कि जो अथारिटी बनेगी, उसको बिना कोई कारण बताये सरकार खत्म कर सकती है। इस प्रकार का प्रावधान सरकार के हाथ में नहीं होना चाहिये। जैसे क्लाज 10 में लिखा है -

"The Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette and for reasons to be specified therein, direct that the Authority shall be dissolved from such date and for such period as may be specified in the notification."

किन कारणों से इसको डिजाल्व करेंगे, किन पर नहीं करेंगे, किस प्रकार के अधिकार दिये जायेंगे—ये सब बातें इसमें होनी चाहियें।

वह अथारिटी विशेष कर एकमपोर्ट के लिए बनाई जा रही है, लेकिन इस इण्डस्ट्री को डेवलप करने के लिये भी इसमें व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये, किस प्रकार की मछूलियों को पैदा करे, किस प्रकार उनको पकड़ेंगे—इन सब बातों का प्रावधान होना चाहिये। उन को क्या क्या मछूलियते दी जाय, क्या क्या साधन मिलने चाहिये—ऐसी बहुत सी बातें हैं जिनका इसमें प्रावधान नहीं है। जब तक ये बातें इस बिल में नहीं आती हैं, इस बिल का परपज पूर्ण नहीं है, अपूर्ण है और इसमें सुधार की गुजाइश है।

इसमें मछुली पकड़ने के लिये ट्रीलर्स का जिम्मा है और कहा गया है कि बाहर में खरीदे जाय, लेकिन एक ही देश के बने होने चाहिये। मेरी मान्यता है कि इस में फारन-एकमचेन्ज का बर्डन पड़ेगा। मैं यह चाहता हू कि जो हमारे देशों ट्रीलर्स हैं, उनमें डिफेक्टम हो सकते हैं, लेकिन उनको सुधार जा सकता है, उन ट्रीलर्स का इन्वेन्माल किया जाय।

इस अथारिटी को जो पावर्स दी गई है, उसमें मिवाय सेस के और कोई प्रावधान नहीं है। इसमें कहा गया है कि हम 3 परसेन्ट तक सेस लगा सकते हैं, जिमको डेवलपमेंट और बेटरमेंट के लिये खर्च किया जायगा। मेरी मान्यता है कि इसको चारों तरफ से देखें—मैराइन प्राइक्टम हमारी खाद्य समस्या का बहुत बड़ा भाग बन सकती है। यह ठीक है कि आज खाद्य समस्या नहीं है, लेकिन ऐसे अवसर आ सकते हैं जब कि देश में खाद्य समस्या पैदा हो जाय, उस समय इसका उपयोग किया

[श्री शिवनाथ सिंह]

जा सकता है। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि चाहे फूड प्रॉसेसिंग हमारे पास मरचण्ड हो, तो भी मैरिटाइम प्रोडक्ट्स को खाद्य का बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा बना सकते हैं और इससे बहुत बड़ी आमदनी हो सकती है। आज जहाँ हमें 40 करोड़ रुपये के आमदानी इसमें आमदनी होती है, हम इस उद्योग को डेवलप कर के इस आमदनी को बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ा सकते हैं। होम-कन्जम्पशन के लिये इसको बढ़ाये, इसमें सुधार लायें, इसमें देश का भला होगा।

इन शब्दों को नरफ संकेत करना हुआ मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि इसको मिलिट्री में भेजा जाय ताकि इसमें ठीक तरह से प्रावधान हो सके। मिलिट्री कमेटी के नामों के बारे में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है, आज तक जो डिस्कशन हुआ है, उसको देखते हुए आप भेजना चाहें तो भेजिये और यदि यह समझते हैं कि इन डिफेन्स को इस स्टेज पर क्योर किया जा सकता है, तब मुझे कोई शिकायत नहीं है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara)  
rose—

MR. SPEAKER. Your name is not here

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN. We were asked to give you the names directly. I would request you to give us some time

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Eluru) : We asked the Deputy Minister for Parliamentary Affairs and he asked us to send our names direct to you.

MR. SPEAKER : You must have some system of doing the work

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND) : The hon. Members have not given their names. I am telling this in their presence.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior) : They are also saying it in our presence.

MR. SPEAKER : All of you are talking in my presence. Mr. Unnikrishnan.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : Mr. Speaker, I, for one, welcome this Bill. . .

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member may continue after lunch

13 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the Clock*

— —

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch at five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Marine Products Export Development Authority Bill—Contd

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I unreservedly welcome the Marine Products Export Development Authority Bill, 1972. This Bill has come not a day too soon, because not only the marine exports industry is facing a crisis, but it also happens to have come at a critical juncture of our history. I have another reason for being gratified about it, because I belong to a State which has contributed more than any other State to the development of marine exports, both in volume as well as in value.

The Indian sea food industry and that of Kerala entered the world market in 1962. Since then, we have been able to maintain a continuous lead and, therefore, I have an additional reason for being gratified over the introduction of this very important Bill. But I would urge the House and also the Ministry of Foreign Trade to view the problems confronting this industry on the larger canvas of our own economic development. There are additional reasons also for this, because after the victory in Bangla Desh and after the recent Indo-Pakistan war, we have really emerged as a maritime power between Singapore and the Suez. We have seen in history that maritime powers have not emerged

because of the strength of the Navy alone but also on the strength of merchant marines and in modern times also with the development of the fishing industry. I would invite the attention of the House to a book called "*Russia looks to the Sea*" by Mr. David Fairhall, the defence correspondent of *the Guardian*. He has devoted one whole chapter to the Russian fishing effort and has pointed out how during the short span of seven or eight years, Russia has emerged as the third biggest fishing nation in the world, next only to Peru and Japan. According to the statistics of "Year book of fisheries statistics" the Russian marine production has gone up from 2.5 million tonnes in 1958 to more than 8 million tonnes. That is how Russia has emerged as a big maritime power.

Since we have a long coastline and particular geographical position and there are immense possibilities. It can contribute not only to our marine exports but also to the development of our total national economy and our own international position, I would urge the hon. Minister to take a larger view of these things.

But I find that in clause 10, while five members are proposed to represent the economic Ministries, representatives from the Ministries of Defence and External Affairs and the Planning Commission have been left out. I am surprised at this, because as the hon. Minister very well knows, there are many aspects of this industry which involve close consultation and liaison with these Ministries. There is another reason also why the External Affairs Ministry should be brought in, because the question of fisheries jurisdiction and its limits have been subject to an international debate ever since 1958 when Iceland raised the problem. Several Geneva Conferences have taken place. It is of vital importance to the growth of our industry which hopes to export about Rs. 100 crores worth of marine products in a few years' time.

Talking about this industry in India, I am sorry to say that certain unfortunate developments have taken place. I am referring to the closing down of a number of marine export units in Cochin due to unfair competition which has entered into this sphere. While on the one hand, our Government talks continuously and against incessantly monopolists, I cannot understand how the

Government of India or the Ministry of Foreign Trade can allow big monopolists to enter this industry. The Indian Leaf Tobacco Co., the Indian Tobacco Co., DCM, Britannia Biscuits and even an international monopoly like the Union Carbide have been allowed to enter this sphere with disastrous consequences for the small exporters. I hope the hon. Minister will take note of this development. I am sure the House will be at one with me in demanding that this should be stopped forthwith, because the so-called big entrepreneurs are squeezing out the small exporters who, despite everything that you may say about the smallness of their operations, they have contributed in a very big way in enabling this industry to play a pivotal role in India's exports.

Now there is a related problem of registered exporters policy and entitlement which has become a big racket. I would like to know who is indulging in this racket because the small exporters who have been given this entitlement cannot dispose it of and they find a ready market in Bombay. The big exporters have entered the field not only to the detriment of these interests but also to convert the whole thing into a big racket. I would urge upon the Minister to stop these entitlement licences forthwith because they are having a disastrous effect on the marine export industry as a whole.

I am sure the hon. Minister knows that a number of units in Cochin have closed down, including the pioneering units who entered the field in the late fifties. I refer to the Cochin Company and the Indo-Marine Agencies. In view of the importance of this question, I would urge upon him to look into this question and urge the Finance Ministry to arrange for finance through the Nationalised Banks for small exporters.

Once again I welcome the Bill which is a first step in the right direction. Despite its handicaps and shortcomings in the drafting of the Bill, I hope it will help our marine export industry and the national economy as a whole.

SHRI DHAMANKAR (Bhiwandi): I rise to support the Marine Products Export Development Authority Bill. There is a huge wealth hidden under the sea water in the form of minerals, fish and other bye-products.

[Shri Dhamankar]

It is very necessary to exploit them not only for consumption within the country but also for export to earn foreign exchange.

There are different schemes being implemented at State level and also at the Central level. Thana district in Maharashtra has a long coastline commanding an ample wealth of fish and other by-products. The State Government is developing it by adopting several schemes, specially in the co-operative sector. We need to train the fishermen, the young boys and impart to them scientific knowledge of fishing, canning and other aspects. The State Government has started a Fisheries School at Satpati near Palgar for the primary and secondary levels. I would suggest that education at college level with a bias on fisheries should be imparted. Universities should be asked to take up this matter and establish fisheries colleges at different centres on the sea-coast.

Fish and its bye-products such as shark liver oil, glue etc. are being developed and there is a considerable potential for export to earn foreign exchange. There are various schemes sponsored by the Central Government. I would mention one here. In Kochivda near Bassein, there is a scheme being implemented by the Central Government. A sum of Rs. 7 lakhs has been given for fisheries for setting up an ice factory for preservation and also for given boats operated by diesel engines. It is a co-operative society which gets financial assistance from the Central Government. This is the only scheme in Thana district, but the scope for the industry there is vast. I request Government to have other centrally-sponsored schemes also on this coast.

One of my hon. friends who spoke suggested that this industry should not be nationalised. I agree with him. It is a new industry and I would request Government to give the maximum preference for the co-operative sector. In the co-operative sector, there are fishery societies being financed by the State Government by giving medium term loans, but the interest rate is high. I would request that concessional interest rates be given on loans to these societies which are engaged in developing these products.

Boat-building also needs to be undertaken.

At Satpathi there is a society with boat building as one of its activities. It needs enough finance to produce more boats and supply them to the different fishing-centres on the various coasts.

Canning factories on a co-operative basis have also to be developed for canned fish which needs to be developed. There is a big prospect for tank fish to be exported.

With these few words, I support the Bill.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, just give three minutes for the hon. Member from Orissa.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : All right

SHRI D.K. PANDA (Bhanjanagar) : Sir, while welcoming the present Bill, I would just like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister the realities that should be faced in Orissa. The Chilka lake which occupies a large area in Orissa, is one of the biggest lakes in India. It needs development. Already, the World Bank is going to send its own expert team to find out whether it is possible to make it useful--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : How does all this come under marine fishing ?

SHRI D.K. PANDA : I am coming to that

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : In the lake there is fish.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The Bill is about marine fishing ; not lake fishing.

SHRI D.K. PANDA : The Orissa Government has already given its proposals, because that will be the biggest exporting centre for fish, since good possibilities are there. That has been examined by the expert committee of the Orissa Government and the proposals have been forwarded to the Centre, and the Centre has also, on its own, referred the matter to the World Bank for developing it as the biggest fishery centre. For that purpose, the World Bank are sending their own experts to find out the sources.

With regard to Gopalpur Sea-port, there is also a development project; and the proposals have reached the Centre, and I am sure the Centre will take into consideration that aspect of the matter because the sea is deepest at that point which is specially helpful for the fishing industry. Therefore, these two aspects may be taken into consideration and the projects quickly developed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Shri Shashi Bhushan. I make an exception for you. Only five minutes.

श्री शशि भूषण (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सागर में जो हमारी सम्पत्ति है उसको खोजने के लिये हमें फोर्ड फाउण्डेशन और दूसरे देशों से कुछ मदद मिली और अमरीकन विशेषज्ञों ने देश में खोजना शुरू किया। उन्हें पता चला कि हमारे देश में सागर के अन्दर, आमपाम के सागर तट पर बहुत सा खाद्य पदार्थ है तथा दूसरी चीजें हैं जिसको वे ले जा सकते हैं, और तकरीबन 40 करोड़ के करीब उन्होंने निर्यात किया। उसमें बड़े बड़े अमरीकन मोनोपोलिस्ट्स हैं, जैसे सी स्टार, आटरमेंड सी फूड प्राइवेट लिमिटेड इत्यादि, और भी बड़ी बड़ी कम्पनियां हैं जो आज हमें मदद देने के लिये हमारे पाम आती हैं। उस के बाद कहेंगे कि हम में वैमिलस खरीदिये, कंटेनमेंट खरीदिये तथा अन्य सम्बन्धित माल खरीदिये। जैसे अमरीकन ने मिल्क प्लान्ट्स लगा दिये देश में जिस का 10 परसेंट भी यूटिलाइजेशन हम नहीं कर सके। अरबों रुपये के प्लान्ट्स जंक के रूप में पड़े पड़े खराब हो रहे हैं, और वह पाउडर बेस्ड इंडस्ट्री थी। सामान पड़ा पड़ा खराब हो रहा है जिसकी टूट फूट हमें देनी पड़ती है उन्हीं से। तो इनके सारे प्लान्ट्स खरीदिये, और सारा सामान खरीदिये, और जो पाल वह यहां से ले जाते हैं उसमें इंडियन गुड्स का कहीं कोई जिक्र नहीं होना बल्कि दूसरी कम्पनियों के लेबिल लगा कर माल बेचते हैं। इस प्रकार का काम विदेशी कम्पनियां कर रही हैं। पहले हमारा राया फंसवा देते हैं और फिर उद्योग को पनपाने में हमारा साथ नहीं देते। इसी प्रकार का इतिहास इस मेराइन प्रोडक्ट इंडस्ट्री में भी है। हम

से कहते हैं कि पहले उनसे हम प्लान्ट्स खरीदें, और दूसरा सामान खरीदें, वैसिल्स लें लेकिन इस सबका लाभ हमारे देश को न मिलकर वही लोग उठाते हैं। इसी प्रकार की ओर भी मोनोपोलिस्टिक कम्पनियां हैं। हमारा कोई मार्केट अपना नहीं है। खोज के साथ साथ ये फोर्ड फाउण्डेशन या दूसरी जो आर्गनाइजेशन है, वे एम्प्लोनेज का काम भी साथ साथ करती रहती हैं। इस वास्ते हमें बहुत सतर्क इनसे रहना होगा। हिन्दुस्तान के भी जो मोनोपोलिस्टिक कनसर्न है जैसे तम्बाकू कम्पनियां हैं, पैसा उनके पाम भी बहुत है। उनसे भी सतर्क रहना चाहिये। सरकार नेशनलाइज नहीं करना चाहती है तो उसके बजाय वह ज्वायंट सेक्टर की जो बात चल रही है, उस में इसको कर दे, ज्वायंट सेक्टर शुरू कर दे। कम से कम मोनोपोलिस्ट्स को इसका मौका नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये। एन मौके पर खास तौर पर अमरीकन कम्पनियों ने या हिन्दुस्तान में उनकी शाखाओं की भी चाहे कोई भी इंडस्ट्री हो, उन्होंने हमें विट्टे किया है। इन कम्पनियों के जाल में न फसे। हिन्दुस्तान का जो बहुत बड़ा मोनोपोलिस्ट है, उसको अगर लाना ही है—आजकल उन पर बहुत कृपा दृष्टि हो रही है—तो आप ज्वायंट सेक्टर करें, कोओ-प्रेटिव्ज बना कर या दूसरे ढंग से इस काम को करें।

इस बिल का जो मकसद है वह बड़ा अच्छा है और अच्छे मौके पर यह आया है। सम्पत्ति जो सागर के किनारे और नीचे है, उस सम्पत्ति का आपको ख्याल आया, यह एक अच्छी बात है। लेकिन ये सम्पत्ति खोज निकालने की सब चीज हम अपने देश में भी बना सकते हैं जबकि इनको ये कम्पनियां बाहर से खरीद कर ला रही हैं। बहुत सी चीजें हमारे देश में बन सकती हैं। हमारे बड़े बड़े कारखाने हैं, रांची में हमारा कारखाना है, दूसरी जगहों पर हैं, जहां काम नहीं है, वे पूरा काम नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। वहां पर इन वैसिल्स के पार्ट को बनवायें, जो बाहर से आ रहे हैं। इतना ही मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI A.C. GEORGE):** My job has been very much lightened because the hon. Members who participated in the discussion have thrown a lot of light on the subject, and I may thankfully acknowledge that there is almost unanimity in supporting this Bill.

Of course, one or two friends pointed out that there are some defects in the Bill and were naturally thinking of sending it to a Select Committee. One or two friends suggested that deeper thought has to be given to different Clauses. I have absolutely no hesitation to accept that, but this Bill is already late. It ought to have been brought much earlier, and this subject cannot afford to be left in the lurch for any more time.

We are discussing about an industry which during the short span of ten years, has made great strides. As my hon. friend Shri Unnikrishnan pointed out, between 1961 and 1971 the export has become ten-fold. In 1961, the export of marine products was Rs. 4.13 crores. This year, I am happy to inform the House, we have already crossed the Rs. 40 crore mark. Last year it was only Rs. 35 crores. Within ten years it has increased from Rs. 4 to Rs. 40 crores and in the last year by Rs. 5 crores.

According to a preliminary study made by the Indian Institute of Foreign Trade, we are quite hopeful that by 1973-74 the export will be to the tune of Rs. 61 crores, and that by 1978-79 we can make a reasonable target of Rs. 118 crores. There is immense wealth in the ocean. This is a completely untapped source, and the points made by hon. friends are quite relevant.

Shri Haldar was pointing out that in Bangla in some part the prices are very high. At the same time my good friend from Mysore, Karwar, was pointing out that hundred mackerel could be had for one rupee. Shastriji, on the other hand, pointed out that for a kilo of rather moderately good fish you have to pay Rs. 12 in Delhi. This symbolises the real problem of this industry. At one point the toiling class is getting only a meagre income, if not a pittance.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I think you are conserving them for export.

**SHRI A.C. GEORGE:** We will have to take the totality of the picture for export. So, we are envisaging an over-all improvement in the entire situation. Locating the shoals, doing necessary research work, fisheries biology, fisheries technology, production improvement, marketing methods, everything that is connected with the marine products industry and its export are envisaged in this Bill.

It has been pointed out that there are not enough powers, but when we come to the discussion of the Clauses, I shall point out what has been incorporated in the different Clauses. But I am happy to note that there is over-all approval and over-all support for this Bill.

My hon. friend Shri Somasundaram has pointed out that the Centre is slowly trying to encroach on the rights of the States, but I may inform him that this Bill was brought to the notice of the Tamil Nadu Government and it has been welcomed by the Tamil Nadu Government. In fact, all the maritime States of the country have welcomed it, and we are happy that there is a very large measure of support to this Bill.

My hon. friend Shri Stephen has pointed out that there are not enough powers. We will come to that in the Clauses, but I only submit that this Bill may not be sent to the Select Committee, and it may be passed as quickly as possible, after going through the Clauses.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I shall put amendment No. 1 to vote. The question is:

“That the Bill to provide for the establishment of an Authority for the development of the marine products industry under the control of the Union and for matters connected therewith, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 11 members, namely:—

- (1) Shri Chhuttan Lal
- (2) Shri Hiralal Doda
- (3) Shri Indrajit Gupta
- (4) Shri Nathuram Mirdha
- (5) Shri Lalit Narayan Mishra
- (6) Shri Amrit Nahata
- (7) Shri Birender Singh Rao

- (8) Dr. H.P. Sharma  
 (9) Shri Ram Deo Singh  
 (10) Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee ; and  
 (11) Shri Ram Chandra Vikal

with instructions to report by the last day of the first week of the next session" (1)

*The motion was negatived*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question

‘That the Bill to provide for the establishment of an Authority for the development of the marine products industry under the control of the Union and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration’

*The motion was adopted*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER . The question is :

‘That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.’

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill*

*Clause 2 (Definitions)*

SHRI C. M. SETHUPATHI (Muvattupuzha) : I beg to move

Page 2, line 16,

after “fishery products” insert

“,fished from sea water” (2)

Page 2,

after line 36, insert

‘(m) “off-shore fishing” means fishing in waters more than twenty fathoms in depth;

(n) “deep-sea fishing” means fishing in waters more than forty fathoms in depth.’ (3)

I am speaking on all my amendments. The two major points which I would like the Minister to take care of are these. Marine products have been defined to cover all types of fishing products, sea fish as well as inland fish. The entire fish is sought to be brought under the purview of this Bill, but when we

pass on to Clause 9 we find that direction and financial assistance are contemplated only for sea fish. Clause 9(2) (d) reads :

“rendering of financial or other assistance to owners of fishing vessels engaged in off-shore and deep-sea fishing and owners of processing plants or storage premises....”

This Authority will have power to give financial assistance only to one class of persons engaged in fishing, i.e. only those who are fishing from the sea. Even there not all of them are covered. It is confined only to those engaged in off-shore fishing, i.e. more than 20 fathoms but below 40 fathoms and deep-sea fishing i.e. more than 40 fathoms. Only the big monopolists and big magnates are engaged in fishing far out into the sea and the Bill seeks to give financial assistance only to them. There are certain classes of people who really need assistance—the in-shore fishing people with non-mechanised or small mechanised boats. There are persons who are doing inland fishing. All of them contribute a substantial portion of the entire fishing produce of the country. It is these people who need assistance that they may equip themselves for the higher type of fishing. But this Bill says, we will give assistance to deep-sea fishing and off-shore fishing people, namely, that type of people mentioned by Shri Shashi Bhushan and Shri Umnikrishnan ? One of my amendments seeks to give assistance to the other type of people also. Let them give or not give, but let the Authority be vested with the power to give financial assistance to these people, if they feel it is necessary to do so

Secondly, as I emphasised yesterday, let us not forget the multitude of fishermen who are fishing with country boats and engaged in non-mechanised traditional fishing. Let us not forget the workers who are exploited there. We are seeking to collect 3 per cent *ad valorem* on the quantities which are exported and that will come to a substantial amount. Is that to be conserved only for assisting the owners of fishing vessels, storage houses and conveyances, or is for assisting the workers also, who are exploited, living in huts not quite fit for human beings to live in ? Should there not be a provision in the Bill which authorises the Authority with the power to give assistance to them also if the Authority in its wisdom feels that it is necessary and appropriate to do so ? That provision is not there.

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

Thirdly, the Authority is composed of two sections, official and non-official. The official section is covered by certain ministries. I have mentioned the Labour Ministry. Mr. Unnikrishnan has mentioned two ministries. Though he has not tabled any amendment, the hon. Minister can certainly take note of it. If it is to be a comprehensive body taking care of everything and acting as a sort of clearing house for the different departments to operate so that there may be no bottlenecks, is it not necessary that all the ministries concerned with this should come together round the table and have a forum for discussion?

The purpose is that representatives of every interest must come into this body. My complaint is, while the representatives of the ministries and of the owners of vessels, storage houses and conveyances, the big man, the middle operator who makes money, are there, workers have no representation. The Bill is for supervising the functioning of the big man, whether he must be given licences, export permits, etc. This Authority is constituted to exercise that jurisdiction over him.

But this authority is being loaded up with his representatives only whereas the persons to be looked after, the workers, people who are working on a co-operative basis, taking boats from the Government and working on a co-operative basis, catching fish and selling, they are not represented there. There are thousands of small boat-owners who do not operate in the deep sea and they are not represented there. Yesterday I had information from my place that currently a struggle is going on between the country boat owners and the mechanised boat owners. The sea-coast of Quilon is lined up with country-boats in order to prevent others from operating in the coastal areas because their livelihood is being threatened. So, there is contradiction and conflict between their interests. All of them have to be represented here.

Coming to the definition clause, as a lawyer I find it difficult to understand certain provisions of this Bill. "off shore fishing", "deep sea fishing" etc., are not legal technical terms. They have got to be defined. We do not find those terms in Webster's dictionary. We may perhaps find them in fishing technology. Should they not be defined so that there will

be no difficulty later on? So, I would suggest that there should be a definition clause.

These are the reasons why I have tabled these amendments. The hon. Minister may look into them, which I suppose are not idiotic, and agree to adopt those amendments which are acceptable to him.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: My hon. friend, Shri Stephen, has moved some amendments. The point raised in one amendment he has himself answered towards the latter part of his speech when he said that for the definitions of "off shore" and "deep sea" fishing there is no legal sanction "in shore" is considered to be upto 10 fathoms "off shore" from 10 to 40 fathoms and beyond 40 fathoms is "deep sea" fishing for which there is no legal sanction. They are technical terms.

14.38 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY *in the Chair*]

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: Why do you not define it?

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: It cannot be defined by law. It is a technical term.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior): What about fishing in troubled waters?

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: These things can be included in the rules that we are framing. So, I accept the spirit of the suggestion.

Coming to representation for different categories, if you go through the composition, already five direct Ministries are represented there. Then clause (4) says "the interests of persons employed in the marine products industry". Over and above that, clause (6) says "such other persons, or class of persons, who, in the opinion of the Central Government, ought to be represented." Ten seats are left for them. We have provision for employees and we have provided ten seats for other interest. So, we can definitely include them there.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN :** What exactly do you mean by "employees in the marine industry"? "employee" means employed on wages by some body, "employed" means engaged in the industry, or employed in the co-operatives, functioning and answerable to nobody. These are different types of persons. So, the term "employee" can have many meanings. When you are so liberal on so many other questions, why could you not be liberal with the persons who are working there?

**SHRI A. C. GEORGE :** In the case of other similar statutory authorities, these details are not included in the Bill. These are details which are worked out when we frame the rules. We can define as to who are the employees and make provision for them in the rules.

About owners, we have only said, "interests of owners of fishing vessels, processing plants" etc. There is no mention of big owners or small owners. We can define "owners" to include small owners also.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN :** No, that is wrong. Vessels are defined here. It says :

"fishing vessel" means a ship or boat fitted with mechanical means of propulsion"

It is the owner of this fishing vessel who is given representation. It is all right for off-shore fishing. But there are large fleets of non-mechanised boats operating inshore. You must also ensure that inshore and inland fishermen also come into the picture. Your definition does not take care of them. The other people also must be given financial assistance or something. They also must be represented there. The different interests must be taken into account. Every type of owner will not come in under this definition of a fishing vessel.

**SHRI A. C. GEORGE :** In the composition there is a clearcut provision. Out of thirty members to be there, we have defined only twenty; the rest ten are left to be defined at the stage when we frame rules and go into details. All these aspects are to be brought out and can be considered by the House then.

**SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI :** (Shajapur) : Why do you not assure that adequate representation will be given to that community?

**SHRI A. C. GEORGE :** I can categorically give an assurance to this House that adequate representation will be given to the smaller sector also. I am sorry, Sir, that I will not be able to accept the amendments.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Is Shri Stephen pressing his amendments?

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN :** No, Sir. I wish to withdraw them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendments Nos. 2 and 3?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS :** Yes.

*Amendments No. 2 and 3 were, by leave, withdrawn.*

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** The question is :

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 3 was added to the Bill.*

**Clause 4—(Establishment and constitution of the Authority).**

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Is Shri Stephen moving his amendments?

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN :** I am not moving my amendments.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** The question is :

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 4 was added to the Bill.*

*Clauses 5 to 8 were added to the Bill.*

**Clause 9—(Functions of the Authority).**

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Is Shri Stephen moving his amendments?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : I am moving only amendment No. 9 I am not moving the other amendments.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE : I am accepting amendment No. 9

*Amendment made :*

Page 4, lines 46 and 47,—

*omit "under the technical guidance of the Central Government" (9)*

*(Shri C. M. Stephen)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

"That clause 9, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause 9, as amended, was added to the Bill.*

*Clauses 10 to 34 were added to the Bill.*

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

SHRI A. C. GEORGE : Sir, I move :

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

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

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

SHRI C. JANARDHANAN (Trichur) : Sir, I support this Bill and I hope that this House will pass it as soon as possible, because it has come at the most opportune moment, although I would have been happy if the Minister had accepted some of the amendments of my hon. friend, Shri Stephen. Shortcomings are there and, I think, the Bill is not adequate. But even with all its weaknesses, I think, this Bill can do a great lot to strengthen the marine industry in this country.

The Minister, while replying to the debate, was telling us that in the last ten years our exports increased tenfold. May be, he is right because he is speaking from figures, but I am afraid about the condition in 1972. I come from a State where the marine industry is very much developed. Some of my friends here referred to the fact that many of the units of the marine industry in that State

are closed down because of some technical difficulties, dearth of fish, no facility to go in for deep sea fishing, and people not getting adequate help from the Government. I hope, the exports will go up this year. I do not know if it will ever be a fact. Anyway, with this new Authority, I hope, the marine industry in Kerala will be developed soon and the Government will take care of that State.

Two or three years back, the State Government of Kerala placed before the Government of India a Master Plan to develop our marine industry and to increase the production of marine products. But nothing has happened so far. If that attitude is going to continue with this new Authority, I think, nothing is going to happen. So, the attitude of the Government of India should change and, I hope, it will change and that will improve our marine industry.

With these words, I support this Bill.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Eluru) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the outset I thank the Government for bringing forward this Bill which is going to be passed now.

Andhra has also 600 miles of coast-line. The Government of Andhra Pradesh have submitted several proposals to the Government of India, particularly to catch prawns which is the foreign exchange earner with big potentiality of sea fish from its coastal area along with the Kerala State. Though the Andhra Pradesh Government have submitted 16 or 17 proposals from 1955 onwards, they have not sanctioned technically even 3 or 4 of them. Finally, the Andhra Pradesh Government requested to sanction at least the proposal to exploit prawns which is the most delicious food for American and British people and which they cannot get in their country. The freezing facilities and transport facilities are given to only Madras and Kerala. They do not touch Vishakhapatnam and Kakinada. On account of lack of transport facilities and freezing facilities, the Andhra Pradesh Government are not able to exploit the potentialities of the marine industry, the fishing capacity, and to help the Government to earn foreign exchange.

I would like to quote here a news-item which appeared in the *Hindu* dated 27.3.72. It says :

"The Union Cabinet is understood to have cleared a proposal for an agreement with the Soviet Union for the supply of deep sea fishing vessels to give fisheries a big boost during the Fourth Plan."

The Government should at least give some preference to Andhra State where there is big potentiality in marine industry. Some of the Russian deep-sea fishing vessels may be allotted to Andhra Pradesh along with other States. There are already Norwegian projects in Malabar and they are doing well. They are earning foreign exchange.

Many of the hon. Members have supported the Bill and they have given certain suggestions. I hope, the hon. Minister will consider them. The hon. Minister has also given an assurance that at the time of rule-making they will consider the proposals made by the hon. Members, particularly to get all the benefits to fishermen in our socialistic pattern of society. There are no facilities for small fishermen. The State Governments are also giving help to big fellows. As my hon. friend, Shri Shashi Bhushan, said, there are big firms which are exploiting fishermen and which are exploiting the Government. They are exporting fish and making huge profits. There are 4 or 5 big firms operating in Andhra Pradesh which are making huge profits. The Andhra Government, for lack of funds, are obliging the foreign companies and also big Indian companies. It is better, at the time of rule-making and allotting money, the Government should give preference to coastal areas of the State. Fishermen are the people who risk their lives going into the deep sea fishing. Even though there are no mechanical boats, they are going into lot of areas in the deep sea. Therefore, preference may be given to the fishermen cooperative societies.

Government should also consider helping the Andhra Pradesh Government. There are certain proposals submitted by them. I think, the Ministry of Foreign Trade and the Ministry of Food & Agriculture are dealing with this. Both the Departments together should consider how best to help the State Governments, how best to export and earn foreign exchange.

So far as the proposals submitted by the Andhra Pradesh Government are concerned, I want the Government to expedite the matter and to satisfy the marine people there.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE : Right from the beginning of the discussion of this Bill, various points have been made by the hon. members. But the core of the point is, as many of the friends correctly pointed out, exploitation and that too exploitation by big houses in small men's business.

While we note with gratification that export has increased ten fold—the graph is going up steadily—we may have to think how much the actual producers, the fishermen, the employees who are engaged in this trade, are benefiting by that. The lure of foreign exchange, we are quite aware, is bringing in quite a few big cartels into this field. Through this Bill and the further rules to be framed, it will be the endeavour of the Government of India and this Marine Products Export Development Authority to see that our exports grow in a highly encouraging manner and at the same time the benefits pass on to the man who is really earning that. I do not want to mention to the House, I do not want to make it more clear, but we are quite aware that all is not going well in this trade. Some people who have absolutely nothing to do with fishing business are moving into this small men's business simply for the lure of foreign exchange and some other manipulation that may possibly be made. We are trying our best to prevent it, and quite soon we will be bringing up proposals to plug these loopholes. It will be the endeavour of the Government of India—the Ministry of Foreign Trade and the Marine Products Export Development Authority once it comes into existence—to see that this industry caters to the benefit of thousands and thousands of employees and lakhs and lakhs of fishermen; every care will be taken in our further actions to see that the benefit is given to the producer, the toiling class, and the present lacunae like lack of discipline and regulations are removed. Even yesterday I pointed out that the very necessity for the establishment of this Authority arose from lack of discipline; anybody can enter this, anything can be done and any sort of manipulation can go on, and we have little powers now to control it. With the establishment of this Authority we are quite hopeful that we can eliminate the middlemen, the exploiters and the big shots who are moving into the small men's business.

I thank the hon. members for all the valuable suggestions. All the suggestions will be given very due consideration, very serious consideration, and the maximum possible

[Shri A. C. George]

accommodation will be made in the national interest, in the interest of the industry, when we frame the rules. I may again assure the hon. House that the employees, the fishermen and people who are engaged in this field will always be given representation and due consideration.

SHRI K. GOPAL (Karur) : The hon. Minister mentioned about 'big shots' Can he be more specific about it? It seems, monopolies like India Tobacco, D. C. M. and Britannia are trying to enter this field. Can the Minister be specific about the 'big shots'? May I also know whether definite steps will be taken to prevent people who have no connection whatsoever with this industry, entering the field?

MR CHAIRMAN He said that all consideration will be given to the suggestions made by the hon. Members and utmost care will be taken

Now, the question is :

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

*The motion was adopted*

— — —

15 hrs.

#### MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—Contd

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, we take up further consideration of the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Mr. Vajpayee

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर) : सभापति जी, राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने जिन शब्दों के साथ अपना अभिभाषण समाप्त किया है, मैं वहीं से प्रारम्भ करना चाहता हूँ "... महानता इस राष्ट्र का आवाहन कर रही है- वह महानता जो परम्परागत शक्ति-संचय द्वारा नहीं बल्कि आत्मिक बल से प्राप्त होती है।"

राष्ट्रपति महोदय के ये शब्द स्वयं मे बड़े मर्मस्पर्शी हैं इनमें निहित भाव अंतःकरण को आन्दोलित और अनुप्राणित करने की क्षमता रखते

हैं। आत्मबल से प्राप्त होनेवाली महानता का आवाहन एक ही वाक्य में भारत के उज्ज्वल अतीत और उज्ज्वलतर भविष्य की झाकी प्रस्तुत कर देता है। भारत को महान बनना है इसमें सन्देह नहीं है। महानता हमारी नियति है, यह भी निर्विवाद है। हमारी महानता हथियारों के अम्बारों पर निर्भर नहीं होगी। यह भी एक ध्रुव सत्य है। लेकिन पता नहीं राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में महानता का आवाहन खोखला क्यों जान पड़ता है? मालूम नहीं आत्मबल का उल्लेख पाखंड क्यों प्रतीत होता है।

सम्भव है इसका एक कारण यह हो कि जब महानता के आवाहन का उल्लेख हो रहा था तब केन्द्रीय तक में, राष्ट्रपति महोदय के ही सम्मुख विदेशी राजनीतिज्ञों की साक्षी में इम मदन का सब से बड़ा विरोधी दल प्रधान मंत्री को लोकतंत्र की हत्यारिणी और फासिस्ट कह रहा था। आवाहन महानता का हो रहा था और प्रदर्शन उच्छ्वसलता का निया जा रहा था।

माक्सवादी मित्रों ने उस दिन जो कुछ किया उसका प्रशंसा नहीं की जा सकती। उनका आचरण आपत्तिजनक था। पश्चिम बंगाल में चुनावों में घाघली के ममाचार्य में भी मिले हैं। पश्चिम बंगाल में क्यों, अन्यत्र भी ऐसे तरीके अपनाए गए जिन के चलते चुनावों को सर्वथा निष्पक्ष और स्वतंत्र नहीं कहा जा सकता। किन्तु यदि किसी दल को इम बारे में अपना रोष या आक्रोश प्रकट करना था तो उसका स्थान राष्ट्रपति महोदय वा अभिभाषण नहीं था, उस दल के सदस्य अभिभाषण के बाद इस मदन में आकर अपनी बात कह सकते थे। जनतंत्र में कहीं न कहीं तो मर्यादा की लक्ष्मण रेखा खींचनी पड़ेगी।

किन्तु क्या सत्तारूढ़ दल ने लक्ष्मण रेखा का उल्लंघन नहीं किया है? क्या उसका आचरण आदर्श रहा है? उस दिन राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के मध्य में ही सत्तारूढ़ दल ने अपने को निर्बसन कर दिया। जब माक्सवादी सदस्य बाहर जाने लगे तो तालियां बज उठीं।