

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill,
Enacting Formula

Amendment made

"Page 1, line 1,—

for "Thirteenth" substitute—
"Fourteenth".

[Shri Bibudhendra Mishra]

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill".

Shri Bade: You cannot take votes now. There is no quorum.

Mr. Chairman: This is lunch hour.

Shri Bade: The voting cannot take place.

Mr. Chairman: The quorum is questioned.

I think the hon. Member knows that at 2-30 p.m. the quorum cannot be challenged.

Shri Bade: There can be no voting.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: The practice is that during the lunch hour we do not question the quorum. But for voting you must have the quorum.

Mr. Chairman: No division can take place. If you challenge division, we shall postpone it. There is no division now.

The question is:

"That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

Shri Bibudhendra Mishra: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

13.25 hrs.

INDIAN EMIGRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Madam, I move*:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Emigration Act, 1922, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The proposed amendments are needed to bring the law in line with recent developments in communication and also to prevent illicit emigration and prescribe more deterrent punishment for violation of the law. The parent Act of 1922 had the twin objective of controlling the emigration of skilled and unskilled workers beyond the limits of India and also protecting the interests of such categories of workers as may need the protection of the Government. Today we find that unskilled labour cannot go out of India. It is totally banned. For instance, emigration to Malaya, Singapore and Brunei was prohibited in 1938, to Ceylon in 1939 and to Burma in 1941 by series of notifications under sub-section 1 of section 30A of the Indian Emigration Act of 1922. With regard to skilled workers, emigration is now governed by the provisions of Chapter IV of the Act. The provisions

*Moved with the Recommendation of the President.

are made applicable only to those categories of skilled workers who because of poverty, lack of education and other things require the protection of the Government. They are not made applicable normally to those highly skilled technicians who by reasons of their educational attainments and better economic conditions can be expected to look after their own interests. Section 22 of the parent Act provides no protection to unaccompanied domestic servants. This is deleted 31 of the parent Act. The Act did not affect persons who are not of Indian parentage. Now this is being changed into citizens of India instead of persons of Indian parentage. The amendment also contemplates the provision for confiscating vessels and country crafts used for illicit emigration. This was necessary because in recent years hundreds of people had migrated to Ceylon by using country craft and thus violating the local law and have put themselves to all kinds of hardship and the Government found itself absolutely helpless because the punishment prescribed in the parent Act of 1922 was not deterrent enough. So, that is also included in the amending Bill. Since there are no amendments, I hope the Bill will be passed without much controversy.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Shri Yallamanda Reddy (Markapur): Generally, we would like to support the Bill as the hon. Minister says the whole thing now goes against the Act because there are some lacunae in the Act. But if we go to the past history of emigration, we know that from this country, formerly British imperialists have been taking people to other countries for exploiting cheap labour and Indian labourers could give. There are people who by violating the Act take some people to other countries and get benefited by the Act.

13.30 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

802 (A) L.S.D.—6.

Apart from taking advantage of the lacunae in the Act, there are also people who taking advantage of the poverty and unemployment in the country, try to trade in these people by emigrating them to other countries. In spite of the fact that there are powers given to Government under the existing Act to check this, Government are not willing to utilise those powers to check the illicit emigration, because those people who are engaged in this trade of sending people to other countries are very influential and very much connected with the high officials of Government here. Therefore, my submission is that before Government seek more powers by this amending Bill, the hon. Minister must tell us how they are implementing the old provisions of the Act, and how with those powers they are checking illicit emigration to other countries. According to my information, Government are not at all seriously implementing the powers that are already given to them. So, I do not know Government are going to implement in future the powers that would be given to them under this amending Bill.

After 1941, there was no emigration and virtually, Government prohibited all emigration to other countries. But even after the prohibition of 1941, illicit emigration continued on a large scale. From the reports alone from Ceylon, we know that in 1960, nearly 4000 people were sent to Colombo without any authorised passports; that means that illicit emigration was taking place. In 1961, nearly 1700 people were deported from Ceylon to India, and in 1962, nearly 1400 people were deported. That shows that in spite of the ban after 1941 so many people have been sent to other countries by other means. The hon. Minister says that it was because of the lacunae in the Act that those people were sent to other countries. But I submit that that is not the whole truth. No doubt, the lacunae in the Act contributed to some extent for this illicit emigration. But, at the same time, there are people who have used

[Shri Yallamanda Reddy]

this opportunity to trade in illicit emigration, and they are getting profits out of it, and they have not been punished properly.

Therefore, I submit that while taking these powers, Government must see that the Act is properly implemented and illicit emigration is checked. Unless Government take necessary steps to check this no useful purpose will be served by amending the Act.

At present, Government have come forward with the proposal to amend only one aspect of the Act. But there are also other things in the Act. For instance, under sections 7 and 8, Government are empowered to look into the welfare of the emigrants in other countries. Section 7 provides:

"Agents in Foreign Countries: The Central Government may, for the purpose of safeguarding the interest of emigrants in any place outside India appoint persons to be agents in such places and may define their powers and duties".

Section 8 provides:

"Advisory Committees: The Central Government may for the purpose of assisting any Protector of Emigrants appointed by it or any person appointed by it under section 5, constitute an advisory Committee in such manner as it may think fit and may prescribe the procedure to be followed and the functions to be performed by such committee."

As far as my knowledge goes, Government have not taken any concrete step to appoint this advisory committee or to look into the welfare of the emigrants in other countries. As far as my information goes, Government have not thought of appointing this advisory committee till now. I do not know why they have not taken proper steps in this regard. I do not know whether they feel that the rights of these emigrants in other countries are

being properly safeguarded and the emigrants are being treated well there. But the fact is that Government have not taken care at all regarding this matter.

Till recently, a lot of emigration was taking place to Great Britain. But we know that in the U.K., the British Government have since passed an Emigration Act which is virtually conceived of on the basis of colour prejudice. I do not know what steps have been taken by our Government to protest in this regard.

Also, there are many people living in other countries, who have left their entire family or part of their families in our country. I do not know what steps our Government have taken to see that the wives and children and other members of their families who are left over here are sent to those people in case they are required to go there. This is an important thing. I do not know what Government propose to do in this regard.

I may also point out that there are so many people in Burma, Malaya etc. who have gone from South India, and who are living there for so many years, but who have left their families in the southern parts of the country, and they are sending some money from there to their families who are left over here. But, nowadays, those people find it very difficult to send any remittances to their families who are here. I do not know how our Government are helping those people to send their remittances duly to their families that are left over here. I might mention that there are so many people who are finding it difficult to legally send the money required by their families here, and they are resorting to illegal methods, and there are also some people who want to trade in this. For example, they will take Rs. 100 from those people but send only Rs. 50 to their families here. There are some banks in Calcutta which trade in this.

They take Rs. 100 from the emigrants there, they take 50 per cent of it, and send only the other 50 per cent to the relative who are left over in this country. Therefore, I would like to submit that Government should take proper care about these people and see that they are properly helped economically or socially in those countries where they are living.

Therefore, while supporting this Bill, I would request Government to give us necessary information about these advisory committees and also about our agents in foreign countries who are to look after the emigrants from our country who are staying in these countries. Unless Government take steps to implement these provisions of the Act also, no useful purpose will be served by simply taking additional powers just to prohibit illicit emigration.

Shri K. L. More (Hatakanangle): Before I support this measure, I would like to make a few observations with regard to this measure. The present measure has been brought forward to check illicit emigration of our labour, and for that purpose, sections, 2, 22, and 31, in particular, are intended to be amended.

In section 2, emigration has been defined as departure by sea out of India. It does not take into consideration the possible violation of the Act through departure by air, and that is provided for in this Bill.

Section 22 provides that nothing in Chapter IV shall apply to any case in which a person engages another to accompany him out of India as his personal domestic servant. It applied only to unaccompanied persons and not accompanied persons. That distinction is eliminated now by deleting section 22 of the Act.

Section 31 provides that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to the departure out of India by any person who is not born of Indian parents.

This has created a lot of confusion since the Indian Emigration Act is extended to the territories of Dadra, Nagar Haveli, Goa, Daman, Diu, Pondicherry, Karaikal and Mahe. We must put in the words 'a citizen of India' instead of 'persons of Indian parentage'. These are the three main provisions contained in this measure.

As regards enhancing the penalties under the Act—sections 25, 26, 27, and 30A—the punishments provided for in these sections are not considered sufficiently or deterrent. Therefore, these sections are intended to be amended.

My submission is that this is a benevolent measure and everyone must lend his support to it. But we should consider why is it necessary for labour or emigrants to go to foreign countries. We should remedy that condition first. The fact of the matter is that our labour is cheap and foreigners take advantage of that fact. If we raise the standard of living in our country, if our labour ceases to be cheap, the inducement for foreigners to take advantage of our labour will be less. If we make them better educated and if we provide healthier conditions, they will be able to stay here and not be induced to go abroad. So my humble suggestion to Government is that instead of relying more on this measure, they should take positive steps to ameliorate the conditions of labour here so that they will not be induced, ordinarily or otherwise, to go to foreign countries. With these observations, I support the Bill.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): The Bill deals with a problem of considerable importance to Indians who are emigrants and to other persons who come to India and reside here. One of my hon. friends has given us some idea as to how emigration from this country began long ago. What was known as indentured labour was a problem which arose on account of the emigration policy pursued in British days. The British in their colonial expansion desired to bring under cultivation and use for industrial purposes many of

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

their lands which were spread out. So they wanted to recruit suitable labour for work in those lands. For example, most of the lands in Ceylon are under cultivation, tea, rubber and other things, are cultivated by the help of Indian labour. Various measures were taken in those days through the instrumentality of the Government of India itself by the foreign people who wanted to make these experiments in plantations there. So Indian labour was induced to go there. There used to be a good deal of correspondence; certain agreements also used to be made in those days. In that way indentured labour came into existence. Even in our country, labour is sent from one province to another, for example, to places like Assam for a similar purpose. But that type of problem is not covered by the Bill and I do not therefore wish to say anything about it.

Things went on like that. For some time, they were governed by some kind of understanding between the Government and these industrialists or the governments which were taking them, as to what should be their position. Sometimes this was reduced to regular agreements; sometimes it was in the form of correspondence in which these conditions were mentioned. Now, after the colonial governments in those parts ceased to exist, the problem became really very serious. I refer particularly to conditions in Ceylon. The question as to what should be the conditions of work of the labour was a matter of discussion between the Governments of India and Ceylon for a long time. Some kind of understanding was likely to be arrived at. Later on, Ceylon became a self-governing country like India. After that, what has happened is that the Ceylon authorities do not recognise all those conditions under which the labour force was taken there as binding upon them. They insisted that these people, i.e., the emigrants, should

be entirely under their exclusive jurisdiction in their constitution.

Now they are treating all the Indians who are there as landless people, people who do not have any rights. That is the main trouble. There are 7—8 lakh of such people in their plantations. The Ceylon Government do not want to make them citizens of Ceylon except under certain very stringent conditions which it is impossible for them to comply with. Out of thousands of people who applied for Ceylon citizenship, only a few hundred applications have been sanctioned and the rest turned down. That is the position. Out of the 7 lakhs of persons, I am sure hardly a lakh of people have been considered as having any right of citizenship in Ceylon. The remaining are there as stateless people.

The matter has been under discussion between the two Governments. Recently I was delighted to know that some proposals had been sent by the Government of Ceylon for the consideration of the Government of India for determining the status of the Indian immigrants who are there. I thought the hon. Minister would take the opportunity of this Hill to explain what those new proposals are and how as a result of those new proposals the Government of Ceylon proposes to better the conditions of these labourers in the plantations who have been there not for decades but for generations.

I concede one point, namely that in 1948 we made a law prohibiting all labour from India to go out to other countries by sea or by land. So, any labourers who have gone after that stand on a different footing, but the other labourers, most of them, have been born in Ceylon and have been living there. There is some kind of racial feeling, and a party of the Ceylonese is determined, so far as I know, to see that not a single Indian remains there as an citizen with an honourable profession to follow. They want that most of them should go

back to India, but in India we do not recognise them as our citizens. So, a large number of them are without any rights. They are not allowed to be citizens of Ceylon, nor are we able to admit them as citizens here.

This Bill does not deal with that problem in any way, but problems like that exist not only in Ceylon, but also in Burma in a somewhat different form. The economy of India, particularly in Madras State and certain other parts, depended to a great extent on the money sent by these people in Ceylon and Burma to their dependants in India. The policy adopted by Ceylon and Burma is to stop those remittances coming into this country. These are all problems very seriously connected with the economic position of those people and their rights also.

Under the Bill certain powers are being taken by the Government of India, but the real problem of Indians abroad and emigration does not end by passing this law here. Something more has to be done, and I have taken advantage of this opportunity to bring forcibly to the notice of the Minister the matter of the labourers living in Ceylon, Burma, Malaya and some other countries, who had gone there on the clear understanding before 1948 that if they remained there it would be as citizens, or they could come back. All those things have gone now. In Ceylon except those Indians who have been in Jaffna as Tamils for a long time, they have no rights. That is the position taken there. Why should these Indians be adversely affected?

I only wanted to bring to the notice of the Government of India the serious position of Indians there, and the attitude of those Governments in spite of relations of cordiality, friendship and intimate connections which India has with them. These Indians have really helped Ceylon and all these countries to come to a higher point of prosperity which they enjoy today. When Ceylon represented its case for independence, it stated that so much was its population, which contained 10 lakhs

Indians also, and pointed out the importance of the country and the progress they had made, a progress to which the largest contribution had been made by the Indian labourers, industrialists and traders. All those reasons by virtue of which they were able to get their independence are now clearly overlooked by them, and they only stand by their right as a sovereign people to make such laws as they like for their own people. Ceylon for Ceylonese has become the motto there. I am not here to criticise them, but they should have been willing and ready to absorb all those Indians who were there before 1948. My humble submission to the Government of India is that when they consider the new proposals, an attempt should be made not only to maintain cordial relations but to secure certain guarantees for these people who morally are justified in asking to be absorbed in Ceylon as natural citizens.

These are the only considerations which I wanted to bring to the notice of the Government. Otherwise, I support the Bill.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): On going through the Bill I felt I had to express myself on a few aspects of the problem.

There was a time when our people could go unchecked and unhampered anywhere they liked out of the country. Later, the then British Government also moved in the matter, and put some checks. Today I feel the time has come when the entire question should be gone into *de novo*.

Having seen some of the countries abroad, the first question I would like to raise is whether we can afford to send our skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled labour outside. Secondly, if at all we are superfluous in these categories, we should see where we are

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf]

sending them. Government should enter into agreements with the governments of the other countries where these people want to go. Today, when our people go to other countries for service, taking up jobs or any other work, sometimes they not only do not get the jobs, but the way they are treated is humiliating.

Therefore, firstly, when our country itself is making such rapid strides in all round development, we have to see whether we should allow them to go out at all. Secondly, our Government should make a proper survey to find out which are the parts or areas from where they still want to emigrate to other countries. Thirdly, if they go out at all, Government should take upon itself the responsibility of seeing to it that where they go they are looked after well. As our friend pointed out, restrictions are put on their sending remittances to their dependants here in India. We have to see that such restrictions are not there, that they have proper living and service conditions. Then alone they should be permitted. Merely placing restrictions on going by air or sea or road would not help in the manner we want. Therefore, my submission is that this Bill, at the moment, is all right. I should certainly welcome this Bill being passed, but my feeling is emigration has got national honour involved in it. I would mention that this concerns not only skilled and semi-skilled labour, but others also. For instance, in Punjab a number of rack-ets came to light. Hundreds of families were coming and going this way and that way. A number of things happened. Therefore, Government should see which of the elements, which of the sections of the people, which of the parties, which of the skilled or semi-skilled labourers should be permitted to go to other countries on the conditions which I have already explained. I certainly welcome this Bill at the moment which is intended to check the flow of labour.

14 hrs.

I would like the whole question to be gone into. Firstly, there is the question of taking a survey. Then, there is the question whether we have surplus labour, skilled and semi-skilled. And then we must see from which part of the country we can get the labour. I know in a number of cases that there is scarcity. In certain parts of the country there is paucity of skilled labour and also unskilled labour. I will quote an instance. In my State, there was a time, only 10 to 15 years ago, when there was an overflow of skilled labour in a particular art. Somehow, they began to get some work within this country, in Bombay, and gradually there was a flow of skilled labour, artisans to Bombay, from that part of the country. After ten years, what has happened is that in their home State, within the country, they have lost that are altogether. Therefore, the Government should look into this question and see whether there are enough jobs elsewhere, whether the living conditions are good, whether sanitation and health needs are proper, etc. After that, we must see whether they are in a position to remit their earnings in foreign exchange or see other legal ways to their dependants in this country. Keeping in view all these things, we must proceed, and see that their number is restricted, semi-skilled and skilled. With these few words, I support this Bill. I would like the hon. Minister to enlighten us on these points.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when I read this Bill I find that the amendment will not solve the problem which it seeks to solve. What we are doing by this amendment is merely extending certain provisions and enhancing the punishment for unlawful emigration. My submission is that the original Act of 1922 requires drastic modification or repeal. For instance, now, in section 2(1) (c), as against the definition of "emigrate" and "emigration" which means "the departure by

sea out of India", we are adding "air". But what is emigration really? It says "any person who departs under an agreement to work for hire in any country beyond the limits of India...." Again, "any person who is assisted to depart, otherwise than by a relative, if he departs, for the purpose of with the intention of working for hire or engaging in agriculture in any country beyond the limits of India". This Act of 1922 was an Act which in no way brought credit to India. That provided for indentured labour; the British when they were here, in order to rehabilitate their own colonies abroad, sent labour from India called indentured labour. So long as section 2 remains on the statute-book, I submit that it does not enhance our prestige. Why should there be any agreement with any of the countries to take our labour or hire our labour from here? May I ask, in all humility, whether there is any such Act in any other independent country where the people of another country can hire or take labour from that country on their own conditions? What we are doing by amending this Act is this: we are only enhancing the punishment, and omitting the word "Indian" and the old Emigration Act remains as it is. So, my submission is that the Government should reconsider the provisions. Insertion of the words "such other ports and such airports" etc., will not solve the problem so long as section 2(1)(c) remains as it is. It should be the Government who should, at the request of any other Government, send their skilled or unskilled labour abroad if our conditions are acceded to. The indentured labour was used by the British and that still remains. My submission is that the main Act of 1922, namely, the Emigration Act of India, was a slur on our honour and it is remaining in spite of this amendment. I would request the hon. Minister to consider this in that light. Why should we still be prepared to allow our labour to go abroad as indentured labour or hired labour for the period specified and then allow them to remain there at the sweet will of the

other country? It should be the Government of India's duty not to let our people go abroad. The laws should be such as to dissuade the people to go. The very fight of Gandhiji began in Africa because of indentured labour. We should consider this measure in that light. The amendment that we are seeking to make, namely, a harder sentence for unlawful emigration, will not solve or remove the blackest spot on our honour which has been put upon us by the Act of 1922.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, many of the comments made do not relate to the Bill at all, because the Bill is very much restricted in its scope. It does not deal with Indians abroad, or with the Stateless persons in Ceylon or with Indians who are in Burma and who are prevented from sending remittances to their families here, nor does it take into consideration the discrimination shown to Indian settlers abroad as in South Africa. It is a fact that under colonial rule, a large number of Indians unskilled labour—was taken abroad for developing the colonies, and this left behind problems for us which we have not been able to solve successfully. Dr. M. S. Aney referred to Stateless persons in Ceylon. It is a fact that large numbers of people, of Indian origin, have settled abroad and they do not enjoy the right of citizenship, but these things are not related to this Bill. They are considered at the proper levels, diplomatic and otherwise, and we hope that those problems will be solved on a day.

As far as the present Bill is concerned, as I have said in my opening remarks, it deals with two or three specific problems the solution of which is found necessary in order to make the implementation of the measure more effective. I was very pained that one of the hon. Members should have said that the implementation of the original Bill was made impossible because of the influence of certain individuals with the Government, etc. It is very wrong to attribute motives like

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon]

that. The Government tries its best to see that the enactments are properly implemented. The working of the first Emigration Act has shown that because of certain technological developments and developments in the means of communication certain changes had to be made in order to make the Bill effective.

Most of the Members seem to be confused or they did not care to understand what I said in the beginning. As far as unskilled labour is concerned there is a total ban on it. Why did we put this ban on unskilled labour? Because it is unskilled labour; that is likely to be exploited. They are ignorant, they do not have any special skill, their utility is limited and they can be easily exploited. Therefore, in their case it has been totally banned and by 1941 there was no possibility of any unskilled labour getting out of India except through illicit means. And, this has been so. The number of illicit emigrants who have been in Ceylon and who have been repatriated to India is well known to us. We have found that it was difficult to put a stop to illicit emigration to Ceylon because the existing law did not provide for punishment which would prevent such illicit emigration. It is true that large numbers of people leave the country.

Shri Yallamanda Reddy: Sir, on a point of information, I would like to ask whether the hon. Minister means to say that only because of a lacuna in the Act these people have illicitly migrated to other countries? We want to know whether any cases were instituted and, if so, what punishments were given?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: According to the present law we cannot confiscate the vessels or the craft and the means that they use to send people abroad. The result is that even if we get to know about gangs that are operating we find that it is difficult to deprive them of the means by which they make illicit emigration

possible. From time to time we have had reports from Madras saying that under the existing law it is not possible to prevent it because as long as they have their country crafts and steam launches it is not possible to prevent or stop illicit emigration. That is why we find here that the punishment is made a little more deterrent by giving power to the Government to confiscate the means by which illicit emigration is encouraged.

An hon. Member referred to the fact that section 3 and section 4 of the original Act dealing with the appointment of advisory boards and agents were not implemented. It is not necessary now, because the Protector of Emigrants now get proper reports from our Missions abroad about the state of Indian nationals who are in employment or who have migrated. Therefore, it is easy for us to deal with them directly and more authoritatively than by appointing an agent over whom we may not have adequate control.

Some hon. Members mentioned about emigration of skilled labour. The last but one speaker mentioned about emigration of skilled labour. Emigration by any man today is not possible because every Government has laid down its restrictions regarding immigration into its country. For instance, some of the countries prescribe quotas. Only a particular number of our nationals can emigrate, for instance, to Canada or the United States. The restrictions are sufficiently difficult so that it is not possible for anybody to go everywhere as it was possible in the early decades when there were no passports, no travel documents, etc. Therefore, we cannot encourage emigration into other countries except according to the agreements that already exist between India and the other countries.

With regard to skilled labour it is very easy because no skilled person can go out of the country unless the

Government is satisfied that the agreement executed by the person concerned and the Government or the agency which employs him is satisfactory and the necessary guarantees are given so that his salary is protected and remittances to his family are assured. Only when all these things are assured a skilled person is allowed to emigrate. We do not have any problem as far as skilled labour, technicians or trained persons are concerned. The difficulty is only with regard to unskilled labour or illicit emigrants.

For instance, the House will remember, sometime ago we had a reference to the way our female labour is treated in Kuwait. There we find that there are gangs operating which take these people by air saying that they could be or were employed as servants. There is no provision to check them when they go by air. Now, this amending Bill enables us to take sufficiently strict measures to see that people are not taken by air under such false pretexts.

So, Sir, the scope of the Bill is very limited. The fact that no amendment has been moved shows that nothing objectionable or anything adverse is there to the amendments that are proposed by the Government in the amending Bill. It is true that we can make a more effective Bill, as suggested by the Members, by having more deterrent punishments. We will have to see how the amended Bill works, and if more changes have to be brought about, of course, it can be done.

Mention was made about emigration of labour from one region to another. That is not covered by this Bill. One hon. Member mentioned about the British Immigration Act and wanted to know how that would affect our emigration problem. As regards the effect of the United Kingdom Commonwealth Immigration Act is concerned, the Act is generally designed to control and restrict entry into the United Kingdom of Commonwealth citizens who seek employment

there. So it really is not a problem of emigration for us, and when Indian nationals go there, of course, they have to conform to certain procedures laid down under the Immigration Act. We are watching to see whether it will affect our nationals adversely, and if anything affects our nationals adversely certainly we will take adequate measures to see that it does not affect our nationals adversely.

Sir, there is nothing more to add except that I am very grateful to all the hon. Members for supporting this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Emigration Act, 1922, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are no amendments. The question is:

“That clauses 2 to 17 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 17 were added to the Bill.

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

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, I move:

“That the Bill be passed”.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill be passed”.

The motion was adopted.

14.18 hrs.

IRON ORE MINES LABOUR
WELFARE CESS (AMENDMENT)
BILL

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour and Employment (Shri