

TARIFF COMMISSION REPORT re: CALCIUM LACTATE AND GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION THEREON.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following papers, under sub-section (2) of Section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951:

- (i) Report of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Calcium Lactate Industry, 1953.
- (ii) Ministry of Commerce and Industry Resolution No. 8(5)-T.B./53, dated the 31st October, 1953.
- (iii) Corrigendum No. 8(5)-T.B./53, dated the 7th November, 1953, to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry Resolution referred to at (ii) above.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-157/53.]

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1950, and the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and to make certain consequential amendments in the Government of Part C States Act, 1951, be further extended upto Tuesday, the 1st December, 1953."

I may say, Sir, that the Select Committee has practically finished its deliberations. We are going to have a meeting early next week for the purpose of finalising the report and it may be possible to present the report even before the 1st December. We are giving some time to hon. Members who may wish to present dissenting notes.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1950, and the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and to make certain consequential amendments in the Government of Part C States Act, 1951, be further extended upto Tuesday, the 1st December, 1953."

The motion was adopted.

COIR INDUSTRY BILL.—Concl'd.

Clause 12. (Control of export, etc.)

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): I beg to move:

In page 4, lines 42 to 44,

for "No coir yarn or coir products shall be exported otherwise than under a general or special authorisation granted by the Board in the prescribed manner"

substitute "No coir fibre, coir yarn or coir products shall be exported otherwise than under a license issued by or on behalf of the Board in the prescribed manner".

We had previously included only coir yarn or coir products, but now we have added coir fibre also.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

In page 4, lines 42 to 44.

for "No coir yarn or coir products shall be exported otherwise than under a general or special authorisation granted by the Board in the prescribed manner"

substitute "No coir fibre, coir yarn or coir products shall be exported otherwise than under a license issued by or on behalf of the Board in the prescribed manner".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 12, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 12, as amended, was added to the Bill.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Clause 13.— (*Imposition of a duty, etc.*).

Shri Karmarkar: I beg to move:

In page 5, for lines 12 to 17 substitute:

"13. *Imposition of a duty of customs on export of coir fibre, coir yarn and coir products.*—(1) With effect from such date as may be specified by the Central Government by notification in the Official Gazette, there shall be levied and collected as a cess for the purposes of this Act a duty of customs on all coir fibre, coir yarn and coir products which are exported, at such rate not exceeding one rupee per hundredweight as the Central Government may, by the same or a like notification from time to time, fix."

This amendment ensures that the levy of excise duty will be made only from the dates specified in the official notification. This has been done to avoid sudden imposition of the levy, which may otherwise be injurious to the trade.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 5, for lines 12 to 17 substitute:

"13. *Imposition of a duty of customs on export of coir fibre, coir yarn and coir products.*—(1) With effect from such date as may be specified by the Central Government by notification in the Official Gazette, there shall be levied and collected as a cess for the purposes of this Act a duty

of customs on all coir fibre, coir yarn and coir products which are exported, at such rate not exceeding one rupee per hundredweight as the Central Government may, by the same or a like notification from time to time, fix."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 13, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 13, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 14 to 16 were added to the Bill.

Clause 17.—(*Accounts and Audit*)

Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottal): (I beg to move:

In page 5, for clause 17 substitute:

"17. *Accounts and Audit.*—(1)

The Board shall maintain proper accounts of the receipts and expenditure and relevant records, and prepare an annual statement of accounts in such form as may be prescribed by the Central Government in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General of India

(2) The accounts of the Board shall be audited annually by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India and the expenditure incurred by him in this behalf shall be payable by the Board to the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

(3) The accounts of the Board as certified by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India or by any other person appointed by him in this behalf together with the audit report

thereon shall be forwarded annually to the Central Government, and that Government shall cause the same to be laid before the House of the People."

The provision in the Bill relates to accounts and audit. It is said in clause 17(2):

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

I submit that the appointment of the auditors by the Government is totally against the provisions of the Constitution. Since the advent of the Constitution, greater and greater importance is being paid by Government itself, on the recommendations of the P.A.C., to the fact that the control of Parliament over the money expended and drawn from the Consolidated Fund must be regularised and must be strict.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): May I interrupt the hon. Member and say that I would be prepared to accept sub-clause (3) of his amendment to be added as sub-clause (4) of clause 17?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as the maintenance of accounts is concerned, is it not provided under the rules?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Yes, Sir. So far as certifying of the accounts and placing them before the House is concerned, there is a particular clause referring to it in the Bill. I am, however, prepared to accept my friend's amendment. Sub-clause (3), to stand as sub-clause (4).

Shri Vallatharas: In substance, the other two parts of my amendment may be the same as the clause as it stands, but there is one point which I wish to submit. The hon. Finance

Minister has been pleased to bring to a normal form the provision for the audit and that form has been observed in the Air Corporations Act and the Rehabilitation Finance Administration Act. I am merely transferring Section 15 of that Act here, so that a uniform practice may be adopted.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I think it will serve the purpose of my hon. friend if I accept the last portion of his amendment. It will ensure a certificate by the Auditor-General and the placing of the accounts before the House. This is essentially what he wants.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He also wants that the accounts should be maintained in such form as may be prescribed by the Central Government in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. But is there not provision for prescribing the form of accounts? I thought it is contained in clause 26(f). Will it not satisfy him?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Besides, if the Auditor-General has to certify the accounts, naturally he will lay down the conditions under which the accounts should be maintained.

Shri Vallatharas: I accept that, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, I omit the first two parts of the hon. Member's amendment and put only the third part.

The question is:

In page 5,

in clause 17, add the following as sub-clause (4):

"(4) The accounts of the Board as certified by the Comptroller, Auditor General of India or by any other person appointed by him in this behalf together with the audit report thereon shall be forwarded annually to the Central Government, and that Government shall cause the same to be laid before the House of the People."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

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

Clause 18 was added to the Bill.

Clause 19.—(Report and returns)

Shri Karmarkar: I beg to move:

In page 6, for lines 12 to 15 substitute:

"19. *Report and returns.*—(1) The Board shall submit to the Central Government and such other authority as may be prescribed, a half yearly report in every six months and an annual report in every year on its activities and the working of this Act for the preceding six months and the preceding year respectively; and a copy of every such report shall, as soon as may be after it is received by the Central Government, be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

I would like to propose an omission in this amendment, viz. the words "in every six months" and "in every year". "Half yearly report in every six months" and "annual report in every year" is likely to create confusion. A half yearly report is for every six months and it has to come within the next six months. So, I request that the words "in every six months" and "in every year" may be deleted. These words are redundant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can give an additional argument for the omission, which is that a report may be given before six months also

Shri Karmarkar: I appreciate it, Sir.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Qullon cum Mavelikkara): If you omit the words "in every six months" and the report is not submitted within six

months, what is the good of this provision? If it is submitted after six months, then it is no half-yearly report.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): What is the guarantee that the report for a half year may not be submitted after two years? So, the words "in every six months" should be there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the words "within six months" will be all right—"a half yearly report within six months".

Shri Karmarkar: I submit very respectfully that it is not necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: An hon. Member has pointed out that it may take a number of years to submit a half yearly report. What is the harm in making it specific?

Shri Karmarkar: I submit that this House is vigilant and no half year can pass without a report. "Within the six months after the half-year is over" might have a damaging effect, namely, that the tendency will be to observe the spirit of the law and submit the report after five months and 29 days are gone. I have, however, no objection. Naturally we would expect every half-yearly report to come within a reasonable time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Within the next six months—will this be better? I think so, and in the case of the annual report it will be "within the next year". But even this does not seem to be necessary when we come to the latter part of the sentence "and the working of this Act for the preceding six months and the preceding year respectively". Here again, there is a danger because it speaks of the immediately preceding six months or year. What will happen if one whole year is left out? Anyhow, I will put the amendment to vote, deleting the words "in every six months" and "in every year".

The question is:

In page 6, for lines 12 to 15 substitute:

"19. Report and returns.—(1)
The Board shall submit to the Central Government and such other authority as may be prescribed, a half yearly report and an annual report on its activities and the working of this Act for the preceding six months and the preceding year respectively; and a copy of every such report shall, as soon as may be after it is received by the Central Government, be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Next amendment—Shri Ramaswamy is absent.

Shri S. V Ramaswamy (Salem): I am here, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member ought not to have been away from his seat.

The question is:

"That clause 19, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 19, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 20.— (Penalties)

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (My sore): I beg to move:

In page 6, line 22, for "five hundred" substitute "one thousand".

"This is not a very substantial amendment. The purpose of it is to make the penalty more effective. If you read clause 12, you will find that "No coir yarn or coir products shall be exported otherwise than under a general or special authorisation granted by the Board...". Sir, if you leave the provision as it is, it can only prevent small exports, but so

far as the big exports are concerned, it will be ineffective. So, I want to raise the penalty from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,000. This is a very minor amendment and my only purpose is to make the penalty more effective. I hope the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry will accept it and I appeal to him again that there is no other purpose beyond preventing more effectively the illegal exports of coir products.

Shri Karmarkar: In addition to the provision here, we have other powers under the import and export regulations to debar such wrongful export. The present provision, in our opinion, is sufficient.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does he desire to press his amendment?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I wish to press it, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 6, line 22, for "five hundred" substitute "one thousand".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 20 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 20 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 21 to 25 were added to the Bill.

Clause 26.—(Power of Central Government to make rules.)

Shri Karmarkar: I beg to move:

In page 8, for lines 8 to 10, substitute:

"(k) The registration of coir spindles and looms for the manufacture of coir products as also the registration of manufacturers of coir products, and the conditions for such registration; the grant or issue of licences under this Act; the fees to be

[Shri Karmarkar]

levied in respect of such registration and licences; and the suspension and cancellation of such registration and licences;"

The amended clause extends the rule-making power of the Government to registration of coir spindles and looms as also to registration of manufacturers of coir products and also to suspension and cancellation of such registrations and licences.

Ms. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 8, for lines 8 to 10, substitute:

"(k) The registration of coir spindles and looms for the manufacture of coir products as also the registration of manufacturers of coir products and the conditions for such registration; the grant or issue of licences under this Act; the fees to be levied in respect of such registration and licences; and the suspension and cancellation of such registration and licences;"

The motion was adopted.

Amendments made:

(i) In page 8, line 11,

for "licences and authorisations" substitute "registration licences".

(ii) In page 8, after line 16, insert:

"(3) All rules made under this Act shall as soon as they are made be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

—[Shri Karmarkar]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 26, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 26, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 27 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Long Title

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now the Long Title. Does Shri Sharma desire to move his amendment?

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): I am not moving, Sir.

Shri Madiah Gowda (Bangalore South): I beg to move:

In the Long Title,

after "control" insert "and development".

Shri Karmarkar: We have no objection.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: May I make a suggestion, Sir? All we have done is to follow the language of item 52 of Schedule 7, List I. If we add anything more, we shall be going beyond this item, which says:

"Industries, the control of which by the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest."

I think it is safer to stick to the wording of the Constitution whatever our ideas may be as to the meaning of control—whether it means development and something else also.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): In clause 10 it is stated that "It shall be the duty of the Board to promote by such measures as it thinks fit the development under the control of the Central Government of the Coir Industry."

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The Preamble is just for the Parliament to take power to enact legislation and naturally that ought to follow the language of item 52.

Shri A. M. Thomas: The Preamble merely says, control, but what you really mention in the body is control and development.

Shri Madiah Gowda: May I take it that my amendment is accepted?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not making any heavy weather of it. I am merely suggesting that this is the pattern that we follow and we are sticking to the wording of the Constitution. If the Chair feels that some other wording should be used, we have no objection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have no say in the matter. I leave it to the House to decide. All that was pointed out was that while the word "control" is used in the Long Title, in the body of the Bill the word used is "development." When that is so why should Government be shy of using it in the Preamble? That the Constitution does not say so, I personally do not think is an argument. However, it is for the House to accept or not to accept the amendment.

Shri Madiah Gowda: In the body of the Bill it is made clear that the measure is for the development of the industry.

Shri D. C. Sharma: May I make an observation, Sir? When I said that the Bill should be named as the Coir Development Bill I had more the psychological reasons than the verbal reasons in mind. When I take up any newspaper I find that people make a great deal of noise whenever anything is decontrolled. The word "control" has come to have a very very bad odour, so far as Indian economy is concerned. When you talk of controlling anything it means that that thing is going to be finished almost, or that thing is going to be put under some kind of discipline which will not be conducive to its growth. So, taking the psychological aspect of the question into consideration, I think the proper word to be used will be "development".

Sir, I have gone through the Statement of Objects and Reasons as also the clauses of the Bill and I find that it is very heavily weighted on the side of development and not on the side of control. There is only one clause in which it is said that those people who produce some kinds of coir articles will be controlled and

they will be licensed. Otherwise, I think the whole purpose of this Bill is to develop the industry and not to control it. Sir, I think if you have a baby you should give the right kind of name to him. This is a very good baby and you should give...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Many a man who is called a "Sundara" does not deserve that appellation at all!

Shri D. C. Sharma: But I think this is something beautiful. The purpose of this measure is to put the coir industry on a sound financial footing, to make it a source of dollar income, and to bring us good money from abroad. But I find that the Bill is called the Coir Control Bill. I suggest that in place of the word 'control' the word 'development' should be used. Though both the words imply regulation, if you have an omnibus word like development, it implies both advancement and regulation.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister in all humility and in all sincerity that he should change the title of the Bill and call it the Coir Development Bill.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I am afraid, Sir, that if at this stage I make a very long speech, the hon. the Commerce Minister may perhaps say as he said yesterday about an hon. Member who had tabled an amendment that he wanted to speak for the sake of speaking. I have to bring to the notice of the House certain very important matters which have not been discussed in connection with this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not now in the third reading stage.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Sir, I have tabled an amendment which seeks to substitute the words "and development" after the word "control" in the title.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That was moved by Shri Madiah Gowda.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I have also some justification...

Shri A. M. Thomas: The hon. the Mover of the Bill was prepared to accept it.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That does not matter. It is on my amendment that I speak and I want to say something that was not discussed in the House. I must be given an opportunity to say why I have moved this amendment. Do I not get that opportunity?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can go on: I cannot decide at once.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Sir, certain aspects of this industry have not been taken into consideration by Government. If they had taken into consideration certain aspects about which I shall presently say something, then, there was no need for my amendment. It would not have been necessary at all to move such an amendment and ask for the substitution of the word "control" by the word "development".

I say, Sir, that Government has not understood the exact position of the industry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid the hon. Member is going too long and too far beyond the title.

Shri V. P. Nayar: The title is long—it is called the long title.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Development is a word which has already been used in the body of the Bill and there are provisions regarding development. Therefore I would allow the amendment seeking to substitute the word "control" by the word "development". But in a discussion on the long title the hon. member cannot say that a number of things have been overlooked and provision has not been made for them in the Bill.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Sir, it is at this stage where I can draw the attention of the House to certain serious omissions on the part of Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry the hon. Member must have said that on the motion for consideration.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That is exactly why I say so now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has lost his opportunity.

Shri V. P. Nayar: On the motion for consideration I cannot discuss the merits of the various provisions. I might particularly mention that in the reply of the hon. Minister he did not care to touch a single point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot allow him to speak on the long title. Various matters may be relevant at various stages, but this is not the stage.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I want to know whether I will be precluded from speaking at the time of the third reading?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me see what he is going to say—whether it is relevant.

The question is:

In the Long Title, after "control" insert "and development".

The motion was negatived.

Shri A. M. Thomas: The hon. Minister said at an earlier stage that he would accept the amendment.

Shri Karmarkar: That showed my anxiety to accommodate my friends; but on going through it carefully I found I could not accept it.

Shri A. M. Thomas: But his senior colleague was not against the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not a point of order; the same hon. Member may change his mind.

The question is:

"That the Title and the Enacting Formula stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri Karmarkar: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

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

Shri B. K. Das (Contai): Sir, In supporting the motion I beg to draw the attention of the hon. Minister that the area from which I come, the province of West Bengal, Assam and Orissa in the east of India are coconut growing areas. In undivided Bengal there was a large coconut plantation. Unfortunately we have lost a big portion of our coconut plantation. But the Coconut Committee has already taken up the case of West Bengal and they are trying to develop this plantation in West Bengal. So I desire that the hon. Minister while taking the Members of the Board will kindly keep in mind the case of West Bengal and other neighbouring provinces where there are large tracts of coconut plantation.

Another point to which I beg to refer is that the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry said that after setting matters right in Travancore-Cochin he is going to spread his tentacles to other provinces. I should think that he may not wait for so long a time, because this industry can be well developed as a cottage industry in Bengal and other neighbouring provinces. Of course we know that it is a very important industry in Travancore-Cochin and in the South. But if this industry is developed on a cottage industry basis, our province and other provinces such as Orissa and Assam will also be able to give a good account of themselves. In the face of the growing unemployment and other troubles before us I hope that the hon. Minister will see to it that this industry is developed in those provinces also. I think if proper care is taken in the working of the Bill and the Board is brought into

existence very soon, all these provinces will be much benefited.

With these words I support the motion.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Sir, at this stage I do not want to discuss all details because we have had a sufficient discussion on the various provisions. But I wanted to bring before the attention of the House certain very important points which have been left out by the Government.

The very approach made by the Government in respect of this coir industry, I beg to submit, has not been correct, as the various provisions of the Bill will show. The Government do not seem to have understood the position in which the coir industry is at present. You will remember, Sir, when I made the motion for sending the Bill to Select Committee I quoted figures after figures—because I know that my hon. friend Mr. Karmarkar is keen on figures, and out of his pockets he produces all sorts of figures—to show how the adverse trade balance in certain countries which used to take coir from us had further deteriorated owing to certain influences, that the coir industry itself had no inherent defect in it immediately to cause this crisis, and how the Government could tackle the question only if an approach is made from a different way. It is about that point that I wanted to submit a few words.

We find this in the Statement of Objects and Reasons: "With a view to controlling production, improving its quality, weeding out the undesirable elements in the export trade and developing the internal market so as to reduce the industry's dependence on exports, it is considered necessary to establish a Statutory Board". I submit that this way of tackling the problem has exceeded the limit of absurdity which even our planners should be ashamed of. What is the exact position of the industry? How are you going to get internal markets? Every day we find reports in the papers about our food position and

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

Shri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai talks to people here in this country that there is a surplus of food now, because the purchasing power of the people has so much deteriorated that it is not possible for them even to purchase their rations. So says Dr. P. S. Deshmukh. So says Shri M. V. Krishnappa. When the people on the one hand do not have enough money to purchase their rations or to purchase their clothing how are you going to improve the internal sales of coir mats (very costly things) in such a time as to prevent the industry from getting into a worse crisis?

And it is stated that another object is to weed out certain undesirable elements. I put it to the hon. Minister: Who are those persons who are considered to be undesirable elements? I submit to you that there are certain undesirable elements with whom, of course, the Government has only sympathy. The coir industry is in the grip of certain monopolists. There are very big firms—Volkart Brothers, Bombay Company, Pierce, Leslie & Company, Aspinwal, William Goodacre. Out of about 500, a hundred are called big factories and the entire production is controlled by foreign firms. If you analyse the total export—I very much wish that Mr. Karmarkar will give me some figures about that—I know that 80 per cent...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Was not all this said in the consideration stage?

Shri V. P. Nayar: Not at all, Sir, and the hon. Minister did not have the courtesy to reply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no question of courtesy. Enough has been said about foreign interests having a monopoly.

Shri V. P. Nayar: What I say is that undesirable elements there are, I admit. But it is this foreign element which is undesirable. I put it to him whether he is prepared to do away with these undesirable elements. What is the object of forming a Board? Is he going to give a guarantee to

us here that the moment the Board functions he shall confiscate all British capital in this industry? Then I am one with him and all my support is with him. But that is not what he wants.

Probably he thinks there are middle men. There are middle men, not hundreds but thousands. You have to provide them with something. It is not a question of middle men being undesirable elements. The most undesirable elements which you can think of in the case of this industry are the British capitalists whom you allow to operate here to the very serious detriment of our people. They suck the blood of our people and you say you have mercies for them. It was last year during the Commerce debate that the hon. Minister said that those British firms know how to avoid tax but they do not evade tax. Government has a very great sympathy for these British capitalists. If the coir industry is to be set on a proper footing the first thing you have to do is to liquidate this foreign capital. You must take over all the factories from them and prevent them from exercising a grip over the coir industry with the result that hundreds of thousands of people are not having not only enough food but have to get on with a starvation diet.

The Labour Bureau of the Government collected certain statistics from which, you will be amazed to see that on this industry, even according to Government, five or six lakhs of people live. According to us 1.2 million people will be dependent in Travancore-Cochin and Malabar alone on this industry. In such a vital industry, an industry so vital to the life of Kerala, you find—it is not my figure but the Labour Bureau's—in one factory the average basic pay was 1 anna 11 pies and the average earnings 4 annas 3 pies. That is the unemployment position, in an industry on which 1 or 1½ million people depend.

The hon. Minister said when he made the motion that 75 to 80 per

cent. of the coir produced in this country is exported. That 75 per cent. which is exported fetches only about Rs. 10 crores. If you calculate, the value of the whole production will be about Rs. 12 or 12½ crores, on which will have to depend 1½ million people. It is less than Rs. 100 a year according to the government calculation while as a matter of fact it is much less. I do not think anywhere else in the world millions of people depend on an industry as they do on the coir industry, yet with such small income.

What is the Government going to do about it? It is not by setting up a Board. If you spend Rs. 12 lakhs on rehabilitating this industry in the way you contemplate now, it is just like putting a drop of scent into the ocean. There is not going to be any benefit out of it. That is why I said that the Government have not understood the problem. They have not cared to study the problem from the proper perspective in which they ought to have studied. These days they seem to be maniacal about setting up Boards. I know there is not a single Board which is functioning under the Commerce Ministry which can be styled as a Board which is existing for the purpose of improving the particular industry or trade. In this country, setting up of a Board has become an office of hiring. We all know that times out of number questions have been put on the floor of the House as to how offices are being misused in these quasi governmental organisations. I need not reiterate all that here.

There is also another aspect. They seem to think, that a certain quality control can help the coir industry. How, I ask? What is the chance of having quality control? Coir yarn is being spun in hundreds of thousands of houses. Is it possible by a Government notification to have quality specification in these thousands of houses? It is absolutely impossible. No Board can do it at all. If it is a question of mats and mattings, out of 525 factories, 100 factories are big factories, and British capital controls most of them. I was amused yesterday

when Shri Karmarkar, said that both the Thomases from Travancore-Cochin made very valuable contributions. Certainly, I am very happy that my hon. friends, especially those who come from my place get such compliments from the hon. Minister. But, I was reminded, when he said about two Thomases, about a third Thomas in our place. With your permission, Sir, I wish to say what it is about.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Another Thomas will be here in a day or two.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That would be a worse Thomas than the Thomas I am referring to.

There was one gentleman called Thomas. His father fixed a marriage in Quilon. He is living in a place called Pundara, a few miles from Quilon. Thomas the father, one day got up and said, my dear son, you must go to Quilon tomorrow. Thomas was so wise that he did not ask why. Next morning when the cock announced the day break, Thomas the son got up and immediately proceeded to Quilon on foot. At about 3 o'clock in the noon, Thomas the son came back. Then, the father asked, my dear son, where had you been. Then son said, I had been to Quilon. The father asked: why? The son said "Ah", that is the expression for "I do not know". That is exactly the way in which this Government has done things. People wanted the coir industry to be developed and they said, we must have a Board. Government now want to set up a Board. Why? Government also have to give the same expression 'Ah', we do not know what it is for. The fourth Thomas who will be coming here will be of the same type. I do not want to proceed further about that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But, this Government does not speak in Malayalam.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Though they want to speak, they cannot speak in Malayalam. There are so many peculiarities in Malayalam which it will be impossible for them to learn for some time.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Is the hon. Member giving a lecture on languages?

Shri V. P. Nayar: This is not a matter to be lightly discussed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All this would have been more appropriate on the clause relating to the constitution of the Board. The hon. Member could have said all this.

Shri V. P. Nayar: The whole point is, I was at a handicap, because I had sent a motion for reference of the Bill to the Select Committee and I was initiating the discussion. I wanted to be as brief as possible because I thought that the Minister will have the wisdom to accept the motion. In that case, the House would have been spared all this discussion. As a matter of fact, I was as precise as possible. I only wanted to impress upon the House the points for which reference to the Select Committee was necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that I am saying is that he could have said the same on the clause relating to the constitution of the Board. That is all.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That is not the only point about the Board, that upsets us. Then, he says there is the export trade. I was also very much amused because at the time when he was saying that, I was going through the speech of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari day before yesterday. In answer to Shri H. N. Mukerjee, this is what he said:

"If one is not convinced today and will not be convinced tomorrow or the day after or for many years to come, it means that he is determined not to be convinced. I am afraid we could not carry conviction to those people who will never be convinced."

I think that this is the best justice that Shri T. T. Krishnamachari has

done to himself. Times without number we have told him, this is the position you have to free trade from a particular bloc, and you have to send coir goods to other countries. Now, they say that this Government has made enquiries through proper trade channels. Even yesterday Shri Karmarkar said, if those parties, who must be honest business men do not want to send it to other countries, what are we going to do. That is exactly the point. These people, the British capitalists will never try to send these goods to other countries. Why should they? Because they know that the present Indian Government so long as it is in power, will shield them. They know that they will continue to have their monopoly. It is because of that that this Government is fighting shy and feeling reluctant to touch the British capitalists, who are so bad in this country. We can see with what clearness of vision, the Government approach the whole question. Later on, of course, they corrected themselves. They said that the first interest to be represented in the Coir Board was the interest of the coconut growers. Again, I am reminded of some story.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid the hon. Member is repeating only what all has been said at length during the discussion, and not anything new.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I have got before me the proceedings of yesterday. If you will be so good as to point out any repetition, I shall take my seat. I have been going through every detail.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Coconut growers are provided for; absence of special representation for labour is made up that way.

Shri V. P. Nayar: With great respect to the Chair, I submit that we use some of the words very often, the words 'and', 'is' etc.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. I am talking of the substance and not of form. The hon. Member may go on. There is no good spending time over

again on what has been said. Let him kindly bear that in mind.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Therefore I say, it is not a question of a Board being set up to avert the crisis. The industry is in its worst crisis. The hon. Commerce Minister does not perhaps know to what depth the crisis has now reached. If only you refer to the export figures, you will find that in 1952-53, you have exported more coir mats for lesser price: about 25 or 30 per cent less. Does the hon. Minister suggest that it is because of the absence of quality specification that the price is going down? Certainly not. Why should you hide things? Why don't you come out and say, it is because of the international situation? It is because other countries which used to buy coir from us are not in a position now to purchase more coir. It is not because our workers have overnight turned into very bad people. It is not because our factories started producing inferior quality or had raised the prices. It is because of other things. I submit, I reiterate that any approach of this Government to this problem, if it is to bear fruit, must start with confiscating the British capital which has so long been operating in this industry which has had a monopoly in the industry. Unless they do it, there is no question of this Board doing anything. It will only, as I said, be an office of hiring. I am reminded of how when various Members opposite showered praises on the Government and said, this is a good measure, we shall have it. There was an anxiety also which the hon. Minister very often wanted to make quite plain that he is not more keen to have this Bill than some of us. That is one of the reasons for which he opposed the motion for Select Committee. But, he knows what this measure will do.

Sir, I shall resume my seat with this comparison. When I heard the speeches of some hon. Members on the other side praising the Government for this Bill—not that I say that I do not want this Bill; we shall try our best; so far as the coir indus-

try is concerned, this is very innocuous—I was reminded of the story of six blind men going to see what an elephant was like. One man touched the ear and said that the elephant is like a fan. Some Members spoke about coir prices, including the hon. Minister. This reminds me of the story of those six blind men who went to see and have an idea about an elephant.

This is not the way in which we ought to help the industry to rehabilitate itself. We have to do certain other things, and unless the Government are more serious, I am afraid that this Coir Board will very shortly come up before this House for further discussion of certain matters like nepotism, graft, corruption and all those things.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): May I say a few words?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are there coconuts in Assam?

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Yes. That is what I was going to tell.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, this is the third reading.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I have nothing to say about the merits of the Bill. The Bill is already nearly passed. Only I want to say.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Coconuts are given as presents.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri:...that coconuts grow in plenty in Assam, and there is a saying in Assam that the monkeys do not understand the value of coconuts. The idea is this, that because the monkey would not be able to cut it like other fruits.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The monkey probably knows the coconut fibre. The fibre is the question here.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I am coming to the fibre question. The monkeys come and nip the buds, the practically speaking and eat them up while

[Shri R. K. Chaudhuri]

they are very tender, and that is how the husks do not come into existence.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are there monkeys also in Assam?

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Yes, there are monkeys in Assam. They are decent monkeys, they are not like monkeys of these other places. They do not cause harassments.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Are they monkeys or chimpanzees?

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I have made a vow that I won't speak lightly in this House, because the Members of the House laugh at my cost. That is why I was going to say something very seriously.

My point is this, that a lot of husk is being wasted in Assam. They come to no use because people do not know how to make proper use of it. The Government should give attention to Assam also where a large quantity of coconuts grow. There is room for expansion of coconut growing there. And furthermore, a large number of coconuts are imported from outside provinces, and the husks of those coconuts also go for nothing. Therefore, I wanted to draw the attention of the hon. Minister yesterday also to this aspect of the matter.

Then, as regards the working of the Board, I have to say a few words. I think it is not proper to have an official Chairman. I think that the meetings of the Board in which Members of Parliament are Members should be presided over by a Member of Parliament, and preferably by the Minister.

An hon. Member: Of which Party?

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Of any Party.

From my experience of the Central Silk Board, I know that it sits, if at

all, once a year, and it should not be difficult for the Minister to preside over the general meeting of the Board. And, therefore, although the law has been passed—the provision is there—I shall ask the Ministry to see that only the Minister or any Member of Parliament presides over the Board meetings.

Then, I also know from my experience of the Central Silk Board that the Standing Committees or the Executive Committees of the Board may be constituted even without a single Member of Parliament. I know the present Silk Board has not got a single Member of Parliament in the Executive Committee. This Committee has been functioning for more than a year now. It may be quite possible that as the majority of the Members of the Board are not Members of Parliament, they may not choose to select a Member of Parliament in the Standing Committee. Therefore, there should be some rule or something to the effect that at least one Member of Parliament should be a Member of the Executive Committee of the Board.

Then, I would also submit that if this Board is really going to function properly, there should be at least two or three sittings of the Board in the whole year, so that the Members may come and give their suggestions. In one sense the coir industry is more important than the silk industry, because the coir industry is now only beginning to grow. There is ample room in this country for expansion of the coir industry, and therefore, due weight should be given to the activities of this Board, and for that purpose, I submit, the Minister himself should preside over the Board meetings. In the Central Silk Board, a general meeting of the Board was called only this year in the month of November. Then it was adjourned to the 1st December. Then it has been adjourned again to 19th December. The plea is that the hon. Minister wants to be present at the meeting and as he will not be able to be pre-

sent on the particular date, the meeting has to be adjourned till the 19th December. I quite welcome the idea of the Minister presiding over the Silk Board. I therefore want the Ministry to follow that example. In order to let the Minister take an active interest in the working of the Board, the Minister should be the Chairman of this Board.

Shri Karmarkar: I will be brief, and particularly so as there are not many new points brought out in the course of the debate. I am sorry my friend, Mr. Nayar, is absent just now. That is one of the reasons also why I shall be brief in dealing with the temperamental aspect of what he said.

We on this side of the House always take good care to see to it that we do not miss any important points arising out of the debate, but we also owe a duty to the House not to take its time to a longer extent than is absolutely necessary.

One point relevant I found in the observations of the hon. Member who so much complained over and over again that his points had been missed. That one point I briefly alluded to in the course of my reply earlier. And the point was he pointed out that our exports recently have fallen, and according to him the reason was that we did not try to push up these exports in a particular section of the world. I just referred to that in my earlier observations and said that so far as our exports are concerned, their destinations are not limited or controlled, and naturally we leave the question to the trade,—not only the trade here, but also the trade of the countries to which he referred. It is as much necessary for the importing countries to be anxious. Naturally, trade is always anxious, and if over a long period of time exports do not go to a particular country, the logical conclusion is that that particular country does not want that type of goods. But, this does
513 PSD.

not absolve the Government of all efforts possible to promote our exports in all directions. We have been trying to do that in the best manner possible.

In fact, the article he referred to was an article by way of analysis, and I am sure that, if for nothing else, for some information at least on which he based his arguments, he must be indebted to the article which he referred to. That mentions objectively the conditions in the various countries with a view that the concerned sections of the trade may benefit by it. For instance, one of the things it mentions is that in the United Kingdom there is no import duty on mats and mattings, but there are other factors, other material competing in the market. And we cannot complain with the world if the conditions are difficult. We have got to adjust ourselves to the situation and do the best that is possible in the situation. My hon. friend also knows that as compared with the last three years, both the value and the quantum of exports have gone down. We were afraid that it might continue to slide down. My hon. friend has given me a complement for carrying figures with me. I often have them with me, and it is rather discomforting to him, if I take out my figures, as soon as they are required, but I could not help the situation. Here are these figures. If during the 12 months from April 1950 to March 1951, our total value of exports was Rs. 7 crores and odd. in 1952-53, it was about Rs. 4 crores and odd. This is in respect of yarn. In respect of coir and coir products, if the value of exports in round figures was a little less than Rs. 11 crores in 1950-51, it was a little more than Rs. 7 crores in 1952-53.

Now, the reduction in the prices is naturally due to many causes beyond our control. Naturally, if a particular product is not required, then also the prices depreciate. If on account of the general fall in prices due to world conditions—which we do welcome in certain sectors, so far as our

[Shri Karmarkar]

imports are concerned—the prices fall in respect of our exports also, we cannot complain about such a change. If my hon. friend cares to look into the figures for the last six months from April to September 1953, he will find that if in April 1953, the export of coir and coir products was of the order of 87,000 cwts., in September, the figure has progressively risen through 110,000 cwts. and 118,000 cwts. to 125,000 cwts. If in the present circumstances of today, in spite of depression, our exports have gone up, it is certainly encouraging. In terms of value also, our exports have gone up from Rs. 47 lakhs and odd in April 1953, to Rs. 67 lakhs in June, and to Rs. 62,85,000 in September. I entirely agree with the hon. Member that the prices are not the same as they were, and that is precisely the reason why we should make greater efforts, firstly, for the proper development of this industry, and secondly for propagating exports. But certainly an unreasoned opposition to such a Bill as this, I should very respectfully add, is not one of the ways of promoting the coir industry itself. Ultimately, there are certain questions which have to be considered objectively. There are certain questions which form part of a platform. I have no complaints about parts of a platform, but when it comes purely to an economic measure like this, certainly, we have to view it objectively, whether under the circumstances prevailing, this industry ought to be controlled or not, whether a Board is necessary or not. My hon. friend is free to have his own estimates of these Boards, but we have another estimate and that is that these Boards are necessary. Naturally when any industry has to be controlled like the silk industry, we move with a little bit of caution. Now we feel that unless we take larger powers to control the industry, unless we vest the Board also with larger powers, the cause of the promotion of any particular industry will not be served. It is with that view that we have created this Board with fairly ample powers, reserving ample powers for

Government themselves to be able to control the Board in its activities.

My hon. friend in a lighter vein referred to many Thomas's, and I hope he would not worry, if I add another Thomas to the whole category. I knew of two Thomas's who took a reasonable view. I knew also of the traditional Thomas, who was a doubting Thomas. But I wish to say this, with absolutely very great respect for my hon. friend, that I have to meet a Thomas, who, when the Bill was in its earlier stages said that some Board is better than no Board, and who at the end of the debate said that no Board is better than some Board. I have to meet such a Thomas yet. I am afraid my hon. friend was not just meaning that when he said, but he was rather laying emphasis on the point with a view to coaxing us to better efforts, rather than seriously laying down that no Board is better than some Board as provided for in this Bill: for, ultimately, I am quite sure that he is as anxious—though, of course, in another manner—about the coir industry, its development and the promotion of coir products, as anybody else. I am quite sure that though in the debate itself, he alluded to considerations, which in my humble opinion, were rather irrelevant, for the purpose of this debate,—at least some of them were irrelevant—he is still as anxious as we, for the promotion and proper development of the coir industry and for the promotion of the exports. So far as his opinion is concerned, perhaps he belongs to that section which feels that it should never say a word about anything good that Government have done. I know there is a conventional section which believes that the moment they say anything good about what Government have done, that very moment Government will begin to sit back. But I am quite sure that when the hon. Member referred to these things, he was rather anxious that if any effort requires to be made for promotion of these exports in any direction of the world, then that effort should be made, and that all efforts for the proper promotion of the industry should not suffer from any laxity.

That is the rather very constructive meaning that I have been able to derive from the observations that he made.

Alluding to another point—my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar is happily present here now—which he made, I should like to say that we normally study the compliments given to us, naturally, with a little pleasure, but we study with particular care all that is said against us, and as is my usual practice, with reference to the observations falling from my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar, I carefully listened to the debate on the last occasion, and I had a note made of the points he had made. After he complained now also, I again referred to my notes, and I found that he has made precisely the same points so that I have no fresh points to answer. In fact, I should be abusing the liberties given to me by this House, if I were to go on controverting every little observation that he has made.

There was also another point that was made by my esteemed friend here from West Bengal and my esteemed old colleague—not old in the usual way, but old because he has been my colleague for a long time—Shri R. K. Chaudhuri. My hon. friend Shri R. K. Chaudhuri referred to Assam. I would like to say that this is at present a regional question, and the House will appreciate that this is rather a pressing question in the areas of Travancore-Cochin, Malabar, and that region, where, as I said yesterday, this problem is of extremely great economic importance. The economic importance of this industry is rather very heavy in that area. But I would be very happy, if owing to the efforts of my hon. friend Shri R. K. Chaudhuri Assam could be a little more active and people like my hon. friend get a little more active in that State. In Assam, as my hon. friend knows, land grows profuse crops, and that is one of the little difficulties why smaller industries are not coming up. There is not that amount of unemployed labour

there, as is easily and superfluously available in Travancore-Cochin. I am quite sure that when Government put into operation this measure, they will have in view not only Travancore-Cochin and Malabar, but also any area where coconut fibre can be turned into useful products. My hon. friend stated yesterday that we should look towards Assam also. But we shall look about it later, and when I say that, it is only a question of relativity in time. Ultimately we want to take over the whole industry as early as possible, and first, of course, comes the area which is very much giving us cause for anxiety, and is causing concern to all who are interested in the economic well-being of that part. But still, so far as the operation of the Bill is concerned, we have in our purview, the development of the coir industry as a whole, whether it is Ratnagiri, or West Bengal or Assam. But that does not mean that in order to have an industry prospering in Assam, there should be an Assamese Member in the Board: if two Ministers are here, who are able to look after the coir industry as a whole, even though they do not belong to Assam, I think it follows that an Assamese Member is not necessary.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I never said that.

Shri Karmarkar: You never said that. I am on the point that we cannot always satisfy the regional requirements, in the nominations to our Boards. If sometimes, it does happen that from a particular region, a Member is not nominated, it should not be misunderstood to mean that Government are less anxious about that particular area.

I have almost done, for there are no more real points for which I should take the time of the House. We are concerned with the working of the Board. I know some reference was made to keeping out undesirable

[Shri Karmarkar]

elements. There are so many undesirable elements, speculators, people who profiteer, etc. But there is a small element—I would not say undesirable element, but a very difficult element—which even in the case of measures which are good for the country beyond all reasonable doubt, still obstructs the work of the normal operation of Government's measures, which, it is very obvious on the very face of it, lead to the good of the country. I do not refer to any other undesirable element though there is certainly a section of that element in our country. So, we have to take care to see that we bring to the people the usefulness of the measure.

With these words, I appreciate very much the general tenor of the debate, including the rather carping observations my hon. friend made, which smelt of a little strong pepper—I should tell my hon. friend that I am a lover of pepper and very strong chillies—and also the other mild types of observations that he made, though in my humble opinion, they were not very relevant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

ANCIENT AND HISTORICAL
 MONUMENTS AND ARCHAEO-
 LOGICAL SITES AND REMAINS
 (DECLARATION OF NATIONAL
 IMPORTANCE) AMENDMENT
 BILL.

The Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Shri K. D. Malaviya): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Declaration of Na-

tional Importance) Act, 1951, as passed by the Council of States, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this is a very brief and more or less routine Bill which seeks to amend the list of ancient and historical monuments and archaeological sites and remains. As the House is aware, article 246 of the Constitution gives to Parliament exclusive power to make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List I in the Seventh Schedule. Item 67 of this Union List I of the Seventh Schedule deals with this subject which is under discussion here and for which I have moved this Bill. According to this, the Government must obtain the prior sanction of Parliament to declare any monument or historical remains and sites as objects of national importance and each historical monument or site which is to come under Government protection and care must receive the sanction of this Parliament. That is why this Bill is before the House.

This amendment Bill was first moved in the Council of States and since then Government have given consideration to some more monuments and sites and amendments to this effect are also before us. I have already given notice of these amendments and they will also be moved in due course. In the very nature of things, such a work of investigation and examination has become a continuous process. It has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that further additions to the Schedule to the 1951 Act are to be made due to the fact that some more monuments, sites and remains have to be declared as of national importance, and they always are under examination. Therefore, I hope, Sir, that this brief Bill will not take much of our time and the amendments that have been tabled will be dealt with summarily. With your permission, I will move the amendments also notice of which has been given by the Minister.