

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the hon. Members that I have received the following letter from Shri N. Sathianathan:—

"I am constrained to remain here for purposes of my treatment at least till the end of this month. I intend continuing my treatment till the end of this month and try to attend the session during the first week of December 1953.

For the above reason, the House was pleased to grant me permission to be absent from the House till the end of the last session.

I request the hon. Members of the House through you to extend the indulgence a little further, to grant me further permission to be absent from the House till the first week of December 1953."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri N. Sathianathan for remaining absent from all the meetings of the House till the end of the first week of December 1953?

Leave was granted

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

DELIMITATION COMMISSION, FINAL ORDER No. 2

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 9 of the Delimitation Commission Act, 1952, a copy of the Delimitation Commission, India, Final Order No. 2, dated the 15th September, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S—153/53]

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INDUSTRIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following papers in accordance with sub-section (3) of section 35 of the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948:—

- (i) Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Industrial Finance Corporation

of India on the working of the Corporation during the year ended the 30th June, 1953; and

- (ii) statement showing the assets and liabilities of the Corporation at the close of the year and the Profit and loss Account for the year.

[Placed in Library. See No. S—154/53]

HALF-YEARLY REPORT OF THE REHABILITATION FINANCE ADMINISTRATION

Shri A. C. Guha: I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Rehabilitation Finance Administration for the half-year ended the 30th June, 1953, in accordance with sub-section (2) of section 18 of the Rehabilitation Finance Administration Act, 1948. [See Appendix I annexure 37.]

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947".

The motion was adopted.

Shri Abid Ali: I introduce the Bill.

COIR INDUSTRY BILL—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up for consideration the Coir Industry Bill.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon cum Mavelikkara): I rise to support the motion for referring this Bill to a Select Committee of members of Parliament who understand the implications of the Bill and also the working of the industry. A lot of crocodile tears have been shed on the unemployment situation in the Travancore-Cochin State not only in the coir industry but in other industries as well, but no tangible steps have been taken as yet

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.] to solve that problem. It is a well-known fact that the handloom industry in our State is in a dilapidated state and the coir industry, which is supposed to maintain a million people, is also in a very sad plight, and such has been its plight for the last 7 or 8 years. This Bill has been presented before the House with the object of passing it very soon into a law. But unfortunately, this Bill does not deserve to be passed into a law as it is full of flaws and as it does not understand the working of the Industry. Undue haste is also reflected in refusing to allow the Bill to be sent to a Select Committee. Three long months have now gone by after the Bill has been moved in this House and no steps have been taken about it. If it had been sent to a Select Committee in the initial stages, certainly the Bill would have come back as a better Bill, which would serve the interests of the workers and also the interests of the industrialists in the coir industry. A mere perusal of the few amendments introduced by Government will show that for all these months they were completely ignorant of the working of this industry. The Government did not know what role the "retted husks" have to play in the industry; they had not provided for any representation of those people who convert the husks into coir yarn. Now all these amendments are sought to be moved. But they only touch the fringe of the problem, and, as such, I think that the Bill ought to go to a Select Committee so that the implications of the Bill may be brought into consonance with the working of the coir industry.

Again, I do not understand how coconut growers all over India come into the picture. As a matter of fact, the coconut growers only of the coastal belt come into the picture, as husks which are more than 4 days old cannot be retted and used for coir, and the husks in the interior are only used as firewood. Therefore, I see no reason why the coconut growers in Madras or Bengal should get representation in this Bill.

Sir, the coir industry has got certain peculiarities. The raw husk is soaked in sea water which is saltish as well as sour. This particular kind of water is prevalent only in some parts of the coastal belt. The husk is soaked for four to six months, then it is taken out, beaten and coir yarn is spun. If you want strong golden coir yarn, naturally you have to soak it only in this kind of water which is sour-saltish, or brackish. Therefore, in spite of all the attempts made by the Ceylon Government they could not compete with the Travancore-Cochin State or Malabar in producing the best varieties of coir yarn. Because other parts of India, even though they produce coconuts do not have this kind of water, there is no point in giving them any representation on the Board.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are Government willing to accept this motion for reference to Select Committee?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): Very respectfully, No.

Shri N. Sreekantam Nair: The Bill that has been placed before the House is defective in two fundamental aspects. The framers of the Bill have not understood the main workings of the industry. The Bill has to go, if any relief has to be given to the industry as such, deep into the causes of the collapse of the coir industry in the past.

The price of raw materials is one of the main factors that has brought about the ruin of this industry. The price of raw husk and the price of retted husk has to be finalised. The ceiling price of raw husk and retted husk has to be fixed and also the minimum prices of the various varieties of yarn. The intervening stages have to be filled up by fixing the minimum wages of the workers involved. The House will appreciate the magnitude of the problem when it is realised that one *candy* of coir which fetches in the market from Rs. 200 to Rs. 750, depending on the whims of the market, takes 100 to 125 man days for production. Then you have to provide for the price of raw materials and the commission of the middlemen. After

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair]

making allowances for all these expenses, a worker would not get on the average more than Rs. 50 a year. For this the worker has to go deep down in the dirty water, bring out the retted husk, beat it out, spin it into yarn and take it to the market. For all this he gets on an average Rs. 50 a year. The rise in the price of Coir does not affect the wages of the worker. It is snatched off by husk-dealers and middlemen. Therefore, minimum price has to be fixed for the raw husk as well as retted husk; minimum wages for the various stages of production has to be fixed. Finally the minimum price of the various varieties of yarn has also to be fixed.

Here you will find a very insuperable difficulty. Foreign monopolists are in control of the entire export of coir yarn and coir goods. About 85 per cent of this business is in their hands and any attempt in the past at controlling the prices of coir yarn and coir goods has been fought tooth and nail by the foreign monopolists. Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Ayyar when he was Diwan of Travancore State made an attempt to control the coir industry through warehouses. But the foreign capitalists fought this proposition and made it impossible for Government to control it. So, any attempt at controlling the coir industry presupposes Government establishing organisations which can buy the entire stock, hold it, whether it is in warehouses or by some other agency. That has got to be decided. All these important aspects have been completely ignored in this Bill and the Bill has been framed in complete ignorance. Ignorance may be bliss to those in authority, but to millions of people who are concerned with this, it is a life and death issue.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Does the hon. member mean to suggest that the prices should be fixed by the Bill itself?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: No, there must be provision for it.

Shri A. M. Thomas: There is provision for it.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Another aspect of the Bill which I want to bring to the notice of the House is that the measure has been drafted with a fascist outlook. The president is to be nominated by Government: representatives of the various interests are to be nominated; there is no mention of representatives of workers anywhere in the Bill. In the original Bill there was some mention of employees. Even that has been removed now by an amendment which refers to 'persons engaged in the production'. That naturally means, technically, the employers and not the employees. So, there is no provision anywhere in the Bill for any representatives of workers, in spite of the fact.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What about clause 4(3)(b): "persons employed by growers of coconuts"?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: That is now sought to be amended by an official amendment. Even otherwise, growers of coconuts will have nothing to do with the industry at all. So, it does not mean anything. Growers of coconuts themselves have very little to do with this industry; much less persons employed by them. I think it is a very serious aspect which this House has to consider. Government as a whole, at least the Commerce and Industry Minister, as a rule, wants to make all these boards and bodies official puppets. In the past there have been certain boards the constitution of which had been democratic, e.g., the Coffee Board and the Tea Board. But amendments are being made to make these Boards also Governmental machines. This is another Bill that has come up in which the president, the secretary, the vice-president are sought to be Government-appointed; the representatives of the various interests are also to be nominated by Government. I would ask this House whether this is going to be the democracy we are going to have in future? If that is so, the Minister may as well nominate people who are to represent the various constituencies and there

will be no opposition here. It will be jolly good for them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the Board intended to be a small parliament?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: If Government wants the practical experience of the common man, the businessman and the worker, then naturally they must represent the real interests, not some stooges. So, they have to be elected by the organisations. The workers' representative must represent the trade unions; the Chambers of Commerce must send their representative and not somebody whom the hon. Minister wants to nominate.

Sir, there has already been much talk over the constitution of the Board. In the past there has been much quarrel. So many sentences have been deleted from the proceedings of this House on this particular subject itself. Let us forget the past and turn a new leaf. Let us see that these boards are democratic in their functioning and democratic in their constitution. Let us see that the maximum benefit comes out of these measures. If the Minister is going to carry on in anger, naturally the other side will carry the same feelings and this House will be converted into a battleground of opposing camps. Let us forget the past, particularly the instance of the Rubber Board. I would request the Government that the Secretary of a Board, drawing about Rs. 500 or 600 should not be promoted from chaprassis and clerks. You cannot send anybody there, especially when important public men are at the helm of affairs on such boards. Only responsible people should be sent and the Government must take the responsibility if they send Tom, Dick and Harry and if they are turned back. Such incidents have taken place in the past and they have led to rousing of feelings. Let us forgive and forget the past.

I hope this Bill will be sent to the Select Committee for consideration.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): This Bill has been introduced into this House during the last session

and there was a suggestion for the Bill to be sent to a Select Committee. On the ground of time the Ministry refused, but indefinitely postponed the Bill to this day perhaps waiting for a psychological moment to discuss the Bill in Parliament on the eve of the elections in Travancore-Cochin State.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the coir long enough to connect that?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Yes. If they think the passing of this Bill is going to have any influence on the psychology of the people in Travancore-Cochin State I wish to tell the Minister in all sincerity that he has not understood us. The moment, though belated, has arrived and I wish this Bill every success and request the Government to implement the provisions of the Bill as soon as possible; and perhaps there will be a distant hope of influencing the psychology of the people in Travancore-Cochin State.

The Bill vitally affects the economic destiny of the Travancore-Cochin State, because the coir industry is one of the principal industries in the State. Recently it has been going through a slump, a depression which had affected the rank and file of society to such an extent that unemployment is prevailing in the State. The importance of this industry can be understood only if the Minister himself goes down to the State and has a look at it—as his seniors have gone down and come back. Journeying on along the coast down to the lands end the visitor is impressed by the luxuriant verdure of coconut trees, coconut palms growing by millions, loaded with bunches of coconuts, almost bending low waving to and fro as if to invite the visitor to have a refreshing, delicious, sweet drink of a tender coconut. But seated along the shady coolness the lagoon the visitor can see, thousands and thousands of women busily engaged in turning the wheel, retting the husk, cleaning the fibre and carrying on a business to earn just a few annas, to eke out a hand to mouth existence, from sun-rise to sun-set. The visitor

[Kumari Annie Mascarene]

also sees rows of boats plying along the backwaters, loaded with coconut yarn and fibre, to feed the manufacturers most of whom are European companies, exploiting the country, the industry and labour.

But today the sandy shore is deserted. The wheels turn no more. The busy hands that turn the wheel lie idle and dying, and the husks rot under water. There is depression and famine too raging all along the coast, and the people are in a fix. The matter was brought to the notice of the State Government by the members of the local Legislature. Memoranda were submitted to them. But that Government heard them not. We ourselves, Members on this side, invited your attention, not once or twice; we have brought this matter before you and had discussions on the subject—to no effect.

But today you have brought the Bill, not because we have invited your attention but because there is a shrinkage, is fall in your exchange position and you feel that you have lost control of the foreign trade that you commanded. That is why you have brought this Bill at this psychological moment.

Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang): And not for the election?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: That is side show, Sir.

Shri Namblar (Mayuram): By-product.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): Subsidiary industry.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Now Government wants to strengthen itself with statutory powers to direct and control the production and distribution of this industry and regain the market they have lost.

As far as this Bill is concerned I fully agree with the general principles of this Bill. But I wish to point out a fundamental fact that by the Centre

taking control of this indigenous industry the State Government is deprived of its direction and control in respect of an industry which is a source of income to the State Government and which employs thousands and thousands of labourers. I have absolutely no difference of opinion with regard to the Centre having an industrial dictatorship. I quite agree with you provided you have the grit, the courage to nationalise all the industries in the State.

Shri Syamaandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): I quite agree.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Though the scope of developing the industry is great in this country, especially in Kerala, we are confronted with certain impediments. I suppose they are already familiar to the Minister. We have to stand a keen competition with manilla and sisal fibres from the Philippines and the Dutch East Indies. Poverty had driven our people to produce cheap and inferior variety of coir yarn so much so that we have lost its credit in the market. But what affects us very seriously is not the inferior quality but the exportation of coir yarn abroad and allowing coir goods to be manufactured abroad when we have all the facilities at our command to produce them within our own country. Our goods can be produced of the right quality, they can stand white ants and rotting tendencies. We have got a complete control in the fibre economy of the world for producing the best coir fibre. Government will therefore do well to control these tendencies and consolidate our position in the foreign market so much so that the industry will revive in our country and employ many who are still unemployed. Every encouragement should be given to the producer to find an internal market. The Government may say that exporting our goods will bring us dollars and the exchange position will not shrink. But, I wish to tell the Government that to find an internal market is in consonance with the

dignity and self-respect of our nation. If we can find an internal market for all our goods within our own country like what the Soviet land is doing—they are trying to make their own goods in their own country and they get very few things from abroad and they find a market for their goods within the country—this nuisance of international dependence with all kinds of lease and land-aid could be got rid of.

3 P.M.

I now wish to draw the attention of the Government to a very important point, namely, mechanising and Indianising this industry. Of course, my friends will say that as a cottage industry, this employs so many hands and is a source of livelihood to the people there. I agree. But I wish to stress that the problem of unemployment should be solved and can be solved in other ways, by nationalisation of industries, giving land to the landless and allowing this industry to be mechanised, and Indianised. In this age of advanced science, when the forces of nature are harnessed and brought under control to yield cent per cent. service to humanity, when we have got at our command natural resources of minerals, metals, power and the advantage of a tropical climate, when we are not lacking in mental or intellectual equipment and industrial habits, why should we still stick to the primitive way of manufacturing goods and retard the progress of the scientific age of culture and civilisation? I am not a believer in khadi. Nor do I believe in the moral or philosophy of khadi or handloom.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): Why?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: They served the purpose of boycotting imported goods at a time when we had to challenge the imperial power. We have finished that job and today we cannot ask the people to live on the moral and philosophy of khadi. They want food, clothing and shelter; they want to industrialise the country to solve the problems of poverty and unemployment. Therefore, there should be the

most advanced form of industrialisation so that we can have the best of products with the least labour and with the least effort. It is for the ruling party to take up this stand. Instead of allowing the teeming millions of India to be disintegrated by the glamour of *isms*, it is for you who are now in power to take up the question of industrialisation and invite the wholesome co-operation of the nations which you have had at your back at the time when you were agitating. I request the Premier of India to lead the nation from political liberty to economic salvation, instead of being lured into the glamour of power which he had already had during the last 7 years. Every bit of the country is now standing for food, clothing and shelter. Parties are still in the stage of organising themselves. But, people cannot wait. It is for you to take up this question very seriously with the power at your command, to consolidate, organise and industrialise this country and help this coir industry to develop in its fullest form so that we may solve the problems at our door and help the people to live a better and richer life as citizens of the Indian nation.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise to meet a point made by Shri N. Sreekantan Nair and comment on another. Shri N. Sreekantan Nair has said that it is not necessary that anybody from North India, Bengal and other States should be appointed in this Committee.

Some Hon. Members: Certainly not from Assam.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: As representatives of coconut growers.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: You may be sympathetic towards us.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: That is all the more reason why it should be done. There is provision in this Bill for research. In our parts, we are not manufacturing coir; we are merely growing coconuts. Every manufacture which is added on to agriculture gives a by-product and the result is, it becomes more and more economical. In our parts, where we grow only coconuts,

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

we find that cocoon growing is going out of practice. Unless and until we can develop some by-product, it may be that growing cocoanuts will not be economic at all later on. Therefore, we have to find out if at all it is possible to make coir industry also thrive in Northern India. It is for this reason that we want that this provision for research should be enforced for the purpose of finding out whether and how far the cocoanuts grown in these parts also can be utilised for the manufacture of coir. I think this is a very good idea that provision for research has been made. My hon. friend Shri N. Sreekantan Naid said that cocoon grown in certain parts of Travancore-Cochin itself is not utilised for the manufacture of coir. This suggestion could also be with reference to those parts of Travancore-Cochin which are not manufacturing coir at present.

With regard to the other point which was raised by Shri N. Sreekantan Nair, on the question of representation, it was said that all the personnel are being nominated rather than representatives of industry and labour being taken on the Board. On this question, I also had great confusion some time back as to what would be proper. I am not yet myself clear. But, I have one experience on which I have had to make a decision. The experience was with regard to the Central Tea Board. The Central Tea Board, as it is constituted, has representatives of the industry and labour. Government merely nominates the representatives of industry and labour. The result was that the Members of this Board did not owe allegiance to the Government though it was a Board of the Government. It was found that when the Government decided to walk out of the International Tea Market Expansion Board, when they walked out of the Tea Market Expansion Board, the Members of the Central Tea Board protested against the action of the Central Government and they moved a resolution in the Central Tea Board against that decision. It was found that these persons who were representatives of the industry—I am talking

particularly of the representatives of industry and not of labour just now....

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Foreign industry.

Shri K. P. Tripathi:representatives of the foreign industry owed allegiance not to the Government here, nor to the Government of West Bengal, not even to the industry in India, but to the marketing interests in London. Therefore, they were guided by the decisions of the marketing interests in London. Therefore, it was thought necessary that a way should be found out whereby this could be obviated so that we might get a Board on which the Members were there not because they were members of certain industrial organisation, but were experts in the line, and were members of the Board under the control of the Government. This differentiation had to be done. How could it be done? It was for this reason that it was decided ultimately that there should be nomination by the Government and not representation by the industry.

If these foreign interests continue to send their representatives on to the Board, then the policy of the Board will continue to be decided in an anti-national way. How is it to be done? Take for instance, coir. The major portion of the coir industry is controlled by foreign interest. Therefore, if you allow them to represent this industry, the result will be that they will continue to exploit this Board for their own interest. They will get the money from the Government of India, which will be got by taxation....

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: What if the European is nominated? The position is the same.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: There is the possibility that he may not be nominated. Then, even if he is nominated, he is not the representative of the industry as such. It may be that he may take a different line. I do not suggest that he will ever take a different line, but the possibility is there. In the other case there is no possibility at all.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I do not want any representation to be given to any foreign interest at all.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: If that is possible, well and good. I do not know whether it is possible or not. I think the Government of India should, after having taken this power, not nominate foreign interests. They should nominate anybody who is capable of representing this industry, and I think it may be possible to find out non-foreign interests as representatives.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: What about labour?

Shri K. P. Tripathi: All this comment does not apply to labour. I am talking only about foreign interests. Labour is not foreign. Labour is Indian. Therefore, it will continue to have the Indian aspect and not the foreign aspect before it.

Shri Nambiar: Do you want labour there or not?

Shri K. P. Tripathi: Certainly I do want.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Not nominated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may kindly address the Chair. He need not worry himself about the interruptions.

Shri V. P. Nair: I want a clarification. Because he said labour has to be there, we are asking him through you whether it is his idea that the representative of labour should also be nominated, according to him, or should he be elected.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: With regard to that, I personally would prefer that he is not nominated by Government, but since the Government is adopting a uniform policy, I realise the difficulty of the Government to make a distinction between the method of nominating labour and the method of nominating an industrialist, and therefore, I would not insist upon that point just now, because it is an experimental measure as yet.

Shri Achuthan rose.—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Eswaran.

Shri Achuthan: My name is Achuthan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Both mean the same thing.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): "Achuthan" also is "Eswaran".

Shri Achuthan (Crangannur): I am very glad to congratulate the Commerce and Industry Minister in coming to this House with this Bill.

Even though we had a Central Coconut Committee Act some years back, at that time the Central Government, in its wisdom, did not think it worth while to have a Board of this nature for the purpose of augmenting the interest of the coconut growers and the coir industry and for the expansion of that industry. Now at least they have found that with regard to this industry, unless it is taken up by a separate body independently of the Central Government and much time is devoted in that line, proper justice cannot be done in the matter and the common man will have to suffer as well as the country. So, naturally, the Commerce and Industry Ministry really deserves appreciation.

Many of the Members of this House may not have a clear idea of the coir industry prevailing in the West Coast of this vast continent. Mainly Travancore-Cochin State is concerned, and partly Madras also is equally interested—Malabar, Mangalore side; south of Bombay also, to a certain extent, has got this interest. In fact, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you may not be closely aware of this coir industry, even though you may know of coconut and its uses in this country. Many publications there are of the Central Government as well as other organisations which go to show that it is almost a cottage industry employing millions of people. In fact, in Travancore-Cochin, excluding the handloom industry, this is the one major industry which has to be

[Shri Achuthan]

developed in order to solve the unemployment problem, and indirectly many other political problems also. In fact, from Cape Comorin up to Cranganur on the northern side, which is my constituency, in half the portion this is the main industry. From reports we see that even after the growth of this industry for a number of decades, less than 50 per cent. of coconut husk is even now, not used for the manufacture of this yarn, ropes, mats and mattings. That can be verified from the publications of the Government of India. In the publication "The Indian Central Coconut Committee—what it is and what it does", they clearly state:

"It has been estimated that only about 43 per cent. of the potential supplies of husks in India are utilised for coir making. Where they are not used for coir extraction, the husks are burnt as fuel. Thus a huge reservoir of fibre which is wasted at present awaits to be exploited by the scientist and put to better uses."

That is the position of this coir industry. As was remarked by my hon. friend Kumari Annie Mascarene, it will require some mechanisation, some sort of betterment in the manufacture of this coir yarn, fibre and coir products. To that we agree. I do not find any magic or any other solution to tackle the unemployment in Travancore-Cochin, at least in the coastal region, except by organising this coir industry on a proper basis, and more on a co-operative basis. The Travancore-Cochin Government attempted to do something in that line during the last three or four years, but they were not successful because then came the decline in foreign markets.

The June issue of the *Journal of Industry and Trade* gives a picture of the present position of coir products in foreign markets, and how, if we try our best to achieve economic production, we can capture in a better way the foreign markets, so that there may not be any slump in the coir industry

as it exists today. At present, even after hard labour, a well-built man or woman cannot expect more than 12 annas per day. Moreover, this industry, excepting the factory side, is even now managed or controlled by middlemen and capitalists. According to me, this industry must be exclusively in the possession of co-operative societies, and labourers must have complete control over them. Unless this industry is taken over from the capitalists by co-operative societies statutorily the unemployment problem of labour in that region and also the political condition in Travancore-Cochin State will not be solved. So, even though the growers of coconuts can expect some return from the husk out of the coconuts, to my mind, there must be a tendency on the part of Government to see that hereafter the growers do not expect much out of the price that they get for the husks, but it must be set apart for the benefit of the labourers and the common man there and they must get proper wages for their work. So that, not only can we capture foreign markets by our low cost of production, but also we can see that very soon every house in this vast continent of India is supplied with mats and mattings and other manufactures for their daily use at very cheap and attractive rates. Unless the Commerce and Industry Ministry takes care to see that the growers do not depend upon the price that they get from the husks, but exclusively on the value that they can get from the coconuts that they sell, according to me, there is no hope for this coir industry to thrive. While we are urging on the Commerce and Industry Ministry to see that the price of coconuts is not lowered by their commercial policy in regard to import of coconut oil or copra, it must be borne in mind clearly that the price of coconut oil must be so maintained as to see that reasonable returns are given to the coconut growers of that region. That is the most important point, which the Ministry has to take into account, while deciding their import policy or the import duty. The coconut growers

must depend for their economic living on the coconuts that they sell, for the purposes of edible oils and manufacture of soaps.

Even if a Board is established, of the nature contemplated in the Bill, unless the whole industry is taken over by co-operative societies statutorily either on behalf of the Central Government or the State Government concerned, we may not have the advantages that we expect for the time being, viz. that the labourers should be well-employed and well-paid. A major portion of my constituency is in the coir industry region, and I know personally how it is worked out there. It is in a very crude form there. There are coconut growers who are not willing to sell their husks. The husks may be lying there for two years, and even three years, still they would not sell these retted husks to the labourers, who want to see that they are converted into fibre or coir yarns, unless the growers get the price demanded by themselves, from these labourers. That is the position with regard to these retted husks.

Then comes the question of capitalists, who purchase these husks in bulk and take them to backward regions. They also demand very high prices for these retted husks. Even if there be a great demand for these retted husks, for the purpose of manufacture of fibre or yarn, they would not sell it, unless they get the prices demanded by them. If a family needs 100 or 500 retted husks, for their daily labour, they will not be in a position to purchase them, unless they pay very high prices to these capitalists. These are the two handicaps prevailing in these areas, which are operating to the disadvantage of the labourers. Even though a labourer may have some capital worth Rs. 10, or 25 or even 50, at his disposal for the purchase of this retted husks from the capitalist, still he is not able to purchase it at a reasonable price from these capitalists, who sell it to the big industrial concerns, which have their headquarters at Alleppey and other places. Unless we change the present policy to the line of Indianisation, it

is not worthwhile for me to deal with that aspect here. So long as these foreign interests and big industrial concerns remain here, and have a monopoly, so far as the mechanised industrial side is concerned, we have nothing to hope for.

Considering the fact that the coir industry is a cottage industry which is employing millions of people in that region, it is worthwhile for the Central Government to see that the Board is established as early as possible, representing all interests concerned. Mr. Sreekantan Nair was complaining that he may not get justice done with regard to the labourers. In fact this Board is mainly concerned with the question of giving proper wages to the labourers employed in this industry, and seeing that in the whole region, nobody remains unemployed on account of slump in the industry or slackness on the part of Government in regard to progress of the industry. Shri Sreekantan Nair can rest assured that the main representatives in the Board will be persons who will have a real interest in the welfare of labour, and I have no doubt about that matter in my mind. If the Central Government want to see that something is done for the progress of this industry, that the labourers do not remain unemployed, but get the reasonable wages to which they are entitled, and that the whole region is in a prosperous condition, it is high time that the slackness disappears, and the Centre in co-operation with the State Government concerned, take up the matter in right earnest.

I am not for sending this Bill to a Select Committee, nor am I in favour of any serious amendments, at this stage. We should first see that the Bill is put into operation, after its being passed, so that we shall be able to see whether there are any loopholes or lacunae or drawbacks in the machinery that has been brought into existence under this legislation. We shall have to give this Board as it is to be constituted a fair trial, before we can raise a cry that it is not working properly, or that the Central Government

[Shri Achuthan]

have more powers with them, or that the Board has not been treated properly. If the recommendations of the Board are not accepted by Government, the members of the Board may resign and walk out, and instead of the Central Government dissolving the Board, they themselves can dissolve the Board. In fact, when a Board is constituted, it will be to the interest of the Central Government, to see that all trust is placed on this Board, which is expected to look after the interests of the coir industry.

A number of amendments have been tabled. There are some Members who feel that the Board is something like a small parliament, consisting of some 40 members. I am not at all worried about the number. It may be limited to 25 or even 20 by the Central Government, if they so desire. But I am interested in seeing that the Board is constituted as early as possible, and starts working. It is not an easy thing, as it is supposed to be. In Travancore-Cochin, we even went to the extent of fixing the price of coconut husk, some three or four years ago, but we found it a difficult task, because the capitalists and the middlemen were there, and the labourers were hit hard in all respects. Therefore I am concerned with the establishment of the Board and its beginning to function. The Board should in co-operation with the State Government concerned see that the labourers get a reasonable wage for the labour, that the coir industry prospers, and that foreign markets are captured. The cost of production must be lowered, so that it must be a very cheap article throughout the world. If the Board succeeds in seeing that the growers of coconuts are not to depend on the money that they get out of the sale of husks, but on the value they get out of the sale of coconuts. I hope this industry will have a very bright future both in India as well as outside. From the article I referred to in the 'Journal of Industry and Commerce', I find that this industry has got a very wide scope for expansion. If we take up the question in

right earnest. I do not want to tire the House by reading that article. But one thing I would like to draw attention to in this connection. A number of countries outside India are now importing coir fibre or coir yarn or other products made out of coir.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I seek a clarification from the hon. Member?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may not be yielding.

Shri V. P. Nayar: He will yield, Sir. I suppose the hon. Member is referring to page 747 of the 'Journal of Industry and Commerce'. May I know whether he has seen that the countries that have been listed belong to one group only, and that there are no countries representing the vast sections of people on this side of the world?

Shri Achuthan: That question has been raised a number of times also.

Shri V. P. Nayar: What is your opinion?

Shri Achuthan: That is a matter to be looked into by the Central Government. When there is any market anywhere, in any part of the world, we must see that our products reach there. That is my view. If anybody wants our products from anywhere, we must send them there. So that, according to me, it is an important measure.

Now, Sir, I will give some statistics which are with me. We were exporting in 1951 13.49 lakh cwts. of coir products. This export is reduced in 1952 to 12.20 lakh cwts. In 1952, the value of this export was reduced by 36 per cent. This is a very serious matter.

I find that the Central Government departments have been purchasing coir products worth Rs. 9 lakhs. That means, roughly 1.32 per cent. If an attempt is made in that direction not only with regard to the Central Government departments but also the State Governments, we can have some better hope in this line. My point is

this. All products manufactured from coir must find a place not only in India but in the outside world. The prices must be so adjusted that this can be done. The price level of coconuts and coconut oil to be so maintained that the Government can take husks for low prices. These husks can be taken, by legislation, from the growers of coconuts for a nominal price and set apart entirely for the labour class of that coastal region. We need pay only the wages of those labourers, and we can export the products to all parts of the world at a very cheap price.

So I congratulate the hon. the Commerce and Industry Minister in seeing that the Bill is passed in this session, today or tomorrow, without sending it to a Select Committee. A Board must be appointed and recruitment must be done as early as possible and the work must be done in right earnest, so that when we go back from this session to our parts we can at least say that we are not indolent or negligent or unconcerned with regard to the lot of the so-called coir industry labourers and the Central Government are keen in looking to their interests. I congratulate the Commerce and Industry Minister, Sir, in taking up this Bill in right earnest.

Shri Kelappan (Ponnani): The lady Member who spoke on this Bill was very vehement against khadi and *charka*, and against cottage industries in general. I do not know whether that member would like to mechanise the coir yarn industry. The coir yarn industry is a cottage industry par excellence. It is the one industry that provides work for the poor people all along the coast. This industry is of such vital importance that without it very many poor families along the coast will have to starve. In every house of the labourer and peasant in Malabar, Cochin and Travancore you can see the women folk in the huts twisting coir yarn from morn till evening. They carry this to the nearest shop in the evening and meet part of the household expenses. In the poor houses in our parts, it is the usual custom for the master of the house

to go out for work and purchase the rice. The women folk in the house twist coir yarn and purchase whatever they require by way of condiments and other things. All along the coast you can see, in fact all the poor people soaking their husks along the coast, beating it into fibre and twisting it into yarn. Suppose this is mechanised, it would mean that thousands of families would lose the one employment or trade that they have.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: It cannot be easily mechanised.

Shri Kelappan: It cannot be mechanised either.

I thought, Sir, that it would have been better to send this Bill to a Select Committee. I was inclined to think that it would facilitate the work of this Parliament. It is a Bill that concerns only one or two States, but then it concerns them vitally. This whole House is not interested in it. If the Bill, in the first instance, was considered by a Select Committee of persons interested in it, the work of this House would have been facilitated and much time would have been gained. But now I find that the Government have come out with a number of amendments which were suggested by other Members. So probably at this late stage it is not very desirable to send it to a Select Committee.

It has been our sad experience that Boards of this kind—we have Boards for tea, coffee etc. constituted to regulate trade—have not been very helpful to those industries. Therefore, one may be excused if one feels that this also may not be very helpful to the industry in question. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is said that this industry is of very great economic importance to Travancore and Cochin. May I inform the Minister that it is equally important to Malabar?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I would like to apologise for the omission of Ponnani taluk in Malabar.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: To a lesser extent.

Shri Kelappan: There is, I find in this Bill, provision to license the production of yarn. It says:

"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" by "regulating under the supervision of the Central Government the production of coir yarn and coir products by licensing coir spindles and taking other appropriate steps."

As you do not control by licence cotton spinning on *charka*, I suggest this coir yarn twisting on cottage basis should not be controlled by any licence fee. I do not know what the Minister means by licensing coir spindles. Mostly, in Malabar especially, the *charka* is not used for twisting this yarn. It is done mostly by the hand and, as I mentioned before, thousands of families do this work. If that is to be controlled by licence it would be a serious calamity.

Similarly, we find every shop in the village stocks coir fibre for the use of the people in the neighbourhood and these poor shop-keepers cannot really afford to pay any licence fee. Even now, they have to pay to the District Boards a very large amount by way of profession tax and so on. For soaking pits, originally the fee was 5 pice per cent. of area, and now it has been raised to 10 annas. Similarly, there was only a small profession tax before but now it has been raised to a licence fee of Rs. 10 per 20 cents and Rs. 40 above 20 cents. Small producers find it difficult to carry on this business paying a heavy fee.

About the Board that is to be constituted under the Bill, the proportion of representation for the interests concerned with the industry are not given. The number of members of the Board is given as 40. I think it is unnecessary to have 40 members on a Board of this kind and waste public money. The number may be reduced and labour must have adequate representation. I feel it would be really

desirable to fix the number of members for each interest concerned in this business. With these words, I support the motion.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): Sir, I desire to seek some clarification rather than make a speech. It has been suggested on this side of the House about some amenities to be provided for labour. I think, in the development of any industry, labour forms an integral part. I fail to see, in clause 10 which describes the functions of the Board, any mention about amenities to be provided for labour. I wish to know whether Government contemplates any such provision or have forgotten to make the provision or whether they do not contemplate any such provision at all.

Then, Sir, with regard to clauses 13 and 14, it is stated that the entire fund would be placed at the disposal of the Consolidated Fund of India. In the analogous legislation, namely Lac Cess, Tea Cess, Coffee Cess, Soft Coke Cess and Cotton Cess, no such provision has been made or thought of. In regard to this provision, I would like to ask, Sir, whether this Fund, when it is placed at the disposal of the Consolidated Fund of India would be able to secure any interest.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No, Sir.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: For instance, when the Railway Depreciation Reserve Fund of nearly 30 crores of rupees is taken over to the Consolidated Fund, every year, I think they are paying an interest of 3 to 4 per cent. In this connection, is it not possible for the Government to make a similar provision to see that this Fund fetches some interest by placing it at the disposal of the Consolidated Fund of India or in any other decent investment. Because, Sir, if the Fund accumulates to say 50 lakhs of rupees and if 50 lakhs of rupees are not going to be spent immediately, at the rate of 4 per cent. It will get at least 2 lakhs of rupees by way of interest every year. Similarly, I find that in the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund there is an accumulation of 80 to 90 lakhs of

rupees. If only it is possible to place it in good investments, they must be able to secure 4 or 3½ per cent. interest. I would like to know from Government whether it is not reasonable on their part to place it in the Consolidated Fund of India or any other investment so as to get a decent amount by way of interest which will go to the further accumulation of the Fund.

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): I feel great pleasure in according support to this Bill which was long overdue. My pleasure is heightened by the fact that the prosaic provisions of this Bill were beautified by a poetic description of Travancore-Cochin given by the hon. lady Member there. In fact, I was so carried away by that beautiful description that I was reminded of Kalidasa's famous lines in Sakuntala. In the fourth Act Kalidasa describes.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A coconut tree?

Shri M. D. Joshi: Somethink like a coconut tree, Sir. I suppose it was a coconut tree; Kalidasa was describing the departure of Sakuntala and he says that Sakuntala was given as a present several articles by several trees.

क्षीमं केनचित्दिदूपाद्दुतरुणा मांगल्यमाविष्कृतं
निष्ठ्यूत इक्षरणोपभोगसुलभो साक्षात्स :
केनचित् ॥

One tree gave her a silk garment; another gave a red fluid to point her nails with; and so on.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): Sir, on a point of information. Is the hon. Member referring to any Member who is present in this House by the name Sakuntala?

Shri M. D. Joshi: I do not catch the humour of my friend.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These remarks do not require an answer.

Shri M. D. Joshi: Our hon. friend there wants to know, I believe, the name of the hon. lady Member who gave us the description. But she is not

now here. Perhaps he referred the hon. lady Member whose name happens to be that. (शकुन्तला)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Humorous remarks are never commented upon.

Shri M. D. Joshi: So, Kalidasa's description appeared to me perhaps to refer to a scenery not of any northern country but perhaps from my own home district or perhaps from Travancore-Cochin. Apart from this....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is that district? Is the hon. Member also interested in coconut growing?

Shri M. D. Joshi: Certainly. I come from that part.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is that part?

Shri M. D. Joshi: Ratnagiri.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has not yet disclosed to this House how he is interested in this.

Shri M. D. Joshi: That is the purpose of my speech. I am only making preliminary remarks as to how I was carried away by the beautiful description supplied by the hon. lady Member.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member wrote to me that belonging to Ratnagiri, a long coastal district along the west coast, he is interested in this Bill. Is he not going to say that to the House?

Shri M. D. Joshi: I am coming to that, but before doing so I wish to mention one or two points referred to by my friends opposite. I was surprised by the comments made by Mr. Sreekantan Nair about the appointment of members of the Board. Being in the opposition, my friend is naturally apprehensive that the interests of labour may not be well looked after. My friend here also expressed some doubt as to whether appointment of members by Government was a good thing and whether election was a necessity. When we were under the former rulers, it was natural that appointments made by the foreign

[Shri M. D. Joshi]

Government should have been looked upon with suspicion or even feelings of enmity, but under the rule of a popular government, I do not understand why hon. Members should be so much afraid. In fact, there is a Ministry to look after the interests of labour and I am sure that in the matter of this industry also the interests of labour will be well looked after.

I was greatly surprised by the remarks offered by the hon. Lady Member that she is not a believer in cottage industries. She is entitled to her opinions, but I want to tell her that she is going against the current.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: No.

Shri M. D. Joshi: That is what you believe. Ultimately the current will engulf you.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Let us see.

Shri M. D. Joshi: I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend Shri Achuthan when he says that industries must be fully managed by co-operative societies and they must be divorced from capitalists. Certainly that is so, but situated as we are, we have to take them as they are. We must bide our time and wait for a suitable opportunity.

With these preliminary remarks, I now come to the subject proper. In the first place, this subject should be divided into two parts. Firstly, we must deal with exports and secondly with internal development. As regards exports, they depend upon various factors: the production of coconuts of the proper variety and selection of coconuts of the proper stage for husking; and then, after selection, the application of the best means for production of coir of the proper quality. The average annual production of coconuts in the last five years was 3,300 millions. 53 millions of them are used as tender coconuts and 2 millions of them are used for seedlings. The husks of dried coconuts are not used for this purpose, because they are not useful. In all, about 1650 million coconuts are used

for husking. Our problem is how to advance this industry by augmenting the production of coconuts. I come from Ratnagiri, a narrow strip along the western coast. There are also two other districts near mine, namely, Kolaba and North Kanara. These three districts of Bombay State are coconut growing areas.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is there any coir industry there?

Shri M. D. Joshi: Yes.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Very small.

Shri M. D. Joshi: What I want to point out is that unfortunately as much attention as is required and as we expect to be paid is not paid to the development of the coir industry there. It is true that the Bombay Government through their village industries committees have tried to advance the cause of this industry to a certain extent, but generally speaking, the progress is very poor. It is my earnest request to the hon. Minister to pay greater attention to this backward area. The hon. Minister of Commerce, Shri Karmarkar, was himself a representative of my area some years ago when he stood for election to the Central Assembly. He had an opportunity of travelling through my part and observing the conditions there. He will therefore be able to realise the truth of my remarks when I say that my part of the country is sadly undeveloped and needs special attention. Therefore, I welcome this Bill with all my heart.

4 P.M.

The question of exports in the matter of coir articles is a very complicated and difficult one. It has become so, because certain new countries have come into competition. They produce finished articles from flex and other materials and our coir goods lack that finished quality which has been evolved by foreign manufacturers. The question for consideration therefore is how we can offer to the market finished goods of refined and high-quality which can stand competition.

Another point is regarding the price. Indian quality coir matting costs more and it is said that it is inferior. I do not know, but then the prices tell their own tale. Indian coir matting costs 11 sh. 9 d. to 12 sh. 3 d. per whereas New Zealand flex matting costs 5s. 6d. to 11s. 10d. These are the retail prices. The difference in the wholesale prices is equally striking. Indian matting costs 6s. 9d. to 7s. 1d. for wholesale goods, while New Zealand flex matting costs 3s. 2d. to 6s. 10d. It will be realised, Sir, that in the face of such competition, to expect that the Indian coir mats or other articles will hold their own against foreign goods is rather too much. Therefore, it will be a question for Government to see how best to produce excellent articles and to float them in the foreign market. It is a matter of pleasure that we are exporting coir articles in large quantities to the United States, to the United Kingdom and to other countries as well. But on account of this handicap, the question of exports has caused us great concern. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, this fact is mentioned, and therefore deep research will have to be undertaken by the proposed Coir Board to improve the qualities of coir production. As far as my part of the country is concerned, I am very anxious that the coir industry should be set on a firm and definite footing because the advancement of cottage industries alone can help and can lift my region from the backwardness into which it is rotting. The Bombay Government has realised this, but unfortunately there has been practically no progress. Only at two places—at Vengurla about 100 miles from Ratnagiri, and at Sawantwadi—there are two centres of training, where 12 trainees are trained every year. I think the progress at this rate will not carry us very far. I, therefore, request with all the emphasis at my command that in order that backward regions may be set on a better footing and the problem of unemployment—a most urgent problem—may be solved, the coir industry needs all the help which the Government of India can give. Sir, coir articles have a distinct

521 P.S.D.

purpose of their own which no other article can serve. This fact, if properly realised and worked upon, will yield good results and I have high hopes that the coir industry will hold its own against foreign competition if the use and distinctive features of coir articles are brought home to the consumers in foreign countries. With these words I heartily support the Bill.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem):

The coir industry is primarily an industry pertaining to the Travancore-Cochin State. My interest in this matter is also here, because in Salem District and in the neighbouring district of Coimbatore, there are certain industries based upon coir. They do not of course make goods which are exportable, but nevertheless I welcome this Bill, for any improvement made in this industry in the Travancore-Cochin State will have its very good reactions in other parts of the country as well. My interest in this Bill is somewhat different and it is based upon the statement made 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 on the lines of Boards set up for other plantation industries.”

Now I would urge upon the hon Minister for Commerce and Industry to see whether this statement is not equally applicable to some of the other industries as well, as for instance, the drugget industry and the handloom industry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are we not getting into some other matter?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I am merely, saying that this principle may be extended to the drugget industry. I wish

[Shri S. V. Ramaswamy]

to improve the Bill in three ways and I have tabled three amendments. It appears that after all the amount that is going to be realised from cess is only Rs. 12 lakhs per year. I have moved an amendment that the office of the Board shall be located in Travancore-Cochin State, because I have a fear that this office might also be located in New Delhi. I confess to a sense of horror of over centralisation in New Delhi.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It will not be.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I thank you, Sir, for this assurance. My second amendment is with regard to Clause 11. The powers are given to the Government to dissolve the Board. I only wish to add one clause at the end of that section "and such notification may as soon as possible be laid before the House". We discuss elaborately here, we set up Boards, funds are created and the thing goes on. For the Board to be dissolved by an executive order, there must be some statutory provision for informing this House.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: We will do that.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Thank you once again. My third point is with regard to clause 19. I wish to add a third sub-clause to clause 19 to the effect that the Central Government shall place before Parliament an annual report of the working of the Board, containing *inter alia* a full statement of the accounts. Again I have to observe that after elaborate discussion, we pass these Bills and Boards are set up. What exactly they do, we do not know.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: You may ask a question.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: If the Government be pleased to place an annual report before the House, we shall be able to know about the progress of the Board or whether it is worth while scrapping it, in which case we shall

gladly do so. With these remarks I am glad to support the Bill, and I hope the hon. Minister, who has conceded my first two amendments, will also think it fit to concede my third amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There has been sufficient discussion now on this matter.

Shri C. R. Iyyanni (Trichur) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may reserve his remarks when we proceed to consideration of the clauses. But if he wishes to speak now, let him be brief.

Shri C. R. Iyyanni: Sir, while I welcome the measure, it is my painful duty to say that in the declaration that is made here it is stated that the Government should take under its control the coir industry completely, whereas we find that the function of the Board is only of a very limited nature. Unless there is a Board of this nature it is not possible for this industry to stand on its own legs. There are various difficulties that this industry has to face. From 1952 onwards the quantity of exports has considerably decreased; secondly, the price of the article has also gone down. Of course, there are various reasons for it. One reason is that stockpiling has ceased. The Korean question is going to be solved; we do not know when it will be. But all the same, there is a feeling in the minds of the people that we are not going to have the fear of war in the near future. These are the two things that are responsible for the slump and reduction in the price of articles that we are exporting.

Then there is going to be competition from outside. From East African side there is the seisal manufactured articles; then there is the hemp production. These two items happen to compete with our coir products. So, unless there is a Board started by the Central Government, it is not possible for us at this juncture to stand on our own legs. Otherwise, our industry will go down and if the industry goes down,

there is not the slightest doubt that the people inhabiting the coastal areas of Travancore-Cochin and Malabar especially will come to grief. Their number is not a small one. It will come to about 5 lakhs. They are engaged in this industry which is their main source of income. This industry is both a cottage industry and a factory industry. The hon. lady Member was saying that we have to give up cottage industries.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: No, not that way: mechanise coir production.

Shri C. R. Iyyunni: That is exactly what I am saying. What will be the result of mechanisation?

Kumari Annie Mascarene: They are doing it already.

Shri C. R. Iyyunni: If you mechanise the industry, you throw out of employment so many people. Certainly that is a thing which we would never wish. The point is we must have cottage industries, small scale industries and large scale industries. All these must work side by side and in a harmonious manner. Otherwise there will be plenty of unemployment and the result will be our country will gradually go down from the point of view of industry. So, the Statement of Objects and Reasons has been considerably enlarged for which there is absolutely no need.

Again in the matter of constitution of this Board all the powers are taken by the Central Government. I do not know why such a thing should take place. The various States interested in this industry may be given power to nominate members of various categories mentioned in the Bill. In regard to the other Boards, for instance the Tea Board, we find that the Vice-Chairman is elected by the Members of the Board. Here that power is taken by the Central Government.

Then again another unusual power taken by the Central Government is that they can say that "this Board from this day onwards will not exist". They are members appointed by the Central Government and it is unlikely that as a body they will go against what the Central Government dictates

to or directs them. But we find that absolute power is given to the Central Government to dissolve the Board without even calling for an explanation from the Members as to their misbehaviours or misfeasance. I do not see any reason why such arbitrary power should be in the hands of the Central Government. I agree the Central Government can call for an explanation as to why the Board has not done such and such a thing, or why they have exceeded their bounds, or acted contrary to the directions given by the Central Government.

I hope that the Minister will bear all these suggestions in mind and try to accept the amendments that are moved.

[SHRIMATI AMMU SWAMINADHAN
in the Chair.]

Shri Basappa (Tumkur): Madam Chairman, while thanking you for giving me this opportunity, I feel I owe a word of personal explanation to this House for speaking on this subject. Coming as I do from Mysore, which is the third biggest coconut producing area, I feel I must speak on this occasion regarding this Coir Industry Bill. Of course, I do concede that it is not a main industry in Mysore; I do concede that Travancore-Cochin and Malabar area has got a greater interest in this industry. But at the same time I must say that Mysore which has 1,82,000 acres of land under coconut cultivation attaches some importance to this cottage industry which is developing in some parts of our State. The Minister of Production, who was Chief Minister of Mysore, was taking a lot of interest in the development of this industry. My hon. friend Mr. Madiah Gowda has sent some amendments to this Bill. For all these reasons I say that Mysore should have a proper representation on the Board that is going to be constituted.

Then, with regard to the fundamental question at issue, Madam, I must say that this crisis, the depression in this trade is due not only to the trade itself, to the industry itself, but also to international aspect. The inherent defect in the industry is one

[Shri Basappa]

thing; the international aspect of the industry is another thing. The Commerce and Industry Minister seems to emphasise more the inherent defect of the industry and he wants to set matters right. Our friend Mr. V. P. Nayar, if I followed the trend of his arguments, said that our exports will have to be developed in particular directions. He referred to one set of countries. My hon. friend Mr. Achuthan suggested that we should look for other countries also. I think there seems to be truth in both these versions. If we are thinking of developing this industry in this country we must not only see that the inherent defect in the industry is wiped off, but also look for new markets to which our goods can be exported profitably. From that angle I say that all these aspects will have to be considered and looked into.

I welcome this Bill because it has come at the appropriate time. An explanation has already been given as to why the Central Government is interfering at this stage. Formerly it was thought that it was a State subject and that the Travancore-Cochin State would manage it well, and even the Coconut Committee of the Centre was not allowed to do much to improve this industry. But now a time has come when the Centre has to assume greater power over this industry because unemployment in that State, as we have seen from the proceedings of this House, has reached a very high stage and we are also losing foreign exchange.

On account of these factors we have to welcome this Bill. We are now thinking of developing cottage and village industries in the country. This is a very fine opportunity for doing so. To organise this industry on a co-operative basis the State will have to take more powers into its hands. It is because the industry was ill-organised in the former days that we are suffering today. And the Government did not hesitate to come forward to send its expert, a special officer, to go and see

matters there. Also, a conference was convened at Trivandrum. Certain things were evolved there for developing this industry: first of all, the export side of it; secondly, how the quality of the goods can be improved; thirdly, how the industry can be controlled; and fourthly, the production side of it and also internal markets. These are the four aspects that they confined their attention to, and they have given certain reasons for developing these aspects. The Board which is going to be constituted by this Bill will look into all these aspects and try to implement those things.

With regard to the constitution and the powers of the Board. I think there is already a good democratic set-up in the Board and the Vice-Chairman is going to be elected. There is an amendment being brought by the Government itself which shows their readiness to see this Board function well. With that we must be satisfied and we must not say that the Board should be fully autonomous, because we have seen past experience. Complete autonomy without government control may lead to anywhere. A certain amount of overall control by Government is necessary.

Parliamentary control over this will also be established because the rules will be placed before the House; also, the report that will be submitted to the Government, I hope, will be placed on the Table of the House, so much so that parliamentary control and Government control will be sufficiently there.

We can therefore proceed with the Bill and expect the Board to implement some of the recommendations of that committee. There are not very many complicated matters in this Bill. I therefore do not see any reason for sending it to a Select Committee. We have spent a good deal of time over it, we are not rushing through this Bill. I therefore commend the Bill for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Chairman: Shri A. V. Thomas.

Shri A. V. Thomas (Srivaikuntam):
Madam Chairman.....

amendments as proposed by the
Ministers.

Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottai): On a point of order, Madam. Am I to understand that only those who are interested in coconut or are living in areas of coconut are to be given preference to speak on this Bill? I stood thrice but have not been called. As I see from the trend, only those who come from coconut areas are given the chance. I want to know whether any such convention is being created. I must submit that chances must be fairly distributed to all people so that, even though the interest may concentrate upon one section, yet the general interests of the nation may not be lost sight of and the responsibility which people have may be fairly discharged by all concerned.

In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is stated that undesirables will be kept out of the trade. I only hope the Minister will also keep other undesirables out of the Board. I do not know how far he will be able to resist certain pressure groups who will want only their representatives to go on the Board. I know the Minister and I fully trust he can hold his own and keep the undesirables out.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think there is any point of order there. I do not think there has been any convention that only persons coming from coconut areas are allowed to speak. Members have to catch the eye of the Chair; Shri A. V. Thomas just caught my eye and I have called upon him. There is no point of order in it.

There have been objections in similar Bills to the question of nomination concerning the appointment of the Chairman, etc. Those objections to a certain extent stand. But as I explained a little while ago, in view of the essential need of the Bill I do not propose to say anything in that respect. All I would say is, let us have this Bill passed, let us work it for a few months or for a year or so, and if it is found necessary and if the members nominated to the Board bring the matter to the notice of the Government I hope the Ministers concerned will give their careful consideration to it and make any amendments or alterations that may be required.

Shri A. V. Thomas: Madam, I heartily welcome this Bill. I had some little misgivings about the Bill as it was introduced. But since then I see that the Ministers themselves have tabled quite a number of amendments. This really makes the Bill more acceptable.

A lot has been said by the previous speakers about the whole industry so that there is no necessity for me to cover the same ground again. Reference was made to the quality of manufactured articles. As far as the manufacturing side is concerned Travancore-Cochin produces the best quality. Of course they also produce poor quality. But then these are required for certain cheap markets. The manufacturers have tried to improve the quality and no complaint is received, provided the price they ask for is paid. But that does not mean that that is the end of it.

I must also at the same time be frank and say that there are still certain clauses in the Bill which may not meet with the approval of those interested in this industry. But it is the circumstance which necessitated the introduction of this Bill, that is the great slump which overtook the coir industry and which rendered lakhs of people workless and reduced them to penury, it is that which makes me to accept this Bill as it has been introduced, with the

We have to do a lot of research and find out ways and means by which, while we make the quality super excellent, at the same time

[Shri A. V. Thomas]

we can reduce the cost in order to make the manufactured articles go into the market and be absorbed by the people concerned.

I fully commend the Bill and request my friend Mr. Nayar not to press his motion for reference to Select Committee. Personally I feel that the Bill should be passed as quickly as possible, if possible today itself. The other matters can be considered as we work out the Bill.

An Hon. Member: What about labour representation?

Shri A. V. Thomas: As I understand the Bill, labour also should be represented. I think there is a clause there for the representation of producers, workers etc. I think I am personally satisfied with the Bill as it stands now.

Mr. Chairman: As we have had enough general discussion and as I think that hon. Members can also speak when the clause by clause consideration is taken up, I would request the hon. Minister now to reply.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): I would like to say a few words.

Mr. Chairman: Hon. Members will have enough opportunity to speak.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I come from a place where coconut is grown. The hon. Minister does not even know that.

Shri Karmarkar: Since the hon. Member wants to speak, I would have no objection.

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. Members will have enough opportunity to speak in the clause by clause stage. I request the hon. Minister to reply.

Shri Vallatharas: There are some aspects which have been totally left out. Those who are interested in the trade and in coconut growing localities have given their views. There

is the legal aspect; there is the question of economic administration. On these points, there has been no representation at all. If you are pleased, you can also give some time to Members to speak on these matters.

Mr. Chairman: I think in the clause by clause consideration, you will have full opportunity to speak. Now, I have called upon the Minister.

Shri Vallatharas: Clause by clause consideration would not admit these arguments.

Mr. Chairman: I have called the Minister now.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: As a compromise, let my hon. friend and myself speak and then you can call upon the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I have already called upon the Minister to speak. Now you will be able to find some points in reply.

Shri Karmarkar: I should say at the very outset that I appreciate very much the tenor of the whole debate. At the same time, I should say that it will not be possible for me within the brief time which I propose to give myself at this stage, to refer to each point in detail. Broadly, Madam, there have arisen two or three points. One of them was the necessity to give representation to labour in this Board. I shall start by stating our position in this regard. We have here a specific provision providing for representation of labour. A small misgiving might have arisen in the minds of some hon. Members because, instead of the word 'employed in that particular industry', we say, 'employed by growers of coconuts'. We have enlarged that category and we want to give representation to labour wherever they may be employed. When we have used the word 'employed' that should not make any difference at all in the representation

which we want to give. That particular sub-clause is intended specifically to give representation to the working classes, engaged in that industry.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Why not say that in the clause itself?

Shri Karmarkar: Because, my hon. friends will appreciate that in respect of other growers or manufacturers other sub-clauses deal with them. There is specific representation for them and they will not be smuggled into this sub-clause which is meant principally for the workers themselves. I should like to start with an assurance that we shall see to it that the workers are given proper representation.

We were asked on the floor of the House whether organisations would be represented. That should take me to the second point which I should like to make clear to the House. Difference of opinion cannot exist regarding the advisability of having Government Control Boards. Let me say at the very outset that we are not in any doubt as to the precise nature of the Board. We want it to be a representative Board, representative in the sense not technically of this organisation and that, though we shall consider all relevant organisations when making nomination—that goes without doubt—whether growers or manufacturers or labour. But, that does not pin us down to give a sort of elective representation to the organisations as such. I may inform my hon. friends opposite, who are keen about this point about organisations as such, that recently, for instance, till some time ago, we had on the Import Advisory Council one of our consultative bodies, representation given to a particular body among others. My hon. friends will be very much interested to know that when the selection of that representative came up, there was actually an election as to who should be the representatives,

two or four or whatever the number was. There was secret ballot and things like that. In a body like this we do not want all that to happen. Our principal intention is to create a practical, workable, active body, working under the auspices of the Government, working under the auspices of this sovereign Parliament, working in the best interests of all the interests concerned.

There, again, one important point that was raised was, why should this be an entirely nominated body. The whole scheme of this Board, as we would like all these Boards to be, is that the working of this Board should be as much as possible under the constant consideration of this House. There is also an advantage in having autonomous Boards in some other sectors of our economy. But, where something of work is concerned, it is always better that Parliament should be able to raise any question about it either through interpellation or at any stage during the Budget discussions. This arrangement should not enable the Minister to rise up and say, this is an autonomous Board beyond the purview of the Parliament unless the Act is amended. We want this Board and the work done by the Board to be subject to the scrutiny of this House. We have always been insisting on this, however powerful the Board may be. No board will work to the satisfaction of all the interests concerned unless it is amenable to public opinion and the two Houses of Parliament are the best forum where public opinion can be concentrated. The whole scheme is that the Government which is amenable to this House, take upon ourselves the responsibility of nominating the Board and then, the actions of the Board will be open to scrutiny by the House whenever this House chooses to exercise that scrutiny. It may be an interpellation, special discussion or budget discussion, etc. At all times, the Board's activities should be amenable to constant control of this House. We could have

[Shri Karmarkar]

become popular by giving representation to the different bodies, by creating some small electoral colleges, and things like that. We have taken all the responsibility on ourselves for the proper nomination of the various interests. I should also say that so far as it is humanly possible for us, we have tried to see that different sectors of this very important industry are given proper representation.

I do not say that this Bill is a measure of perfection. But, it is a step in the right direction, and as we hope, a useful and effective step in that direction. My hon. friends both the Thomases—though the name Thomas goes with some other appellation—have made nice contributions to the debate. To make myself clear, they are not doubting Thomases, but they are Thomases with faith and they have made an excellent contribution for a proper understanding of this measure. As my hon. friends suggested, if there is any lacuna or defect in the working of this Act, certainly we shall ourselves volunteer and come forward before the House for its agreeing to such improvements in the structure of the Bill that appear to be necessary.

I have just now dealt with the structure of the Board. By and large, we think that the Board should work satisfactorily. I also referred to the advisability of having Government Control over the working of this Board, including the power to dissolve it. A point was made that consultation should be provided before dissolution if such dissolution becomes necessary. After having created a Board of our own, naturally, we do not want to look upon it as a suspect Board or as an accused Board at any stage. We have reserved to ourselves the power of dissolution because in case it is necessary to do so, we shall not hesitate. In doing that, we shall naturally be subject to the scrutiny of this House. There is no question about that. To give an opportunity

to the Board to explain themselves must place them in the category of accused people. If there is a serious emergency, it is only then that we can contemplate dissolution of the Board, created by ourselves, under the auspices of an Act of this House.

The second point that I wanted to reply to, I have already referred to, namely the question of representation. A point was sought to be made at an earlier stage—a point that I should like respectfully to submit, is not relevant to this debate—which I should not like to pass unnoticed, because it is made many a time and debated upon, whether the occasion may be relevant or irrelevant. The point was made that we deal with one set of countries. If there is any misconception in the minds of any hon. Members, I should like to disabuse any such misconception and it is this. So far as our imports and exports are concerned, they are of a general nature. In these days, our foreign trade agreements have changed their old pattern. The old conventional pattern was to get that particular country to agree to import certain commodities in this quantity and quality, and also the export of certain commodities by name are mentioned. We found at an early stage that this would not simply work. It may be possible for us to export, or it may not be possible; it may be possible for the other country to export or it may not be possible. By and by, our bilateral agreements are taking the shape of mentioning in two schedules which both parties desire to export and import respectively. There is no question of any licence, for instance, for the export of coir goods. We do not mention the name of the country except we say either sterling area or dollar area both in respect of imports or exports. We have not, in practice, mentioned any particular country. No export licence of coir or coir products ever bears on its face the country of destination,

unless we enter into a barter transaction which is another aspect altogether. But, in our general working, whenever we issue an export licence, we, of course, limit the quantity when necessary. For instance, in respect of coffee we had to limit the quantity and reduce our exports last year because the quantity available for internal consumption was not sufficient. But, whenever any exportable commodity is available for export, we simply give the man a licence. We do not designate one set of countries or another. The point that I was trying to make out was that we have no leanings with regard to destination of exports. It may possibly be that some hon. Members are not satisfied with our efforts to deal with certain countries. Let me tell them frankly that we are interested now, we have been interested in the past, and that we will be interested in the future also to see to it that our foreign trade develops as much as possible, that our exports increase in value as much as possible and we do not mind if there is a deficit here or a deficit there because in the present position of the Sterling Area, any deficit can be covered by a surplus elsewhere.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. Minister, but I want to seek a clarification from him. Is it not a fact that the export of coir is very largely handled by British firms, and will it be possible that the British firms who have a monopoly in the export of coir and coir products will be interested in sending them to other countries where British people as such do not have a trade?

Shri Karmarkar: I do not myself believe that any *bona fide* merchant, any merchant who wants to serve himself, will limit himself to any desirable destination. I have known of certain cases where merchants have sent goods even to undesirable destinations, but for us there is no desirable or undesirable destination. Some of them even tried to enter forbidden areas or countries. So far as we are

concerned, we allow exports literally to all destinations, and it is hardly necessary for me to add that we are anxious to promote our exports. We are also anxious to have all relevant imports, and so far as our vision is concerned, there is no barrier or distinction between one country and another country. We are interested in the whole of the world as a market for our goods, and we are interested in the whole world as exporters of commodities and manufactured products that we want. I should not like to dilate on this point further. There was a very interesting Resolution almost on this point in the other House, but I need not take up the time of the House by dilating on this point which, in my humble opinion, appears to be rather irrelevant to the issue directly in question regarding the establishment of a Coir Board.

Then there was a small point made. It was a good point I should say. It hardly needs any reiteration from me that we are naturally anxious that coir products, like all of our other products, should be patronised by the Government, both at the Centre and in the States. The Government of India have recently constituted a Purchase Enquiry Committee, and that is going into this question also as to how far and in what manner we can promote the patronage of locally produced goods. On that question there could not be any difference of opinion.

Of course, something could be said about the exact number, whether it should be 40 or 30. It all depends on how we are looking at things. The number forty may look too small or may look too large, but when it came to representation of various interests, we arrived at this number not by any sort of exact astronomical calculation, but on a practical basis. If it is found to be too large, we shall be happy to cut down the number. It may save some money to

[Shri Karmarkar]

the Exchequer also. If it is found to be too small, we shall not hesitate to enlarge it. Ultimately in such matters there can be no opinion as such on any side.

Then, a point was made as to why growers of coconuts should be given representation. We wanted to give representation to all sectors, whosoever is connected with coir products, and therefore we started right from the growers themselves. Then we gave representation to manufacturers as also labourers and other categories, the State Governments concerned and all that.

Now, there was a small discussion as to what was meant by the principal States mostly concerned with the industry. Someone suggested that in addition to Travancore-Cochin there is also Malabar. In drafting or saying these things we are not very meticulous. We know that by and large the hon. Members of this House are aware of the area where coconut grows—and I am quite sure we are expecting something from my hon. friend Shri R. K. Chaudhuri of Assam where also coconuts grow, and I happen to know that Assam grows very good coconuts also amongst other very good things. The point is in giving representation when thinking about this industry our attention is bound to be riveted on the regions where this is the principal industry, and we mention Travancore-Cochin and Malabar and that area because there it is largely an industry which gives employment to a large number of people. I may, in this connection, refer to the hon. lady Member who made such a very nice speech—parts of it I could have just adopted as my own speech, especially where she made a human appeal in the interests of the industry. She also very kindly invited me to visit Travancore-Cochin which I have been very anxious to do for a very long time, because it is a very lovely part of the country I

am told with very lovely people, with a very industrious and intelligent population.

Incidentally, Madam, you are also in the Chair, but that is not why I say this, viz., it is area which rather, from us students of economics, does require a little special attention. It is an area....

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Beautiful area!

Shri Karmarkar: of ample labour, in the sense of productive labour. And that area abounds so much in cottage industries that recently when there was a slump in our export trade of coir products, I know very well what a great misery the people there had to suffer on account of this shock to the industry. It is an area where the people are not in a position to absorb any such shock. For instance, in the part of the country where I come from, if cotton fails, something else is grown; the agriculturist is richly producing all things, and there the population, economically, are in a position to absorb the strength of a shock. But the area to which the coir industry principally belongs is one where people cannot easily absorb a shock without damaging themselves if there is the least disturbance.

There is also the employment problem. Something was said about mechanisation and non-mechanisation, and cottage industries and things like that. Well, these are times when we have to go carefully. Any mechanisation has to be done in such a manner as not to do irreparable damage to the people concerned. We have to proceed cautiously in this matter. If we disturb a cottage industry on account of over-mechanisation and are not able to give them alternative employment; well, that will create a very serious problem. In Travancore-Cochin or the coir industry area, this is also a very

serious problem, and we shall have to take measures in respect of over-mechanisation or starting cottage industry strictly from the point of view of the people's benefit.

Then, something was said about export. It is a pity coir is a product which we cannot absorb ourselves with the best goodwill. Even with internal consumption, on howsoever a large scale, we would not be able to do all that is necessary for the coir products. This is a produce which, to a substantial amount of time, has to depend upon exports, and there again, all the elements come in. We have to sell at a reasonable price. We have to finish our products in a nice manner. The export market must readily absorb it. And it is a product which happens to depend upon the mercies of the export market. Naturally we are interested in it. There is a drive for export promotion, and I need hardly assure the House that these products will receive the best attention that we can possibly give so far as export is concerned.

I entirely agree—though it is an immaterial matter from his point of view—with Shri N. Sreekantan Nair in what he said regarding the peculiarities of this industry. It is these peculiarities that give us cause for concern, and I need hardly assure him that we will do all that we can so far as it lies in our power to help the industry, whether it is price stabilisation, or whether it is minimum wages. Of course, the caprices of the market is a thing beyond our control. Foreign monopoly is a very favourite subject with him amongst others. It concerns us also, but I shall not take up the time of the House by giving our views on the subject which have been given extensively on previous occasion. But basically I think we agree.

Something was said about democracy. I do not know what the hon. Member meant by that. Democracy came to us about 60 years back not from the top to bottom, but from the

bottom to the top, with municipalities, local boards etc., and ultimately we have now achieved sovereign democracy. I do not think the hon. Member is anxious to move the hands of the clock in the reverse direction. In a matter of this kind, the Board must be a very practical and working body, which will be subject to controls easily, if control is necessary. This is not the place where we can really exercise our discretion of making the Board more democratic than necessary.

I need hardly refer to Mr. Kelappan's point regarding cottage industries. I agree in substance and spirit with what he said. We cannot afford to do away with the cottage industry basis, unless we are able to substitute it with something better.

Something was said about Mysore also. I come from a place which is rather near Mysore, but on that ground, I shall not wax eloquent on the matter. But we know that even people in Delhi have the privilege of enjoying coconuts from Mysore. But this is not a limited question, confined to only some areas. Wherever it is possible to develop the coir industry,—apart from the fact that in particular regions, it is of great importance, as for instance, in the south—we are bound to do whatever could practically be done to develop it on the cottage industry basis or in any other suitable manner, whether it is Ratnagiri or any other place. I believe Ratnagiri also partakes partially of the nature of these areas where other means of production are very small, and there is a large amount of unemployed labour.

I should like to conclude on the point which my hon. friend Shri A. M. Thomas referred to, namely, let us give it a fair trial. I am very happy to note that all these Members who have spoken on this Bill have one point in common, and it is that we should try to give the best trial possible. I am quite sure that with the co-operation of this House and the co-operation of public opinion

[Shri Karmarkar]

outside, our efforts in this direction will prove to be a success.

I should also say at this stage incidentally—so that I may save the time of the House later on—that we have tried to see which of the amendments we should really adopt. So when we worked on this Bill, we worked absolutely with an open mind. It was not as if we were in any way reluctant to accept anything that was acceptable. In fact, even after this Bill is passed, we shall continue to work with an open mind, so far as the admissibility of any amendment is concerned. But I should indicate here that such of the amendments as have been before the House and have been found to be acceptable by us in the interests of this legislation, have already been tabled in the name of myself and my colleague. Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. The other amendments, I regret very much to say, are amendments which we shall have to oppose.

In conclusion, I should once again say that I appreciate very much the general tenor of the whole debate.

Mr. Chairman: Before we take up the Bill clause by clause, I would like to enquire of Shri V. P. Nayar, whether he wants to press his amendment moved on the 7th August 1953, for referring the Bill to a Select Committee.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Yes. I have also to submit that in pressing my amendment, I should draw the attention of the House to the fact that last time when even before this amendment of mine was moved Shri Karmarkar said:

“Therefore, while I would deem it my duty to oppose the motion for reference of the Bill to Select Committee.....”

He created an impression that he was more eager than some of us here, to have the Bill passed. But

the House must know that had my amendment been accepted, we would have had a thorough discussion, and we would have been able to place the report of the Select Committee one week after the Bill was referred to the Select Committee. But now more than three months have elapsed, and yet the Bill could not be passed. This was the attitude of Government which the House should note. And I press my motion for referring the Bill to the Select Committee.

Shri Karmarkar: I should like to say a word, because I did not touch upon it earlier. I shall just say a word with regard to referring the Bill to a Select Committee.

I am grateful to my esteemed friend for drawing my attention to the fact that I had opposed the motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee then. I regret very much to say that our position continues to be the same now. But I should like to tell my hon. friend that we were really anxious to see this measure through. If there was ground to oppose that motion then, there is really more ground now to oppose it, as my hon. friend will agree, because three months have elapsed, and so the problems require a little more attention.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That is so.

Shri Karmarkar: But I can give the hon. Member this personal assurance that we had no pre-notice or prescience that in spite of our opposition to this amendment of my hon. friend, three months were going to elapse, without our really meaning it. We are anxious to see such measures through as early as possible. Therefore I feel compelled to oppose my hon. friend's amendment for referring the Bill to a Select Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Before I put the amendment of Shri V. P. Nayar to the vote of the House, may I point out to him that the date he has

given in his amendment is 17th August 1953? It may require some correction for the date.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That can be changed to 25th of November, 1953.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put Shri V. P. Nayar's amendment to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Kumari Annie Mascarene, Shri A. K. Gopalan, Shri K. A. Damodara Menon, Shri K. Kelappan, Shri P. T. Punnoose, Shri K. T. Achuthan, Shri A. Nesamony, Shri Eacharan Iyyani, Shri C. R. Iyyunni, Shri A. M. Thomas, Shri A. V. Thomas, Prof. C. P. Mathew, Shri Nettur P. Damodaran, Shri N. Sreekantan Nair, Shri D. P. Karmarkar, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, and the Mover, with instructions to report not later than the 25th November, 1953."

Some Hon. Members: The 'Ayes' have it.

Mr. Chairman: I shall first ask those who are in favour to stand in their seats.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Let us have a division.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): If I may submit, Madam, it may be the intention of those who are supporting the amendment that their names should be recorded for whatever reason they know best. If that is so, I submit that it is necessary to have a division and have the names recorded.

Shri Karmarkar: I am afraid, from this side of the House I should say that to have a name recorded is not a matter of right. If the Chair has any doubt, then it could happen, and the Chair can call for a division. The Chair can ask those who are in favour to stand up first, and those who are against to stand up in their seats afterwards, and I think that will clearly solve the problem.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: On a point of order, Madam. There are many

Members anxious to vote, and so let the division bell be rung.

Shri V. P. Nayar: We are hardly having a quorum here.

Shri Karmarkar: I should say that that is also not a relevant consideration. If there is quorum in the House, then the House is competent to vote. So it is not necessary to call upon our colleagues from the corridors.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: The general practice is that the division bell is rung.

Mr. Chairman: I am in the hands of the House, and if the hon. Members are anxious to have a division, they can have it.

Shri Karmarkar: The House has to say that.

Mr. Chairman: Let there be a division.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

5 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.. There is an amendment to the original Motion and a Division was called on the amendment. The 'Ayes' will stand in their places.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, I submit that before you came and the Chairman was conducting the proceedings, I had submitted before her that for whatever reason—I do not know what it is—the sponsors of this amendment wished to have their names recorded in the Division. And that is why, Sir, it is necessary for us to have a real Division and not a counting of heads.

Mr. Speaker: I mean a real Division and I shall record the names of those who stand up.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It cannot be unilateral record because a Division implies in Parliamentary procedure, as far as I can understand, that there is a recording of names on either side. That is very important.

Mr. Speaker: Before the hon. Member comes to any conclusion about what I am doing, let him see what is being done.

[Mr. Speaker]

Those in favour of the amendment will stand in their places.

Their number is 12.

Those against the amendment will stand in their places.

Their number is 118.

The names of those who have voted for or against have been taken down and the lists would be hung up, and if Members find any inaccuracies therein, they will kindly have the lists corrected.

AYES

Chowdary, Shri C. R.
Krishnaswami, Dr.
More, Shri S. S.
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.

Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
Nambiar, Shri
Nayar, Shri V.P.
Ramasami, Shri M. D.

Rab, Shri Gopala
Rao, Shri P.R.
Rao, Shri Vittal
Reddy, Shri Esawara

NOES

Achal Singh, Seth
Achuthan, Shri
Agarwal, Shri H.L.
Agrawal, Shri M.L.
Akarpuri, Sardar
Altekar, Shri
Azad, Maulana
Balasubramaniam, Shri
Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri P.L.
Basappa, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B.R.
Bhandari, Shri
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Bhatt, Shri C.
Bheekha Bhai, Shri
Bose, Shri P.C.
Charak, Shri
Chaudhary Shri G.L.
Chaudhury, Shri R.K.
Choudhri, Shri M. Shaffee
Damodaran, Shri G.R.
Das, Shri B.K.
Das, Shri S.N.
Datar, Shri
Deb, Shri S.C.
Desai, Shri K.K.
Deshmukh, Dr. P. S.
Deshmukh, C.D.
Deshpande, Shri G.H.
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Dwivedi, Shri M.L.
Gandhi, Shri V.B.
Gounder, Shri K.P.
Guha, Shri A.C.
Gupta, Shri Badshah
Hazarika, Shri J.N.
Hem Raj, Shri
Iyyunni, Shri C.R.
Jagjivan Ram, Shri

Jain, Shri N.S.
Jangde, Shri
Joshi, Shri M.D.
Joshi, Shri N.L.
Joshi, Shrimati Sulhadra
Kajrolkar, Shri
Kale, Shrimati A.
Karmarkar, Shri
Katju, Dr.
Khan, Shri Sadath Ali
Khuda Baksh, Shri M.
Krishnamachari, Shri T.T.
Krishnappa, Shri M.V.
Lakshmayya, Shri
Lal, Shri R.S.
Lallanji, Shri
Madiah Gowda, Shri
Mahtab, Shri
Malaviya, Shri K.D.
Mathew, Shri
Matthen, Shri
Maydeo, Shrimati
Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri L.N.
Mishra, Shri Lokenath
Misra, Shri R.D.
Morarka, Shri
Musafir, Giani G.S.
Natesan, Shri
Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
Nehru, Shrimati Uma
Neawi, Shri
Nijalingappa, Shri
Parekh, Dr. J.N.
Parikh, Shri S.G.
Patel, Shri B.K.
Patel, Shrimati Maniben
Patil, Shri Kanavade
Pawar, Shri V.P.

Rachiah, Shri N.
Raj Bahadur, Shri
Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
Ranbir Singh, Ch.
Rane, Shri
Roy, Shri B.N.
Sahaya, Shri Syamnandan
Saigal, Sardar A.S.
Saksena, Shri Mohanlal
Samanta, Shri S.C.
Satish Chandra, Shri
Sen, Shrimati Sushama
Shahnawaz Khan, Shri
Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
Sharma, Pandit K.C.
Sharma, Shri K.R.
Shivananjappa, Shri
Suhkha, Pandit B.
Siddananjappa, Shri
Singh, Shri T.N.
Sinha, Dr. S.N.
Sinha, Shri A.P.
Sinha, Shri Anirudha
Sinha, Shri Jhulan
Sinha, Shri K.P.
Sinha, Shri N.P.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Siva, Dr. Gangadhara
Subrahmanyam, Shri T.
Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu
Thimmajah, Shri
Thomas, Shri A.M.
Thomas, Shri A.V.
Tivary, Shri V.N.
Tiwari, Pandit B.L.
Upadhyay, Shri Shiva Dayal
Vyas, Shri Radhelal
Wilson, Shri J.N.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now, we will proceed with the further consideration of the Bill.

The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the control by the Union of the

Coir Industry and for that purpose to establish a Coir Board and levy a customs duty on coir fibre, coir yarn and coir products exported from India, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I will now take up clause by clause.

Clause 2.— (*Declaration as to expediency etc.*)

Shri C. R. Iyyunni: I am not moving my amendment, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Then there is no other amendment.

The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3.— (*Definitions*)

Shri Karmarkar: Sir, coir usually means coir fibre. In order to make the point clear this has been expanded.

Amendment made:

In page 1, line 19, for "from coir" substitute "wholly or partly from coir or coir yarn".

—[*Shri Karmarkar*]

Shri C. R. Iyyunni: I am not moving my amendment, Sir.

Further Amendment made:

In page 2—

(i) after line 6 insert—

'(h) "husks" means coconut husks, both raw and retted; and

(ii) lines 7 and 8 for "(h)" and "(i)" substitute "(i)" and "(j)" respectively.

—[*Shri Karmarkar*]

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 4.— (*Constitution of Coir Board.*)

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

In page 2, for lines 19 to 22, substitute—

"(3) The Board shall consist of a Chairman and such number of members not exceeding twenty-five as the Central Government may appoint from among persons who represent—"

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the purpose of my amendment is to make the Board more compact and concise. Just now when the Minister was replying to the general debate, he made an observation, a very significant observation that the main purpose of the Bill is to make the Board workable and more practicable. I certainly endorse that opinion but I want to put a question to him, whether the Board so constituted under the present Bill will fulfil that purpose. Sir, if we read this particular clause, we will come to know that in the Board there will be 40 members and the Chairman will be nominated by the Government. Sir, we all know from experience that Boards which possess very large numbers of members cannot function smoothly and efficiently. We are aware how the Silk Board and other Boards which possess a large number of members cannot meet often and cannot transact business and very large Boards always constitute a hindrance to smooth working. So, there is no harm done if the number of members who go to constitute the Board is reduced. So, I have suggested in the amendment that for the word 'forty' the word 'twenty-five' be substituted.

Further, Sir, I have also suggested that (g) in sub-clause (3) of clause 4 may be deleted. The main purpose

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

in deleting this sub-clause is to take away power from the Central Government from appointing people with a view to favour them. If this sub-clause is kept then there is a danger that the Central Government, with a view to favour a few individuals here and there, may appoint them to the Board under this provision. So, with a view to avoid this, I have suggested that this particular sub-clause may be deleted from clause 4.

Further I submit that the Chairman of the Board has to be nominated by the Government according to the Bill. While replying to the debate, the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry said that the Ministry is responsible to Parliament and therefore when the Chairman of the Board is nominated by the Ministry it means the Board also will be responsible to Parliament. I feel that is a very queer logic. Whatever bodies are appointed by Government cannot be controlled by Parliament directly or indirectly. It is our experience; our Government may be responsible to the Legislature. This Ministry may be responsible to the House. We all agree that nothing that is done by a Board or a committee that is appointed by this Government can be controlled directly or indirectly by this Parliament because we know how very difficult it is for such a large body as this Parliament to exercise direct control or supervise the activities of the Board. I suggest that by nominating the Chairman, that is by giving to Government the power to nominate the Chairman of the Board, we will be only helping the Government to favour one or two individuals. The Chairman may not enjoy the confidence of the other members of the Board. The Chairman appointed by Government may in effect mean an imposition on the Board. There may not be sufficient understanding between the Chairman and the members. The only way of making the Board more democratic is to allow members to elect their own Chairman. Government have agreed to the

election of the Vice-Chairman; I do not see why the same principle should not be applied here. Both the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman should be elected. Further, the Board must be a compact body. Forty is a large number. It is more than the number of members in the legislature of a Part C State. It is necessary to take steps to form a compact board, so that we may avoid administrative expense and other difficulties.

I once again move that my amendment may be accepted.

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 2, for lines 19 to 22, substitute—

“(3) The Board shall consist of a Chairman and such number of members not exceeding twenty-five as the Central Government may appoint from among persons who represent—”

Shri Karmarkar: I beg to oppose the amendment. We are also not enamoured of a very big Board, but we should make it possible for giving representation to the different interests concerned. We have been careful to say that the membership will be “not exceeding forty”. If we can do with a lesser number, we shall certainly keep to a lesser number. In view of this, I trust my hon. friend will not press his amendment.

About the Chairman, after a great deal of consideration we have decided to nominate the Chairman. He will be a man responsible to the Government. We have conceded the suggestion that the Vice-Chairman may be elected from among the members. I think that this compromise will work well.

Shri M. D. Joshi: As a corollary to my speech during the general discussion, I humbly suggest to the hon. Minister that in view of the welfare and the development of the Ratnagiri and Hanavar districts in this matter, the need of our region may be taken into consideration and one seat may kindly be reserved for my district. I

do not want it to be mentioned anywhere, but then our needs may be given consideration and one seat may be reserved for us.

Shri Karmarkar: Regarding this, since it has been mentioned by my hon. friend, I may say that though we shall not be reserving a seat for any area, we shall certainly give consideration to the suggestion that he has made.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, for lines 19 to 22, substitute—

“(3) The Board shall consist of a Chairman and such number of members not exceeding twenty-five as the Central Government may appoint from among persons who represent—”

The motion was negated.

Shri Vallatharas: I beg to move:

(i) In page 2, lines 19 and 20, for—

“(3) The Board shall consist of a Chairman and such number of other members not exceeding forty as the Central Government may think” substitute—

“(3) The Board shall consist of such number of members not exceeding forty as the Central Government may think”

(ii) In page 2, after line 31, add—

“(3A) The Board shall elect a Chairman from among its members.”

In the democratic set-up of things, it is quite natural that the members who constitute the Board should have the privilege of electing their own Chairman. There may be special considerations which may make the Government feel that the Chairman must be a person of their choice, but in this case Government has fortified itself in more than one way. First of all, all the members are nominated by Government. Secondly, money from the Consolidated Fund is to be granted by Government. Thirdly, there are also Government representatives on the Board. Fourthly, Government has power to abolish the Board. With

these four fortifications in the background, I do not see any justification for nominating the Chairman. Of course, if the reasons are convincing, I may withdraw my amendments, but I do submit that in the democratic set-up of things and on the basis of the points which I have urged, the Chairman must be elected and not nominated.

Mr. Speaker: Amendments moved:

In page 2, lines 19 and 20, for “(3) The Board shall consist of a Chairman and such number of other members not exceeding forty as the Central Government may think” substitute—

“(3) The Board shall consist of such number of members not exceeding forty as the Central Government may think”

In page 2, after line 31, add—

“(3A) The Board shall elect a Chairman from among its members.”

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: My amendment also concerns the election of the Chairman.

Mr. Speaker: He may speak on this amendment, because the fate of his amendment will be decided by the fate of this one.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: The hon. Commerce Minister was speaking in a derisive tone when he referred to democratic practices. It has been the democratic practice of this House and even of the British Government when they ruled this country that in such Boards the President is generally elected. But unfortunately certain incidents in your absence occurred in some parts of the country, which had their reactions and coloured the mind of the hon. Minister, so much so that he felt that such Boards should have nominated Chairman. Whatever may be the rights and wrongs of the incidents that took place and that found a reverberation in this House for several sessions, it would be, to say the least, unwise to change the entire

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair]

set-up of these Boards. When the Secretary is appointed by Government, it takes away the confidence of the people, if the Chairman is also nominated. It will be a body controlled completely by Government with all responsible officers appointed by it. The mere election of the Vice-Chairman does not serve the purpose. This is a Board in which real practical experience of the industry is required. It is not like the Tea Board. I find that the provisions of the Tea Board Act have been transplanted here, as if the coir industry and the tea industry are the same. I do not find any meaning in that. The Chairman must be an elected man with some powers to act. If it is found that something untoward had happened previously and on that score all the democratic practices are now cut off, my feeling is that even history will not support that action.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: This is a new venture that the Government is undertaking. It might even be necessary in the initial stages to have an official chairman and since the object is really to see that the Board works properly, we have taken powers for nomination. I do not know what the hon. Member, Shri N. Sreekantan Nair, meant when he referred to some incidents and Government's vision being coloured and all that. In any event, Government feel that some serious effort has to be put behind this coir industry and they would therefore like to reserve the powers of nominating a Chairman. Later on, we may nominate a non-official chairman. Initially, it is the intention of Government to have an official chairman.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put amendments 41 and 48 together.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: What about mine, No. 42?

Mr. Speaker: It has not been moved. I had stated earlier that he may merely speak on the amendments actually moved, and if any of them is negated, then his amendment will be barred. The question is:—

(i) In page 2, lines 19 and 20, for—

“(3) The Board shall consist of a Chairman and such number of other members not exceeding forty as the Central Government may think” substitute—

“(3) The Board shall consist of such number of members not exceeding forty as the Central Government may think”

The motion was negated.

Mr. Speaker: The question is: In page 2, after line 31, add—

“(3A) The Board shall elect a Chairman from among its members.”

The motion was negated.

Mr. Speaker: List No. 2, amendment No. 22—Shri Sreekantan Nair.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I think this also goes out.

Mr. Speaker: Does Shri Thomas move it?

Shri A. M. Thomas: I do not move.

Mr. Speaker: List No. 2, amendment No. 23—Shri Iyyunni.

Shri C. R. Iyyunni: I am not pressing this, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: List No. 3, amendment No. 43—Shri Nayar.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

In page 2, line 22, for “among persons who are in its opinion capable of representing” substitute “persons representing”.

This is a very simple amendment and the idea behind this amendment is very clear. The difference between “persons who are in the opinion of Government capable of representing” and “persons actually representing” is obvious and the Government will surely understand the difference and in that case there will be no difficulty for the Government to accept it.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: They do understand the difference and that is why they prefer to stick to their own line.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, line 22 for "among persons who are in its opinion capable of representing" substitute "persons representing".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: List No. 2, amendment No. 24—Shri Sreekantan Nair.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I beg to move:

In page 2,

(i) line 22, for "who are in its opinion capable of representing" substitute "who are elected by representative organisations on the following basis"

(ii) for lines 23 to 29 substitute—

"(a) not more than two from the producers and suppliers of husks;

(b) not less than five from the trade Unions representing coir yarn workers;

(c) not less than five from the coir yarn manufacturers and coir yarn dealers;

(d) not less than five from the workers engaged in coir goods manufacturing;

(e) not less than five from the coir goods manufacturers and exporters;

(f) five members of Parliament and five members of the Travancore-Cochin State Legislature;"

The first amendment, i.e. amendment

(1), is very clear. According to me, Sir, the members of the Board should be representative of the various interests, whether they be capitalists, merchants, or employees. Without this, there is no meaning in saying "those who are capable of representing". I can represent some interests only if I am elected by the organisations representing those interests. It does not matter whether it is an organisation on employers or employees. For example, coconut growers have their own organisation and they should have their accredited representative on the Board and not somebody whom

Government thinks as capable of representing the coconut growers.

In the second amendment, i.e. amendment (ii), I am trying to fix the proportion to some extent of the representatives in a Board of 40 members. (a) not more than two from the producers and suppliers of husks; the price of husks is a fairly important issue in the coconut trade, though not the most important issue, and the husks do play a part in the production of coir, because they are the primary raw material.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: On a point of order, Sir. I think there is no quorum in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Has he counted the number?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: It is 38, that is less than 40.

Mr. Speaker: Let me see. If it is 39, we may have my name to make up the 40. I see more Members are coming in now and so let us proceed.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: The interests representing the husks must not have too much representation in the Board. Then,

(b) not less than five from the trade Unions representing coir yarn workers; the House knows very well that there are several thousands of such people in this trade and they must be adequately represented. As it is, these people do not get more than Rs. 50 in a year for the hard work they are putting in this trade. So, they must have their representatives to voice their grievances and this number must be not less than five.

(c) not less than five from the coir yarn manufacturers and coir yarn dealers; of course we demand elected people to represent trade unions. We must also out of equity say, that employers should get 5 seats.

(d) not less than five from the workers engaged in coir goods manufacturing. The manufacturing process

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair]

In (c) is entirely different from the coir goods producing process. One is almost a machinised process in which lesser number of workers are engaged—but at the same time it is one of the most important industries in Alleppey Shertalai, Quilon and other areas and there tens of thousands of workers are employed in this work. They must also get adequate representation.

(e) not less than five from the coir goods manufacturers and exporters. This naturally follows.

(f) five members of Parliament and five members of the Travancore-Cochin State Legislature.

This is a rough idea which I am trying to give to the House as to how the representations can be made. Actually it gives a total of 32 members now and there are eight more members whom the Government can choose as they like—it may be from the point of view of interests, areas or persons themselves. I submit that this amendment may be accepted. Finally I may point out Shri Thomas, a Congress Member, an eminent employer and exporter, said that pressure will be brought to bear on the Government and so it is always better the representation of the various interests is prescribed, I mean the limits, in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest that Shri V. P. Nayar may also move his amendment, i.e. No. 44.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

In page 2, for lines 23 to 31 substitute—

“(a) manufacturers of coir products nominated by their organisations;

(b) workers of coir factories nominated by their unions, their number being five;

(c) producers of coir yarn;

(d) workers engaged in production of yarn to be nominated by their unions;

(e) three members to be elected by Parliament from among its members;

(f) the Governments of principal coconut growing States;

(g) two members to be elected by the Travancore-Cochin Assembly and one member to be elected by the Madras Assembly from among their members;

(h) such other persons or class of persons, who, in the opinion of the Central Government, ought to be represented on the Board.”

It is practically the same as the other amendment, but my amendment seeks to have some other changes, though substantially it is the same as the one moved by Shri Sreekantan Nair.

Mr. Speaker: I shall take vote separately, but the discussion will be common.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Here again, I am faced with the same difficulty—the difficulty is that the hon. Minister can say that it is because they have understood in that spirit that they are going to oppose it. I can only promise the hon. Minister that I will give him arguments, but cannot give him an understanding.

Sir, originally when the Bill came before the House, the first interest which was sought to be represented was that of growers of coconuts. Subsequently, wisdom dawned and Government tried to make a further change, but there also it is not at all sufficient. Instead of “growers of coconuts”, what Government propose now is “growers of coconuts and producers of husks and coir yarn”. Government are convinced that growers of coconuts have no axe to grind and so I fail to understand why the Government should not accept the amendment which we propose here. In fact, Sir, if it is the intention of Government to give representation to the real interests in the industry, then I do not see any reason why Government should

ignore these amendments, because I have in my amendment provided for the representation of manufactures of coir products nominated by their organisations. What harm is there, I do not know. All that I have asked for is for representation of workers of coir factories nominated by their unions. We are not asking for ten representatives to be on the Board. You must understand that there are hundreds of thousands of workers in this industry and to represent them we are only asking for five workers, but let them be elected. Why they have to be elected is a matter on which we have many things to say.

We have always found that in such boards without exception, so far, very often become offices of hiring. We have found several such instances. It is not a question of boards having been constituted and the personnel recruited on a proper basis. We want to eliminate that. If Government genuinely feel that the interest of the workers is an important interest which has to be represented in this Board then it is better you leave it to the workers. They have their organisations. They have gone through very many battles for establishing their rights. They are very well organised. Why don't you give them an opportunity. If you want that the interests of the workers should be represented it is not enough that somebody in New Delhi says that I consider, the Government of India considers that this particular gentleman is capable of representing labour much better than the representatives of labour elected by trade unions. We cannot lose sight of the fact that if Government wants the services of somebody who must represent labour and who must represent labour to the best of his capacity, then it can only be by an elected representative of labour.

Then, Sir, we are not here asking that Government should not retain any power in the matter of nomination. Sub-clause (h) of my amendment provides for "such other persons or class of persons, who, in the opinion of the Central Government,

ought to be represented on the Board". Government interests should certainly be represented; we do not dispute that. But for the sake of the industry, for the sake of hundreds of thousands of our workers, for the sake of thousands of other people who are interested in this industry, please accept my amendments.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, I am again in the unfortunate position of not being able to understand the hon. member to the extent of being able to appreciate his arguments. In fact, in regard to nomination of members on such boards we have given an assurance in the case of other Boards of this nature that we shall invite organisations to send panels out of which we will nominate. I am afraid I am not in a position in regard to this particular industry even to give that assurance at the present moment, because it is not yet organised to the extent that we can give an assurance of that nature. Perhaps in time it might be and then when the Board is reconstituted we might ask for panels of names to be sent by representative organisations. At the moment I am afraid I cannot go beyond the four corners of the wording of this particular Bill. I, therefore, have to oppose the amendments moved by the two hon. members opposite.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In page 2, for "who are in its opinion capable of representing" substitute "who are elected by representative organisations on the following basis"

(ii) for lines 23 to 29 substitute—

"(a) not more than two from the producers and suppliers of husks;

(b) not less than five from the trade unions representing coir yarn workers;

(c) not less than five from the coir yarn manufacturers and coir yarn dealers;

[Mr. Chairman]

(d) not less than five from the workers engaged in coir goods manufacturing;

(e) not less than five from the coir goods manufacturers and exporters;

(f) five members of Parliament and five members of the Travancore-Cochin State Legislature;"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In para 2, for lines 23 to 31 substitute—

"(a) manufacturers of coir products nominated by their organisations;

(b) workers of coir factories nominated by their unions, their number being five;

(c) producers of coir yarn;

(d) workers engaged in production of yarn to be nominated by their unions;

(e) three members to be elected by Parliament from among its members;

(f) the Governments of principal coconut growing States;

(g) two members to be elected by the Travancore-Cochin Assembly and one member to be elected by the Madras Assembly from among their members;

(h) such other persons or class of persons, who, in the opinion of the Central Government, ought to be represented on the Board."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now proceed to amendments No. 3 and 4.

Shri Karmarkar: I beg to move:

(i) In page 2, line 23, for "growers of coconuts" substitute "growers of coconuts and producers of husks and coir yarn";

(ii) page 2, line 24, for "persons employed by growers of coconuts" substitute "persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn and in the manufacture of coir products".

Mr. Chairman: Amendments moved:

(i) In page 2, line 23, for "growers of coconuts" substitute "growers of coconuts and producers of husks and coir yarn";

(ii) In page 2, line 24, for "persons employed by growers of coconuts" substitute persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn and the manufacture of coir products".

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Sir, here at least the legitimate interests of labour can be safeguarded if the hon. Minister in his amendment No. 4 substitutes the word "employed" for the word "engaged".

Shri Karmarkar: It does not make any difference.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, I think the word "engaged" is better than the word "employed". "Employment" is perhaps a little more restrictive than "engagement". It may be that a person may have been formerly employed, but now he has got other interests in this particular industry. For example, all labour Union representatives are not employed, they are very often outside that particular industry.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: We are not even anxious about trade union interests!

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: But I am anxious!

Shri S. C. Samanta: I am thankful to the hon. Minister for having brought forward this amendment No. 3, whereby he seeks to give representation to producers of husks and coir yarn along with growers of coconuts. But I am feeling some difficulty. My apprehension is that by the addition

of this representation the coconut growers' interests may be affected. There are many undeveloped and under-developed parts of India where coconut grows profusely, but there is no scope for making husks there. I may mention that in Bengal and other parts of India half the quantity of coconuts grown remain unused for coir that is, the milk of the coconuts is drunk when the coconut is green. If persons from this area are represented in this Committee they will suggest means for utilising these coconuts for making husks. If, as is sought to be done, the scope of representation is enlarged only producers of husks and coir yarn may be represented on the Committee and the growers of coconuts may go unrepresented. If the hon. Minister agrees with my view, I shall move my amendment No. 45.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid there is a little confusion. Essentially, this relates to coir industry. The question of retting of husks is an integral part of this industry. If it is a question of growers of coconuts they have to go on the Coconut Committee. Here only those people who are interested in coir could be represented. In any event, no harm will be done to people who come from Bengal. If there is a possibility of that industry developing in Bengal they may be nominated under sub-clause (d).

Mr. Chairman: I shall put these amendments to the vote of the House.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Can these amendments be put to vote together?

Mr. Chairman: I am going to put them separately. First of all I will put No. 3. The question is:

In page 2, line 23, for "growers of coconuts" substitute "growers of coconuts and producers of husks and coir yarn".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put No. 4.

The question is:

In page 2, line 24, for "persons employed by growers of coconuts" substitute persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn and the manufacture of coir products".

The motion was adopted.

Shri Madiah Gowda: I beg to move:

In page 2, omit line 25.

In view of the fact that the hon. Minister has just moved an amendment (No. 4) under clause 4 which includes 'manufacture of coir products', item (c) (line 25 in page 2) is redundant. So it need not be there. It is a very simple amendment which the hon. Minister can accept. He has brought it out under item (b). So item (c) is redundant.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, it is not very clear, because this particular amendment moved by my colleague is intended essentially to represent labour, and this definitely states "manufacturers of coir products". People manufacturing must be also engaged in it, but there might be a slightly strained interpretation on 'manufacturer'. If he does not mind, it can remain there. Redundancy is no harm.

Shri Madiah Gowda: The doubt will arise ...

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is not exhaustive but only illustrative.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Member wish me to put the amendment to the House?

Shri Madiah Gowda: No, I do not press it. I wish to move my next amendment (No. 27). I move:

In page 2, line 29, for "the principal coconut growing States" substitute "Travancore-Cochin, Madras and Mysore States".

I want that the 'principal coconut growing States' mentioned in clause 4 should be made clear. From the speeches that I have heard it looks

[Shri Madiah Gowda]

as though Travancore-Cochin is the only State where coconut is grown. It is not so. I have in my hand the Report by Shri C. M. John who is an authority on the production of coconuts in India, published in 1952, where it is stated that in the matter of production of coconuts, Madras stands first, then comes Travancore-Cochin. It is no doubt true, even as the word Kerala indicates, that the first and foremost part of the country where the greatest importance is stressed on coconut is Kerala, that is Travancore-Cochin. But it cannot be said that the other parts of India, particularly Mysore which is responsible for nearly one-third of the production of coconuts, are less important. As was just now mentioned by the hon. Minister, the coconut produced in Mysore is sweeter—*Gangapani* produced in Mysore is well known. Regarding coir itself, when we are producing nearly one-third husks in Mysore, it cannot be said that in the production of coir products it cannot come up to the level of Travancore-Cochin or other parts of India. It is true that in regard to the production of coir products sufficient attention is not bestowed in other parts as in Travancore-Cochin. That does not mean in the least that greater attention should not be paid to those parts which are backward in regard to the production of coir products. Unfortunately, though Mysore produces a large quantity of husks, for want of sufficient encouragement these husks which are very valuable raw products are burnt as fuel mostly. A large number of poor people are living even now by producing ropes and such other things from coir, in Mysore. (Shri A. M. Thomas: Mysore is not excluded.) So I want that in this Bill it should be made very clear that Mysore is also an important State where coconuts are grown and coir products are produced. It is no doubt true that Bengal is also an area where coconuts are produced, but the area in Bengal is only 16,000 acres whereas in Mysore the area where coconuts are grown is

1,80,000 acres. There are also other parts in India where there are a few thousand acres of area in which coconuts are grown. But the most important States in India today so far as the growing of coconuts is concerned are Madras which produces 15 million and odd coconuts every year, Travancore-Cochin which produces 13 million and odd coconuts every year, and Mysore which produces about 3 million coconuts every year. My fear is that by the amendments that have just now been moved by some of my friends coming from Kerala, it looks as though Mysore and even Madras can be neglected in the matter of representation on this Board. So I want that it should be made very clear in the Bill itself that Mysore is also a coconut-growing State and it should have a proper representation in the Board that is to be constituted. It is for this purpose that I have moved this amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

In page 2, line 29, for "the principal coconut growing States" substitute "Travancore-Cochin, Madras and Mysore States".

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The position is this. My hon. friends opposite wanted to restrict the number to 25. I think it is a very good suggestion. A big and unwieldy Board does not work. We probably will have to begin with 25 or 27 or 30 Members. The problem is a pressing one so far as Travancore-Cochin and Ponnani Taluk in Malabar are concerned. We have got to do something about it. Once we do something in the place where the industry exists and not in a very good condition, we can then spread our tentacles wider. There is no point in our trying to give representation to Mysore, Bombay, Bengal, Orissa, Madras, etc., now categorically. We have probably to do it later on. That is why we have got the number of Members in the Board flexible as 40. Initially we will begin with a small Board and concentrate on the area where some attention is

needed. I am unable to accept the suggestion made by the hon. Member.

Shri Madiala Gowda: I fail to understand why Mysore needs no attention.

Shri Karmarkar: We shall give attention to all areas.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: We shall certainly; but not yet.

Mr. Chairman: I am putting the amendment to the House.

The question is:

In page 2, line 29, for "the principal coconut growing States" substitute "Travancore-Cochin, Madras and Mysore States".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Amendment No. 46.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I do not wish to move my amendment No. 46.

Mr. Chairman: Shri V. P. Nayar: Amendment No. 47.

Shri V. P. Nayar: It is clear from the wording of the amendment. If it is the consistent policy of the Government not to pay any attention to any of our amendments, I do not think there is any purpose in my pressing it.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Member propose to move it?

Shri V. P. Nayar: I do propose to move.

I beg to move:

In page 2, line 30, before "such other persons" insert "persons employed by manufacturers of coir products and"

The amendment as I have worded is sufficiently clear.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

In page 2, line 30, before "such other persons" insert "persons employed by manufacturers of coir products and".

521 P.S.D.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have already mentioned about this. Shri N. Sreekantan Nair made a suggestion and I said, we prefer the wording as it is.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In page 2, line 30, before "such other persons" insert "persons employed by manufacturers of coir products and".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 4, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 5 and 6 were added to the Bill.

Clause 7.— (Vice Chairman)

Shri Karmarkar: I beg to move:

In page 3, lines 5 and 6, for "The Central Government shall appoint from among the members of the Board" substitute "The Board shall elect from among its members".

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

In page 3, lines 5 and 6, for "The Central Government shall appoint from among the members of the Board" substitute "The Board shall elect from among its members".

I will request Shri V. P. Nayar to speak on his amendment No. 50 if he wants to because if this amendment is passed, amendment No. 50 will be barred.

Shri V. P. Nayar: What about amendment No. 49?

Mr. Chairman: That has been moved?

Shri V. P. Nayar: Amendment No. 49 has not been moved. That is also on the same subject. Only amendment No. 5 has been moved.

Mr. Chairman: Therefore, when it is moved, his amendment cannot be moved. At the same time, I wanted to call the attention of the hon. Member to amendment No. 50 which is on the same subject. Practically that is the negative of this proposition. If this amendment is passed, amendment No. 50 will be barred. I therefore wanted to say that if he so wishes, he can speak now.

Shri V. P. Nayar: It is precisely because of that that the amendment has been so worded also.

Mr. Chairman: I have seen the wording. My difficulty is, if this amendment is carried, I won't be able to allow his amendment. If he wants to speak on it, he may do so now.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I do not want to speak anything. What is there to speak? But, I move it.

I beg to move:

In page 3,—

(i) lines 5 and 6, omit "from among the members of the Board"; and

(ii) line 6, after "a Vice-Chairman" insert "to be elected by members of the Board".

Mr. Chairman: I put amendment No. 5 to the House.

The question is:

In page 3, lines 5 and 6, for "The Central Government shall appoint from among the members of the Board" substitute "The Board shall elect from among its members".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment No. 50 is barred.

Mr. Chairman: There is no other amendment to this clause which I can put to the House.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That Clause 7, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 8.—(Executive and other committee)

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

In page 3, —

(i) omit lines 9 to 17.

(ii) in line 18, for "(3)" substitute "8. Committees.—(1)"

(iii) in lines 23 and 25,—for "Nos. (4) and (5)" substitute "Nos. (2) and (3)."

The purpose of my amendment is to change the structure of the Board and the working of the Board.

I would like to draw your attention to the Statement of Objects and Reasons. There, it is stated that the approximate amount that will accrue after the levy of the duty will be about Rs. 12 lakhs. Out of this amount, nearly Rs. 6 lakhs will be spent for the administration of the Board. I cannot understand whether the purpose of the Bill will be realised if this huge amount, nearly half the amount is to be spent on the management of the Board itself.

The reason for this huge expenditure seems to be that the Bill contemplates a huge paraphernalia; it contemplates a Board within a Board. It should be avoided. I can understand that there should be a Board. I can also understand that there may be Standing Committees or *ad hoc* Committees for different purposes, but I cannot understand a Board within a Board.

Here if you see Clause 8 you will note that the Executive Committee will be formed out of the Members of the Board. The reason may be that the Board is so large, and it may become very difficult to manage the affairs of the Board. So, let us have a smaller Board without Executive Committee. That seems to be the logic of the whole thing. But I fail to understand for what purpose there should be a smaller Committee. There are Standing Committees contemplated; *ad hoc* Committees will be

there to assist the activities of the Board, and there is the Board itself. So, if you make it a very complicated affair, I think we will be almost submerged in this labyrinth. The structure will become very large, and the main purpose of this Bill will not be realised. And further we have to spend a lot of money, nearly half the amount realised. So, with a view to bring about compactness in the structure of the Board, and also with a view to improve the efficiency of the Board and bring about more economy in the administration of the Board, it is necessary, and it is imperative I think, to avoid this Executive Committee. So, Sir, I appeal to the hon. Minister to delete this particular portion. I am not in any way against appointment of Standing Committees or *ad hoc* committees. Let them be there, but this Executive Committee within the Board is totally unnecessary and it should be deleted.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

In page 3,—

- (i) omit lines 9 to 17.
- (ii) in line 18, for "(3)" substitute "8. Committees.—(1)"
- (iii) in lines 23 and 25, for "Nos. (4) and (5)" substitute "Nos. (2) and (3)."

Shri Karmarkar: I beg to oppose the amendment, largely for the reason suggested by the hon. Member himself. This executive committee will be absolutely necessary, since, as the hon. Member will appreciate, the Board will consist of somewhere between 25 to 40 members, and we shall therefore feel it necessary to have an executive committee, firstly for facility of working, and secondly to make it unnecessary for the bigger body to meet oftener than absolutely necessary. This executive committee will be a compact committee consisting of a chairman and five or six other members, who will carry out the programmes chalked out from time to time by the bigger Board.

Such a body is absolutely necessary, in our opinion, if the Board's work is to be anything that is practical. We had experience of this in the Silk Board also. Likewise, in this Board also, if it has to meet only once or twice a year, the work that will be expected of this Board will not be done, unless this executive committee is there. So this executive committee is absolutely necessary for the purpose.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In page 3,—

- (i) omit lines 9 to 17.
- (ii) in line 18, for "(3)" substitute "8. Committees.—(1)"
- (iii) in lines 23 and 25, for "Nos. (4) and (5)" substitute "Nos. (2) and (3)."

The motion was negatived.

Shri Madiah Gowda: I beg to move:

In page 3, line 17, after "whom" add "not more than".

The object of this is to see that the executive committee which, I am sure, is a very important committee, and which the Government also want to be there, for the purpose of carrying on the day-to-day affairs of the Board, must consist of more non-officials than officials.....

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I think we will accept the amendment.

Shri Karmarkar: It does not make any difference.

Shri Madiah Gowda: The hon. Minister stated that he would accept the amendment. I am obliged to him for that.

Mr. Chairman: The question is.

In page 3, line 17, after "whom" add "not more than".

The motion was adopted.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

In page 3, line 17, add at the end "and one shall be from among the members representing the workers".

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

When you have a Board consisting of 40 members, and when you elect from amongst the members, a committee consisting of five or six members, and you lay down.....

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am prepared to accept my hon. friend's amendment.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Then I shall say nothing. I have only to offer him my thanks.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It might be necessary to say—probably we will do it tomorrow—there might be some other addition, in order to tie it up with the language used in the Bill. Perhaps we might be able to amend it tomorrow. We may have to add some other words to tie it up with the nomenclature used in clause 4.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Supposing the Bill is passed today, what will happen?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The only point is that in terms of the amendment moved by my colleague, the term 'worker' will mean "persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn and in the manufacture of coir products". That is given in clause 4(3)(b).

Shri V. P. Nayar: That will necessitate a discussion.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not trying to defeat the purpose. I am merely pointing out that the term 'worker' has not been defined. It is better therefore to relate it to the nomenclature in clause 4.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Does not the hon. Minister think that the word 'worker' is more comprehensive, instead of an explanation in that behalf?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Since it has not been defined, it is much better to relate it to the category mentioned in clause 4(3)(b), and if my hon. friend.....

Shri V. P. Nayar: All right, let us see the draft.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If we are finishing the second reading today, I would, with your permission, move an amendment to that effect in the third reading.

Mr. Chairman: So this amendment is acceptable to Government subject to certain drafting changes to be suggested subsequently.

Shri A. M. Thomas: We will pass clause 8 later on.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is only a verbal amendment.

Mr. Chairman: If it is possible to give the amendment now, I will place it after five minutes.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid the legal draftsman is not here.

One shall be from among the members representing persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and all that. That is the real thing that has got to be put in.

Mr. Chairman: Kindly put it down on paper.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I will put it down.

Mr. Chairman: The next one is Mr. Gurupadaswamy's amendment No. 53.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

In page 3, line 19, omit "other".

It is only a very small amendment. If the word "other" is there, it creates an impression that there is another standing committee pre-existing. So I feel that the word 'other' may be deleted.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

In page 3, line 19, omit "other".

Shri Karmarkar: We could just say 'such standing committees or ad hoc committees'. We can omit the word 'other'. We have no worry about it.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It does not mean that the executive committee is not the standing committee. What is the objection to the word "other", I cannot see. I do not think it is an offensive word at all.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I would like to withdraw it.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman: Then amendment No. 54.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

In page 3, line 26, for "one half" substitute "one third".

This is a small amendment, Sir. I want that for the words 'one half' 'one third' may be substituted. It is to bring down the number of members who are not members of the Board. In the *ad hoc* Committee, the number of members of the Board and the number of members who are not members of the Board should not be on the basis of parity, because it may lead to procedural complications. It may not be wise also to give equal representation to non-members of the Board. It is only from that point of view that I have suggested this small amendment and there is no harm also in reducing the number from one half to one third. Sir, I hope it may be acceptable.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

In page 3, line 26, for "one half" substitute "one third".

Shri Karmarkar: Well, Sir, it is really not an amendment which we might accept with advantage. I am prepared to say that there shall be less than one-half. 'Does that satisfy the hon. Member?'

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Very well.

Mr. Chairman: So the amendment is accepted or there will be another amendment?

Shri Karmarkar: 'Their number shall be less than one half of its strength'.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Member accept this?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In page 3, line 26, for "shall not exceed one half of its strength" substitute "shall be less than one half of its strength".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: I will just put the clause after I have got that new amendment.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put Mr. Nayar's amendment together with the drafting changes suggested by the hon. Minister.

The question is:

In page 3, line 17, add at the end—

"and one shall be from among the members representing persons engaged in the production of husks, coir and coir yarn and in the manufacture of coir products."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 8, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 8, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Shri V. P. Nayar: If there are no amendments let us at least get an opportunity of eliciting certain information. It is said:

"The Central Government shall, after consulting the Board, appoint a Secretary to the Board who shall exercise such powers etc....."

I would like to know whether the post will be filled by proper advertisement from suitable candidates. It has been our experience that such appointments are not filled in that manner.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: They will be covered by such rules and regulations as are made by the Government.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Will they be considered to be actually Government servants?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Yes.

Shri V. P. Nayar: We have been told that in the case of certain autonomous bodies they do not come within the purview of Government rules. Only the other day, with reference to the Rehabilitation Finance Administration.....

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is a statutory Body and this is also an Advisory Board; therefore this is part of Government machinery.

Clause 9 was added to the Bill.

Clause 10.— (Functions of the Board)

Shri Karmarkar: There are amendments 6 to 11.

The object is the original Bill required that production was to be done by licensing coir spindles. This was considered insufficient and the phrase has been expanded to cover registration of looms for manufacturing coir products etc.

Amendment made:

In page 3, line 46, after "production of" insert "husks".

—[Shri Karmarkar]

Further amendment made:

In page 3, lines 46 and 47, for "by licensing coir spindles and taking other appropriate steps"

Substitute "by registering coir spindles and looms for manufacturing coir products as also manufacturers of coir products, licensing exporters of coir, coir yarn and coir products and taking such other appropriate steps as may be prescribed".

—[Shri Karmarkar]

Further amendment made:

In page 4 line 8, after "arranging" insert "when necessary."

—[Shri Karmarkar]

Further amendment made:

In page 4, lines 13 and 14, for "coir fibre, coir yarn and coir products" substitute "husks, coir fibre and coir yarn and manufacturers of coir products".

—[Shri Karmarkar]

Further amendment made:

In page 4, lines 15 and 16, for "coir fibre, coir yarn and coir products" substitute "husks, coir fibre and coir yarn and manufacturers of coir products".

—[Shri Karmarkar]

Further amendment made:

In page 4, line 17, after "licencing of" insert "retting places and"

—[Shri Karmarkar]

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

In page 4, omit lines 23 to 25.

Sir, in sub-clause (1) of clause 10, the language used is:

"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".

I think the same language has been repeated thrice in the course of the Bill.

So, in moving this amendment, I want to avoid repetition. Lines 23 and 25 on page 4 and lines 1 to 6 on page 6 convey the same meaning. So, it is unnecessary to repeat that the Board will function under the Government. It is known that the Board has to function under the control of the Government, and its

activities, functions, policy and everything are controlled by the Centre. That is why I have moved for the deletion of these words.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

In page 4, omit lines 23 to 25.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: This is tied up with clause 26. I agree that it may be a repetition, but since we have clause 26 in which the Central Government is given the rule-making power, we must say that the Board must follow the rules. It would not be direction. The rules will be there and they will be followed. Directions are apart from the rules and will be issued if necessary.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In page 4, omit lines 23 to 25.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 10, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 10, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 11.—Dissolution of the Board.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

In page 4, for clause 11, substitute—

"11. *Continuance or reconstitution of the Board.*—The Central Government may, by notification in the official gazette, continue the same Board or reconstitute the Board at the end of every three years."

The purpose of my amendment is to prescribe a period for the Board. In the Bill, the tenure of the Board is left to the sweet will of Government. It is the normal practice when such a Board is constituted under a statute to prescribe the tenure. According to the Bill, at any time and in any manner, Government may

terminate the Board and constitute another one. Unless there are grave allegations or charges and unless there are serious lapses on the part of the Board, it is very unfair if Government were to terminate the Board. Of course, we know that Government will not misuse—the power, but there is no harm in providing the period in the Bill itself. The members of the Board should know for what period they have to function.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Please refer to clause 26(2)(a).

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: It only refers to "term of office". There is no mention of the period.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: But "term of office" means the period.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: But I want the period to be specified. My suggestion is that at least a three-year period may be fixed. I think this period is fair and will be accepted by the House.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

In page 4, for clause 11, substitute—

"11. *Continuance or reconstitution of the Board.*—The Central Government may, by notification in the official gazette, continue the same Board or reconstitute the Board at the end of every three years."

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: This more or less takes away the powers of dissolution in clause 11 and seeks to substitute something else. So far as the term of office is concerned, the rules will provide for the term of office. If the rules provide the term of office of the members of the Board and in the case of all of them the term of office is made co-extensive in the rules, then the Board automatically goes. I do not think Government will be able to accept this amendment. It takes away from the power of dissolution.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In page 4, for clause 11, substitute—

"11. *Continuance or reconstitution of the Board.*—The Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette continue the same Board or reconstitute the Board at the end of every three years."

The motion was negatived.

Hon. Members: It is 6-30 now.

Mr. Chairman: This is only a small point and let us finish clause 11 and then adjourn. There is only one amendment. Shri Iyyunni may move his amendment.

Shri C. E. Iyyunni: I beg to move.

In page 4, for lines 26 to 28 substitute:

"11. *Dissolution of the Board.*—

(1) The Central Government may, if the Board does any act exceeding the powers conferred upon it or acts in a manner contrary to the rules or prejudicial to the interests of the industry or acts or fails to act contrary to the directions given by the Central Government, call upon the Board to show cause why the Board should not be dissolved and if no explanation is offered or if the Central Government is dissatisfied with the explanation given, it may suspend or dissolve the Board from such date and for such period as may be specified in the notification."

Sir, what is stated here in clause 11 is that the Central Government may by notification in the Official Gazette, direct that the Board shall be dissolved.

Shri Karmarkar: If I may intervene, unless the hon. Member wants to make a speech, we are prepared to accept his amendment.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I do not understand the insinuation "if the hon. Member wants to make a speech".

Mr. Chairman: What is wrong in it?

Shri Karmarkar: The hon. Member does not wish to make a speech, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Then I put it to the vote of the House.

Shri C. E. Iyyunni: The hon. Minister has accepted it and there is no need for putting this to vote, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member has been sufficiently long in this House and he should know that even if the hon. Minister has accepted it, the House may not accept it. The question is:

In page 4, for lines 26 to 28 substitute:

"11. *Dissolution of the Board.*—

(1) The Central Government may, if the Board does any act exceeding the powers conferred upon it or acts in a manner contrary to the rules or prejudicial to the interests of the industry or acts or fails to act contrary to the directions given by the Central Government, call upon the Board to show cause why the Board should not be dissolved and if no explanation is offered or if the Central Government is dissatisfied with the explanation given, it may suspend or dissolve the Board from such date and for such period as may be specified in the notification."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"Clause 11, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 11, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The House then adjourned till Half Past One of the Clock on Thursday, the 19th November, 1953.