

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

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

Shri Biswas: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is very little time. The House will now stand adjourned to 2-30 P.M. today.

The House then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The House re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

INDIAN COCONUT COMMITTEE
(AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): I beg to move:

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister is moving on behalf of Shri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai. I want to make the proceedings correct and complete. The order paper shows this motion in the name of Shri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai. Whenever any other Minister is acting on his behalf, he has to say 'The Bill stands in the name of.....' and that he is making the motion on his behalf.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: On behalf of Shri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944, be taken into consideration."

This is quite a simple Bill, and there are only a few changes that are proposed which seek to amend certain sections of the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944.

This is quite a simple Bill, and section 2, Act X of 1944, and we are proposing to modify the definition of the word 'mill'. Formerly, a mill was

mittee Act, 1944
"any place in which copra is crushed for the extraction of oil,

which is a factory as defined in section 2 of the Factories Act, 1934."

The present definition that is proposed is:

"any premises in which or in any part of which copra is crushed or is ordinarily crushed with the aid of power for the extraction of oil".

Then there is an *Explanation* added:

"'power' means electrical energy or any other form of energy which is mechanically transmitted and is not generated by human or animal agency."

With regard to all the amendments that have been suggested, there is a fairly comprehensive explanation accompanying the Bill in the shape of the Statement of Objects and Reasons. I need not therefore take very long to explain the provisions of this Bill. Yet certain brief comments would probably be necessary. This definition of the word 'mill' has been altered with the intention of including all mills where the extraction of oil is done with the aid of power, irrespective of the number of hands employed. As has been our experience, with the existing definition, there were chances of evasion, and so this new definition has been proposed.

So far as clause 3 which seeks to amend section 4 of the original Act is concerned, the changes that are proposed are more or less verbal ones. For instance, the change from the word 'Vice-chairman' to 'Vice-President' of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research is one such. By the sub-clause (aa) that has been proposed, it is intended to add 'The Agricultural Marketing Adviser with the Government of India.' He was not there originally, and now we propose to include this Adviser also as a member of the Committee.

Coming to sub-clause (ii) of clause 3, it is proposed to substitute clause (d) of section 4 of the parent Act with the following:

"(d) four persons representing respectively, the Governments of Assam, Madras, Mysore, and Travancore-Cochin, appointed in each case by the State Government concerned;"

Here, the difference between the original Bill and this Bill is only the addition of the State of Assam, which

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh]

will now have a representation on this Committee for the first time.

Coming to sub-clause (iii) of clause 3, we are substituting in the place of the Central Assembly and the Council of States, the words 'The House of the People' and the 'Council of State.' There is no other difference except the coupling of Travancore-Cochin, because it now constitutes one State. Originally they were separate, and the representation also was separate. There is, however, no addition to the representation given to the various States.

In clause 4, we seek to substitute sub-section (1) of section 7 of the principal Act by the following sub-section:

"(1) The Central Government may appoint any of the persons referred to in section 4 or any other person to be the President of the Committee, and if any other person is so appointed that other person shall be deemed to be a member of the Committee for all the purposes of this Act."

For long, there was a complaint that one person is acting as the President of so many Committees. We therefore thought that we should have power to appoint somebody else as the President, and necessarily if anybody is appointed as President, he must be made a member of the Committee also.

In clause 5, we seek to amend section 9 of the principal Act. In sub-section (1) for the words "and coconut poonac." the words and brackets "coconut poonac and such other coconut products (excepting coir and its products) as the Committee may determine." shall be substituted. This is intended with a view to enlarge the scope of the activities of this Committee, and has been found necessary on account of the suggestions that have been made.

In sub-clause (ii) of clause 5, we seek to substitute for clause (b) of sub-section (2) of section 9 of the principal Act, the following:

"(b) the supply of technical advice to growers of coconut, and to persons engaged in any coconut industry."

Here also, the intention is the same as I referred to previously, namely mak-

ing the technical advice available to a larger number.

Clause 6 seeks to add a new section to the principal Act. The purpose of this amendment is to give the Committee scope for widening its activities, and deals with the submission of a monthly return by the owner of every mill with regard to the consumption of copra in that mill. It is possible that new mills may come into being, and particulars may not be furnished with regard to the consumption of copra, for the assessment of the cess. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to ensure that the owner of every new mill which is set up will send an intimation to this effect to the Collector within a fortnight from the commencement of its business. The various heads under which the information is to be supplied have also been indicated.

I, therefore, submit, Sir, that there is no amendment which has been sought which can be questioned on any of the grounds. There were, however, two omissions which, I frankly admit, and I am glad that my friend, Mr. Damodara Menon has given notice of two amendments which are necessary. They are necessary because of the fact to which I referred, namely, there being one State now instead of two.

I propose to accept them.

There are some minor amendments, notices of which have been given by some hon. Members of the House. I would not like to comment upon them at this stage. They will probably be commented upon when this motion is adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What exactly is the work such Committees have been doing for sometime, how far is it useful and how can it be made more useful?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I would have been glad to give a resume. But with your permission, Sir, I would circulate a note, because I do not think most of the amendments are of any great radical nature. They are only verbal. Therefore, I have not taken any steps in providing a lot of literature on this. When one of my friends said that he would like to see some literature on this subject, I told him that there was enough literature the hon. Member could be drowned in. I would not use the same phrase with regard to all the hon. Members. They are too many to be drowned in the files of one Committee. The papers are many but I propose to give a succinct note on the work that these Committees are doing and what, if any, changes we propose to make so far as their work is

concerned. I assure the House, Sir, that I am looking into the working of every one of these Committees probably with a different eye than from that which it had been looked at, and I think I will be able to satisfy the House so far as the work of each of these Committees is concerned.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): May I suggest, Sir, that we discuss the Bill after getting the note?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): That is not possible.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have only made a suggestion. Questions have been asked here repeatedly about the working of these Committees in the interest of the producers, what help has to be rendered and so on. Not only Members of this House but people are watching every Bill that is introduced here, so that there may be a sense of relief that really some more effective measures are being taken not merely for the purpose of getting more cess even from small factories employing two or three people, but for the benefit of the coconut growers and so on. Every Bill which a Ministry brings becomes more popular by saying all that on the floor of the House. Now, that need not stand in the way of our proceeding with this Bill. I will place the motion formally before the House before discussion is started.

Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944, be taken into consideration."

Shri P. T. Chacko (Meenachil): Sir, the amendment of this Act is highly necessary, but a more exhaustive revision of the Act would have been more welcome. This Committee was constituted specially for the improvement and development of the cultivation, marketing and utilisation of coconuts in India. It was functioning for the last seven years from 1945 onwards and I wish to point out now that it has completely failed in its objectives. It has failed mainly because of the defects in the constitution of the Committee itself. I have with me five annual reports of the Committee and certain reports of the proceedings of the meetings of the Committee. I do not know whether the Government have carefully examined all these reports. If they had examined all these annual reports, they would have found that they proclaimed that the committee was a colossal failure in its functioning. I may be permitted to point out, in brief how it has failed. Sir, the main problem is one of increasing pro-

duction. Formerly India was exporting coconuts and its products, but for the last so many years India has become deficit in coconut production and it is importing coconut and its products from outside. So one of the main functions of the Committee was to see that the production of coconut and its products was increased by its efforts. Now, there is absolutely no remarkable increase in the production of coconuts; neither is there any increase in the area under cultivation now. There are three major problems with which the cultivators are confronted. One is the disease commonly known as the leaf and root disease. From the last annual report it can be seen that the Committee could not bring this disease under control by its efforts for the last seven years, it has done nothing in this field. In the 5th Annual Report, the last which I could obtain, there is a remark by the Chairman of the Committee on this question. He says:

"The scheme for investigation of the diseases of the coconut palm had been started in 1937, but there is a standing complaint from coconut growers that they have received no tangible benefit as a result of the investigation undertaken by the experts".

By investigation the Committee has given some scientific names to these diseases and they have found out that the causes of the diseases are some six varieties of fungi which are flourishing on the coconut trees and roots. But it has given absolutely no benefit to the cultivator. In my State, Sir, about 50 per cent. of the cultivators own only 30 to 50 per cent. of land, according to the Report of the Coconut Committee itself.

Then the second question is about manure, and it seems from the reports of the Committee that it has never thought about supplying manure to the cultivators or finding out which manure is good for this cultivation.

Then the most important question is one of fair prices. If fair prices are given to the cultivators, of course there will be an increase in production without any other effort. Prices sometimes go down, according to the report of the Committee itself, to Rs. 15 to Rs. 20 per thousand, that is, about Rs. 114 and onwards per ton of copra, and sometimes, as was in 1939, a ton of copra costs about Rs. 169. In 1948-49, it was Rs. 132. Such is the fluctuation in the price of coconuts. The Committee from the very start was alive to this fact. In the first annual report it remarks:

"The coconut growers were among those who were badly hit

[Shri P. T. Chacko]

by the great economic depression of the pre-war years. The prices have slumped to such an extent that coconut cultivation has become almost an uneconomic proposition. A factor which contributes to the general effects of the economic depression was the competition which the indigenous products had to face from the imported ones, particularly those of Ceylonese origin".

My submission is that even in this field, the Committee by its working of the last seven years could do absolutely nothing to help the cultivators.

Then there is the question of marketing. It can be found from the audited accounts of the Committee that for the four years ending with March 1950, the Committee gave as grant-in-aid to two marketing cooperative societies Rs. 17,558/12/-. I do not know whether the Government have examined the condition of these cooperative societies at present. If my information is correct, one of the cooperative societies which was functioning at Vaikyam is not at all functioning now and I do not know what has become of the amount which this Committee has given as grant-in-aid to this cooperative society. As my information goes the working of these two co-operative societies was a complete failure. Actually they were not doing any marketing business and they were not helping cultivators. Just like middlemen, they were purchasing a small amount of copra or coconut from Vaikyam and selling the same about ten miles away, at Alleppy. I request the hon. Minister to go into the reports of the Committee and find out whether the marketing schemes of the Committee are being worked out at present and whether the money spent on the marketing schemes is spent usefully.

Now, this Coconut Committee remains a burden on the cultivator. Actually the amount of tax or cess imposed on the cultivators is about six lakhs per year and the poor cultivators who are not getting a fair price in the market are forced to pay six lakhs of rupees every year to the Committee without getting any benefit from the Committee. The main reason for this, Sir, is the defect in the constitution of the Committee itself. From the constitution of the Committee you will be able to find that out of 28 members in the Committee, as per the Bill which is introduced, representation is given to nine representatives of the cultivators and these nine representatives are nominated by various Governments and very often

these Government nominees are not cultivators themselves. Then out of 28 members, five are representatives of the industry. And from certain resolutions of the Committee, it can be seen that the Committee is working not in the interests of the cultivators but in the interests of a few big industrialists in India. So, my submission is that it would have been better for the Government to revise the entire Act and to give more representation to the cultivators. Now, there is no way to give more representation to the cultivators, in the Bill which is now before the House. So, Sir, I have suggested that instead of nomination by the Government, as regards certain seats, as provided for in the present Bill, election may be had and that from States where the majority are coconut growers.

Then also as regards section 7, I do not know what the objection of the Government is in electing the President of the Committee instead of appointing a President, especially because according to section 7(2) of the Act, the Secretary is appointed by the Government. And I do not think that the Government will have any objection to the members of the Committee electing their President. I only request the Government to go thoroughly and carefully into the reports of the Coconut Committee and the working of the Committee and to do whatever is possible to attain the objectives for which this Committee was constituted.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): Sir, I oppose the amendment. I oppose it as most ill-fitted for the time. The original Act itself was a war-time measure in 1944; it is a nuisance today. The Coconut Committee that was constituted in 1944 was calculated to go into the complaints of the civil and military demands for coconut products which were then not available owing to the enemy occupation of the coconut area. It struck me as ill-fitted because the original Act was not so harsh as the amendments introduced. The amendments are clear enough to make one understand that the object of the amendment is to extract as much money from the people as possible by pleading that it is only to prevent evasion of paying cess.

Eight years have passed since the Act was passed and six years since Congress has taken over the administration. I wish to ask them what have they done with reference to section 9 of the Act, which is the only section which will do something for the people at large. I mean the coconut growers. From the conditions existing in the State of Travancore-Cochin today, as a result of the provisions of section 9, clauses (a) to (n), the coconut grower is in a worse position than he was

before. The section provides for research, fixing of rates, fixing of prices etc. I do not think anything is done; because if you go down the coast, say from Madras, you can see the stems of coconut trees standing without the crown, being pested with disease. You go further down to Travancore-Cochin you will see the coconut estates being washed out by pests. I am asking this Government, what have they done to prevent this. They might have instituted an enquiry. But they have done nothing. If they had done anything in the matter the present situation could have been avoided. One of the sub-sections says that the motive of the Act is to fix the price to give fair remuneration to the grower. The price of coconut has now fallen. States like Travancore-Cochin, Malabar and especially South India suffers most with regard to this. And yet they are bringing in amendments to extract a large amount of money without going into the details of the coconut depression that is ravaging the South. They are very clever to bring in amendments and to pass laws. A prudent legislator will pay maximum respect for law and minimise legislation. Obedience to law cannot be imported. It is essentially a creation of home industry. But here what the Government lacks is not legislative capacity but the power to carry out the laws that they make here. (*Hear, hear*). They have failed and failed miserably in carrying out section 9, which is the only section that benefits the people. The other sections are with regard to the constitution of the Committee, expenditure, etc. etc. They want to pass the amendment to prevent evasion, and they do not have any clause in the amendment to benefit the coconut grower.

Government, the other day, in a broadcast said, that the policy of Government is to help individuals or private concerns. The theory of *laissez faire* is now exploded but the Congress Government, in explaining the function of the Industry and Commerce Ministry, said:

"We also believe in planned economy and even though the ownership and management of industrial units may remain in private hands the over-all picture is one in which the State is vitally interested. Finally, although the country's foreign trade is conducted by individual merchants, the State has the responsibility for providing the foreign exchange needed to finance our imports."

This is the policy of the Government. Coconut has fallen in price. We were producing and exporting coconuts but today we are importing. Will the

Government explain this situation? They have done nothing.

3 P.M.

Another aspect of the amendment as well as the Act is that it has no reference to the coir industry. It is said that it was at the request of the then Travancore Government that the coir industry was not included in the Act. Perhaps, that Government had very sound reasons for it at that time. But why has it not been included today?

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I should like to know whether the Government has any intention of having a separate Act for the coir industry or whether it is contemplating a Board or some such thing for dealing with this question. I do hope that the Government will take this question seriously into consideration. I suggest that this amendment may be dropped and the Act also repealed, and Government may bring forward another Act which is more beneficial to the coconut growers in India.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Sir, my hon. friend on the other side told us just now that the prices of coconut have gone down in recent months. He also informed us that some of the cooperative societies started under the auspices or direction of the Indian Coconut Committee are not functioning well and the money spent on them is a thorough waste. I concur with those remarks and in doing so, I wish to point out a few other things which are equally important.

I believe the present Government is a democratic Government. If that is so, it should believe in democratic principles and practices. It should not pay much attention to old-time totalitarian practices like nomination. On a previous occasion, the House is aware, when the Central Silk Board (Amendment) Bill was brought forward by the hon. Minister concerned, one of the amendments was to the effect that the Chairman of the Board should be a man nominated by the Central Government. The Government want to extend that principle to other Acts also. I say that this policy of the Government is absurd, because it is alien to the democratic principle and the democratic spirit.

The hon. Minister said that these amendments are only verbal. I agree they are verbal in the sense that they change the very spirit of the Act. They make inroads into vital principles. The Bill suggests that the Chairman should be a man nominated by Government. If we agree to this nomination we shall be endorsing a principle that is most reactionary and retrograde in its implication. After this Bill, another

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

Bill is waiting to be introduced. There also the same pernicious principle of nomination is put forward for the consideration of the House. It is high time we put a stop to this nuisance of nomination. The purpose of the Bill seems to me to be to confer certain favourable offices of profit on a few henchmen of the party in power. If the Government want to appoint their own men and give them enough dearness allowance and travelling allowance to make a living, I have nothing to say. If on the other hand, they feel that the Committee is not working well under an elected system, then they must look into the causes for it and eliminate those causes. Instead of doing that, they wanted a nominated Chairman. If the Chairman and most of the members are nominated, then the Committee will become a shadow of the Government. It will lose all its autonomy. And even now the Committee as constituted under the old Act has been disabled because of this principle of nomination that is largely and most indiscriminately applied to the constitution of the Committee. I therefore request the hon. Minister to make the office of the Chairman an elected one, and this would be in conformity with the democratic spirit and principles which we have been following all along.

Then, Sir, the Bill wants to introduce a new Section 9A. According to it, the owners of mills should supply information regarding the establishment of the mill, the location, name, address of the owner etc. Of course, all that is necessary but sub-clause (2) of this provision says that if an owner fails to furnish this information in time to the Government, then the owner may be put in prison for three months or he may be fined Rs. 500, or he may be subjected to both fine and imprisonment. I think that this is too severe a punishment. Supposing the owner of a mill does not furnish the particulars, the proper course would be to give notice to him and ask him to supply them within a given time, or failing which he may be asked to suspend the operation of the mill for some time. Otherwise, I do feel that the present provision is too penal. I suggest to the hon. Minister to delete that portion and include another amendment which I have submitted, i.e., to close the mill for a period of one year if he does not furnish the particulars required under the Act.

With these remarks, I strongly object to the amendment of this Act.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): I am glad, Sir, that the hon. Minister has accepted two of the amendments

I had suggested. I hope he will find his way to accept the third amendment also. In that I am suggesting that instead of the Governments of Travancore-Cochin and Mysore nominating three more representatives, that function under clause 4(g) may be assigned to the members of the Legislative Houses of these two States. In that clause we find that the elective principle is generally accepted: two Members of Parliament are to be elected by the House of the People and one by the Council of States. When it comes to the States of Travancore-Cochin and Mysore, the Governments are given power to nominate two persons from Travancore-Cochin and one from Mysore. I suggest, Sir, that since the clause contains the provision of election it must be applied to the States as well. I hope the hon. Minister will have no difficulty in accepting my amendment which is after all a minor one.

Regarding the working of this Act in the last few years, criticism has already been levelled against it. I am also of the view that this Committee has not been able to do much good for the growers of the West Coast, where it has been functioning for some time. The Committee generally meets twice a year and they review some of the activities that are enjoined on them by section 9 of the original Act. But it is a sad fact that the progress of their work has been very very slow indeed. One of the reasons, in my opinion, is that the growers are not taken into confidence and the committee has not entered into their lives and it has not also helped them to reorganise their industry. It should be the endeavour of Government to see that the Committee does something really useful in this respect.

Now, Sir, in the Oilseeds Committee, I find that the growers' representatives are nominated on the advice of growers' organisations. I do not know whether such a provision cannot be included in this Act also. I have not suggested an amendment to that effect, but if the hon. Minister feels that such an amendment would help to see that growers' representatives are on the Committee, I would request him to make that amendment even now, or send executive directions to that effect.

Sir, another reason for the failure of this Committee is that many of their recommendations have not been implemented by Government. When the import duty on Ceylon copra was reduced sometime ago, as a result of which the price of coconut and its products fell here, a question was asked in this House, you might remember,

whether this reduction was done with the approval of the Coconut Committee and the hon. Minister was not able to give a definite reply. My own impression is that the Coconut Committee did not approve of this reduction of the import duty on Ceylon copra, because it would mean unfair competition in the home market to the detriment of the indigenous growers. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that this Committee which is more or less an official one, because most of its members are nominated by Government, would become utterly ineffective if even its recommendations which are of a harmless nature are not implemented by Government.

Sir, I do not agree that this Committee is entirely useless. This Committee can do really good work for the country and also for the coconut growers and the industry in general if its recommendations are implemented and its work is done in the spirit in which the Act expects it to be done. I hope the hon. Minister will look into this matter and see that the Committee's work is done in the manner that is satisfactory to the growers of coconut in this country.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Sir, I have got some observations to make in regard to this Amending Bill, because the Coconut Committee has not done much good to the growers. From my experience of Malabar, I know that it is a general complaint that the price of coconut and its products have fallen down mainly due to Ceylonese imports. I cannot for a moment understand why coconut should be imported, especially into an area like Malabar where you are actually producing more and more coconuts every day. This Committee did not do anything in that respect, though the growers had made several complaints. What useful purpose would be served by this Committee which is constituted on the principle of nomination, I fail to understand. Nor has the hon. Minister who pilots this Bill explained to us what exactly is the good that this Committee is going to do or has done so far.

Then again provision is made for extracting more cess. There are some coconut oil mill owners who are evading the cess. In order to deal with them section 2 is sought to be amended as to make it more comprehensive. It is therefore obvious that the object is to get more cess. What practical help it would be to the growers is not known. So, at the very outset one could understand that this is a measure to exploit the growers rather than helping them. Though the hon. Minister may say that the Coconut Committee is not directly concerned with the coir industry, no one can forget the fact that coir is one

of the important bye-products of coconut. It is a very unfortunate state of affairs that in Sertalai and Ambalapusha taluqs of the Travancore-Cochin State the coir industry has almost collapsed rendering about one lakh labourers unemployed. Taking their families and dependents into consideration about thirteen lakh persons are on starvation level and measures are being taken to see that some relief is given to them. In no way has the Coconut Committee, either directly or indirectly, attempted in any respect to help the coconut industry.

We have not been informed as to the achievements of this Committee. But even without going into details we could understand that this Committee is of no practical use and I am seriously led to believe whether it is necessary to continue this Committee. With these observations, Sir, I oppose this Bill.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Sir, I oppose the Bill. I find that this is a typical instance of this Government indulging in a sort of legislative rigmarole in order to put off certain vital changes that are absolutely essential in existing legislation. Sir, it is not a question of changing certain provisions of this Act or that Act. It is a question which affects tens of thousands of our people especially from my part.

My friend Shri Chacko who spoke before me rightly pointed out that the Coconut Committee existed just to show that it was existing as a Committee and it did not do anything more. Perhaps, the activities of the Committee, Sir, resulted in one or two reports, in some sort of phrase-mongering on the pathological conditions of the coconut industry. They may perhaps have suggested the name *cocos nucifera* for coconut and the origin of the term but nothing beyond that! The Committee has practically been of no help to us. In my part of the country today the coconut tree which was considered to be a *Kalpa Vriksha* or *Deva Vriksha* every part of which was useful for human life, every part of which could be used for some purpose or other, has now become almost a curse. Now, if a man has coconut trees, he cannot get anything out of it. The coir industry has collapsed and tens of thousands of our people drift to a premature grave. This Government says that it will consider the question of appointment of a Coir Control Board. What have they done? Sir, in recent times we have found that the price of coconut has been falling steadily due to the import of Ceylon copra.

My hon. friend Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari will perhaps remember that when I spoke the other day on the

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

Commerce and Industry Budget I said that this commercial policy of the Government is intended primarily to help the big manufacturers, especially Lever Brothers who are heading the list of soap-manufacturers in India. What have you done to change this condition? Why don't you prohibit the import of Ceylon copra into India instead of bringing forth such changes in the existing legislation merely for the sake of showing to the country that here is a Government which is keen on finding out the smallest lacuna in the existing legislation and to fill it up? That is not your real purpose. The purpose of this, if I may be permitted to say, is solely to postpone the real issue of effecting fundamental changes in the existing legislation and to show to the world that the Government is keen on filling up even the smallest lacunae in existing legislation. That is what I take it to be.

In this matter we could have had an idea if the hon. substitute for the hon. mover had told us what the Coconut Committee had done. He has not done anything in that direction. It struck many of us, including the Chair, that when this Bill was brought for discussion we ought to have been given an idea of what this Committee has been doing all these years. This has not been done. I submit, Sir, that even at this stage it is not too late for the Government to stop considering this Bill and give us an idea of what this Coconut Committee has been doing all these years. As far as I know, there may be one or two plant pathologists concentrating on research at finding out certain diseases of coconut trees. I also know that several acres of coconut gardens have been taken over for research purposes without giving adequate compensation to the coconut growers. I would therefore urge upon this House to postpone the consideration of this Bill until we get proper information from the hon. the mover of the Bill or his substitute about the working of the Coconut Committee so far, so that we can have an idea as to where we stand. With these words I once again request the hon. Minister to please favour the House with a complete account of what the Coconut Committee has been doing and then we can consider whether we should pass this legislation or not.

Shri A. C. Guha (Santipur): Sir, several speakers before me have pointed out the defects of the existing Act. The existing Act, it seems, was

made particularly to help the mills but not the coconut growers. The present amendment has not removed this defect. I think this is one of the vital points which the hon. Minister should take into consideration so that this Committee may help the coconut growers in their needs.

Another point is this. I find in section 4(d) of the present Act there is no representation from West Bengal. Of course due to partition, the major portion of the coconut growing area of Bengal has gone out of India. Yet I think that West Bengal is producing quite a large quantity of coconut and therefore there should be some representation on this Committee from West Bengal.

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to one point which is rather a basic point. On several occasions I have pointed out that there are about twelve or thirteen autonomous bodies which collect revenues and those revenues are not even mentioned in the Budget papers. And these autonomous bodies are free to spend that money without any reference to Parliament, without any amount being shown in the Budget papers, and also without any proper audit. About three or four months ago when a Bill was placed before the House during the last session to amend the provisions relating to another autonomous body, I pointed out that no report of that Committee was available even in the Parliament Library and after great difficulty we could get some reports which were three or four years old. As regards these two Committees, namely the Coconut Committee and the Oilseeds Committee I am fortunate enough to have the current report from the Parliament Library. I do not know whether it is obligatory on these Committees to place their reports before Parliament. I may point out that in respect of certain other Committees recently formed, as for example the Industries Development Boards and Advisory Board, it has been provided that they should submit their reports to Parliament and that the amounts to be collected or to be handed over to them should form part of the Consolidated Fund of India. The wording used there is: "The Central Government may hand over the proceeds of the cess collected under this section in respect of..... to the Development Council." But the wording here is that this Committee will receive the cess automatically; there is no control of the Central Government, and I think there will not be any mention of this amount in the Budget papers.

In a subsequent Bill, I think the Coaminess Safety and Conservation Bill, when I pointed out this lacuna it was corrected and a provision was made that the amount collected under that Act by way of cess would form part of the Consolidated Fund of India, that it would be shown in the Budget papers and that there would be proper auditing.

I can mention here to the hon. Minister that several of these Committees have practically no auditing. In fact, the Comptroller-General of India has no control over these funds. I think all these things should be rectified. Here section 4 of the original Act is under amendment, and these things can very safely be put in by amending the wording of section 4 of the original Act, making a definite provision that whatever amount may be collected by way of cess, it will come to the Central Government, the Central Government will make over that fund to the Committee, the Committee will spend the fund according to the directives issued by the Central Government, and the accounts will be audited by the Comptroller-General or his nominee. I think that provision should be made in this Bill.

With these few words I would like to finish my observations. I hope the hon. Minister will accept these suggestions and make proper provision that the accounts may be properly audited, that the fund may form part of the Consolidated Fund of India and that it will not be an automatic right conferred on this Committee to take the amount direct from the cess without being shown in the Budget papers.

Shri Lokenath Mishra (Puri): Sir, I owe it to my constituency to speak a few words on this Bill and I am thankful for the opportunity given to me to speak on a subject which is so vital to my constituency.

On a reading of the provisions of this amending Bill I find that there is a grave omission in it, and that is the omission of any reference to Orissa. As the hon. Minister knows—and if he does not know he ought to know—Orissa is one of the Provinces that grow coconut immensely. It is therefore but proper that such an industry which is so very vital to an undeveloped State like Orissa should not be overlooked on the floor of this House.

I am sorry to say that I do not know what is this Committee about. I do not know even now what the original Bill is. I suppose that this and the original Bill are to provide

for a better production of coconut and it covers the whole field of coconut production. It that is so I do not know as hon. Members said what is this Committee for? It has yet to justify its existence. Sir, I expect that the hon. Minister in charge will give us enough data to form any judgment over this matter but I am sorry to say that I do not yet know what the Government has done. Only one thing I know that in my constituency, in a very prominent place, this Committee rather requisitioned a very big piece of land, for cultivation and research of coconut and unfortunately at the time of last election a point was raised in every meeting as to what is this about. If you go to that land you will find that it is fallow where there were fine paddy fields before. It is now lying useless. I suppose it was on behalf of this Committee that that paddy land was requisitioned for ideal cultivation of coconuts and instead of that we are having not a single tree there and that has become a laughing stock of my constituency. When people asked me in the last election "what about this acquisition of land for coconut plantation" I found it difficult to answer that. I was told by people that some experts came there and started planting. And then others went there and said that this particular land was unsuited for the purpose. From this I surmise that the experts that go from the Centre and are supposed to be Government experts do not know their own business. I therefore, request the hon. Minister to let me and this House know what have been the purpose and functions of this Committee all the while and in fact, what is the responsibility of this Committee.

The second point is that there have been representations from four States, Assam, Madras, Mysore and Travancore-Cochin. Now, Sir, as I was hearing the speakers uptill now, I felt as if Orissa is not a State which need come in the picture. In this connection, I say that Orissa must have representation in this coconut growing because in effect that is one of the main business of a great portion of the State of Orissa and particularly the constituency I represent.—Puri constituency—is famous for coconut growing. Then again, Sir, about the formation of this Committee, I do not yet know who now constitute the Committee but as you find, the Government takes a very great liberty in the constitution of this Committee. I think that people who go from the Centre are people who are known to be experts but are not experts in the practical life. Therefore the Committee

[Shri Lokenath Mishra]

should be so constituted that it will make the best use of real growers of coconut who know better than academicians in the field. Therefore I would submit to the hon. Minister that the constitution of this Committee should be reviewed and in the interests of growers something must be done.

Sir, in this connection I would like to take the advantage of placing before this House the needs of the coconut growers in my constituency. They do not care really how to grow coconut more fruitfully. They are growing coconut in the old ways and now even the production has come down. Even then with that fall in production, the prices have gone so much down that there is no encouragement for coconut growing and I hope this Committee should do something for the actual production of coconut and the Government should take a real interest in this matter. With these words, Sir, I take this opportunity to submit to the hon. Minister to be more practical and effective in this matter so that coconut which is so very good—every part of it, everything is useful—should be given more attention to grow. On behalf of my own constituency I would be grateful if something immediately is done for this particular thing.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): Sir, the amendments to the Indian Coconut Committee Act are overdue because you know, Sir, the Indian Central Coconut Committee is going unrepresented from Parliament. There are other things which should have been taken into consideration by the Government. At this opportunity Government should have abolished nomination and taken the representations from Governments by election from respective Legislatures. From the Act we find that there are nine representations from growers nominated by different State Governments, from Madras 2, Travancore-Cochin 3, Bombay 1, Bengal 1, Orissa 1, and Mysore 1. These persons should have been elected from their respective Legislatures. I am speaking it from my own personal experience being associated with the Committee for the last three years. Sir, Government has told us in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that on insistent demand on behalf of State Governments, Government have given representations to State Governments but I find only one representation has been added from one State, i.e., Assam. I am glad that it has been added. Government should have added the representations from the Governments of West Bengal, Orissa and Bombay because

those who are there from growers cannot speak up the Government's views. This Committee has to do something with the respective State Governments to conduct their affairs in that State. I feel it very much. So I have put an amendment to the effect that these three States which have been left should be represented by the respective State Governments. Sir, Government's insistent demands have come, so they have been given representation. It is not very palatable. Sir, why insistent demands should come? The Indian Central Coconut Committee is to find out whether they should take in the respective representations. There is West Bengal, there is Orissa, there is Assam. Why these States which are on the coastal side should not be represented at once? The Indian Central Coconut Committee might have opposed the Central Government to keep representations on these States. It is our due, Sir. So, I would request the hon. Minister not to lose this opportunity to accept my amendment so that those three States which have been left out should be represented by those Governments.

If the State Governments did not take any interest in the cultivation of coconut, will not the Indian Central Coconut Committee come forward and arrange for their cultivation? You will be astonished to hear, Sir, when I was elected to the Indian Central Coconut Committee last time, I found that there was not a single nursery in West Bengal. I insisted on the establishment of one and you will be surprised to hear that after three years, last year, it has been established in West Bengal. Had I not been there, the State of West Bengal would have gone unrepresented. There are large areas in West Bengal under coconut cultivation. You will also be astonished to hear, Sir, that there was no such resolution or intention on the part of the Indian Central Coconut Committee to start any nursery. There are some nurseries in Orissa. Only one person goes to the Coconut Committee as a grower. The Orissa Government has nothing to do with that. There should be research stations and there should be nurseries in every State where there is possibility of coconut cultivation. There are vast possibilities in Assam also; but Assam was not included. This time, the Government have been kind enough, at the insistent demand of Assam to include one representative. I would request the Government not to wait for insistent demands from any Government, but if they think there are possibilities of coconut cultivation

in any State, they should establish nurseries and research stations and they should give representation to those States, of their own accord.

I am not in accord with Mr. Chacko in one matter. He said that nothing is done for the growers of coconuts. I know there are research stations where they are trying to cure the leaf and root and other diseases and working hard at that; they are publishing bulletins and magazines, not in English, but in the local languages so that the growers may be conversant with all those things.

Shri P. T. Chacko: Circulate some of them.

Shri S. C. Samanta: They are published in numbers about the manures they should put, the medicines that they should use to eradicate the diseases.

I have also given notice of an amendment that from the House of the People four persons should be sent and two persons from the Council of States. There are no other elected representatives there. Only three persons are there. At least there should be six elected persons so long as the Government is not amending the Act to the effect that elected representatives should come from the State Legislatures. Therefore, I would beg of the Government to accept my amendments so that, for the time being, the Act may be amended to produce useful results.

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah): Sir, I am not here to oppose the amendments. Coming as I do from Travancore-Cochin, I have to support the continuance of a Committee like this and submit that it should fulfil its functions properly. Except one hon. Member, and that too apologetically, there is not one Member in the House to say a kind word about the working of this Committee. My hon. friend Mr. Chacko, who knows more about the working of this Committee and the problem in Travancore-Cochin, than I do, has condemned it in very clear, and I may say, very strong language and he said that it has done no work. I am here to stress the suggestion thrown out by the Deputy-Speaker that before this Bill is proceeded with, a brief report of the working of the Committee during the last seven or nine years—a fairly long period—what it has done and what it was expected to do, may be circulated. That is very necessary for us all to understand and appreciate the work of this Committee before the Bill is proceeded with.

The economy of my State, especially of the lower middle classes, depends mostly on the cultivation of coconuts rather than on any other industry or agriculture. We have got rubber and tea; but they do not affect a large number of people as coconut does. I am therefore very keen that this Committee should function properly. I would therefore request the hon. Minister to give us a report or whatever it may be, of the working of this Committee. For the enlightenment of my hon. friends, I may say that coir cannot come into this Committee. This Committee should be purely an agricultural Committee. Coir is an industrial product. This Committee is concerned with the production of coconuts. Till now, the one head-ache of the Travancore-Cochin State has been the coconut pest. It is still as bad as it was. There may have been research in this matter all these years; but nothing useful has been achieved. I would request the hon. Minister to give us a report of the working of the Committee before proceeding with the Bill further.

Shri Pataskar (Jaigaon): Sir, I would like to add only a few remarks; because I do not know much of the working of this Committee. What I find is this. In the year 1944 when this Act was passed for the first time, the number of Members was 23. It is proposed by this Bill to increase that number to 28. So far as I have been able to listen to the debate, particularly Members belonging to all the sides, whatever they have said is not flattering to the achievements of the Committee. Of course, I have yet to listen to the arguments of the hon. Minister in charge. But, the mere increase of the number of Members from 23 to 28 is not likely to improve the working of this Committee. I am not a believer in numbers. Mere increase in the numbers will not at all do good; but, rather, I think it will lead to inefficiency in the working of the Committee. There must be other reasons if this Committee really has not been able to do much. Apart from the remarks made in this House, it has been found that this country, is not self-sufficient in the matter of coconuts, but is importing coconuts from Ceylon, etc. I would confine my remarks to this aspect only. I would submit that you can accommodate every one even in this number of 23. There are people from Assam and Orissa who are clamouring for representation. I have every sympathy with them. But, for that purpose, there is no justification to increase the number from 23 to 28. There is a salutary provision in the existing Bill that the Chairman or the President will

[Shri Pataskar]

be the Vice-chairman of the Agricultural Research Council. He is supposed to be an expert and naturally, he should be the President. If the Government want, for certain reasons, any other person as President, there are already 23 people out of whom any one can be selected. The provision is, if any such person is appointed from outside again, you will be making the number 29. I believe the time has come when we should think of improving the working of the Committee more than of increasing the numbers, by some method. I have given notice of some amendments for this purpose. I believe the less the number of Members in the Committee and the more compact the Committee is, the more efficient it will be and is likely to prove useful. If we simply go on adding to the number of Members, we will only be adding to the burden of the taxpayer and increasing the travelling allowances and other costs such as printing charges, etc., and it will lead to no fruitful results.

Therefore, it was that I wanted to offer these few remarks. I have nothing to say about the actual working of the Committee. Probably when the hon. Minister replies, he may be able to justify and show us how the Committee has been effective, efficient and useful, but, apart from that, I think there is no justification for increasing the number from 23 to 29 which is already too large. Therefore, it is for making these suggestions that I rose, and it is only from that point of view that I have given a few amendments.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Sir, I am very glad a large number of hon. Members of this House have thrown much light on the working or non-working of the Committee. I do not think, Sir, that this was a Bill which did require any resume of the working of the Committee, but that was the suggestion made by the Deputy-Speaker, and I propose to give a very brief outline of the working of this Committee as early as possible, but I might submit to the House that for that purpose, I do not think it is necessary to hold up the consideration of this Bill.

It is wrong to suggest that by proposing this Bill, the Government is trying to get more money. I would like to controvert that suggestion. There is no idea, no intention, of either increasing the cess or in any way augmenting the revenues of the Committee. There is certainly a proposal to amend the definition of the word "Mill", because we find that there were certain evasions, but I do

not think that that can be commented upon as saying that the Government is, by the back door, trying to secure more money and extort money from the growers, as some of the hon. Members went to the length of saying.

Now, so far as the working of the Committee is concerned, I would probably be willing to agree that the Committee has not fulfilled all the expectations that we should have legitimately had. Yet, I would assure the House that I would examine the working of this Committee with the greatest amount of care, and if I really come to the conclusion that the existence of this Committee is unnecessary, I may assure the House, I will have no hesitation in winding it up. But, while certain hon. Members commented on the bad working of this Committee, it was quite clear, Sir, that in the opinion of some Members, at any rate, the Committee had embarked upon certain good proposals. They might not have succeeded. If we see the preamble of the original Act we can find out the intentions with which the Committee was established. The preamble reads as follows:

"Act to provide for the creation of a fund for the improvement and development of the cultivation, marketing and utilisation of coconut".

"Whereas it is expedient to provide for the creation of a fund to be expended by a Committee specially constituted in this behalf for the improvement and development of the cultivation, marketing and utilisation of coconuts in India."

I think, Sir, there can be no quarrel with the objectives with which the Committee was constituted. It may be that during the last seven years of its existence, it has not been able to satisfy our expectations, but I think there must be remedies by which we will be able to achieve it, and I think it should not be beyond human capacity to improve its working.

There were not many who defended the working of the Committee, although my friend Mr. Samanta said that there were certain researches going on. As I have already said, I am prepared to admit that the affairs of the Committee require looking into, and I have promised to do that.

There were certain points which are not within the scope of the Committee.

Hon. Members referred to the prices of coconut and the import policy. I must point my finger to my hon. friend the Commerce Minister, so far as that is concerned. But there also it is not absolutely one-sided. I do not think there is enmity between the Government even in the Commerce Ministry and the coconut growers. The hon. Members while speaking for the growers have probably not paid sufficient attention to the interests of the small soap-makers, soap manufacturers, the consumers of coconut and all the other people who want these things to be available to them at a cheaper rate. The Commerce Ministry, therefore, has been trying to find out a policy to avoid the two extremes—on the one hand trying to protect the interests of the consumer, and probably leaving it to the Ministry of Agriculture to fight for the interests of the growers of coconut.

I think, Sir, that the Committee's existence is not so unnecessary or unrequired as has been made out. What is necessary is to look into its working and to see that the growers, at any rate, who are the main concern of the Committee—it is not so much the consumers—are not to be sacrificed, but the Committee's main business is to enlarge the cultivation of coconut, to suggest better methods of marketing and also to undertake research wherever it is possible. Now, so far as marketing is concerned, an instance has been pointed out by my friend Mr. Chacko where the Committee has been unfortunate and has been unsuccessful. They tried to encourage marketing by helping through co-operative societies, and according to my hon. friend Mr. Chacko, the money has been wasted, and no benefit has accrued. This was probably the attempt of the Committee to see that the coconut growers get better prices. I promise, Sir.—I have not got all the facts about this co-operative society before me to enquire into it and I will see that, at any rate, no further amount—if it is squandered in the way suggested—is again squandered.

So far as the other suggestions are concerned, I will certainly look into every one of the criticisms on the working of the Committee. In regard to the complaint made that we are living in a democracy and yet we are resorting to nominations everywhere. I would submit to the House that there is a certain pattern of the constitution of all these commodity Committees which is being followed so far. Unfortunately, there is no large room for elections. I will tell you

how. There are not many well-organised associations, whether you take the growers, the traders or the manufacturers—although probably the one latter are better organised. I would be the first person to do away with all nominations and resort to elections, but to whom will you give the votes? Are there any well-organised organisations or federations or societies which can be depended upon to safeguard the interests of the growers? I personally feel that it is not so, and I may submit to this House very humbly that one of my intentions in examining the working of this Committee is to see and find out ways and means of organising especially the growers, and it is my intention—unless there is some great and insurmountable difficulty which I do not conceive—as early as possible to bring about this element of election, especially amongst the growers so that they will be more interested in the crops they grow, and they will also be more watchful in protecting the interests which are looked after by the Government for the time being.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Do you suggest a further amendment?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I would.

Shri S. S. More: Where is the necessity for that?

Mr. Speaker: He will take time.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Because this is a matter which will apply not only to this Committee, but probably to every Committee—there is the Cotton Committee, the Jute Committee; there are all sorts of Committees—and it would not be worth while doing it in one place, and moreover, the fulfilment of that objective will also take long. It cannot be done in a day.

4 P.M.

Then, it was also suggested: why have this nominated President? Why not let the Committee members elect one? I would like to point out with reference to the remarks made by Mr. Chacko that even if we are having a larger number as growers' representatives, the few representatives of the industrialists dominate the field. That is my answer to his suggestion for the Committee electing its own president. If his comment is correct, then in most of the cases, it would not be the growers' interests which will be protected, but it might very well be, because the Government would not interfere, that an undesirable person—or a person whom at least Mr. Chacko considers undesirable—will become the president. Knowing the objects with which the Committee

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh]

has been established, and knowing what we wish to get out of the Committee, I think the authority with the Government to nominate a suitable person to be the President is neither undemocratic nor undesirable. If all the members of the Committee were elected persons, then I would have understood the argument that we were foisting somebody on the top of them, who was a nominated person. Most of these persons, as things stand, at any rate, are nominated persons, and to give them a chance to elect a President from amongst themselves, I do not think, is going to make much difference. From that point of view I would suggest that the proposal that has been made in the Bill is reasonable. We would not be gaining very much in the way of establishment of democracy inside the Committee by resorting to the election of only one office-bearer.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

My hon. friend Mr. Samanta fought on behalf of Bombay, Orissa and West Bengal, but while arguing that we should abolish nominations, he has suggested—and there is an amendment standing in his name—that these Governments of the States of Bombay, Orissa and West Bengal, should have the power of nominating one representative each of their own. I do not want to quarrel with the inconsistency in the argument, and I have every sympathy for his supporting the cause of Governments' representation for the States of Bombay, Orissa and West Bengal. I am just at this moment not in a position to accept his suggestion, but I will keep it in view and if there is any other early opportunity, I will certainly see that the claims of these three States would receive consideration.

The last speech delivered on the Bill was by Mr. Pataskar—I wish he were here now. First and foremost, he did not calculate the numbers very correctly. There are at the present moment 26 members, but according to him there were 23, and we are going to raise it to 28. The arithmetic of my friend is wrong; there are at the present moment 26 members, and we are adding only two. That is why I am not in a position to accept the very reasonable suggestion of my friend Mr. Samanta, for adding three more members, because as has been argued by Mr. Pataskar, we are really apprehensive about increasing the numbers too much, because it leads to a not proportionate increase of efficiency, if not an actual decrease in efficiency. That is the reason why I am not in a

position to accept Mr. Samanta's suggestion. The arguments advanced by Mr. Pataskar do not hold much ground, because we are adding only two persons, and that too for very substantial and very urgent reasons. We are adding to the Committee the Marketing Adviser, and a representative on behalf of Assam which has had no representation so far. This representation for Assam has been welcomed also by my friend Mr. Samanta. So these are the two additional members we are adding. For the rest, this is a more or less formal Bill, except that we are changing the definition of the word 'mill', and adding a clause for the supply of information about mills by the owners. There is no other difference of any importance otherwise. In two or three clauses, we have expanded the scope of the Committee's work, so as to give larger benefit to larger numbers.

I had said earlier that I was going to accept the amendments of my friend Mr. Damodara Menon, but I am afraid I have got to go back on my promise, because the work has already been done. I have now been informed that by the Adaptation Order, the modifications suggested by my friend are already incorporated. They were not apparent on the face of it, and therefore I thought that Travancore and Cochin were separately mentioned and separate representation was also given to them, and that now they should be joined. But this work has already been done, and so both the amendments which have been suggested by Mr. Damodara Menon are unnecessary.

Shri Damodara Menon: There is another amendment standing in my name; is the hon. Minister accepting it?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: No, no. The reason as I have already explained, is that we have not got this elective principle anywhere except in the case of Parliament. If it is the intention of this House that elective principles should be followed, then that will have to be done for representation in various other fields also. I do not think we should deal with such a matter in a piece-meal way. It would be better that if there is a representative from the State, he should be an elected person from the Assembly, but we have not accepted this principle so far anywhere else, and I do not think we will benefit much by making a solitary exception in the case of one Committee, when in all the other Committees, the representatives are nominated by the State Governments. I therefore regret that I would not be

in a position to accept the amendments, because there is nothing much that we gain thereby. There is no amendment to the more important clauses, but they are only so far as numbers or representation is concerned, and I hope therefore that my hon. friends will not press their amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall then take up the Bill clause by clause.

Clause 2.—(Amendment of section 2, Act X of 1944).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As there are no amendments to clause 2, I shall put it to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3.—(Amendment of section 4, Act X of 1944).

Shri S. C. Samanta: While I do not press the amendment standing in my name, I would clear a misunderstanding that has crept in the mind of the hon. Minister. He said that I was advocating for election, and at the same time putting in an amendment for nomination as well. That is so, I want that the whole Act should be amended so that there will be election, but so long as that is not done, the State Governments should be represented by their nominees.

Shri P. T. Chacko: I have tabled two alternative amendments to this clause. The second of them reads:

In page 1, for lines 30 to 35, substitute:

"(g) six other persons of whom two shall be elected from among themselves by the members of the House of the People, one shall be elected from among themselves by the members of the Council of States, one shall be elected from among themselves by the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Mysore, and two shall be elected from among themselves by the members of the Legislature of the State of Travancore-Cochin."

I only wish to point out that the Governments are represented by their nominees under another clause, while here the suggestion is with regard to the election of six non-officials. Of these six, three are to be elected by the House of the People and the Council of States. Why not elect the other three also from the Legislative Assemblies of the States of Travancore-Cochin and Mysore? I do not think there is any valid objection and I have not heard the Minister giving any reason for objecting to this. It is true that all the members are not elected, but he has given the reason why all the members could not be elected. Some members for example, the representatives of the growers cannot be elected now as there are no representative growers' associations. The representatives of Governments are also there. They are to be nominated. But these six persons can be elected and I request the hon. Minister to accept this amendment.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Sir, as I have already stated, this should not be taken in a solitary way with regard to one commodity Committee. If the principle is to be accepted, it will have to be of general application with regard to the constitution of all the Committees. I am prepared to consider the suggestion, but at the moment I am afraid I am not prepared to accept it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it necessary to put it to the House? I shall adopt this course hereafter. Instead of putting it to the House and then asking the leave of the House to withdraw, I will not put it to the House if I know from the face of the hon. Member that he is not moving it.

Shri Damodara Menon: Sir, there is an amendment standing against my name.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That also is not moved.

Shri Damodara Menon: I want to move it. That is exactly the same as Mr. Chacko's, but since.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no rejection. I have not placed it.

Shri K. K. Basu: Diamond Harbour): I beg to move:

(i) In page 1, line 30, for "six" substitute "nine".

(ii) In page 1, line 30, for "two" substitute "four".

(iii) In page 1, line 32, for "one" substitute "two".

[Shri K. K. Basu]

Sir, these amendments speak for themselves. They deal with providing greater representation of the Houses.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Sir, I am not able to accept these.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

(i) In page 1, line 30, for "six" substitute "nine".

(ii) In page 1, line 30, for "two" substitute "four".

(iii) In page 1, line 32, for "one" substitute "two".

The motion was negatived.

Shri Damodara Menon: I beg to move:

In page 1, lines 33 to 35, for "one shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Mysore and two shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Travancore-Cochin" substitute "one shall be elected by the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Mysore and two shall be elected by the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Travancore-Cochin."

I am not satisfied with the explanation given by the hon. Minister. As suggested by my hon. friend, Mr. Chacko, the elective principle is accepted and there is no reason why in that clause the same principle.....

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: When I referred to acceptance of the principle, it related to the first two—so far as the joining of the Travancore-Cochin.....

Shri Damodara Menon: My amendment is this.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will put it to the House. Besides the elective principle that is adopted for Members of Parliament, the hon. Minister does not find his way to accept it as a general principle.

The question is:

In page 1, lines 33 to 35, for "one shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Mysore and two shall be nominated by the Government of the State of Travancore-Cochin" substitute "one shall be elected by the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Mysore and two shall be elected by the members

of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Travancore-Cochin".

The motion was negatived.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Sir, I have an amendment. I gave it to the hon. Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member got an amendment to clause 3? Is it acceptable to the hon. Minister?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: No, Sir. I have not even seen it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall go according to the general rule, that unless an amendment is acceptable to the Minister in charge, I will not waive the notice.

Shri A. C. Guha: Sir, I have already pointed out to the hon. Minister and to this House that the cess collected under this Act should not be automatically transferred to this Committee. In fact, there are about 12 or 13 autonomous bodies which have got funds like that and on several occasions I drew the attention of the Finance Minister and he gave me an assurance that he would rectify this so that the fund might be collected by the Government and may form part of the Consolidated Fund of India and then the Central Government will hand over the fund after being properly entered into accounts. Sir, according to that assurance given by the hon. the Finance Minister.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How does this arise out of clause 3? The amendment relates only to persons.

Shri A. C. Guha: "To receive for credit to the Fund the proceeds of the duty...." that is the preamble of section 4 which is going to be amended by clause 3.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not sought to be amended now.

Shri A. C. Guha: The whole section 4 is under amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: "In section 4 for clause (a)"—some portions of section 4 are amended.

Shri A. C. Guha: Clauses (a) to (g). The preamble is the main part.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not want to be technical, if remotely connected with that subject. But the principle is, he wants to give representa-

tion for Parliament. He wants to add two more members and that by the elective principle. Whether the whole thing ought to be handed over to the Committee or not or that it should become part of the Consolidated Fund of India and from time to time money should be doled out to the Committee—though it may be in section 4, it is not touched by this amendment. Therefore, it is beyond the scope of this Bill.

Shri A. C. Guha: Perhaps you may remember that a large amount of money is being handled by these Committees, and the hon. the Finance Minister admitted that this should be rectified. When this clause is under discussion and is going to be amended, opportunity should be taken to rectify that lacuna. In two subsequent Bills this has been done, in the Coal Conservation and Safety Act and also in the Industries Development Act. My suggestion is that the hon. Minister should take this opportunity to include a similar provision so that this fund may be properly audited and made part of the Consolidated Fund of India and be handed over by the Central Government to that Committee. It may not be an automatic right of that Committee to handle that fund and to use it in any way it likes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I only allowed the hon. Member to go on so that he may avoid it in the Third Reading stage. It is not relevant for this purpose.

The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 4 to 6

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is an amendment by Mr. S. S. More to clause 4. "Omitting" is not an amendment. The hon. Member may vote against it. I will give him an opportunity to speak.

Shri S. S. More: Sir, in moving the particular amendment which you have ruled out, my main objection was to emphasise that in forming the different Committees for different purposes the principle of democracy should be followed. Now, Sir, the stalwarts of the present Government have been professing all along and on many occasions, in season and out of season, that they stand solidly for democracy. But our

experience has been, Sir, that they profess democratic principles but in practice they are developing a sort of dictatorial trend. (*Interruption*). My friend is saying, "Nothing of the-kind". That may be his own reaction. But just as we say "The test of the pudding is in the eating", we may scan the different provisions, the different proposals which are footed by the Government and a careful analysis of all these provisions forces one to the conclusion that this Executive Government is grabbing more and more power in its hands. This Executive Government, Sir, when it becomes "power greedy", wants to grab more and more power. Then democracy comes into danger. My amendment is that they should not snatch power from the democratic Government. Mr. Pataskar wonderingly asks, though he belongs to the Congress, why so many seats, so many places of office are being multiplied. I can give him the explanation, if I can give it. Many opportunists, many power-seekers, many job-hunters are flocking to the Congress camp and all of them have to be appeased. Create as many posts as possible, appoint as many Committees as you can, do not care for squandering away the money of the public but keep them all pleased. Everybody has some beggar's bowl in his own hand. Something has to be given to them. Therefore all these posts are created.

Mr. Chacko very bitterly complained, and with some justification I may say,—he complained in spite of party discipline—that these Committees have not discharged any function and still, a vigorous attempt is being made to keep all these bodies alive—not for the purpose of serving the interests of the different classes, either of the coconut growers or the oilseeds producers but—for the purpose of keeping everybody from the Congress camp busy somewhere. Therefore, Sir, I submit that the Vice-Chairman of the Agricultural Council for Research be *ex-officio* President or Chairman of this Committee. Of course, that will take away one place from the hands of the Executive Government.

Sir, I will give one instance of how this power of nomination is being utilised by the Congress people to lubricate their own party. I will cite an instance from the Bombay State.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us not go to other States. The hon. Member might find enough material if necessary here.

Shri S. S. More: That is my own experience and I propose to cite from my own experience.

The Minister of Revenue and Expenditure (Shri Tyagi): He is giving his experience. Was he lubricated, Sir?

Shri S. S. More: When I was inside the Congress we were fighting the Britishers. There was no question of lubrication as a matter of fact. The question of lubrication, Mr. Tyagi knows from his own experience, arose after the 15th August, 1947 and not before that. So, my submission is in the Bombay State, Sir.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think coconut oil is sufficiently lubricating and it is unnecessary to go to the Bombay State.

Shri S. S. More: I accept what you say, Sir. If Bombay State is not to be placed under cannon fire, I am not going to dispute what you say, Sir. This coconut oil and oilseeds are being utilised by the present Congress Government as I have said as lubricants.

My submission is that the Minister in charge was very prolific in saying that he stood by the principle of election and when the time comes he will submit these proposals to some examination and possibly he may introduce the element of election. Now, Sir, why this double process of legislation? Let the Vice-President of the Agricultural Council remain *ex-officio* President of this Committee for some time. If by that time the hon. Minister, who is new to his job and therefore bubbling with enthusiasm, scans all these provisions and if he is really convinced that the *ex-officio* President is over-worked then let him introduce the principle of election and give all these 26 or 27 persons the power of electing their own Chairman. Possibly there may be some claimants for some office here or for some office there; they will have to be satisfied, they will have to be patronised and for all these purposes this power is being taken over by the Executive. Sir, I do not wish to make a very long speech. I oppose this particular clause with all the vehemence that I can command.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Sir, I do not think that what my hon. friend has said calls for an answer from me. He has delivered his vehement opposition so far as Congress and everything that the Congress and the Congress Governments do and he has taken hold of the coconut and on the basis of it administered some new abuses to us. If he analyses the composition of this Committee, he will find that what he fears may be what

he might have probably himself done if he was in this place has not been done by the Government.

Shri S. S. More: I have not followed him, Sir.

An Hon Member: He spoke English.

Shri S. S. More: Not intelligible English.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Sir, it is not the intention of Government to push any Congressman to any position, good, bad or indifferent. I do not think it can be said at any rate so far as the composition of these Committees is concerned; I think that this criticism is really out of place as far as this Bill is concerned or this clause is concerned.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clauses 4, 5 and 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

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

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

INDIAN OILSEEDS COMMITTEE (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946, be taken into consideration."

This Bill follows very closely, Sir, the pattern of the Bill which has been accepted by the House just this minute. There is in this Bill also a new definition of the word "mill". It has been suggested:

"'mill' means any premises in which or in any part of which oilseeds are crushed or are ordinarily crushed with the aid of power."