

Singh and others on Wednesday, the 7th May, at 4 p.m.

(d) Discussion on the proper inspection of the working conditions of Mines in the country for prevention of explosions and flood incidents to be raised by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh on Thursday, the 8th May at 3 p.m.

(e) Discussion on the delay in introducing the Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill to be raised by Shri T. B. Vittal Rao on Friday, the 9th May, subject to the availability of time.

INDIAN STAMP (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Stamp Act, 1899.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Stamp Act, 1899."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Morarji Desai: Sir, I beg to introduce the Bill.

APPROPRIATION (NO. 3) BILL

Shri Morarji Desai: Sir, I beg to move:**

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1955, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts

spent on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1955, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clauses 1, 2, 3, the Schedule, the Title and the Enacting Formula stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, the Schedule, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri Morarji Desai: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

RICE-MILLING INDUSTRY (REGULATION) BILL—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion on the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Bill, 1958. Out of 3 hours and 30 minutes agreed to by the House for the General Discussion, one hour now remains. Thereafter clause-by-clause consideration and third reading will be taken up for which 1 hour and 30 minutes will be available.

Pandit K. C. Sharma may continue his speech.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): Yesterday, I was saying that hand-pounding of rice is not a satisfactory solution to the problem of unemployment for the simple reason that this sort of labour, especially for women, relates to some primitive society of the muscle culture. This is an age of atomic energy which the machine is very welcome to take to the hard job in place of the tender women. What I submit is that proper work should be found for the women and they should not be put to the hard work

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II—Section 2, dated 2-5-58.

**Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Pandit K. C. Sharma]

that relates to hard muscles. In my part of the country, it is one of the questions that arises between the mother-in-law and the young daughter-in-law. The young daughter-in-law complains to her mother that she has got such a nasty mother-in-law that as soon as she goes to her father-in-law's house, she puts her to the task of grinding of wheat or pounding of rice with the result the kindly mothers say that they are willing to send rice and flour instead of letting the daughter to be put to such a hard job. So, it is not a very welcome proposition for the women to take to it. Of course the poor women take to it. But is it too much to expect that in an expanding economy as ours is better jobs can be found and better employment can be given without taking refuge under such hard job?

Suppose there is no mill, what would be the result? The result would be that paddy would be taken to the city. As we know the city market does not accept very gladly paddy as such. The market accepts the rice—not paddy. So, the poor peasant has to take the paddy, pay for its transport and waste his labour in selling it out. So, he is put to unnecessary botheration and unnecessary expense for nothing. On the other hand, if there is a rice mill available at a short distance he can sell paddy there or turn it into rice. They say that the mill owner is a hard bargainer. If he is a hard bargainer and if the poor peasant is exploited, it is up to the poor peasant to take to hand-pounding himself. But despite the hard bargaining mill-owner, the peasant sells his paddy to him. It is proof of the fact that despite a little exploitation and a little hard bargaining, the peasant prefers to sell the paddy to the mill-owner rather than get it pounded in his own home for the simple reason that it is a hard job and an unhealthy job. No young woman who can take to easier work is willing to take this job.

There is the prejudice. Milled rice is worse, or to put it in other words, hand-pounded rice is a much better

food. I think it is the same sort of prejudice which is against the mill sugar as against the indigenous sugar. Experience has proved that there is nothing wrong with the mill sugar. Experience will prove that there is nothing wrong with the milled rice. It is an old prejudice which has not much meaning.

I will conclude by saying that this measure is a hard measure which will not do much to the good of the peasantry nor would it do good to the women who will be put to a hard job.

श्री मनसुनबाबा (भागलपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय तीन बातें सभी लोगों ने मंजूर की हैं। एक तो यह हैंडपाउंडिंग से चावल मात्रा में ज्यादा निकलता है दूसरी बात यह कि हैंडपाउंडिंग का चावल खाने में अधिक स्वादिष्ट होता है और उस में विटामिन अधिक हैं और तीसरी बात जो कि सब से जरूरी है यह कि देहातों में और गांवों में जो लोग बिना काम बैठे हैं उन को इस से काम मिलता है।

मैं ने फाइनेंस बिल पर बोलते हुए यह बतलाया था कि मैं एक कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट के गांव में गया ; मैं ने देखा कि मुखिया गांव में नहीं थे मैं ने पूछा कि कहां गये हैं तो मालूम हुआ कि नजदीक में मिल पर चावल कुटवाने के लिये गये हैं। मैं फिर देहात के भन्दर गया और जा कर देखा कि वहां बहुत से ऐसे लोग थे जिन के पास कोई काम नहीं था। मैं उन के झोंपड़े में गया और पूछा कि भाई तुम को आज क्या खाने को मिला है। उन्होंने ने कहा कि क्या कुछ बाबू। पहले हमारे मुखिया हम से गांव में ही चावल कुटवाते थे लेकिन अब वह अपना चावल मिल को ले गये हैं। पता नहीं आज शाम हम को खाना मिलेगा या नहीं।

हमारे भाई कृष्णचन्द्र जी शर्मा और पांडे जी ने अभी भाषण दिया है : उन्होंने ने कहा कि मिस की चीज सस्ती होती है खाने में भी अच्छी

घौर कई बातें उन्होंने नें कहीं। उन्होंने ने कहा कि यदि ऐसा है तो फिर गेहूँ का आटा घौर मैदा बनाने के लिये भी मिलें क्यों हों तेल निकालने की भी मिलें क्यों हों। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि यदि इन प्रश्नों के भीतर अच्छी तरह से जाया जाय तो कहना होगा कि वास्तव में उन चीजों के लिये मिलें नहीं होनी चाहियें। आप किसी भी डाक्टर के पास जायें चाहे वह ऐलोपैथिक डाक्टर हो या होम्योपैथिक हो या प्रायुर्वेदिक हो तो वह आप को बतलायेगा कि आजकल जो आप मिल का आटा खाते हैं और जो मिल का तेल खाते हैं इस से बीमारियाँ पैदा होती हैं। अगर आप आटा खायें तो आप हाथ की चक्की का आटा खाइये नहीं तो मिल के आटे का चोकर खाइये। तो इन सब बातों को भी हम को देखना है। कहा जाता है कि किस किस चीज को हाथ से किया जायेगा। लेकिन मेरा विचार है कि यदि कोई चीज हमारे देश के लिये लाभदायक है उस से गरीबों को काम मिलता है और उस से हमारा स्वास्थ्य भी अच्छा रहता है तो उसे हम को अवश्य करना चाहिये। अगर यह काम हाथ से होता है और मशीन से नहीं होता तो हम को हाथ से काम करने वालों के विरुद्ध प्रेजुडिस क्यों होनी चाहिये। शर्मा जी ने कहा कि लोगों को एक समय वह बड़ी भारी प्रेजुडिस थी कि मिल की चीनी खराब होती है और जो चीनी हाथ से बनती है वह अच्छी होती है लेकिन अब यह प्रेजुडिस दूर हो गया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे शर्मा साहब न कुछ पढ़ते हैं न कुछ जानते हैं और न कुछ समझते हैं। अमरीका में इस ह्वाइट शुगर के बारे में लोग कह रहे हैं कि यह ह्वाइट पाइजन है। जब अमरीका जैसे डेवेलपड मुल्क में लोग यह बात कह रहे हैं कि ह्वाइट शुगर ह्वाइट पाइजन है। और वे रा शुगर खाना शुरू कर रहे हैं तो हमारे यहां शर्मा जी जैसे लोग यह कह रहे हैं कि मिल की चीनी की तरफ जो प्रेजुडिस थी वह दूर हो गई है। हम को यह बातें सुन कर बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है। लोग अच्छी तरह के अध्ययन नहीं करते और यहां पर आ कर

ऐसी बातें कह देते हैं जो कि वास्तविकता से बिल्कुल उलटी होती है।

हमारी बहिन रेणु चक्रवर्ती ने कहा कि यह ठीक है देहातों में लोगों को काम देने के लिये बहुत अच्छी चीज है। उन्होंने ने एक बात यह भी कही कि सेंटर इस स्टेट की चीज को क्यों अपने हाथ में ले रहा है इसे तो स्टेट के लिये छोड़ देना चाहिये। मैं उन से सहमत हूँ। यदि स्टेट अपने काम को अच्छी तरह से करे तो वह काम स्टेट के हाथ में छोड़ देना चाहिये। परन्तु जहां स्टेट अपने काम को अच्छी तरह से न करे और जो चीज जरूरी है जो हमारे स्वास्थ्य के लिये जरूरी है और जिम से गरीब लोगों को काम मिल सकता है अगर स्टेट उस को न करे तो हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन में अधिकार दिया गया है कि सेंटर को उस काम को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिये।

श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती ने कहा कि मिलों में काम होने में इकानमिक खराबी पैदा होती है क्योंकि उस दशा में मानापाली हो जाती है और ब्लैक मार्केटिंग होता है। परन्तु चूंकि यह एक इंडस्ट्री है इसलिये वह इस को सपोर्ट करती हैं। यह चीज मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। यह कहना कि चूंकि यह चीज हाथ से होती है इसलिये इस का विरोध करना चाहिये या यह कि चूंकि यह चीज मशीनों से होती है और बिजली से चलती है इसलिये इस का विरोध किया जाना चाहिये ये दोनों चीजें मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। हमें इन दोनों चीजों को इस प्रकार से मिलाना चाहिये कि जिस चीज से देश का लाभ हो उस को किया जाये। जिस से हमारा स्वास्थ्य अच्छा रहे। जो और तरह से भी लाभदायक हो वह चीज हम को करनी चाहिये चाहे वह कोई हाथ से होने वाली इंडस्ट्री हो या मशीन से होने वाली।

बस मुझे इतना ही कहना है। मैं इस बिल का हार्दिक स्वागत करता हूँ और मैं अपने डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब से कहूंगा कि अगर वह

[श्री भुनकुनवास]

एक दम से मिलों को बन्द कर दें तो बहुत अच्छा होगा। हां यह जरूर है कि ऐसा करने से जरूर दिक्कत होगी।

हमारे एक मित्र कहते हैं कि अगर मिलें नहीं होंगी तो जितने चावल की आवश्यकता है वह हाथ से कंते कुटा जा सकेगा। हमारा उद्देश्य तो यह है कि थोड़ी थोड़ी जमीन लोगों को बांट दी जाये और वह अपने अपने चावल को अपने हाथ से कूटें ताकि लोगों को स्वास्थ्यदायक चावल मिले। गेहूं को घर में अच्छी तरह से पीसा जाये और लोगों को अच्छा आटा दिया जाये जिस से उन का स्वास्थ्य अच्छा हो। तो हम लोगों को किसी तरह का प्रेजुडिस नहीं होना चाहिये। न तो यह ब्याल होना चाहिये कि हम को बड़ी इंडस्ट्री को सपोर्ट करना चाहिये चाहे उस से देश का नुकसान ही क्यों न हो और न यह ब्याल होना चाहिये कि काम हाथ से ही होना चाहिये चाहे उस से देश का कोई फायदा न हो। ऐसा विचार नहीं होना चाहिये। हम को हर प्रश्न को इस दृष्टि से देखना चाहिये कि इस में देश की उन्नति होती है या नहीं।

Shri Subbiah Ambalam (Ramanathapuram): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the object of the Bill is very laudable for two reasons. It provides employment for the rural population and, at the same time, it gives protection to the hand-pounding industry. Another object of this Bill is to regulate the working of rice mills by issue of licences. But I would like to submit the reasons why a Bill of this type is not necessary at this juncture.

The object of this Bill could very well be achieved by a legislation brought at the State level. It is not necessary to have a legislation at the Centre for the control of such a small industry, an industry which would be started by small proprietors with a capital investment of about Rs. 2000 to Rs. 3000. Moreover, this legislation is not in consonance with the declar-

ed policy of our Government to have more of decentralisation of the administration. At least these small industries like the rice-milling industry should be left to the sphere of State Governments.

The control of such small industries by the Centre will bring in a lot of inconvenience for the people who are working such small industries. For example, provision is being made in this Bill for applications being made to the Central Government for a permit for the establishment of a new mill; forms are also being prescribed in which the application should be submitted. If applications are to be made to the Central Government and it is left to the discretion of the Central Government to grant such licences, it will result in lot of difficulties and inconvenience for people living in rural areas working such small industries. Provision is also being made under sub-clause (4) of clause (5) that before granting any permit under sub-section (3), the Central Government shall cause a full and complete investigation to be made in the prescribed manner in respect of the application and shall have due regard to the number of rice mills operating in the locality, the availability of paddy in the locality, the availability of power and water supply for the rice mill in respect of which a permit is applied for and so on. I would like to submit that these are matters which can very well be left to the State Governments, or even to the District Collectors or local municipalities or panchayats. These are matters which can very well be attended to by State Governments and by the local institutions as is being done now.

But, if the Central Government and the hon. Minister feel that these industries must be regulated on the lines of this Bill, this can be effected by issuing definite instructions to the concerned States so that grant of licences may be regulated as indicated in this Bill. Therefore, I would like to sub-

mit, the necessity for a Bill of this type is not very urgent at present.

Then, the punishment provided in this Bill under clause 13 is very objectionable and also very severe. The punishment provided is six months imprisonment or a fine to the extent of Rs. 5,000, or with both, and in the case of a continuing contravention, with an additional fine which may extend to Rs. 500 for every day during which such contravention continues. This is very exorbitant, I would submit. If, in an industry which is being run with a capital of Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000, for every contravention of these rules a fine of Rs. 500 is to be imposed, I think the people in that industry will not be in a position to pay this fine, and the best thing would be to abandon the industry and resort to some other industry. This, I would submit, will result in a lot of inconvenience and it will also affect the food supply position besides affecting the rice-milling industry.

Some of the hon. Members have also observed that it is not possible to produce rice through the hand-pounding industry alone. The reasons stated are that it is not possible to store hand-pounded rice for a longer period than about 10 to 15 days. But it is not possible to produce all rice by hand-pounding process, when rice is necessary for a week or 15 days. We have to meet the food situation in our country and to feed 400 million people. It is not possible to have a hand-pounding industry alone to supply the needs of our ever-increasing population. Therefore, I would submit that these are matters on which the hon. Minister should bestow more attention. He should see that the objects of this Bill can well be achieved by issuing definite instructions to the State Governments and I am sure these instructions will be carried out to the full satisfaction of the Central Government.

Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister to circulate this Bill for

eliciting public opinion. He should not rush in a legislation of this type which mostly affects the small rice-mill owners and the general public at large.

श्री राम शरण (मुरादाबाद) :
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में विचार प्रकट करते हुये कई माननीय सदस्यों ने सिद्धान्ततः का सवाल उठाया है। फाइनैस बिल पर बहस के दौरान में मैंने यह कहा था कि गवर्नमेंट की आर्थिक नीति को स्पष्ट होना चाहिये जहां तक कि कनज्यूमर गुड्स उपभोक्ताओं द्वारा काम में लाई जाने वाली वस्तुओं का सम्बन्ध है, अर्थात् उन के बनाने के जो ो तरीके हैं— बड़े बड़े कारखानों में बड़ी मात्रा में उत्पत्ति और ग्राम उद्योगों द्वारा छोटी मात्रा में उत्पत्ति— कुछ भेद किया जाय या नहीं, उन में से किस को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाय— बड़ी मात्रा में उत्पत्ति को प्रोत्साहन दे कर छोटी मात्रा में जो उत्पत्ति होती है, उस को करने की कोशिश की जाय या नहीं, इत्यादि यह प्रश्न आज देश के सामने है। जहां तक द्वितीय पंच-वर्षीय योजना और इस सम्बन्ध में गवर्नमेंट की नीति का प्रश्न है, अभी कल सांइटिफिक पार्लिसी के सम्बन्ध में बोलते हुये प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि यह देश ऐसा है, जहां बेल-गाड़ी और अनु-शक्ति—एटामिक शक्ति—दोनों साथ साथ चलते हैं और चलते रहेंगे, जब तक कि इस का कोई खास हल नहीं निकाला जायेगा।

तो मेरा विचार यह करना है कि जिन चीजों की उत्पत्ति बड़ी मात्रा में हो रही है और वे बड़े अण्डे प्रकार से तैयार हो रही हैं, लेकिन यदि उससे देश को कुछ नुकसान हो, तो फिर उन को बड़ी मात्रा में तैयार कराना छोड़ कर ग्रामीणों के द्वारा छोटी मात्रा में तैयार क्यों न कराया जाय। जहां तक हाथ से कूटे हुये चावल का सम्बन्ध है, वह मिल के द्वारा तैयार चावल की अपेक्षा

[श्री राम शरण]

ज्यादा पीष्टक होता है, उस के प्रयोग में खर्च भी कम होता है और उस की मात्रा भी मिल द्वारा चावल से अधिक प्राप्त होती है।

श्री ५० ६० पांडे (नेनीताल) : कुटाई का क्या होगा।

श्री राम शरण : जहां तक कुटाई का सम्बन्ध है, हम को विचार करना होगा कि हम कुटाई के तरीके को कुछ मरल बनायें, जिस में कम मेहनत लगे और जो ज्यादा लोगों को रोजगार दे सके, जिम में लाखों आदिमियों को लगाया जा सके। वह तरीका देश के लिये हितकर होगा और उस को प्रोत्साहन देना हमारा कर्तव्य है। जो भी व्यक्ति देश का भला चाहता है, वह मशीन के खिलाफ नहीं हो सकता है, लेकिन मशीन एसी होनी चाहिये, जो बजाय आदिमियों को डिस्प्लेस करने के, उन का रोजगार छीनने के, उन की सहायक हों, उन के लिये सहूलियत पैदा करने वाली हो। हाथ-कुटाई की अब नई नई चक्कियां चली हैं। जो पहले तरीका था, उस में ज्यादा परिश्रम करना पड़ता था। अब कम मेहनत से बहुत मारा धान चावल के रूप में परिणत किया जा सकता है। लेकिन इतना जरूर है कि वह उबना पालिण्ड और खूबसूरत नहीं होता है। वह पीष्टक होता है। इस में एक रुपया रोज के हिसाब से मजदूरी भी मिल सकती है।

गवर्नमेंट ने १९५४ में एक राइस मिलिंग कमेटी बनाई थी। १९५५ में उस ने अपनी सिफारिशें दीं, लेकिन अब १९५८ में यह बिल हमारे सामने आता है। उस कमेटी ने कई बातों की तरफ ध्यान दिलाया था। एक तो उस का कहना यह था कि यह जो हल्लर सिस्टम है, ये जो चावल निकालने

की छोटी छोटी मशीन गांव गांव में चल पड़ी हैं, ये बहुत नुकसानदेह हैं। उन में चावल टूटता है और भूसी में चावल के टुकड़े मिल जाते हैं, इसलिये वह मवेशियों के काम में भी ठीक प्रकार से नहीं आती है। इस लिये उस कमेटी का कहना था कि ३१ दिसम्बर, १९५६ तक ऐसा प्रबन्ध होना चाहिये कि हल्लर टाइप की मशीनों को बन्द कर दिया जाय और राइस मिलिंग इंडस्ट्री को कंट्रोल करना चाहिये और धीरे धीरे गवर्नमेंट इस को ले ले।

इसके बाद जैसा कि इस बिल को पेश करते समय उप-मंत्री जी ने बताया था, कार्बे कमेटी की यह राय थी कि राइस मिलिंग इंडस्ट्री को बन्द करना लाभदायक मालूम नहीं होता, बल्कि इसके साथ ही साथ हैंड-पाउंडिंग इंडस्ट्री को भी प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये। प्रोत्साहन के सम्बन्ध में राइस मिलिंग कमेटी ने यह सजेस्ट किया था कि इसमें पहले खादी बोर्ड के जरिये हाथ-कुटाई के धान पर जो छः आना फी मन सबसिडी के तौर पर दिया जाता है। उस को आठ आने कर दिया जाय और इस के अलावा जो चावल मिलों में तैयार होता है, उस पर छः आने फी मन के हिसाब से धान पर सेस लगाया जाय और इस तरह से दोनों की कीमतों को बराबर करने का प्रयत्न किया जाय। अगर कमेटी की रीकमेंडेशन्स को कार्यान्वित न किया जाय, तो यह जरूर है कि हाथ-कुटाई के चावल की कीमत बढ़ जायगी। कमेटी की राय है कि इस समय दोनों की कीमतों में सवा पये मन का फर्क है और वह फर्क इन रीकमेंडेशन्स पर अमल करने से दूर हो जायगा।

कार्बे कमेटी की रिपोर्ट इस के अनुसार नहीं थी और मालूम होता है कि इसी लिये गवर्नमेंट ने सबसिडी को छः आने से आठ आना करना और सेस लगाना मंजूर नहीं किया।

इससे पहले रूरल क्रेडिट सर्वे कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में कहा गया था कि धान गांव में कूटने के बजाय शहर में मिल में जाता है और वहां से फिर चावल के रूप में गांव में आता है, भ्रष्टा यह हों कि यह धाना जाना रोक कर इस सब प्रोसेसिंग का काम—धान से चावल बनाने का काम—देहात में ही किया जाय और वहीं उस को खपाया जाय। इस तरह वह चावल सस्ता भी पड़ेगा और बहुत सारे लोग उस काम में लग जायेंगे।

यहां पर यह प्रश्न था कि इसको राज्यों के ऊपर ही क्यों न छोड़ दिया जाय। इस सम्बन्ध में मालूम होता है कि जिस वक्त तक, १९५४ तक, चावल पर कंट्रोल रहा, तब तक बहुत सारे राज्यों ने मशीनों के द्वारा तैयार किये गये चावल पर नियंत्रण किया, लेकिन जिस समय १९५४ में कंट्रोल खत्म हुआ, तो फिर ऐसा होने लगा कि जिन राज्यों में ये मिलें अधिक थीं, वहां से उन राज्यों में फिर चावल जाने लगा, जहां हाथ-कुटे चावल को प्रोत्साहन देने और बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न किया गया था। इस प्रकार से उन राज्यों में हाथ-कुटा चावल सस्ता नहीं हो सका और जो राज्य हाथ-कुटे चावल को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहते थे, वे ऐसा नहीं कर सके। इस लिये अगर कुल भारत के लिये एक कानून बन जाय, तो सब देश में वह एक सा लागू हो सकता है। इस बिल में यह व्यवस्था की गई है कि जितनी भी मिलें हैं, उन सबको एक लाइसेंस लेना पड़ेगा और जो नई चलाई जायेंगी, उन को पहले परमिट लेना पड़ेगा और फिर लाइसेंस लेना पड़ेगा। यह देखना होगा कि किस तरह से उन सबको कंट्रोल किया जा सकता है। यदि उनको ठीक प्रकार से कंट्रोल किया जाय, तो उन बहुत सारे लोगों को काम मिल सकता है, जो कि ~~काम~~—कल बेकार हैं।

रिपोर्ट से यह पता चलता है कि कोई २३ लाख के करीब आदमी इस हंड पाउंडिंग में लगे हुए हैं और जो राइस मिस्स में गये हुए हैं उनका संख्या तकरीबन दस लाख है। यदि उन लोगों को जोकि मिलों में लगे हुए हैं, हाथ से कुटाई का काम दे दिया जाय और जितना चावल मिलों के जरिये से तैयार होता है उतना ही वे कूट कर तैयार करने लग जायें और साल में यदि वे आधे दिन भी काम करें, तो उस मूल्य में इस काम में कोई ४० लाख आदमी लगाये जा सकते हैं। इस प्रकार इन ४० लाख लोगों के अतिरिक्त जो २३ लाख उस समय लगे हुए थे, हम कुल ६०-७० लाख लोगों को इस काम में लगा सकते हैं।

आज देश में हमारे मामले सब से बड़ा सवाल बेकारी का है और खास तौर से अर्थ बेकारी का है। जैसा कि यहां बताया गया है कि जो किसान हैं उनमें से ७८ प्रतिशत ऐसे हैं जिन के पास कोई सहायक व्यवसाय नहीं है और उनको किसी सहायक व्यवसाय की जरूरत है और वह सहायक क्या हो सकता है, वह हमें ढूंढना होगा और कोई ऐसा सहायक व्यवसाय ढूंढना होगा जो देहातों में दिया जा सके। यह व्यवसाय उनमें से एक हो सकता है और इस काम में वे अपनी फुरसत का समय लगा सकते हैं और इस काम को हम इस प्रकार का बना सकते हैं कि वे इसको सहूलियत के साथ और बिना अधिक परिश्रम के कर सकें। हमारे लिये यह भी बहुत जरूरी है कि हम राइस मिल इंडस्ट्री पर या उन मिलों पर जहां कि चावल तैयार होता है, कंट्रोल करें। एक तरफ तो कंट्रोल किया जाना चाहिये और दूसरी तरफ इस बिल में जो कमी है वह यह है कि जैसा कि कमेटी ने अपनी सिफारिश में कहा था कि हलर सिस्टम को जहां तक हो सके, खत्म किया जाये और वोलर सिस्टम को जिससे चावल खराब नहीं होता है और ठीक तरह से तैयार होता

[श्री राम शरण]

है, उसको प्रोत्साहन दिया जाये, इसको भी दुबस्त किया जाना चाहिये। यदि आपने ऐसा किया तो एक तो मिलों के ऊपर आप कंट्रोल कर सकेंगे और दूसरे चावल के हाथ-कुटाई के धंधे को आप प्रोत्साहन दे सकेंगे।

कुछ राज्यों में बहुत अधिक चावल हाथ से कूटा जाता है। जब कमेटी बैठी हुई थी उस समय उसके सामने कुछ प्रांकों पेश किये गये थे। उनको देखने से पता चलता है कि उड़ीसा में ८७ प्रतिशत चावल हाथ से कूटा जाता था और बिहार में ९७ प्रतिशत। कई राज्यों में ६६ प्रतिशत चावल हाथ से कूटा हुआ तैयार होता था। जब इतनी अधिक मात्रा में यहाँ पर चावल हाथ का कूटा तैयार होता है और इसमें लाखों लोग लगे हुए हैं तो यह हमारे लिये विचारणीय विषय हो जाता है कि जहाँ पर कम भ्रादमी लगे हुये हैं और चीज भी अच्छी तैयार नहीं होती है और उसकी मात्रा भी कम है तो क्या यह उचित नहीं होगा कि चावल को कुटाई के उस तरीके को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाये जहाँ कि भ्रादमी भी अधिक लग सकते हैं, चावल भी पौष्टिक तैयार हो सकता है और होता है और और अधिक भ्रादमियों को रोजगार भी दिया जा सकता है।

में खास तौर पर आपका ध्यान सैकशन १८ की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिस की तरफ दूसरे माननीय सदस्यों ने भी आपका ध्यान दिलाया है और जिसमें कहा गया है कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट अगर चाहे तो जो कुछ बंधन इसमें लगाने का सुझाव दिया गया है, उन सब को ढीला कर सकती है और ज्यादा मिलें चालू करने की अनुमति दी जा सकती है। यदि आपने मिलों को बढ़ाने की अनुमति न दी और उन पर ठीक तरह से नियंत्रण रखा तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बिल देश के जो उद्योग धंधे हैं उनको प्रोत्साहन देने वाला सिद्ध होगा और इसलिये मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Rungsung Suisa.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: It is better that as early as possible at the beginning I have an idea as to whom to call, so that I will adjust. What happens is that as the matter progresses, I get names and hon. Members get up.

Shri Warior (Trichur): We know whether we should speak only after the discussion starts.

Mr. Speaker: There cannot be an endless discussion. Hon. Members must start the controversy, instead of waiting for others to start it.

Shri Rungsung Suisa (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I speak, I have to thank you for giving me this chance to speak on such important bill—namely, rice milling versus hand-pounding. Regarding this Bill itself, I have no interest, because it does not affect me in any way. If we look into this Bill very carefully, we find that it does not serve the purpose of the villagers in any way. It says the existing rice mills are to continue to operate. So, there is no use of passing this Bill at all. I have no interest in the Bill itself.

Secondly, as we have no rice mill in Manipur—and, as a matter of fact, we can carry on without rice mills—I have no interest in this Bill and I say, Sir, that in respect of rice problem we people in Manipur are a step ahead of the rest of India because we have better quality of rice and continued circulation of paddy and fresh rice throughout the whole year and Manipur is a challenge to any one in India who think that we cannot get sufficient rice without mills.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member forgets that rice mills can be established there.

Shri Rungsung Suisa: Yes, Sir, we had several rice mills before independence but after independence, all these

rice mills were abolished; it does not serve the purpose of the villagers. I am coming to that point.

I am a villager and a poor man and I work hard with my own hand. Very often I have thought about the plight that the average Indian villager has to face. As a villager, I have to face even the fate of starvation faced by an Indian farmer, in spite of working so hard. As a matter of fact, we have been crying day in and day out that something must be done for the development of the villagers—their economic development and so on. Coming to this important problem of starting rice mills or having hand-pounded rice, we have to take into consideration that there are so many cultivators in India. Taking the minimum percentage, we may take that the village population consists of 50 per cent. of the whole population. I have heard the speeches made by the hon. Members yesterday and today and I have found that practically none of them has spoken about the benefits the villagers get by hand-pounding of rice. I have found from the speeches that some of the hon. Members are against the villagers.

I am a silent member. I have promised within myself that I should not speak for the whole term. Today I have broken my promise, the promise which I had within myself that I should not speak at all within this chamber, not because I do not know how to speak—though I do not know how to speak good English, all the same I can shout without verbs and prepositions. If I choose, because in spite of getting independence in the rest of India the administration of Manipur is still in the hands of servants and it is so corrupted and useless that there is no use in my talking about it and I have got to speak about the naga problem too, but I think shouting alone cannot solve the problem that is why I am silent.

Mr. Speaker: Let us now come to the point.

Shri Rungsung Suisa: But, Sir, the administration of Manipur is still in the hands of servants.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member remarked that he did not speak so long, because he thought.

Shri Rungsung Suisa: Sir, please give more time as I will not speak for the rest of the term.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow him opportunity at the proper moment to speak about the administration of Manipur. Now we are discussing the question of rice mills.

Shri Rungsung Suisa: I am coming to the point.

Mr. Speaker: He must come to the point straight.

Shri Rungsung Suisa: All right. I will leave some part of my speech and speak straight to the point. . .

Mr. Speaker: Why not?

Shri Rungsung Suisa: I believe that problems cannot be solved by speaking or shouting in this House. But when I heard all these speeches regarding rice mill Vs. hand-pounding my feelings were hurt so much that I could not restrain myself. That is why I want to speak.

We have heard speeches, either from this side or that side of the House, that the conditions of the villagers are so poor that we cannot believe that we all are living in the same country and in the same age. We see when we look around that the Indian cultivators are occupied only for one half of the year. But when we consider the problem of rice mills and hand-pounding, we do not think about the villagers. These rice mills have taken at least one-fourth of the profession of the villagers and they have taken the very fruits of labour of the villagers who were already leading only a hand to mouth existence.

Before independence we had several rice mills in Manipur and we thought

[Shri Rungnung Suisa]

we were progressing very much. But what do we find now? These rice mills are owned by the capitalists. At the time of the harvest, these people approach the cultivators and purchase their paddy. They sometimes pay even more than the market rate because they know that somewhere in July or August they will make big profits so at the time of harvest there will be some brisk trading in paddy. The cultivators sell all the paddy, because they are very poor and also because they want to get the momentary advantage of getting money. Then what do we find? When the paddy is in the hands of the rice millers, the villagers are helpless. They have no paddy, no rice, no work and no profession. They have simply to starve. In spite of the control and the anti-black-marketing measures, we find that all this paddy is smuggled out of Manipur and the very workers, who were responsible for the production of this paddy in the village, are forced to suffer. I was also one of the worst sufferers. In Manipur, we have better method of circulation of paddy and we can have better quality rice, first class rice, throughout the year. But what do we actually see here in Delhi? I am a rice-eater in Manipur. But, I cannot eat rice here, because the rice I get here is one that was husked some months ago. So it smells and I cannot take it. I have to take to bread. That is one point.

If you go to any village in India two or three months after harvest, you will not find any house which has enough rice or paddy for the whole year because everything is purchased by the rice mills at the time of harvest. So, the net result of it is that you find that in spite of your advancements in the towns, the villagers of your side are suffering more than we in Manipur.

Since we have abolished rice mills, what do we find? We find that at the time of harvest there is not much of brisk trading in paddy. So, the villagers cannot sell all the quantity

of paddy that they want to sell. Even if they sell some quantity, they cannot get a reasonable price. This paddy goes into the hands of some rich villagers or some people who have got money and again since they are not allowed to open rice mills, this paddy goes into the hands of the poor people again though they have to pay some interest to the rich people by paying some more for their own paddy which they had sold before, so we see in Manipur we have continual circulation of paddy from the villagers to the rich people and back to them. but if paddy is taken to rice mills; the poor villagers have to pay double of what they had got for the same amount of paddy when they sold it, and in addition to this they will not get the small particles of rice, I think you call it kunti, I cannot remember the exact word and gura which are very useful for poultry and cattle, I think it is one of the reasons why your villagers are suffering.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri Rungnung Suisa: I request you to give me five more minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection. But the hon. Member is saying the same thing.

Shri Rungnung Suisa: I am not saying the same thing. I am only explaining the difference between Manipur and the rest of India. Being a villager, I know the position. I have been studying the conditions of the people in Manipur as well as in other parts of the country. I have found that the villagers in Manipur are not suffering more than their counterparts in the rest of India. That is my feeling.

Mr. Speaker: His feeling is all right. But what does he want to do with the Bill?

Shri Rungnung Suisa: I have no interest in the Bill, whether you pass it or not. I am coming to that point.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member definitely says that in Manipur they have been carrying on all along without the mills and that most of the people there are living by agriculture for a number of months, they have no other occupation and if mills are established, there will be unemployment.

Shri Rungsung Sulsa: I am now hitting the Bill. As a villager I know the position. Since I have to hurry up with my speech, I will not take more time. As a villager, I know the conditions of the villagers. If you go anywhere in India, you will find that a man with his own labour, working with a pair of bullocks cannot produce more than 300 maunds of paddy; I know it because I work in the fields and Manipur is one of the best places for the production of paddy but a family can easily pound about 800 maunds of paddy a year and so there cannot be a question of being unable to pound our paddy if mills are abolished. I know it. You would not believe me if I say that my family hand pounds 100 maunds of paddy. It does not take much time. So, I am now going to hit those speakers who spoke against hand-pounding, who said that there will be no circulation of rice, there will be dearth of rice and people will not be able to hand-pound it.

13 hrs.

I say even in Manipur people are urging me to export rice, because they want to pound more rice. But I say "No". The administration is not in my hands that is ours because Manipur being the cheapest place in India if we export all our rice, we cannot live on rice imported from other parts of the country. I know that we are not producing as much paddy as we should. So I say we need not be afraid of not getting rice if all these rice mills are closed. I may tell the House as a villager that even when we may be producing four times as much paddy as we are producing now even then though there is no mill we can hand-pound it very easily.

I speak on this subject from practical experience. You know the conditions of the towns; but I know the conditions of the villages, because I work there with my own hand. So, I say that we should not be worried. As people in the rest of India are accustomed to getting rice from the mills, it will take time for the women to get accustomed to hand-pounding. That I quite admit. But if we want to give them more rice, more food, some money and some occupation throughout the year, I think the working of the mills must be stopped altogether. They must be closed down altogether. If, however, you cannot do this in some of the States, then at least half the rice mills should be closed. And see for yourself whether people will suffer in getting rice or not.

I have tried to explain all these things because I am a villager. Moreover let me say one thing. I know that most of the hon. Members do not come from the villages.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Rungsung Sulsa: At least that was what I gathered from their speeches, because they spoke as they think and they never say what the villagers say, or like or can do or whether they want to pound rice themselves and what safeguards they want from the Government that paddy would not be taken away to the rice mills. None has spoken in this strain.

So we have to be practical. It is not the town people who are suffering; it is not the M.Ps. who are suffering. It is the villagers who are suffering. After all the M.Ps. cannot feed the people; the town people cannot feed the people. It is the poor villagers who have to feed the nation. Unless we teach them the habit of working hard and instil some incentive in their minds to work hard, there is no salvation, there is no salvation for the economic self-sufficiency of India as a nation.

So I say that I cannot support this Bill; if I support any Bill, I would

[Shri Rungsung Suisa]

support a Bill that would close down all the existing mills.

13.05 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am glad that this Bill has been discussed in detail and different aspects of it have been placed before the House. I am grateful to hon. Members who participated in the debate. Very many useful suggestions have been made and they would certainly be taken into consideration, not so much for the purpose of effecting any modification to the Bill as such, but would be taken into consideration in the matter of working of this measure.

Sir, before I come to the two motions, one for circulation and the other for reference to Select Committee, I would like to touch on the question of policy that has been raised by my hon. friend Shrimati Renu Chakravartty. She said that this legislation, however desirable it may be, is an encroachment on the State sphere, whereas another Member from the Opposition—I think it was the hon. Member from Miraj, Mr. Patil,—said that this is a question which has to be tackled at the Central level and not at the State level. I would like to make it clear, Sir, that this is not a case of arbitrary exercise of powers vested with the Centre.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty herself said that having regard to the fact that in the Centre the Congress Party is in power and in all the States except one, the Congress Party is in power there is no difficulty to get by way of persuasion, the uniformity desired. She said: "I see no reason why a uniform system could not be brought about without a Bill which will really give further additional powers to the Central Government." So that, she herself recognises the necessity of a uniformity of approach and a uniformity in procedure. She said that it

can be brought about by persuasion. So, uniformity is desirable; she also does not question that. What we want to do by this Bill is to adopt the pattern that we have adopted in the matter of enactment of Essential Commodities Act. But I may make it very clear that it is not the intention of the Central Government, although it has got the legislative powers and also after the enactment of this piece of legislation the Centre would get the necessary powers, to ignore the State Governments in this matter.

I have made it clear in my opening speech that the decision of Government is to the effect that no new mill should be allowed to be set up and no expansion of the existing capacity of the mills be permitted, unless the State Government concerned is satisfied that it is necessary to do so for the purpose of ensuring adequate supplies. So that, we had in view the idea of consulting the State Governments. Our intention is to delegate powers to the State Governments under clause 19 of the Bill and to issue suitable instructions for exercising these powers. This power is in consonance with the Essential Commodities Act and while it will give necessary powers to the State Governments in regard to issue of permits and grant of licences, we leave the ultimate control with the Central Government. This would ensure uniformity of procedure and action all over the country and would enable the Government of India to issue directions to any particular State if they find that the policy followed by the State is not in consonance with the all-India policy. So, I do not think we need go further into the matter that has been raised by my hon. friend Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.

Then I come to the other motions, one for circulation and the other for reference to Select Committee. My Hon. friend Shri Sharma said that he is not opposing the Bill. He opposed hand-pounding out of chivalrous considerations or considerations of tenderness to the fair sex. You can very

well understand that. But the remedy for this hard manual labour is not to adopt such measures as to bring about unemployment, but to improve the conditions of employment to make improvements in the tools used and to make it as humane as possible.

That is the remedy. It is not by discouraging hand-pounding and throwing out of employment lakhs of people.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty gave as one of her reasons for moving the motion for circulation that this is a very controversial Bill. But, I may say that the Bill is not controversial. We can say that some of the recommendations of the Rice Milling Committee were controversial and that was why we ascertained the views of the State Governments. The views of the concerned ministries of the Government of India were also taken.

Shri Guha and Shri Dasappa complained that we have been sleeping over this Bill for so much time.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): That is true.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I may submit that we have not been sleeping over this Bill. From the views expressed on the floor of this House, it can be found that the State Governments prominently come into the picture in these matters and we have to ascertain their views. The recommendations were communicated to them and there was considerable delay in the matter of receipt of their views. Then after the receipt of their views, we held an inter-departmental meeting of the concerned ministries. We had a meeting of the economic secretaries and a meeting of the Food Committee of the Cabinet. Ultimately, the matter was decided by the Cabinet. The charge that we were sleeping over this Bill for such a long time is not borne out by the real facts.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): Even after the recommendations, there has been delay.

Shri A. M. Thomas: After accepting the recommendations, we drafted

the Bill. We sent the draft Bill for the consideration of the State Governments. Their views were again got and suitable modifications were made in the light of the views expressed by the State Governments on the draft Bill.

I have never claimed that the Bill is intended to carry out all the recommendations of the two committees to which I made a reference in my opening speech. The Bill is in the direction of implementation of those decisions taken on the recommendations of these two committees and only to carry out those recommendations for which legislation is necessary. This Bill is not a panacea for all the ailments of the rice milling industry or of the hand-pounding sector. This is calculated only to have some legislative sanction for some of the steps that we intend to take in encouraging the hand-pounding sector.

The Bill has only a very limited objective. That may kindly be borne in mind when the question of circulating this for public opinion and the question of referring it to the Select Committee are considered. What are the objectives of this Bill? According to the decisions that the Government of India have taken on the recommendations of the two committees, the existing mills have to continue. That is decision number one. Then it has been decided that with regard to allowing any further mills to function, it can only be allowed if absolutely essential. These are the two decisions that have been taken by the Government of India and for that purpose a system of licensing would be necessary. The introduction of a permit system would be necessary otherwise we would not be in a position to enforce these decisions that have been taken. It is only for that purpose that we have brought forward this Bill.

My hon. friend, Shri Guha, who is unfortunately not here, raised the question that the Bill has been badly drafted, hurriedly drafted and most callously drafted. I went through his speech again just to ascertain as to

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

what exactly are the provisions which according to him indicate that the Bill has been badly drafted, carelessly drafted or callously drafted, but I have not been able to come across a single provision pointed out by him which would bear the charges of ill-drafting or careless drafting.

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): He means the whole Bill.

Shri A. M. Thomas: He has got certain complaints against the machinery. He says that the licensing officer shall be tyrant in the mofussil area. His complaint is against the machinery that has to be set up. It is more or less against the bureaucracy. Perhaps, I should get a little more experience to have so much disillusionment which my hon. friend, Shri Guha, has got. The Bill, I may humbly assert, has been carefully drafted and proper and adequate attention has been given. The law officers of not only the Central Government but also of the State Governments have scrutinised this Bill and I do not think they have been able to make the charges which my hon. friend, Shri Guha, made.

I went through the list of amendments also. From that it would be found that the amendments are of a minor nature, except for one or two, which concern questions of policy. That also would indicate that the Bill has not been carelessly drafted as has been contended by my hon. friend, Shri Guha.

Then, my hon. friend, Shri Dasappa complained that the Bill is not even in consonance with the decisions that we have taken. The Government of India has decided that preference would be given to the huller type.

Shri Dasappa: No, sheller type. Don't make a mistake.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Preference would be given to the sheller type. But, I do not think that a rigid approach is desirable in the enactment

of this Bill. There must be some flexibility of approach in these matters. Conditions differ.

Shri Dasappa: When did this wisdom dawn on the Government?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Since he became a member of the Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When it is here just now, we need not dispute when it dawned.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Some flexibility is required as I may point out from the speeches made on the floor of the House. For example, some hon. Members said that certain areas are not being served by mills. In other areas, there is an abundance of mills. So, conditions in one part of the country and the other part of the country differ. All these things have been taken into consideration. Moreover, we have got our ambitious irrigation projects. A place, which is a desert now, may become the granary tomorrow. Perhaps, if an application comes forward for setting up a huller type mill in those areas, we may have to set up a huller. So, it is not desirable to have an absolute ban in those places.

Shri Dasappa is very serious in his views. I have given due consideration to them. He has asked what is there in the Bill regarding recommendation that the co-operative societies should be given encouragement. We know that the general policy of the Government of India is that wherever possible, co-operative societies must be encouraged and the possibility of encouraging co-operative societies is there even within the ambit of this Bill. I would refer to clause 22 (b), which says:

"The Central Government may, subject to the condition of previous publication, make rules carrying out the purposes of this Act.

.

(b) the manner in which an investigation is to be made in

respect of an application for a permit and the matters to be taken into account in granting or refusing a permit;”.

Suppose, an application is made in the matter of the setting up of sugar factories. We have given preference to co-operative societies. It is not because there is any legislation enjoining on us that licences could be given only to the co-operative sugar mills. So, also in this particular case, wherever a co-operative society comes forward and seeks a licence or a permit, as the case may be, we would certainly consider. We would give preference to that society having regard to other conditions, i.e., their paid-up capital, the number of persons who conduct the society and so on and so forth.

Shri Guha said that there are so many recommendations and what have we done with them. So, he thinks that this Bill is inadequate. I may say that the Bill has been brought forward only to implement those recommendations for which legislation is necessary. I have already made a mention of that and even from the list of decisions that we have taken, you will be able to find that we have not ignored the other aspects or other recommendations of the committee. For example, we have adopted these recommendations of the Committee:

“It may be felt to the State Governments concerned to consider the question of exempting from sales tax, the hand-pounded rice produced at hand-pounding centres, certified by the All India Khadi and Village Industries’ Commission, and take such action as they may consider necessary.

State Governments and Defence Ministry, etc., may be advised that they should examine the possibility of purchasing hand-pounded rice for their requirements for jails, hospitals, armed forces, etc. etc.”

These are the decisions adopted by the Government of India. And we have said:

“That other recommendations of the Rice Milling Committee on encouragement of production of hand-pounded rice, improved implements and publicity may be accepted.”

So that, it is not a case of ignoring the other recommendations and adopting only such recommendations as are within the scope or the ambit of this Bill.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): “May be accepted”.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I may also say with regard to some of the recommendations, for example with regard to the recommendation concerning cess on paddy milled in rice mills and increase of subsidy to hand-pounding, there is already a subsidy of six annas per maund on hand-pounded rice. But we do not think it is desirable to have an imposition of a cess on paddy milled in rice mills or an increase of subsidy on hand-pounded rice. If a cess is imposed, that money will have to come from the consumers by way of higher price of rice or from the agriculturists who will be offered a lower price. Both these contingencies are not desirable.

And with regard to exemption from sales tax, the Food Ministry has been generally opposed to the levy of sale tax on foodgrains, but in spite of that some State Governments have levied sales tax. We are certainly in favour.....

Shri Achar (Mangalore): The hon. Minister was pleased to say that if any tax or cess is imposed on the mill rice it may affect the production by mills. As a matter of fact we find that mill rice is much cheaper than hand-pounded rice.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Even in spite of that we know that we have generally to depend upon the mills for the purpose of procurement, and the complaint is that the prices are high. So neither of these steps would be

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

desirable in the present conditions. Then, the other recommendations also have been given due consideration.

Various shades of opinion have been reflected in the course of the speeches made by the hon. Members. But generally, by and large, the opinion is that the hand-pounding industry should be encouraged. That is the predominant view. As to how it has to be done, it is in that that there is a difference of degree in the points of view that have been expressed.

Sir, I think there has not been much support for the recommendation made by the Rice Milling Committee, except some of the observations made by the last speaker, that there must be elimination of the rice milling industry. I do not think such an extreme point of view had been urged by any hon. Member. But my hon. friend Shri Dwivedy was more or less of the view that existing mills may be necessary but it will not be desirable to grant any further licences. Shri Pande's speech has been, I should think, a corrective. Although I do not adopt the point of view advocated by him; it was a corrective, so to say, to the speech of my hon. friend Shri Dwivedy.

My hon. friend Shrimati Renu Chakravartty also advocated, what she termed as, a sort of discriminating mechanisation. But I may say that the policy underlying this Bill also is to issue further licences or to grant further permits only in cases where it would be absolutely necessary, and I think the object she has in view would be served by an enactment of this kind.

In the midst of these conflicting views I should think my hon. friend Shri Achar has taken the most reasonable view which is more or less in consonance with the various provisions of this Bill. However much we may desire to encourage hand-pounding of rice, there are certain disadvantages which we have to take into consideration. Even the Village

and Small Scale Industries (Second Five Year Plan) Committee, which is known as the Karve Committee, say in their report:

"The case for hand-pounding usually rests on three principal arguments: firstly, it gives higher percentage recovery of rice; secondly it provides larger employment per unit of paddy processed; and thirdly, it yields rice with higher nutritive value. In favour of rice mills (mostly shellers) it is generally urged that they provide a fairly effective agency for bulk purchasing, bulk processing and bulk supply of rice; their cost of processing being lower they can supply rice at a lower price which is more within the means of low-income groups; and they can satisfy the consumer preference of certain classes of people for the more polished rice."

My hon. friend Shri Nanjappa from Nilgiris—he is himself a person who consumes invariably only hand-pounded rice—said that the keeping qualities of hand-pounded rice are low. And we have to bear in mind the problems of storage and procurement. Considering all these things we have to adopt a balanced view concerning this matter.

Sir, I do not want to take more of the time of the House. The scope is there for the hand-pounding sector. Even now 65 percent of the milling is done in the hand-pounding sector. There is increase in production contemplated in the Five Year Plan. Towards the close of the Second Five Year Plan we think we would be able to produce 10 million tons more of paddy. So that, there is considerable scope for the functioning of the hand-pounding sector.

The considerations that should weigh with the Government in the matter of the further expansion of the rice milling industry or in granting permits have been set forth amply in

sub-clause (4) of clause 5 of the Bill, namely:

- “(a) the number of rice mills operating in the locality;
- (b) the availability of paddy in the locality;
- (c) the availability of power and water supply for the rice mill in respect of which a permit is applied for;
- (d) whether the rice mill in respect of which a permit is applied for will be of the huller type, sheller type or combind sheller-huller type;
- (e) whether the functioning of the rice mill in respect of which a permit is applied for would cause substantial unemployment in the locality;
- (f) such other particulars as may be prescribed.”

And in that perhaps it may be possible to include some of the other suggestions which have been made by hon. Members of this House.

Sir, although several hon. Members have participated in the discussion of this Bill, I think the Bill would be generally acceptable to the House. It is also necessary that we pass this Bill as early as possible because sufficient time has been taken at various stages. The reports of the two Committees, the Rice Milling Committee and the Karve Committee, have been considered in detail by the various Ministries of the Government of India and the Planning Commission. It is also not desirable to delay further the passing of this Bill and regulating the functioning of the rice mills in order to ensure a healthy development of the hand-pounding industry as also a proper functioning of the mills.

I hope that the hon. Members who have moved the motions—Shri Guha who has moved a motion for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee is not here—I hope my hon. friend Shrimati Renu Chakravarty

would see her way not to press her motion for circulation of the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shall I put to the vote of the House...

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: I would like to press my motion for eliciting public opinion. The difficulty is about the time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is the difficulty with me.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: It cannot be pressed to a division now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: She would be satisfied with a voice vote?

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: All right.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 15th August, 1958.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, Shri A. C. Guha's motion.

Some Hon. Members: He is not here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore it must be put.

The question is:

“That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri S. Hansda, Shri C. D. Pande, Shri Uma Charan Patnaik, Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar Morarka, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, Shri A. M. Thomas, Shri K. T. K. Tangamani, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Shri Surendra Mahanty and the Mover with instructions to report by the first day of the next session.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That the Bill to regulate the rice-milling industry in the interests of the general public be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, we proceed clause by clause.

The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill

Clause 3 (Definition)

Shri Sanganna: I beg to move:

Page 1, line 14, for "one year" substitute "six months".

Page 2, line 21, add at the end "as specified in the licence thereof".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments 7 and 8 are not moved.

Shri Sanganna: In clause 3, there is the word 'defunct rice mill'. If the wording 'defunct rice mill' is adopted, I think many of the condemned rice mills which have been doing no service will be taken into consideration and I think people who are able to do good service in this industry will be deprived of an opportunity. I am opposed to the wording 'defunct rice mill'. In order to encourage the rice mill industry, I think the wording 'defunct' should not be used.

Regarding amendment No. 2, there are conditions for the grant of licence. But, in the clause as it is, there is no specification as to the manner of working of the rice mill. Unless there is some specification, the rice mills will not be properly conducted and the conditions under which the mill has to work cannot be implemented. Unless there is specification, there will be no provisions as to the number of labourers to be employed, and also the terms and conditions under which the labourers have to work. In the absence of any condition, I think the interests of the labourers will not be protected and only the people who are in the industry, that is, the capitalists will be benefited. I request that the words 'as specified in the licence thereof' may be added. In the absence of it, only the employer or the rice

mill owner will be benefited and the labourers who contribute to the working of the mills will not be in an advantageous position. I request the hon. Minister to consider this amendment and accept it if possible.

Shri Heda: I want to add only one word. From the definition clause, one thing is not clear. I would draw the attention of the hon. Minister to that point. Already Shri Sanganna has referred to it, I think partially. Certain rice mills may like to improve their machinery. In what category will they come? I want to know whether such a rice mill would come under the definition of defunct rice mill. Suppose that rice mill not only wants to re-start, but wants to improve its machinery. Will it come under the category of new rice mill or the category of defunct rice mill? That is not clear. Shri Sanganna has expressed the apprehension that such rice mills which are condemned, for the last 10 or 12 years, whose machinery is practically scrapped, may come up and ask for licence under the category defunct mills, and they may get preference. Therefore, the difference between a rice mill which has got machinery, good enough to be operated, but for some reason or other is not operated, and the other defunct rice mill which has no machinery that by itself would be able to operate should be made clear and the position of the Government should be made clear on this point.

Shri A. M. Thomas: With regard to the point raised by my hon. friend Shri Heda, our intention is and it has been made clear also that in the matter of the improvement of the machinery or anything, if no substantial addition to the present capacity is involved, we will freely allow. But, the danger that has been pointed out by Shri Sanganna is that persons who have got mills which are useless and which have not been working for a long time—for one year—would come and apply for licence. But, I think it would not be desirable to revise the definition of defunct, reducing the

period of cessation of milling from one year to six months. Even normally rice mills remain idle for a number of months during a year. If there is unexpected defect in machinery, the mill has necessarily to remain idle for some time. Reducing the period of cessation of milling might cause hardship to certain existing mills which would not be desirable. So much so, I cannot find my way to accept the amendment.

With regard to the other amendment they are matters for rule-making powers of the Government and it is not necessary to have a statutory provision.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put both the amendments to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 1, line 14, for "one year" substitute "six months".

The motion was negatived.

The question is:

Page 2, line 21, add at the end "as specified in the licence thereof".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 5—(Grant of permits in respect of new or defunct rice mills)

Shri Supakar: I beg to move:

Page 2, after line 37, insert—

"2(A) Every application under sub-section (1) shall be forwarded to the State Government for their recommendations, if any, and in granting a permit under this section, the Central Government shall take into consideration such recommendation, if any."

Shri Sanganna: I beg to move:

Page 3, after line 19 add—

"(g) the number of hand-pound and the leg-pound mills (Dhenki) in the locality;

(h) the purchasing capacity of the people;

(i) the number of co-operative societies in the locality."

Shri Subodh Hansda (Midnapur-Reserved-Sch. Tribes): I beg to move:

Page 3, line 17,—omit "substantial".

Page 3, after line 19 add—

"(g) public opinion of the locality;

(h) the number of existing leg-pounding machines (Dhenkis) in the locality."

Shri Warior: I have amendment No. 9.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am coming to that.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): I beg to move:

Page 3, after line 4, add—

"Provided that no permit shall be issued if in accordance with sub-clause (4)(e) the said permit is likely to cause substantial unemployment in the locality."

Shri Warior: What about my amendment No. 9, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Warior's amendment is out of order. He wants to substitute 'State Government' for 'Central Government'. Just now we have adopted in clause 2 that this should be Central Government's jurisdiction and they should do it. Therefore, it would be incompatible with the decision that we have just now taken.

Shri Supakar: I made certain submissions regarding this particular amendment yesterday. It says:

"Every application under subsection (1) shall be forwarded to the State Government for their recommendations, if any, and in granting a permit under this section, the Central Government shall take into consideration such recommendations, if any."

In this connection, over and above what was stated yesterday in arguments from different sections of the House, I wish to draw your kind attention to the recommendations of the Planning Commission in the Second Five Year Plan, where at page 446, paragraph 34, it is stated:

"Taking these into consideration, it is proposed that all power-driven rice mills should be licensed and that no new mills should be allowed to be set up nor expansion of capacity of the existing mills allowed, except where it is considered absolutely essential in the public interest in special circumstances."

I lay special emphasis on the last part, viz., "where it is considered absolutely essential in the public interest in special circumstances." I submit that the respective State Governments are the best authorities who can give their recommendations in the case of these licences and permits, and therefore I feel that this amendment should be accepted. While replying to the general discussion on this Bill, the hon. Deputy Minister himself stated that the State Governments are vitally interested in the establishment of new mills and also in the case of the starting of defunct rice mills. So, I feel that in such cases the responsibility should not be left to the licensing officer, but the enquiry made by the licensing officer as well as the opinion and the recommendations of the State Government should be given a good deal of weight, and if the Central Government takes up the responsibility, they should not do so without consulting the State Governments.

That is the purpose of my amendment, and I hope that it will be acceptable to the House."

श्री बजराम सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक की धारा ५ पर मैंने जो १२ नम्बर का संशोधन प्रस्तुत किया है वह इस प्रकार है :

Page 3, after line 4, add—

"Provided that no permit shall be issued if in accordance with sub-clause (4) (e) the said permit is likely to cause substantial unemployment in the locality".

मेरे इस संशोधन का उद्देश्य सिर्फ यह है और वह उद्देश्य वही है जो कि इस बिल का भी उद्देश्य मुझे मालूम पड़ता है। बिल के उद्देश्य में भी यह कहा गया है कि यह बिल इसलिये पेश किया जा रहा है कि जिसमें मुल्क में जहाँ बेकारी की स्थिति पैदा हो रही है उसके सम्बन्ध में कुछ किया जाये और उसको रोका जाये और लोगों को काम भी दिलाया जाय लेकिन मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि इस धारा ५ में जो बातें कही गई हैं उनके द्वारा तो हम इस बिल के उद्देश्य को ही खत्म कर देना चाहते हैं। इस के द्वारा हम यह चाहते हैं कि पुरानी मिलें तो रहें ही लेकिन नई धान कूटने की मिलों को लगाने के लिये हम इजाजत देने की बात इस में कह रहे हैं।

अभी कुछ समय पूर्व मनिपुर के मेरे क्राबिल दोस्त यह कह रहे थे कि वहाँ पर जो पुरानी मिलें थीं उन्हें भी खत्म करके हाथ से ही धान की कुटाई करा करके जहाँने सारी समस्या हल कर ली है। वहाँ से चावल बाहर कम कीमत पर भेजा जा सकता है लेकिन सरकार इसकी अनुमति नहीं देती है तब पता नहीं कि नई धान की मिलों को खलू करने की क्या आवश्यकता

है ? उसके बारे में इस धारा में कई इस तरह की बातें कही गई हैं जिनका कि विचार नई मिलों को खालू करते समय किया जायेगा या उनको अनुमति देते समय किया जायेगा । उसमें से एक व्यवस्था यह की गई है और Clause 5 (4) (c) में बतलाई गई है और जो कि इस प्रकार है :

“(e) Whether the functioning of the rice mill in respect of which a permit is applied for would cause substantial unemployment in the locality”.

यह विचार किया जायेगा कि कहीं इससे काफ़ी तादाद में बेकारी तो नहीं फ़ैलेगी और यह सोचा जायेगा कि उस सूरत में वहाँ पर कोई ऐसा लाइसेंस अथवा अनुमति दी जाये या न दी जाये लेकिन मुझे लगता यह है कि इस बात का सिर्फ़ विचार ही विचार है कहीं पर यह बात नहीं कही गई है कि जहाँ पर काफ़ी तादाद में बेकारी फ़ैलने की आशंका होगी वहाँ पर कोई इस तरह का परमिट नहीं दिया जायेगा । मैं अपने संशोधन के द्वारा यह चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ पर काफ़ी तादाद में बेकारी फ़ैलने की आशंका हो वहाँ पर कतई किसी तरह का कोई परमिट न दिया जाये और वहाँ पर कोई नई मिल खोलने की इजाजत न दी जाये । मैं समझता हूँ कि चूकि मंत्री महोदय के इस बिल का उद्देश्य भी वही है जो कि मेरे संशोधन का है इसलिये वह इसे मंजूर करने की कृपा करेंगे ।

चूकि धारा ५ विचाराधीन है इसलिये मैं उसके सम्बन्ध में भी अपने कुछ विचार प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ । जब हम यह चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश के कुटीर और गृह-उद्योगों को बढ़ावा मिले और जब हम चाहते हैं कि जो लोग हाथ से धान की कुटाई करते हैं उन लोगों को उसमें प्रोत्साहन मिले

तो हमें ऐसी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये कि न सिर्फ़ जो पुरानी राइस मिल्स हैं वह कम हों बल्कि कोई स्टेज एक ऐसा भी प्राये जब सब प्रकार की ऐसी मिलें खत्म हो जायें । सदन में इस तरह की आशंका प्रकट की गई है कि हाथ से धान की कुटाई करने से मूलक की जो चावल की आवश्यकता है वह पूरी नहीं हो पायेगी । यह कहा गया है कि केवल हाथ से धान की कुटाई करने से यह काम पूरा नहीं हो सकता है । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह सही स्थिति नहीं है । जब हम गृह उद्योगों की तरफ़ बढ़ रहे हैं, जब खादी और ग्रामोद्योग को हम प्रोत्साहन देने हैं और अन्य घरेलू धंधों के द्वारा बनाई गई हाथ की चीज़ों को हम प्रोत्साहन देते हैं तो इस हाथ से धान की कुटाई करने के धंधे को भी हमें प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये । एक तरफ़ स्थिति यह है कि हमारे यहाँ करोड़ों लोग बेकार हैं उनको हम काम नहीं दे पाते हैं दूसरी तरफ़ स्थिति यह है कि जो पुरानी मिलें हैं उनको हम कम नहीं करना चाहते बल्कि नई मिलों के लिये भी हम लाइसेंस देना चाहते हैं जिससे कि वह नई धान की मिलें क़ायम हो सकें । मैं सोचता हूँ कि इसका नतीजा क्या होगा ? हो सकता है कि सदन की और सरकार की यह मंशा हो कि नयी मिलें क़ायम न हों लेकिन मुझे आशंका है कि जो अधिकारी इस क़ानून को अमल में लायेंगे वे उस तरह न सोचें और उनका मशीनों की तरफ़ झुकाव हो । हमारे अधिकारीगण उस तरीक़े से नहीं सोच पाते हैं जिस तरीक़े से कि सरकार के लोग सोचते हैं या जनता के प्रतिनिधि सोचते हैं कि हाथ से बनी हुई चीज़ों को प्रोत्साहन मिलना चाहिये । नतीजा इसका यह होगा कि इसमें जो शर्तें रक्खी गई हैं और जिनके कि आधार पर नई मिलों को खोलने के लिये लाइसेंस दिये जायेंगे उन शर्तों की वह ब्याख्या इस तरह से कर सकते हैं जिससे कि नई मिलें खुल सकें और यह एक बड़े खतरे की बात होगी ।

[श्री बजराम सिंह]

इस सम्बन्ध में हमारी नीति तो यह होनी चाहिये कि यदि फौरन ही हम धान की मिलों को बंद नहीं कर सकते तो कम से कम हम उनको धीरे धीरे कुछ कम ही करते चले जायें और एक ऐसा वक्त ले आयें जब कि जितनी भी हमारे यहां धान कूटने की मिलें हैं उनको बन्द कर देंगे और वह सारे का सारा काम हाथ से ही होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस धारा में यह छूट दी जा रही है कि यह काम कभी पूरा न हो सके। अगर हम बेकारी को दूर करना चाहते हैं तो यह बहुत आवश्यक है कि उधर हम बढ़ें। यह एक ऐसा काम है जिसको कि हमारे यहां जो ऐक्सपर्ट और विशेषज्ञ लोग रहते हैं वे उसे अच्छे तरीके से कर सकते हैं। हम हाथ से धान कूटने के धंधे को प्रोत्साहन दें। मैं समझता हूँ कि मेरा जो यह संशोधन है उसे स्वीकार करके कम से कम उन स्थानों पर जहां कि बहुत बड़ी तादाद में बेकारी फैलने की आशंका है वहां इस खतरे को दूर किया जायेगा।

Shri Subodh Hansda: My amendments are as follows:

Page 3, line 17, omit 'substantial'.

Page 3, after line 19, add:

"(g) public opinion of the locality;

(h) the number of existing leg-pounding machines (Dhenkis) in the locality."

I move these amendments, because by this Bill we want to give more facilities to the hand-pounding industry, and also provide employment to the rural population by encouraging the hand-pounding industry. With this object in view, rice milling operation is going to be controlled, and sufficient care is going to be taken while issuing new licences for rice mills or rice milling operations.

I find that a number of factors have been mentioned in this Bill, which have to be taken into consideration before granting any permit, in order to prevent unemployment being caused as a result of it. But I do not find any provision for consulting the public opinion of the locality or to take into account how many *dhenkis* are working in the locality.

It is natural that whenever a permit is issued for a rice mill and it begins to function, it does result in unemployment; it may be substantial or it may not be substantial, but there will be unemployment. Therefore, I feel that it is not proper to issue licences under those circumstances. When we do not want to create unemployment by the issue of new licences, we should see that no unemployment is caused actually, by incorporating these amendments also in the Bill. Therefore, I request the Minister to accept my amendments.

Shri Sanganna: Since many of the hon. Members who have spoken have spoken in support of my amendment, I shall not say much about it. Anyway, I may submit that in page 3, after line 19, the following may be added:

"(g) the number of hand-pound and the leg-pound (*Dhenki*) in the locality;

(h) the purchasing capacity of the people;

(i) the number of co-operative societies in the locality."

The Deputy Minister has stated in his speech that the hand-pounding industry also will be taken into consideration and will be encouraged wherever possible. Just as in the case of the textile industry Government have given protection to the handloom weavers by fixing quotas in regard to the outturn of the mills, so also, it is necessary to protect the

hand-pound and the leg-pound mills working in the locality, so that the rural people may be provided with employment for months together. The Asoka Mehta Committee have stated in their report that there is a large number of landless labourers who are not having work for months together. So, I feel that if the hand-pound and the leg-pound mills are encouraged in the rural areas, many of them will be employed in this industry. So, it is necessary for Government to take into consideration the number of hand-pound and leg-pound mills in the locality.

Moreover, while granting licences for the working of new mills, it is also necessary that Government should ascertain the purchasing capacity of the people. So far as I know, there are some mills which are having a good outturn, but the rice is lying unused for months together, because the people are so poor that they are not able to purchase the rice, with the result that the rice that is lying in the godowns is deteriorating and going waste. Therefore, in order to have a proper use for the outturn of the mills also, it is necessary that the purchasing capacity of the people must be taken into consideration.

So far as Orissa is concerned, it is not because Orissa is surplus in rice that rice is exported from there, but because the people there are so poor that they are not able to purchase the rice. If the people are not able to purchase the rice, and Government are also going to give a number of licences for the establishment of rice mills, I think no purpose will be served.

So, in order to encourage hand-pound and leg-pound mills, it is necessary that Government should exercise proper discretion and also adopt a judicious attitude in granting licences for the rice mills.

Moreover, it is also the policy of Government that co-operative societies must be encouraged. So, when the

co-operative societies are existing, it is not necessary to encourage the mills. As you might be aware in Orissa, there is a *gramdan* movement, and it is the intention of that movement to encourage rural employment. If the number of mills is increased in those areas, then the very object for which the movement is on will be affected. So, I request the Minister to take into consideration the interests of the rural people who are not having employment throughout the year; and it is because they are not having employment that we have the experience of an exodus from the rural areas to the urban areas.

From these points of view, I urge that the three suggestions that I have indicated in my amendment should also be taken into consideration by Government while issuing licences.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbanga): I support the amendment moved by my hon. friend Shri Braj Raj Singh, that moved by Shri Sanganna, and also the amendment of Shri Subodh Hansda.

Shri Supakar: What about my amendment?

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I oppose the hon. Member's amendment. He has said in his amendment, that the recommendations of the State Government should be taken into consideration before issuing any licence. This would mean that every time an application is made to the Central Government, the matter will be investigated by the State Government or their officers. Therefore, I feel that the amendment moved by my hon. friend is not necessary.

But I feel that the amendment of Shri Braj Raj Singh is very important. If in this age of atomic energy, we are opposing the establishment of mills, it is because the condition in the country is such that a very large number of people are employed in this cottage industry, which is a subsidiary industry for them. So long as we do not

[Shri Shree Narayan Das]

provide a subsidiary employment to a large section of the people in our country, we are not justified in establishing mills, for that will result in a large number of people being thrown out of employment.

In clause 3, certain considerations which have to be borne in mind while issuing licences are given. But there is no mention there as to the importance that will be attached to these various items. I think the utmost importance must be attached to the question of unemployment. The deciding factor should be whether the establishment of a mill in a particular locality will result in substantial unemployment in that locality. Other factors may be there, but this should be the deciding factor. Therefore, the proviso that my hon. friend wants to add by means of his amendment should be accepted by Government. Otherwise, there would be discretion left to the Government, and substantial unemployment will be just one out of five or six factors, and the authorities may be prone to grant permits saying that there are so many other factors in favour of that course and that unemployment is just only one of the factors; and this will result in a large number of people being thrown out of employment. Therefore, I would suggest that Government should seriously consider this amendment. There will be no meaning in passing this measure if we do not emphasise the importance of the employment aspect of the matter and take into consideration whether a substantial number will be thrown out of employment. That should be the deciding factor, so that there may be no discretion left to the authorities who would grant permits.

Here also, I do not know what the meaning of the word 'substantial' would be. That would also depend on the investigating officer. Suppose about five hundred people are thrown out of employment. The investigating

14 hrs.

officer will say: "It is only 500 people; I cannot say whether it is substantial or not." Therefore, we should not use this word 'substantial' and leave it to the discretion of the officer. The word 'substantial' is a comparative term. One officer will say 500 is a substantial figure; another will say that only 1,000 is a substantial figure. Therefore, the use of this word in this clause will confuse things, it should be removed.

Regarding the amendment of Shri Sanganna I hope that these things are taken into consideration. If the investigating officer is sympathetic, he will take all these things into consideration, namely, the number of hand-pound and leg-pound mills, the purchasing capacity of the people and the number of co-operative societies in the locality; specially, if the number of co-operative societies in the localities is included, I think it would be a very healthy provision and that will guide the investigating officer to come to a conclusion.

I will not take much time . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even the time taken is very much.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I would request the Minister at least to accept the amendment of my hon. friend, Shri Braj Raj Singh.

Shri Warrior: In supporting the amendment moved by Shri Supakar, I wish to point out only one factor. There is an analogous process going on here. Last year or so the Central Government took up the responsibility of licensing and issuing permits for starting new newspapers. Formerly, in our State, we had only to fill up a form and give it to the District Collector and we could then start the newspaper. Now, for every small detail the persons have to come to Delhi, because in correspondence it will take two years. I remember a

Madras publisher telling me that he had sent an application for registration of his paper to Delhi. Nine or ten months are over and still nothing is heard. I myself am a publisher and I have that experience. Because I am here, I am able to get things done regarding permits and everything readily, particularly due to my 'MP-ship'.

I can understand if any other hon. Minister had come forward with such a provision, but for the hon. Minister, who comes from Kerala and who has experience of the cultivation process and rice milling process that is going on there, to put forward such a provision is something which I cannot comprehend. There are big lake areas. In those lake areas, at the time of harvest, small hullers of 5 H.P. and 10 H.P. are installed and milling is readily done, and people take the rice and husk and go away. In the monsoon, the huller also goes away. If those small people investing Rs. 300 or Rs. 500 or Rs. 1,000 are to be put to the trouble of coming to Delhi for this purpose, you can imagine the difficulty.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the huller removed by the owner of water?

Shri Warrior: If the owners will not do it, the water will.

The hon. Minister knows that such small hullers are being operated as some sort of a small business. If such people have to come to Delhi for every small detail of licensing, you can imagine how much confusion there will be. So it is not a very small question. That was why I had put forward my 'out of order' amendment. But if Government at least are willing to accept the amendment of Shri Supakar, some relief will be there, because if the licensing authorities get at least the recommendation of the States, it will be something. The States only are in a position—nobody else is in a position—to assess and ascertain who should be given licence to and who should be refused a licence. So I hope the Minister will accept this amendment.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Should all hon. Members speak on this very clause?

Shri Balasaheb Patil (Miraj): It is important.

Shri Warrior: It is the 'heart'.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then hon. Members may not mind about the 'crust' when it is put through.

Shri Balasaheb Patil: I rise to support amendment No. 10. This is very essential because there is one clause, clause 19, which gives certain delegated powers to the State Governments. Those powers are restricted and limited powers and cannot be given under clause 5 for the reason that under sub-clause (3) it is mentioned that 'if on receipt of any such application for the grant of a permit, the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary so to do for ensuring adequate supply of rice . . . etc.' These words indicate that policy matters are involved, and when under this legislation, a policy matter is involved, this power will not be delegated to the States. But when a permit is to be given, the other question arises: there can be a Government belonging to one party at the Centre and belonging to another party in the State. When this is the position, the Central Government may grant permit to a certain person who is very much a favourite with them but not with the State Government. In such case, there will be certain quarrel between the Central and the State.

The second point is that this subject is in the Concurrent List; it is a State subject as well as a Central subject. There are also the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the Ministry of Labour.

Therefore, before giving a permit, it is very necessary that the Central Government should take the advice of the State Government and act accordingly.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर) :
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय जहां तक मैं ने देखा है धारा ५ प्लैनिंग कमीशन की रीकमेंडेशन और उसके उद्देश्य के विरुद्ध जाती है। प्लैनिंग कमीशन की रीकमेंडेशन है कि छोटी छोटी चक्कियों को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाये। अगर हुकम हो तो मैं उसको पढ़ दू। उस में कहा गया है :

“To ensure regular supply of hand-pounded rice to urban areas, marketing depots will be established and steps will be taken to popularise consumption of hand-pounded rice.”

यह है प्लैनिंग कमीशन का रीकमेंडेशन सैंकड फ़ाइव इन्चर प्लेन में। लेकिन इस बिल में परमिट की व्यवस्था की गई है। इधर कुछ नहीं है उधर परमिट रखा गया है। श्री बजर्राज सिंह का अर्मेंडमेंट अपनी जगह पर है लेकिन मैं आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि परमिट देने में बाधा केवल सब-क्लाज (४) है और कोई नहीं है। सब-क्लाज (५) तो यह है कि गवर्नमेंट नई मिल की प्रपोज़ एक डीफ़ैक्ट मिल को परमिट देने में प्रेरेंस देगी। सब-क्लाज (४) के अनुसार परमिट देने के विषय में इन छः बातों का ख्याल रखा जायेगा कि वहां पर कितनी मिलें हैं, वहां पर धान कितना उपलब्ध है, बिजली और पानी की अधिकता है या नहीं, इत्यादि, और अगर लगाई जाने वाली मिल से उस क्षेत्र की ग्रन-एम्प्लायमेंट बढ़ती हो तो उस का भी ध्यान रखा जायेगा।

तो मेरा कहना यह है कि बढ़ती हुई हमारी योजना के परिणामस्वरूप हर जगह पानी और बिजली की सुविधाओं में वृद्धि होगी और जो मोर फूड की योजना से धान भी अधिक होगा। इस अवस्था में कोई व्यक्ति यह दरखास्त देगा कि हमारे

यहां बिजली और पानी सुलभ है, धान भी काफी होता है यहां पर मिल की जरूरत है। इस प्रकार तो यह क्लाज बचाव रोकने के वृद्धि का कारण बनेगी। यह कहा जायेगा कि बिजली खराब हो रही है, पानी खराब हो रहा है वह हेड-पाउंडिंग में काम आता नहीं है और मिल खड़ा करने के अलावा इस का कोई उपयोग नहीं है। यह तो उल्टा ही आर्ग्यूमेंट हो जायेगा। अगर यह व्यवस्था की जाती कि बिजली, पानी और धान की अधिकता के साथ साथ ग्रन-एम्प्लायमेंट पर विशेष दृष्टि रखी जायेगी और उन में संघर्ष होने की अवस्था में यदि बेरोजगारी बढ़ती है तो परमिट नहीं दिया जायेगा तब तो ठीक था लेकिन ऐसा कुछ नहीं है। मेरा अनु-रोध है कि यह ठीक नहीं है यह मन्जूर तो होगा ही लेकिन अगर कम से कम यह संशोधन मन्जूर हो जाये तो कुछ राहत हो सकती है।

Shri Heda: I would hardly take a minute. I want only one matter to be cleared up concerning the huller and sheller type mills. Under sub-clause (5) of clause 5, one thing is very clear, that whenever there is a question of granting a permit, preference will be given to an old, defunct rice mill over a new rice mill. In spite of the fact that yesterday the Deputy Minister was good enough to state that the huller type mills should be eliminated, they have not made any differentiation between a huller type and a sheller type. Both have been kept on par. My only plea is that as between these two, the sheller may get preference so far as the definition is concerned.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Sir, this is, perhaps, the most important clause of this Bill; if I may say so, the central clause of the Bill. Naturally, there have been so many amendments to it. But, I regret I am not in a position to accept any of the amendments.

I will first come to the amendment proposed by Shri Supakar; that is, every application should be forwarded to the State Government for its recommendation. I have made it very clear both in my opening speech as well as in my reply that our intention is to delegate these powers to the State Governments. The amendment is, therefore, not necessary and if it was necessary, especially in view of the very emotional speech of my hon. friend from my State, Shri Warrior, I would have found my way to accept it.

The other amendment which has been moved is amendment No. 19 of Shri Braj Raj Singh. With regard to that I may say that item (e) of sub-clause (4) already provides that the list of facts that have to be taken into consideration should include whether the functioning of the rice mill in respect of which a permit is applied for would cause substantial unemployment in the locality. That is a factor which has to be taken into consideration.

Shri Ranga: But the word, 'substantial' is there; it is likely to be understood in the wrong way.

Shri A. M. Thomas: It is not necessary or desirable to make a specific provision that no permit shall be issued if the mill was likely to cause substantial unemployment. The grant of permit will be subject to various considerations including the need for a rice mill from the point of view of ensuring adequate supply of rice in the area and a decision cannot be taken on the basis of only one consideration.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: But that is the most important consideration.

Shri A. M. Thomas: As I have said in my reply, it is not also necessary or advisable to have rigid provisions concerning this matter. We know that the hand-pounding sector is not an organised sector. So, how can we find out whether there has been loss of employment or not. So, the wording has necessarily to be flexible.

With regard to amendment No. 11, an insignificant unemployment caused by the establishment of a new rice mill in a particular locality may not be sufficient justification for not setting up the mill when otherwise the establishment of the rice mill is considered necessary by the State Government. The adjective 'substantial' appended to the word 'unemployment' is, therefore, necessary and should be retained.

The amendment of my hon. friend Shri Sanganna says that some provisions have to be added. The proposal is to add 3 additional points which should be taken into account by the State Government in granting a permit for the establishment of a new rice mill.

As regards the number of hand-pounding and leg-pounding mills in the locality, it is a point which, in fact, is covered by item (e) already in the Bill which provides that before giving a permit it should be ascertained whether the setting up of a mill would cause substantial unemployment in the locality; and whether the setting up of the mill would affect adversely hand-pounding is a point that would be automatically considered. Moreover, item (f) also provides—'such other particulars as may be prescribed'. Therefore, this will also be taken into account. It is not necessary to add any more items to sub-clause (4) of clause 5 of the Bill.

Sir, I oppose all these amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May I put all these amendments together?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, I would like amendment No. 19 to be put separately.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, I can put all the others together.

I will put amendments Nos. 10, 11, 3 and 12 to the House.

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those against will please say 'No'.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On the strength of the voices I will have to say the 'Ayes' have it. But the difficulty is that I would have to declare all the amendments accepted. So, I should put them separately or a second time together.

An Hon. Member: All the amendments are accepted, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That could not be declared because they may be conflicting with each other. So I will put amendments Nos. 10, 11, 3 and 12 again.

The question is:

Page 2, after line 37, insert—

"(2A) Every application under sub-section (1) shall be forwarded to the State Government for their recommendations, if any, and in granting a permit under this section, the Central Government shall take into consideration such recommendation, if any."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 3, line 17,—omit "substantial".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 3, after line 19, add—

"(g) public opinion of the locality;

(h) the number of existing leg pounding machines (Dhenkis) in the locality."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 3, after line 4, add—

"(g) the number of hand-pound and the leg-pound mills (Dhenki) in the locality;

(h) the purchasing capacity of the people;

(i) the number of co-operative societies in the locality."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 3, after line 4, add—

"Provided that no permit shall be issued if in accordance with sub-clause (4) (e) the said permit is likely to cause substantial unemployment in the locality."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I will put amendment No. 19. The question is:

Page 3, after line 4, add—

"Provided that no permit shall be issued if in accordance with sub-clause (4)(e) the said permit is likely to cause substantial unemployment in the locality."

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those against will please say, 'No'.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The 'Noes' have it.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, the 'Ayes' have it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then this will stand over till 2-30. Clause 5 will stand over. We will proceed to clause 6.

Clause 6—(Grant of licences)

Shri Supakar: Sir, my amendment No. 14 is, for 'shall' substitute 'may'.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It does not require any explanation.

Shri Supakar: It does not require explanation, Sir. But I should say that it should not be compulsory and option may be allowed.

Shri Subodh Hanada: I move:

Page 4, after line 4, add—

"(5) That the terms and the conditions of the labour employed in the mill should be safeguarded."

My amendment is that the terms and conditions of the labourers employed in the mills should be safeguarded. I put forward this amend-

ment because labourers employed in the mills are not paid in time or properly. Again, these labourers have no security of employment. Today one might be working; tomorrow he may be thrown out of employment. This should be protected by laying down certain conditions for the labourers.

In West Bengal, women labourers are employed and they have to work in the night also. So, I feel this is very objectionable. I would like to submit that there should be some condition that no women shall be allowed to work in the night. The working hours also should be fixed—at least 7 hours.

Shri Supakar: Sir, may I point out that there was a mistake in my moving the amendment? I find that it is for clause 5 and not clause 6. I did not move it then. The hon. Minister need not reply to this. I thought it was for clause 6.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That was not moved under clause 5.

Shri A. M. Thomas: With regard to amendment No. 15, I should say that it is on the lines of the amendment that had been proposed by Shri Sanganna for inclusion in the licence form the terms and conditions on which labour is employed in the mill. I do not think it will be possible for me to accept it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put amendment No. 15.

The amendment was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That clause 6 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 7 to 11 were added to the Bill.

Clause 12— (Appeals)

Shri U. L. Patil (Dhulia): Sir, I move my amendment No. 24 to clause 12; and amendments Nos. 25 and 26 are consequential. I move:

Page 6, for lines 4 and 5, substitute—

“the District Judge within whose jurisdiction the Rice Mill is situate:”

Page 6, line 6,—

for “the appellate officer” substitute—

“the District Judge”

Page 6, lines 10 and 11,—

for “the appellate officer” substitute—

“the District Judge”

Under clause 12, there is a provision for appeal against any order passed by the licensing officer. When there is a provision for appeal, the person affected feels that some sort of a justice will be meted out to him if it is not done to him by the lower authorities. In the era of separation of judiciary and the executive, my submission is that at least in the case of appeals, power ought to have been given to the judicial officers. My hon. friend Shri Patil spoke yesterday from his experience that these executive officers did not generally apply their minds to the cases that are before them. If the judicial officers are placed as appellate officers, the executive that are below, namely, the licensing officers and other officers will have some sort of a check and my amendment is to this effect. The other amendments flow from this amendment.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Sir, I oppose these amendments. The nature of the enquiry to be conducted would indicate that it is not of a judicial nature. It may be possible to have a judicial officer but it is not necessary to make it mandatory. So, I oppose them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall put amendments Nos. 24, 25 and 26 to the vote of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 6, for lines 4 and 5, substitute—

"the District Judge within whose jurisdiction the Rice Mill is situate:"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 6, line 6,—

for "the appellate officer" substitute—

"the District Judge"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 6, lines 10 and 11,—

for "the appellate officer" substitute—

"the District Judge"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 12 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 12 was added to the Bill.

Clause 13— (Penalties)

Shri U. L. Patil: Sir, I beg to move my amendments Nos. 27 and 28 to clause 13. One is a consequential amendment that affects clause 17 of the Bill. In moving these two amendments, my purpose is this,

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are 27 and 28 moved?

Shri U. L. Patil: Yes, Sir. I beg to move:

Page 6, line 16,—

for "six months" substitute—
"one year"

Page 6, line 17,—

for "five thousand rupees" substitute—

"two thousand rupees"

In my amendment, both these amendments are given as (a) and (b) and in the draft I have already received from the Notice Office (b) is

shown as 28. This amendment No. 28 is with respect to clause 17. Clause 17 should be deleted. That is the amendments. But I am moving amendments Nos. 27 and 28 as they appear. In moving these amendments, I would like the dispassionate attention of this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The attention of the House is already dispassionate.

Shri U. L. Patil: No, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should not doubt it.

Shri U. L. Patil: My submission is that clause 17 should be taken into consideration before we move to this amendment. It reads:

"Notwithstanding anything contained in section 32 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, it shall be lawful for any magistrate of the first class or for any presidency magistrate to pass a sentence of fine exceeding two thousand rupees on any person convicted of any offence under this Act."

Where is the case for any emergency? Why should such powers be given to the magistrate not commensurate with his jurisdiction? Under clause 13 we find that there is sufficient punishment, namely, six months and five thousand rupees. Under clause 7 also, there is provision for forfeiture of deposit. Will it not be sufficient if the fine is confined to Rs. 2,000? Why should there be this departure from the normal procedure? There is no necessity whatsoever for raising the fine to Rs. 5,000 and inserting clause 17. The aim of justice will be definitely met if the punishment is kept at six months imprisonment and Rs. 2,000 fine. If the Government wishes that punishment should be deterrent then my consequential amendment No. 27 which raises the period of imprisonment to one year may be accepted.

Shri A. M. Thomas: For the enforcement of the provisions, it is necessary that there must be enabling provisions which would authorise the judicial officer concerned to impose

penalties of the type provided in the Bill. The hon. Member from Manipur has said when he spoke on the Bill that the capitalists can flout the provisions of the Bill and put up mills. In such cases it is necessary that the punishment should be exemplary so that there must be real sanction behind the provision contained in this Bill. I oppose these amendments.

Shri Balasaheb Patil (Miraj): May I say a few words?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not after the hon. Minister has spoken. I shall now put amendments Nos. 27 and 28 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 6, line 16,—

for "six months" substitute—
"one year"

The motion was negatived.

The question is:

Page 6, line 17,—

for "five thousand rupees" substitute—

"two thousand rupees"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That Clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 13 was added to the Bill.

Clause 14— (Offences by Companies)

Shri Balakrishnan (Dindigul—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, I am moving my amendment No. 20.

Page 7,—

Omit lines 6 to 13.

My amendment is with reference to clause 14. If a person commits an offence, it is just and reasonable if action is taken against the person who is in charge of the rice mill at the time an offence is committed. Under sub-clause (2) of this clause, an innocent person can be prosecuted for the simple reason that he is one of the partners in the rice mill. A partner has no touch with the daily

affairs of the rice mill. Even if he is away from the rice mill, he can be prosecuted according to this clause saying that he has connived or given his assent. It is true that the prosecution also has to prove that the partner has also given his consent for the offence. But whether the prosecution proves it or fails to prove it, an innocent partner can easily be involved in these cases and can be brought before the court. So, it is an unnecessary trouble to the rice mill partners. So, sub-clause (2) may be omitted.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I oppose the amendment. I think the proviso will serve the purpose of my hon. friend:

"Provided that nothing contained in this sub-section shall render any such person liable to any punishment provided in this Act, if he proves that the offence was committed without his knowledge or that he exercised all due diligence to prevent the commission of such offence."

If the officers or the directors are not made liable for the offence the companies can with impunity flout the provisions and such a contingency would not be desirable.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put amendment No. 20 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Omit lines 6 to 13.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 14 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 14 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the hon. Member moving any amendment to clause 17?

Shri U. L. Patil: No, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, I shall put all the clauses to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That Clauses 15 to 25 stand part of the Bill".

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 15 to 25 were added to the Bill.

Shri Supakar: Sir, may I make one submission. I think there is still some time left. I propose to move an amendment to clause 1 in order to enable the Government to extend this enactment to different States in different times. So, I request that clause 1 may be taken up the next day. There is still some time left.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No time is left.

Shri Balasaheb Patil: We started at 12.15.

Division No. 103

AYES

Assar, Shri
Awasthi, Shri Jagadish
Banerjee, Shri Pramathanath
Bharucha, Shri Naushir
Braj Raj Singh, Shri
Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu
Das, Shri Shree Narayan
Dashratha Deb, Shri
Deb, Shri P. G.
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Elias, Shri Muhammed

Ghodasar, Shri Fatehsingh
Ghosal, Shri
Ghose, Shri Bimal
Ghose, Shri Subiman
Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Goray, Shri
Halder, Shri
Imam, Shri Mohamed
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Mahagaonkar, Shri
Menon, Shri Narayanankutty

Patel, Shri P. R.
Patil, Shri Balasaheb
Patil, Shri U. L.
Patnaik, Shri U. C.
Singh, Shri L. Achaw
Sinhaan Singh, Shri
Supakar, Shri
Tangamani, Shri
Warior, Shri

NOES

Abdul Lateef, Shri
Achar, Shri
Ajit Singh Serhadi, Shri
Ambalam, Shri Subbiah
Anirudh Sinha, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri
Balakrishnan, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basappa, Shri
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Boroobah, Shri P. C.
Chaturvedi, Shri
Chettiar, Shri R. Ramanathan
Chuni Lal, Shri
Daljit Singh, Shri
Das, Shri K. K.
Das, Shri N. T.
Dasappa, Shri
Dindod, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Dublieh, Shri
Elayaperumal, Shri
Harvani, Shri Anwar
Heda, Shri
Jaipal Singh, Shri
Jang Bahadur Singh, Shri
Jena, Shri K. C.

Jhulan Sinha, Shri
Jinachandran, Shri
Kanungo, Shri
Khedkar, Dr. G. R.
Kistavva, Shri
Krishna Rao, Shri M. V.
Lachman Singh, Shri
Lahiri, Shri
Laskar, Shri N. C.
Madhusudan Rao, Shri
Mafta Ahmed, Shrimati
Maitri, Shri N. B.
Malviya, Shri Motilal
Mandal, Dr. Pashupati
Mathur, Shri M. D.
Mehta, Shri J. R.
Mehta, Shrimati Krishna
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Morarka, Shri
Murnu, Shri Paika
Murti, Shri M. S.
Nair, Shri Kuttikrishnan
Naidurgker, Shri
Nayak, Shri Mohan
Nebru, Shrimati Uma
Newvi, Shri
Padain, Shri K. V.
Padam Dev, Shri
Pahadia, Shri

Pandey, Shri K. N.
Patel, Shri Rojeshwar
Radhamohan Singh, Shri
Raghobir Sahu, Shri
Rajiah, Shri
Ram Krishan, Shri
Ram Saran, Shri
Ramanand Shastri, Swami
Ramaswamy, Shri P.
Rampure, Shri
Ranhir Singh, Ch.
Rane, Shri
Ranga, Shri
Rao, Shri Rajagopala
Reddy, Shri Narapa
Roy, Shri Bialwanath
Sadhu Ram, Shri
Sahodrabai, Shrimati
Sahu, Shri Btagabet
Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
Sainal, Shri A. S.
Samantnihar, Dr.
Sambandam, Shri
Sardar, Shri Bholi
Satish Chandra, Shri
Selku, Shri
Serval, Shri Vairava
Shankata Devi, Shrimati
Shankaraiya, Shri
Sharma, Pandit K. C.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will now finish at 2.45 and I will seek the indulgence of the House to sit 15 minutes longer.

We can now dispose of amendment No. 19 which was held over. The question is:

Page 3 after line 4, add—

“Provided that no permit shall be issued if in accordance with sub-clause (4) (e) the said permit is likely to cause substantial unemployment in the locality.”

The Lok Sabha divided.

14.35 hrs.

Sharma, Shri D. C.
 Shrivari, Shri Lal Bahadur
 Siddanajappa, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri H. P.
 Singh, Shri K. N.

Sinha, Shri Gajendra Prasad
 Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan
 Sumat Prasad, Shri
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Tahir, Shri Mohammed
 Tariq, Shri A. M.

Tewari, Shri Dwa
 Thummaiah, Shri
 Thomas, Shri A. M.
 Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Datt
 Venkatasubbsiah, Shri
 Vyas, Shri R. C.
 Vyas, Shri Raahelal

The motion was negatived.

Shri Bimal Ghose (Barrackpore):
 Sir, I voted but it did not work,
 though it was my mistake a little
 bit.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How can I
 help now?

An Hon. Member: The push button
 here does not work.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Assistant
 will attend to it. The result of the
 Division is: Ayes—30 plus 1, that is
 31; Noes—106.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question
 is:

*"That clause 5 stand part of the
 Bill"*.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

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

Shri A. M. Thomas: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

Shri Ranga rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would the
 House show this indulgence that they
 would sit 15 minutes longer because
 Shri Ranga wants to speak on the
 Third Reading? I take it that the
 House agrees.

Shri Ranga: Sir, I will take only
 a few minutes. I am glad this Bill
 has been brought in and it is being
 passed. I cannot but express my
 disappointment at the very slow pro-
 cedure followed by Government in
 giving effect to at least one or two
 recommendations of the Rice-Milling
 Committee.

At this stage, I would like to place
 on record of this House my sense

of gratitude to the father of this move-
 ment in favour of what is known as
 hand-pounded rice. He hails from
 Andhra. He is one of the oldest dis-
 ciples of Mahatma Gandhi, by name
 Swami Sitaram. For two reasons he
 pleaded this kind of legislation; one
 for nutritional purposes and another
 for rural employment.

It is a fact, Sir, that after this
 factory system has come in a large
 number of our rural people have
 come to be unemployed. For a very
 long time, when the British were
 here, so many of us within the Con-
 gress who drew their inspiration
 from Mahatma Gandhi were asking for
 controlling the development of rice-
 milling industry, because more and
 more of our rural people were be-
 coming unemployed and this subsi-
 diary source of employment was being
 denied to them. But we could not
 succeed. Nevertheless, Swami Sita-
 ram was able to bring to the sup-
 port of this movement the other
 consideration that milled rice is not
 so nutritious as hand-pounded rice
 and, what is more, mill rice was one
 of the most important and direct
 causes for the increase of a disease
 called beriberi—a wasting disease
 from which the people who are most-
 ly rice eaters have been suffering for
 a very long time.

There was a time when several
 other political parties were ridicul-
 ing this movement, but at long last
 Mahatma Gandhi himself took it up
 when he founded the All India Vill-
 age Industries Association. In the
 end, the First Five Year Plan itself
 accepted the principle underlying this
 and said that, so far as giving licences
 to future mills was concerned it
 should be stopped and necessary
 legislation should be undertaken.

[Shri Ranga]

The First Five Year Plan is over and two years of the Second Five Year Plan period are also over. At long last, Government has come forward with this legislation.

I agree with both the objectives. One is, so far as the mills which are already in existence are concerned we need not interfere with them. But in regard to giving licences to the future mills, I must confess to a sense of dissatisfaction with the attitude of the Government. They have stipulated so many conditions to be satisfied whereby they have kept the door open for the erection and functioning of more and more mills in future, especially in those areas where till now these mills have not been established. This is likely to keep the door open for further mischief and, I am afraid, the interests of the rural people are not likely to be properly safeguarded. Nevertheless, I am glad that the Government of India has taken this power into their own hands instead of leaving it entirely in the hands of the State Governments, because it is quite possible that, here and there, one or two State Governments may come to be influenced by local interests, powerful interests behind the mill industry. Therefore, they might be inclined to give licences for more and more mills. Hence, to that extent, it is good that the Government of India have kept the final sanctioning power in their own hands and they have also taken power to give instructions to the State Governments subject to which alone any further licences could be given.

So, I wish to say that although the Government has not found it necessary to owe its own gratitude to that very great man, this Bill is really a standing monument to the long struggle for 35 years that that great man, Swami Sitaram, has been carrying on in pursuance of the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हुपारी प्लैन का यह सातवां वर्ष है। फर्स्ट फाइव इमर प्लैन में भी इस विषय पर समिति

की रिपोर्ट थी कि जहां तक सम्भव हो मिले बन्द कर दी जायें और चावल की कुटाई हाथ के जरिये ही हो। इस सेकेन्ड फाइव इमर प्लैन में भी कमेटी ने वही रिक्मेंड किया और सुझाव दिया कि प्रमुक प्रमुक चीजें बढ़ाई जायें। भाव एक तरफ तो गवर्नमेंट हाथ से कुटे चावल पर सभिसडी देती है और दूसरी तरफ हम मिलों के लिये बड़ोतरी का इन्तजाम कर रहे हैं। वो तरफ से दो कंटे डिक्टरी चीजें चलाई जा रही हैं। हाथ का कुटा घान, हाथ का कुटा चावल महंगा पड़ता है इस लिये सभिसडी दे कर उसे बाजार में लाया जाता है। लेकिन सभिसडी दे कर देश का काम कब तक चलेगा यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। प्लेनिंग कमेटी ने कहा कि जहां तक सम्भव हो हाथ की बनी चीजों का इस्तेमाल करना चाहिये। शायद आसाम में कोई घानी बनी है, उसे प्रोत्साहन दिया जाये। लेकिन इस बिल में इस तरह की कोई चीज नहीं है। इसकी दफा ५ और ६ में जरूर है कि लाइसेंस दिये जायें। दफा ५ के अन्दर जो लाइसेंस के क्लॉज रक्खे गये हैं उनमें अभी एक प्रमेंडमेंट आहा गया था। अगर उसे स्वीकार कर लिया गया होता तो अच्छा होता कि जहां जहां नई मिलें खोलने से बेकारी बढ़ती हो, वहां पर परमिशन नहीं दी जायेगी। यह चीजें सोचने की हैं। हमको इस तरफ भी देखना है अगर इस से अनइम्पलायमेंट बढ़ता है . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य यह पहले कह चुके हैं, उसे दोहराने से क्या फायदा होगा ?

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : यह जो बिषयक है एक तरफ से हाथ के कुटे चावल को प्रोत्साहन न दे कर मिलों की बड़ोतरी को प्रोत्साहन देगा जिससे कि बेकारी बढ़ेगी, दूसरी ओर हमारी जनसंख्या बढ़ रही है। अगर एक ओर जन संख्या बढ़ेगी और दूसरी ओर मिलों को लाइसेंस देने से बेकारी बढ़ेगी तो कौसे काम चलेगा ?

इस लिये मेरा कहना इतना ही है कि जो घापके अधिकारी हों वे इस का ध्यान रखें। दोनों तरफ का वे मुकाबला करें। अगर उससे बेकारी बढ़ती हो तो मिलों को परिमिशन न दी जाये। अगर गवर्नमेंट इस तरह का कोई प्रावधान दे सके तो भी कुछ हद तक हमको संतोष हो सकता है और ससिडी का काम भी रोका जा सकता है और आदमी अपने धान को बाजार में बेज सकेगा।

Shri A. M. Thomas: I have nothing to add except to express my gratitude for the strong support given to this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION (AMENDMENT) BILL*

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947".

The motion was adopted.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I introduce the Bill.

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL*

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898".

The motion was adopted.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I introduce the Bill.

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL*

Shri Subiman Ghose (Burdwan): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898".

The motion was adopted.

Shri Subiman Ghose: I introduce the Bill.

HINDU SUCCESSION (AMEND- MENT) BILL*

Shri Subbiah Ambalam (Ramana-thapuram): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Hindu Succession Act, 1956.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Hindu Succession Act, 1956".

The motion was adopted.

Shri Subbiah Ambalam: I introduce the Bill.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL*

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.