

- (vii) to transport and handle all materials and equipment including construction equipment;
- (viii) to store and preserve the equipment and materials required for the construction of the refinery;
- (ix) to construct and erect the refinery with the assistance and under the technical supervision of the Rumanian engineers.

I have no doubt that this collaboration with the Rumanian Government for the establishment of the first oil refinery in the Public Sector will pave the way for greater association with them on other projects as well.

The development of the Assam oil fields and the refining of crude oil from this source is one major project. Its constituent parts are the production and transportation of crude oil by a pipeline to be constructed in two stages, a refinery in Assam to process approximately 0.75 million tons per annum and a refinery in Bihar to process approximately 2 million tons per annum. With the conclusion of the agreement with the Rumanian People's Republic, the Assam Refinery will take shape gradually and, I hope, be on stream by April, 1961. The offers of collaboration for the construction and erection of the Bihar Refinery are at present under consideration and a decision is expected to be taken shortly. As the House is aware, the refineries will be entirely in the Public Sector and the production and transportation of crude oil have been entrusted to Oil India Private Ltd. a participatory scheme with the Burma Oil Co./Assam Oil Co. in which Government of India have 1/3rd share. The Government have taken reasonably speedy actions to see that the Public Sector Projects are established according to a time schedule. Likewise, I hope that the Oil India Private Ltd. which has hitherto

been functioning under the aegis of an *ad hoc* Board of Directors and is shortly being incorporated will also take concerted measures to ensure that the production of crude oil is kept at or about 2.5 million tons per annum and to lay and construct the pipeline upto Barauni in accordance with the time schedule already indicated to them.

12.10 hrs.

ASSAM RIFLES (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend Assam Rifles Act, 1941.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend Assam Rifles Act, 1941."

The motion was adopted.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I introduce the Bill

12.11 hrs.

POISONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Poisons Act, 1919 be taken into consideration."

The Bill is essentially non-contentious. It is very simple. In fact, the amendment sought is of a formal nature.

The Poisons Act, 1919, which is in force at present did not apply to Part B States. It was applicable to the rest of the country. When the States Reorganisation Act was passed, the

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary. Part II—Section 2. dated 19-11-1958.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

laws that were then in force in the various States continued to be operative in the areas comprised in those States. Several of the Part B States now form part of bigger units. The result has caused some little confusion and difficulty. Within the same State in the major part, this Act of 1919 is in force, while in the areas which were formerly comprised in Part B States the old State Act is still in force. So, in order to remove this anomaly, this amending Bill has been brought. It only seeks to apply the all-India Act of 1919 which was amended in 1956 to apply to all the States in the country, except that so far as Jammu and Kashmir State is concerned, only that part which relates to the import of poison will apply to that State. The rest is not being introduced into that State as, under the Order which governs the extension of laws, we cannot do that.

So, this is a very simple measure, and I hope it will be readily accepted by the House

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved

"That the Bill further to amend the Poisons Act, 1919, be taken into consideration."

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): Speaking on the Poisons (Amendment) Bill, I am reminded of the tragedy which overtook several people in Kerala recently because of the serious lacuna in the legislation as it existed then. The hon. Mover says it is in order to introduce a sort of uniformity in the legislation that now he brings forward this Bill. I wonder whether the Government would have thought of any change to the existing legislation on the subject if the tragedy to which I referred had not occurred. The States Reorganisation Act was passed some time ago and yet this was not noticed, and to my mind the impression is

that the serious attention of Government has been drawn to this shortcoming in the legislation only on account of the fact that subsequent developments after the incident showed that Government were not quite powerful enough to prevent abuse by certain merchants.

When we think of amendments to the Poisons Act, we should also take into account the exact situation that prevails in the country. It is not a question whether, on account of the States Reorganisation Act, a change here or there in the existing Act becomes necessary or not.

As you know, the original Poisons Act was promulgated in the year 1919 or so when there was hardly anything which was handled by anybody except those of the medical profession which could be termed as poison. In those days, apothecaries, doctors, chemists and druggists alone were supposed to keep poisons, and the law as it was then framed meant only the restriction of the distribution of such poisons as were kept by the medical practitioners from reaching consumers who might consume them indiscreetly and cause themselves harm. In those days, as I find from one of the two speeches made on the original Bill, the speech by the great V. J. Patel, the only industry which was affected was the leather tanning industry for which some poisons were used. Here, when we think of changing the present law regarding poisons, we should take into account, and very serious account, what is happening in the country with respect to poisons.

I need not go into all these details, because this is not the place to discuss the details of chemistry of poisons. Nevertheless, we must consider that today poisons are being handled in an unrestricted fashion by countless numbers of people, whether it is in the agricultural sector or in the industrial sector. You know, Sir, that such potent lethal poisons as potassium cyanide have become very necessary in

small industries like tampering steel. You know also that in several industries salts of copper which are deadly, salts of barium and salts of phosphorus have become common. These were not envisaged at the time the original Act was contemplated. The situation today is that in the industrial sector, we have necessarily to resort to the use of solid, liquid and gaseous poisons. Solids, liquids and gases which contain poisons, and which are killers, are now being transported from one end of the country to the other subject to certain restrictions which were thought of at a time when these poisons did not go from place to place as we find now.

Then, there has been the greatest danger, in recent years, of the increasing and indiscriminate use of the most deadly poisons in the field of agriculture. A cry has been raised, and repeatedly raised, that agricultural production must necessarily be increased. No doubt it has to be increased, but on the pretext of increasing agricultural production, monopoly firms are dumping into our country poisons, the toxicity of which has never been studied.

You know that one of the commonest insecticides which we use in our country is DDT. If I read out extracts from the *British Medical Journal* or the *American Medical Journal* on the evil effects of DDT, you will be amazed. DDT has such bad results on cattle which feed in the areas where it is sprayed that even in their milk there is a precipitation of DDT. In children who feed on the milk so distributed, doctors have found a sediment of this DDT in their fats. The effects of DDT have not been studied as yet, and that is the mildest of poisons which is used as insecticide. There are ever so many other poisons, weed-icides, fungicides and insecticides which are being allowed to be dumped into the country by firms like the Imperial Chemicals on the basis of certain advertisements and claims made by them. One can read in the press every day of Tata-Fison with photographs of both these people saying that this

insecticide is a positive cure. It may be a positive cure, but really, more than that, it is a positive menace also to the people who handle it. That is why I submitted that we are facing a very grave danger in the matter of poisons which are being allowed to be handled by all sorts of people who do not know anything about these poisons. Government failed to take serious note of the increasing and indiscriminate use of poisons all over the country and bring in suitable amendments to the law even though time and again there have been reports in the press.

I need not go into all that also, but here is an extract from no less a paper than the *Harijan* of December 15, 1951 which makes very interesting reading now. It quotes the *London Health Review* and says:

"It was long ago proved in experiments by Dr. Sir Edward Mallanby (he is one of the authorities on poisons) that the poison gas (Nitrogen trichloride) used to bleach 90 per cent. of the flour used in this country was the cause of hysteria in dogs, that diseases of a similar serious nature were likely to result from the use of this poison (which is also used in the manufacture of deadly chlorine gas) in flour for human consumption. Immediately this discovery was made, the American Government banned the use of the deadly gas as harmful and an unnecessary adulteration of the 'staff of life' (bread). But British milling interests were too strong to allow human health to come before their profits, and people continue to be poisoned by the gas which is the cause of serious disease and death to human beings."

This was about one of the mildest poisons used in 1951, when the whole group of organo-phosphorous compounds had not found any use. And this is what the *Harijan* has commented:

"It is hoped that the food authorities of the Government of India

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

will give their serious attention to the above matter of poisoning peoples' food for monetary profit of merchants and doctors."

But what has happened?

Mr. Speaker: All that is interesting. But may I know how all that is relevant, so far as the extension of this Act is concerned? There is already a Poisons Act, and this Bill merely seeks to extend it to the former Part B States areas. The Part B States were not part of the British India then, and, therefore, this could not be extended then. Now, it is sought to extend the Act to the whole of India. Possibly, this will be relevant for the purpose of a separate resolution, to suggest to Government to bring forward more restrictive measures or to make more restrictive rules or regulations etc. But I do not know how all this arises out of the general discussion of the Poisons (Amendment) Bill

Shri V. P. Nayar: I am not discussing that, but I submit that in the matter of poisons which affect the lives of countless numbers of people, the fact that the States Reorganisation Act has required a particular change is not the main thing which has to be taken into consideration. There are reports and reports which go to show that Government should take some very firm action and introduce a comprehensive legislation. My only complaint to Government is that just as they have taken this opportunity to bring forward a legislation in line with what is necessary, they ought to have brought forward a comprehensive legislation, which they have not done. For, I find that in the recent *Report of the Kerala and Madras Food Poisoning Cases Enquiry Commission*—a commission which consisted of very competent men, chemists, pathologists and everybody else—the very first recommendation is:

"Control should be imposed by a comprehensive statute or statutes on the manufacture, storage, trans-

port, distribution and use of insecticides which are regarded as highly toxic . . ."

If you read the original Act, you will find that no such control is possible under the existing legislation. What is now sought to be done by this amending Bill is merely an extension of the limited control which Government has, which will not at all meet the requirements of the situation. The situation being rather serious, as you know, Government ought not to delay even for a moment the bringing forward of a comprehensive legislation to take powers to completely control not merely the storage and distribution but also the use and handling of these poisons, for, as you are aware, it is playing with people's lives. The tragedy which occurred in Kerala should not be repeated. But by the amendment which is now sought to be made, it is not possible to check it

I have every liberty now to transport a poison which is not known to be a poison. Even the original Act does not define what a poison is. Poisons may be anything. All the crude drugs which may be used from the Ayurvedic herbs may also contain little doses of poison, but they are quite safe doses. That poison and the poison which is contained in an organophosphorous compound should be distinguished in this Act, and unless Government want to see that those who introduce these new things in the name of insecticides, weedicides and fungicides should run away from this country with all the profits . . .

Mr. Speaker: The original Act provides for specifying the nature of the poison with respect to which a licence is necessary

Shri V. P. Nayar: You know exactly the case which arose in the follidol incident. Follidol is a poison which contains parathion. Even two milligrams of it are fatal to a man. And it is not merely that; it is not an ordinary type of poison which requires

to be taken before it can kill a person; it is a contact poison. If I place two grains of it on my body, then I am finished. Even in the case of such a poison, when we have the law as it is, and which now the Home Minister is seeking to extend to the territories comprised in the erstwhile Part B States, you have seen that folidol was packed in hundreds of drums, labelled on one side as poison and on the other side as harmless. This is one of the most virulent, most potent and most lethal poisons known in the world today, and yet, with impunity, an importing firm could transfer, without having regard even to the small precautions which are necessary, packages containing this poison to a distant place; and the packing was not properly done, and, therefore, the packages leaked, and what is more, it was allowed to be transported along with foodstuffs which resulted in that tragedy.

This is not the only poison if folidol was the only poison which is increasing in its use, then I would not have said anything, nor would I have spoken on this Bill at all. But you know that in the name of killing mosquitoes, gammadene is used; in the name of killing flies

Mr. Speaker: Has not enough been said to request the Home Minister to bring forward a comprehensive Bill?

Shri V. P. Nayar: In doing so, I submit, the Home Minister should take these things also into consideration. I do appreciate the spirit with which this Bill has been moved for consideration, but I have a feeling that the Home Minister may not have known all the details which not merely make it necessary but compel the Government to bring forward a comprehensive legislation, instead of merely bringing forward this amending Bill to extend the meagre provisions of an Act which was originally drafted in 1919, when Government did not know anything about poisons, when the people were not using any poison in their day-to-day life. But the context is completely

different today, and hundreds and thousands of people in our country have necessarily to use poisons, the nature of which they do not know, but which they are forced to use because of the higher technique in agriculture or industry.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): The hon. Member knows a great deal about poisons, which many of the hon. Members here do not know. So, he should be allowed to continue. And his speech is becoming very interesting.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection. I shall arrange for a lecture under the auspices of the Indian Parliamentary Group

Shri V. P. Nayar: Do I deserve that honour?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, certainly

The hon. Member has said enough to show that a comprehensive legislation ought to be brought forward.

Shri D. C. Sharma: May I request the hon. Member to tell us what poisons are useful for human beings?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has got ample opportunity outside. We are sitting here only for five hours

Shri V. P. Nayar: Several poisons are used in medicines also, but there is hardly any poison which will restore young age. That is the only poison which is still beyond human ingenuity.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): Does the Hon. Speaker fear that too much of this will poison the debate?

Shri Achar (Mangalore): In fact, we have had a discussion on the subject during the last Session.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I shall conclude by once again requesting the Home Minister to consider the present context of things when there is an unrestricted use of poisons merely because some monopoly firm imports it and advertises it saying that this is a fly-killer

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

to the perfection, or that this is a mosquito-killer to the perfection, to take this very serious and menacing situation into consideration and assure us that no time will be lost in promulgating a law which will have all the necessary controls to prevent the misuse by any firm or any person of any poison which is dangerous to human life or the life of cattle or the life of plants.

Shri Achar: May I just say a word or two? I am not going to make a speech. But I would just recall to your mind and to that of the Home Minister that we had a full discussion on this matter during the last session.

There was a report by the Ministry of Health, Government of India, and also the *Report of the Kerala and Madras Food Poisoning Cases Enquiry Commission*. These were fully discussed last time, and that very poison, which my hon. friend has just now referred to, namely follidol, was the subject-matter of considerable discussion on that occasion.

In the course of that discussion, we saw the great danger of allowing these poisonous substances to be imported, and that too, not in a proper condition. In fact, the follidol which comes from Germany formerly used to be imported in aluminium containers. Somehow, the rules were relaxed, or I do not know how it happened, it began to be imported in wooden containers.

They begin leaking and get mixed up with foodstuffs also. As a result, in Kerala there were something like 100 deaths and more than 300 to 400 attacks. The people suffered.

So I agree with what Shri V. P. Nayar submitted, that we have to have a full enactment dealing with this matter fully. In fact, last time I also partook in the discussion. It has at least to be examined whether the condition of importing has been changed. Formerly, it used to be imported in aluminium containers, now they are using wooden boxes and sometimes these start leaking and get mixed up

with foodstuffs also. Consequently, serious disasters and even deaths occur.

So when we are having an enactment to deal with this matter, I too felt that we must have a more exhaustive law on the subject, especially in view of the fact that we are getting several kinds of insecticides in plantations for agricultural purposes. Though, no doubt, they are for agricultural purposes, they are at the same time very poisonous. Follidol is a very virulent sort of poison.

I only want to draw the attention of the Home Minister to the Report of the Ministry of Health which contains several recommendations also as to how these regulations have to be framed. I would request him to consider the question of having a full enactment on this matter.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Do I understand that poisons are all imported into this country and we have no poisons of our own in this country?

Shri V. P. Nayar: We have poisonous cobras

Pandit G. B. Pant: I listened to Shri V. P. Nayar with real interest. I am really sorry that a tragedy which involved many lives should have occurred in Kerala. The Report of the Committee that was appointed to deal with that matter has already been brought to the notice of Parliament. We are, however, concerned here with a very simple amendment. So far as that goes, I think Shri V. P. Nayar has no objection.

As to the grave situation that exists today, I wonder if he has moved any resolution or given notice of any non-official Bill for tightening the existing law, regulations or rules. Considering the feeling that he has expressed over this subject, I would have thought that some sort of initiative would have been taken by him. He is presumably aware of the fact that the Poisons Act of 1919 was amended in 1956. It is of a fairly comprehensive character. Any poison or anything which is regarded as poison can be

brought within the purview of this Act. The State Government has only to notify a specific thing as being poison and the rest follows. If there were any very grave menace in Kerala, it was open to the State Government to issue a notification and to take such other steps as it might have considered necessary. There was nothing to prevent the State Government from doing so. In fact this Act, though a Central Act, gives the powers to the State Governments. They have to issue notification and rules, and their discretion is not fettered in any way. If there has been any remissness, I think the Central Government cannot be blamed for that.

Shri Nayar may also be knowing that the subject of poisons appears in the Concurrent List, so that if any State Government wanted to supplement, to further tighten the rules and laws relating to poisons or, having regard to the existing situation, thought that amendments of a far-reaching character were necessary, it was free to proceed accordingly.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Today the practice is that the Central Government give import permits and allow the import of such substances. None of the State Governments is informed about the ingredients of substances so allowed to be imported. It is only when such a tragedy takes place that governments can take note, because the Report says that paratheon cannot be detected by any known method; it so happened that in Kerala there was a specialist who was in U.K. only last year and he alone could find out traces of that; nobody else could.

Pandit G. B. Pant: If a thing cannot be found out, then neither the law framed by the Central Government nor by the State Government can make any difference.

Shri V. P. Nayar: The import people know.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Whatever may be imported, once a thing has been imported by a State, it is open to the State Government to do as it likes.

Shri V. P. Nayar: There is no process.

Pandit G. B. Pant: It can frame any rules and regulations. It can even specify a thing which is not poison as poison, because there is no test. I think Shri V. P. Nayar knows that there is absolutely no test, no criterion, even prescribed as to what is poison. The State Governments have given a blank cheque under the Act of 1919 which, as I said, had been amended in 1956. But I have no objection, and I appreciate what he said. I am not an expert on poisons. I have not specialised on the subject. I take it that he is an expert and is in a better position to advise me.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Except in speech.

Pandit G. B. Pant: At least he is an expert so far as speech goes; I do not pretend to be so even to that extent.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I said that my speech has no poison.

Pandit G. B. Pant: If it is only in the matter of speech that he is an expert, then I am afraid what he has said does not bear too much weight.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I said my speech has no poison, but I know something about poisons.

Pandit G. B. Pant: He cannot have tried various poisons and still be here hale, hearty and robust in order to tell us what we should do. Perhaps he has not used poisons. I would not advise him to do so even for the purpose of acquiring special knowledge.

But leaving that aside, I think it is desirable that the matter should be fully examined, and if any changes are called for, they should be made. I do not in any way turn down any suggestion to that effect.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

The present Bill, as I said, is a very simple one. I do not see how the points to which my attention has been drawn are really germane to the Bill before us; nor does it debar the introduction of any other Bill. So far as this Bill goes, there can be no objection. As I said, if the situation was grave in any place, new rules could be issued by the State Government, and if any new law was needed, as the subject happens to be included in the Concurrent List, the State Government could well have introduced a Bill and got it passed by its own legislature.

It seems that no State Government has felt the urgency or importance of this matter to the extent that Shri Nayar has felt. So if even the State Governments have not been concerned to that extent, I think he cannot blame us for not having realised the gravity of it to the extent to which he now realises or to which, he imagines, people should realise. But all this is protected. If there is any lacuna or defect, it should be set right. I hope so far as this Bill is concerned, there will be no difference of opinion in this House.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Poisons Act, 1919, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill

Clause 3 (Amendment of section 3).

Amendment made:

Page 1, line 12,—

after "In section 3" insert—

"and clause (b) of section 6"

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

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

Clause 3A (New)

Shri Viswanatha Reddy (Rajampet): Sir, I beg to move my amendment No 2

Page 1,—

after line 13, insert—

"3A Amendment of section 3.—
 in section 3 of the principal Act after sub-section (3), the following sub-section shall be added namely:—

"(4) All rules made under this Act by the Central Government or by any State Government shall be laid for not less than thirty days before Parliament or the State Legislature, as the case may be, as soon as possible after they are made and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament or such Legislature may make during the session in which they are so laid or the session immediately following."

Pandit G. B. Pant: He wants to amend the original Act. Probably that cannot be done

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister says that this Bill is only extending the scope of the original Act. The original Act itself is not amended by it. Therefore, it does not seem to be in order.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I point out to the hon. Minister that it is difficult for us to find out what rules have been made and what regulations have been made. In the original Act, there is the power to make rules and regulations. In fact, even in our Library we could not find the Acts that applied in the State of Travancore-Cochin. It is not available. I agree to the extension of this law to all the States if it is done even without a reference or notification of the rules and orders. But some arrangement should be made so that important regulations that are made, are available to us.

Shri Viswanatha Reddy: The Committee on Subordinate Legislation has recommended to this House that in such cases where rule making power is delegated to the administration, those rules should be placed before the House. We are only following the recommendations of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation. I do not think that there should be any difficulty for the hon. Minister to accept this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I can only say that since the Committee on Subordinate Legislation was formed, we have invariably requested the Government and the sponsors of any Bill that wherever power is given to frame rules they should add this clause also, viz., that it will be laid on the Table of the House for such modification as the House will desire. This, I find, is an original Act where there is no such provision. It is an Act of 1919. Then the rules were only issued by way of gazette notifications. If a precedent were necessary, this House can go into the original Act also. I leave it to the hon. Minister.

On a prior occasion when the Detention Act was sent to the Select Committee, power was given to the Select Committee to modify not only those sections which required modifications on account of the Bill, but also independently even those sections which had not been touched upon. If

the hon. Minister is agreeable the House can certainly modify the original Act, even to that extent. I leave it to him.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): There has been a precedent even in the proposition laid down by the hon. Speaker now. You can act in any circumstance.

Mr. Speaker: No, it is only with the consent of the hon. Minister.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Then I ought to have been allowed to say something on this. You circumscribed my speech.

Mr. Speaker: Very well, when the rules are framed

Pandit G. B. Pant: The position is not as simple as it would appear, because under the original Act, the rules are to be framed mostly by the States. So, we cannot ask the States' legislatures to undertake any responsibility. It is open to the States' legislatures to make any provision they like about the rules that their governments make. We can say that the rules that are framed by their governments will be laid before the legislatures or if they do not so choose then they will not be so laid. In fact, the whole scheme of this Act of 1919 is intended to give certain rights and powers and to impose certain responsibilities on the States. The Centre has very little to do in the matter. We cannot pass a law here to the effect that rules that are made by the State Governments shall be placed before the State legislatures. We will be encroaching upon the domain of the State legislatures. If it were only in connection with our own legislation, I would have had no objection to have even a rule to that effect and I may say apart from that if any rules are framed by us we will place them on the Table of the House even if there is no provision in the Act itself. But we cannot introduce any amendment which will affect the State legislatures.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Could the hon. Minister tell us whether there is any rule framed by the Centre which calls upon a man who imports or applies for a import licence of anything which may contain a poison to exactly describe the poison and its potency?

Pandit G. B. Pant: I cannot say anything about that. I can say that if any rule is framed by the Central Government we will place a copy of that on the Table of the House and it will be open for Parliament to accept it or to reject it or to amend it and we will be bound by the decision of Parliament.

Shri Viswanatha Reddy: The subject matter of the Bill is in the Concurrent List and not in the State List. So, whatever legislation is passed here with reference to this subject the States, I think, are bound to agree to that under the Constitution. Therefore, in the circumstances if you include the provision in this Bill, there will be sufficient safeguard for us to see that the rules are placed before the State legislatures

Mr. Speaker: So far as two points that have been raised are concerned, the hon. Minister has given an assurance that whatever rules that may be framed by the Centre will be placed on the Table of the House so that hon. Members may move Resolutions thereafter accepting it or rejecting it or even trying to modify it.

So far as the other point is concerned, I do not want to give a ruling now because it is not necessary to go into that matter. But once this house passes a legislation in the Concurrent List and clothes the various States with power to frame rules it is not open to this House to say that those things must be laid on the Table of the House so that they may have an opportunity of seeing them. I am of the opinion that now the matter does not arise and therefore I do not want to decide it. It is only academic now. So, now let us confine to what has been sprung up now, viz.,

that the House agrees that in a repealing Act or in an extending Act, we do not go into modification or amendment of the original clauses. Therefore it is not necessary to pursue this matter. It is enough, I think, as the hon. Minister says that whatever rules that are framed by this Government are placed on the Table of the House

Now, clause 3A is not pressed.

The amendment for the insertion of New clause 3A was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Schedule, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill"

The Schedule, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Sir, I move:

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

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I ask for an answer to a question? Will the hon. Minister tell us whether the Government contemplate bringing a comprehensive legislation on this and, if so, by what time we may expect it, because it is a serious matter?

Mr. Speaker: He has answered it.

Shri V. P. Nayar: He says that he sees the point which I made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member, who is in possession of all these things, could bring an amending Bill. What is the meaning in repeating the same thing? The subject is in the Concurrent List and therefore the States

may also look into the Report of the Kerala and Madras Food Poisoning Cases Enquiry Commission and then take suitable action.

Shri V. P. Nayar: My point was that most of these poisons are controlled at least at the time of their arrival by the Government of India, so that it is necessary for the Government of India to formulate all the vigorous provisions.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have already indicated that we will look into the matter.

Mr. Speaker: I shall formally put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is :

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

The motion was adopted.

12.51 hrs.

INDIAN ELECTRICITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Electricity Act, 1910, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members; 30 from this House, namely: Sardar Hukam Singh; Shri Pondekanti Venkatasubbaiah; Shri Vinayak Rao K. Koratkar; Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi; Shri Chandramani Lal Choudhry; Shri Shree Narayan Das; Shri Shivram Rango Rane; Shri Ramappa Balappa Bidari; Shri K. R. Sambandam; Shri M. Ayyakkannu; Shri N. K. Pangarkar; Sardar Amar Singh Saigal; Shri M. G. Uikey; Shri Abdul Latif; Shri Pulin Behari Banerji; Shri Bhagwan Din Misra; Shri Ram Shanker Lal; Shrimati Krishna Mehta; Shri S. Hansda; Shri Diwan Chand Sharma; Shri

G. D. Somani, Shri K. T. K. Tangamani; Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair; Shri Shraddhkar Supakar; Shri Ignace Beck; Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel; Shri Baishnab Charan Mullick; Shri Premji R. Assar; Shri Braj Raj Singh, and Shri Jaisukhlal Lalshanker Hathi and 15 members from Rajya Sabha:

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee.

Sir, this is, in a way, a measure which seems to amend the existing Electricity Act of 1910; it is a non-controversial measure. We find that in 1910 the generation and consumption of electricity was very meagre compared to the present position. The Acts that were passed in 1887, 1893, 1903 and 1910 were passed having regard to the conditions then existing. The first Act of 1887 was passed only with a view to have some safety measures for the protection of life and property. There were not so many electric power generation plants then; there were no such large distribution lines or big hydro-electric power stations. So, in a way, that was an Act only for protecting life and property. Subsequently, in 1910 also, the Act that was passed took into consideration some other safety measures but it also provided for the terms and conditions on which licences should