

have to reach that point, they have to go from the shore 10 Km. and come back another 10 Km., which means 20 Km., which will consume a barrel and a half of diesel, which costs Rs. 650. In these days whether Rs. 650 can be spent economically on such trips is a question which has to be considered.

Then, Prof. Madhu Dandavate referred to the territorial waters and said that if we can decide what are the territorial waters, why can we not decide this line of 5 Km. With all due respect to him, I feel that this is not correct, because we are making this provision penal. If the trawler comes within the area of 5 Km., it is an offence and he will be prosecuted. But is it possible to prove in a court of law that a particular trawler came within 5 Km? It is well nigh impossible. So, all these persons would be acquitted, because they will get the benefit of doubt. So, what is the use of such laws, which cannot be implemented, which will simply remain as dead laws in the statute book? If you want to see that the interests of the small fishermen are protected, this is not the way of coming up with legislation.

Further, this cannot be implemented by the coastal guards, because we have only one ship. Taking into consideration the length of this coastline, I think it is not possible. Even the small launches, to which a reference was made by Prof. Dandavate, even they cannot do it. Therefore, I would request you to consider one aspect. Instead of spending on the coastal guards, or on police and other things, is it not possible for us to assist the small boatmen, who have small boats, for getting their boats mechanised. So, why not formulate a scheme to financially assist those, whose boats are not mechanised. We can give them money for mechanisation. This is the only way in which we can solve the problem. If you make 5 Km. and beyond 5 Km. limits, you are only asking them to fight among themselves, and that will not solve the problem.

I would, therefore, request the Government not to get this Bill passed, but to take the opinion of the experts. So, I press my amendment. Let us have the opinion of the experts on this particular issue.

17.15 hrs.

RE. AMENDMENTS TO THE MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: A list showing the numbers of amendments to the Motion on Address by the President treated as moved on the basis of the slips received from Members concerned, has been put up on the Notice Board for the information of Members.

In case any Member finds any discrepancy in the list, he may kindly bring it to the notice of the Officer at the Table immediately.

17.15 hrs.

COUNTRY FISHING BOATS PROTECTION BILL—Contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. B. K. Nair may speak.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL (Ernakulam): Sir, I am on a point of order. I gave my name two days ago. But my turn has not yet come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am keeping your name in my mind and your name will be the next.

(Interruptions).

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: Will you tell me when my name will come, so that I can go after speaking?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already told you. Probably you did not care to listen. I told you very definitely that your name will be next after he has

[Mr. Chairman]

spoken. Can anything be clearer? (Interruptions). And I imagine that both of you are from the same State.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL: That is a different thing. The person who gave the name first must be called first and if you go out of the way, I have nothing to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that discretion lies with the Chair and I think you won't like it to be withdrawn.

SHRI B. K. NAIR (Quilon): I am happy to have the opportunity on this occasion to mention some general issues regarding the welfare of fishermen. I am glad that certain aspects concerning the lives of fishermen have also been included in this discussion apart from the question putting a limit on the motor boats in respect of their area of operation. The fishermen community, you must remember, is a community which contributes very much to the welfare of the nation without getting anything at all in return. In fact, it is only a one-way traffic so far as they are concerned. They are living in the poorest of conditions and are neglected. This 6,500 kilometres of coastline is inhabited by these people within one kilometre or so of the coast. You don't provide any housing for them. They just live in huts huddled among themselves. No roads are built, no educational facilities are provided. They are labouring for the nation without getting anything. It is a one-way traffic. This community of 65 lakhs of people is a neglected community. We don't give them any amenities. What I want to mention is that housing is one of the major items that we have to pay attention to. Next, education and medical facilities for them have also to be provided. Apart from all this, there is the question of security so far as these people are concerned. During the monsoon these people go into the sea and it is very often that many of them do not return. There is no scheme of insurance to insure that something is made available to their

families if something happens to them. So, I have been suggesting in this House on more than one occasion the institution of a fishermen's welfare fund. A Fishermen Welfare Fund should be instituted. It should be collected by way of a levy on sea food exports as we do in the case of coal mined. We have 200 crores of sea food items for export. Levy on a modest scale can provide the fund for various welfare amenities.

Insurance should be there for accidents, etc. Unemployment benefit and old age benefit should be given.

There is the problem of sea erosion. My own State of Kerala is very much prone to sea erosion. So many huts get washed away. Lives are lost. Action should be taken to check sea erosion and to give protection to the fishermen.

Adequate fishing harbour facilities are not available. We are talking of country boats but where will these be kept at night. So fishing harbour should be made for the purpose. In Neendakara harbour, perhaps the biggest in the country, problems are many. This now provides facilities only for mechanised boats. Along the coast of Kerala there are many sites where adequate harbour facilities can be provided for country craft also. Construction of a breakwater near Quilon should also be taken up. About 5000 fishermen families can be provided security for their habitation and also for keeping their boats. I hope you will kindly pass on this request of mine to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is listening you.

SHRI B. K. NAIR: I hope he will also reply.

The people are largely uneducated. They are confined mainly to fishing for their livelihood. Many of them are unemployed because they are illiterate. Without education there is no scope

for employment. Some sort of occupational, technical education facilities should be provided so that their load of unemployment on their families is lifted. Only one or two male members of unemployment on their families is able to sustain their family. Some sort of craft training or technical training should be provided to these people. This is the community. I am repeating, from which we take the maximum by way of nutritional food and export commodities but they themselves live on a meagre standard of living. Their standard of life is far below the average.

Even the Sixth Plan document does not make a mention of these poor men and their problems. No provision has been made for their improvement.

They do not have spokesmen. Nobody has taken up their case as is done in the case of farmers and other categories.

This is a class of workmen who have never gone on strike throughout their life. We hear of L.I.C. strike, strike by Government Servants. But we have never heard of strike by the fishermen. As Mr. Churchill said, "It is in another context it is a case of so much being owned by so many to so few."

About the suggested protection of 5 km. or 10 km., I think, it may not be workable. Yesterday, we were discussing about prohibition. This also is just like that here. It is not practicable to enforce it. The coast guard is there. But despite that smuggling is taking place. There is a coast-line of 6,500 km. It will not be possible to protect the entire coast line. It is rather much to expect that. These people are carrying on with traditional craft and traditional fishing methods. My suggestion is that steps should be taken to provide them also with mechanised boats. Otherwise, this community cannot survive for long. We are in an age of mechanisation. To earn their livelihood without mechanised boats, they are bound to suffer. They should be provided with mechanised boats so that they can earn a

little more and have a better source of livelihood.

Lastly, when we talk of mechanised boats, I would like to just mention that the other day, I was listening to the case of motor boat owners at Quilon. No less than 2000 motor boats are plying in Neendakara harbour. They were saying that they were running at a heavy loss. Every boat, every day, needs about 200 litres of diesel; there are about 5-6 workmen on each boat and there are other expenses also. At least Rs. 600 to Rs. 700 expense is involved in respect of each boat per day. The return, their catch, is only worth Rs. 300 to Rs. 400. Therefore, they are losing about Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 per boat, per day. So, I suggest that the supply of diesel at a subsidised rate may be given to these people as we are doing in the case of kisans.

SHRI XAVIER ARAKAL (Ernakulam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, many hon. members have expressed their views and I am not in a mood to add anything more.

Further, this subject-matter relates to Schedule VII, State List, Item No. 21 and, therefore, the operative part of this Bill may not be implemented or cannot be implemented by the Central Government. That does not mean that this House should not deal with this vital subject. As earlier speakers, one after another, have said, this concerns the weakest section of our society who contributes a large amount of foreign exchange.

Going through the Government pronouncements, I find, in the President's Address of last year, it is stated:

"Government are aware that optimum utilisation of our sea resources is important for our future economic development. Since a multi-disciplinary approach is required to exploit the vast resources of the ocean, appropriate institutional arrangements are being worked out."

[Shri Xavier Arakal]

Again, referring to the Finance Minister's speech dated 11th March, 1980, it says:

"...of agricultural and allied activities must receive high priority in our Plan and it has set apart Rs. 32 crores for exploitation of inland and marine fish potential."

I would like to know from the Government how much money is spent on the socio-economic developmental activities for these weaker sections and how far welfare measures are implemented for the benefit of these people. It is said that if proper exploitation and exploration are conducted we can feed millions and millions of people in India. 70 per cent of our people are illiterate and about 40 per cent of our people are below the poverty line. This poverty and illiteracy can be eradicated provided there is a scientific approach to this issue.

Going through some of the articles, I find that sea area is divided into three categories. (i) territorial sea area up to 12 miles and (ii) contiguous zone up to 24 miles and (iii) exclusive economic zone up to 200 miles. There again, it is divided up to 8 fathoms, 8 to 10 and 10 to 12. Though it is divided in these, I would like to know what are the steps taken by the Government to see that these demarcated areas are properly utilised without disbalancing the ecology of the oceanography. What is the study report on this issue? I am told that there are 6,000 deep sea vessels in Thailand 12,000 in Japan and India has around 60. These foreign trawlers come to the Indian water territory and exploit sea resources, which has immense wealth. As earlier speakers mentioned, there is no system of supervision, surveillance or to apprehend these poachers. It is said that in West Bengal alone, every month Rs. 5 crores worth of fish are caught by these trawlers. What steps we have taken? According to the Shipping Act, are we in a position to do anything? How many vessels

have we impounded? Navy say that they do not have the vessels, ship going materials, to dictate and apprehend these poachers? The number of poachers is not meagre and small. Who is controlling the coastal area? When there are clashes between mechanised boats' crew and the traditional people, there is nobody to look after them. As Mr. Faleiro has said, it is being looked upon as a law and order problem. Actually, it is not a law and order problem. It is really a class-war between those who have (*Interruptions*) this advantage of technology, work and resources, and those who do not have.

A survey conducted by the Kerala Government has revealed that 50 per cent of these fishermen are in debt. It is seasonal work. Therefore, they are most of the time starving and when they borrow the money, their hands are tied to these money-lenders. How much have we given out of Rs. 32 crores set apart in our Budget towards this end?

Going through the articles, I see that there are 13 organisations handling this vital subject. Agriculture Department, Commerce, Science and Technology and Indian Council of Agriculture. A Seminar was held in Cochin. It has highlighted the defects of not co-ordinating, not linking, various organisations of this Government. If you want to do anything for these weaker sections and to stop the exploitation of sea wealth, it is high time that we coordinate all these agencies of the Government.

It is said that 50 million tonnes of fish is within 30 miles of Indian coastal area and, only 2.5 million tonnes are caught, and out of this 2.5 million tonnes 1.5 million tonnes are caught by Indians and 1 million tonnes are caught by the poachers. See the magnitude of this problem. We have the resources but we are not in a position to exploit them. We have six million people who are traditional fishermen, but we are not in a position to give them anything—I would not say 'anything'; I

mean, not anything in a substantial way. What is the reason for this? The reason is that, as Prof. Ranga said, they are not an organized sector; their interests are not properly highlighted or lobbied in Parliament as well as in the State Assemblies. I am surprised to see that six imported vessels, deep sea fishing vessels, have been given by the West Gengal Government to private agencies. In West Bengal over three lakhs of fishermen are struggling for their existence. Could the State Government not have organized a cooperative movement, co-operative society, and given to them? A remarkable work in this field has been done by the Kerala State; they have initiated and organized cooperative societies through which these mechanized boats and other equipment are given. What I am saying is that all the State Governments are not taking interest. The seriousness of this problem is not realised yet. This being a States subject, if the Centre comes forward with a legislation on this, certainly there will be resistance from the States. I fully agree with the suggestion that proper guidelines should be framed and issued for the information of the people.

The second point I would like to stress is that the cooperative movement should be strengthened and encouraged in this sector. A bitter experience of Kerala in this regard is that, if a co-operative society is organized, then vested interests crop up and they see that it does not function. As I said earlier, because of their indebtedness, they are not in a position to resist this. Unless there is a strong will on the part of the Centre, I am sure any measure that we may be taking or the State Government may be taking may not be fruitful. Therefore, my second suggestion is that the cooperative movement should be highlighted and encouraged.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arakal, please sit down. I want to assess the sense of the House. This debate started at 3.40 today. Two hours are now over. What is the sense of the

House? Should the debate continue? And for how long?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Should be continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For how long? Normally we adjourn at 6.00 p.m.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL RECONSTRUCTION (SHRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN): We may adjourn at 6.00. It can continue on the next occasion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, we will adjourn at 6.00 p.m. The debate will continue next fortnight...

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): What about the next Bill, the Constitution Amendment Bill, in my name? Will it lapse?

MR. CHAIRMAN: My information is that the Bill does not lapse. If this Bill is carried over to the next day, the next priority will be there; it will not lapse.

Mr. Arakal may continue.

The third point I was suggesting is that this matter being in the agricultural sector which is a priority sector, there should be subsidy. Whether it be for the diesel or for other purposes, there should be subsidy in the matter and unless subsidy is given, many of these boat-owners will be put into trouble. They will not be able to carry on their work.

The fourth suggestion is that there should be a gradual mechanisation in this field. Just as we have adopted gradual mechanisation in the agricultural sector, harvesting of the sea should also be mechanised gradually, through the co-operative movement. Unless we take in the traditional fishermen and train them in this modern art of catching fish and harvesting the sea, there will be serious incidents having national repercussions where violence may be resorted to. To avoid that there should be gradual mechanisation, bearing in mind that it does not disturb the ecology of the oceanography.

[Shri Xavier Arakal]

The fourth suggestion is that there are over 18000 mechanised boats now in India operating in our sea-shores. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what are their wages and service conditions. Do they get any share in the catch? As far as my information goes, the big mechanised boat-owners give very small wages to these people. There is no fixity of service. The labour laws are not applied to them. Therefore, my fifth suggestion is that they should be covered by provident fund and other labour welfare legislation.

The final suggestion is that there must be a co-ordinating committee at the district level to have discussion with the mechanised boat-owners as well as the traditional fishermen. Lack of understanding and communication have created many problems. Not only problems, many fishermen were killed which could have been avoided, provided there was a co-ordinating committee to understand, to communicate and to co-ordinate between the mechanised boat-owners and the traditional fishermen. Therefore, these suggestions must be taken into consideration.

As I said earlier, the Central government as per the Constitution, is incompetent to legislate on this point. However, we can give guidelines as to how it should be implemented. As far as the implementation is concerned, I fully agree with the hon. Member that it is very difficult to supervise. I am sorry to say that the proposition put forward by Prof. Dandavate is not practical. As a practical proposition this co-ordinating committee can be used.

These are my suggestions which I hope, the hon. Minister will consider.

श्री रामबिलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) :
सभापति महोदय, अभी अराकल जी ने और कई अन्य साथियों ने मार्गदर्शी सिद्धान्तों के सम्बन्ध में बतलाया है। जहां

तक मेरी जानकारी है—प्रापर-गाइड-लाइन्ज तो हैं, लेकिन उन गाइड-लाइन्ज का कैसे पालन किया जाय—यह समस्या उत्पन्न है। आप देखिए—10-2-1978 को केरल विधान सभा ने एक प्रस्ताव पास किया था, यह प्रस्ताव यूनेस्को सली पास हुआ था, जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था—

“This House requests the Government of India to cancel their decision to introduce mechanised fishing by private industrialists in consideration of the fact that this will land lakhs and lakhs of traditional fishermen of Kerala in unemployment and thereby create a grave financial loss to them.”

यह प्रस्ताव पास करके उन्होंने केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास भेजा था। जहां तक मुझे याद है—10 अप्रैल, 1978 को एक शार्ट-नोटिस क्वेश्चन के जवाब में तत्कालीन कृषि मंत्री—श्री बरनाला जी ने इस सदन को आश्वासन दिया था, जिसमें उन्होंने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा था—

“We are trying to have about 5 k. m. from coastlines for the conventional fishermen whose boats are not mechanised. Beyond that, up to the distance of 10 k. m. for the fishermen whose boats are mechanised and beyond that, for the trawlers. This is what is being considered by us.”

यह बात उन्होंने स्पष्ट रूप से कही थी।

सभापति महोदय, जितने भी इसके मार्गदर्शी सिद्धान्त हैं, वे स्पष्ट हैं और उनके सम्बन्ध में विभागीय निर्देश भी जारी हुये हैं—पहली प्रायोरिटी कोआपरेटिव सोसायटीज को दी गई है, दूसरी प्रायोरिटी स्टेट कारपोरेशन के लिए है, तीसरी इन्जीनियर्स के लिए है और चौथी लार्ज-हाउसेज के लिए है। इन मार्गदर्शी सिद्धान्तों और निर्देशों के होते हुये भी उनका पालन नहीं हो रहा है। हमारे कई

साधियों ने ठीक ही कहा है कि जब कभी बड़े बिजनेसमैन और छोटे मछुओं के बीच में झगड़ा होता है तो वह एक प्रकार से "क्लास-वार" है, आर्थिक पहलू पर ही झगड़े की शुरुआत होती है, क्योंकि सबसे अधिक मछली समुद्र के किनारे पर ही मिलती है। सरकार की ओर से स्पष्ट कहा गया था कि जो बड़े-बड़े मछली पकड़ने वाले हैं उनको बे-आफ-बंगाल में या अण्डमान-निकोबार में जाकर यह काम करना चाहिये, 10 किलोमीटर तक उनको इजाजत नहीं दी जाएगी लेकिन आपको यह सुनकर आश्चर्य होगा कि सरकार ने किन लोगों को इसके लाइसेंस दिये हैं? जो बिस्कुट बनाने वाली कम्पनियां हैं, साबुन और तेल बनाने वाली कम्पनियां हैं, जैसे टाटा आयल मिल कम्पनी है . . .

सभापति महोदय : आप मछली से बिस्कुट पर कैसे चले गये ?

श्री रामबिलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) : इन लोगों को लाइसेंस दिए गए हैं।

सभापति महोदय : आप मछली के बारे में बोलिए।

SHRI CHITTA BASU: What he says is exclusively relevant.

सभापति महोदय : आप अपने प्वाइन्ट पर आइये, क्योंकि आपके बोलने का समय निर्धारित है।

श्री रामबिलास पासवान : मैं यही बतला रहा हूँ कि बिस्कुट बनाने वाली कम्पनियों को मछली मारने के लाइसेंस दिए गए हैं।

सभापति महोदय : आप फिर बिस्कुट को नहीं छोड़ रहे हैं, मछली पर आइये।

श्री रामबिलास पासवान : मैं आपके सामने सरकार का जवाब पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ—जिसमें सरकार ने इसी हाउस में

कुबूल किया है कि जितनी मस्ती नेशनल कम्पनियां हैं, जिनको बिग-हाउसेज कहते हैं, जो बिस्कुट बनाने का काम करती हैं लेकिन मछली भी मारती हैं, जो ब्लेड भी बनाती हैं और मछली भी मारती हैं, जो तेल बनाती हैं और मछली भी मारती हैं—इन सबको सरकार ने लाइसेंस दिये थे। इनको लाइसेंस देने का पीरियड भी बही है जब आपकी सरकार थी, जनता पार्टी के पीरियड में लाइसेंस नहीं दिए गए, बल्कि उसने रोक लगाई थी। मंत्री जी अपने जवाब में इसके बारे में बतलायें। जनता पार्टी की सरकार के पहले आपने लाइसेंस दिये थे और अब बाद में भी आप उनको लाइसेंस देते जा रहे हैं। जनता पार्टी के समय के कृषि मंत्री श्री बरनाला ने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा था कि जो बड़े-बड़े औद्योगिक घराने हैं, उनको मछली मारने की अनुमति 10 किलोमीटर के अन्दर नहीं दी जायगी। उसके बाद उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि हम स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स को भी लिख रहे हैं। उन्होंने लिखा भी होगा। उन्होंने यहां यह भी कहा था कि हम एक काम्प्रीहेंसिव बिल लायेंगे, लेकिन मुझे पता नहीं स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स की तरफ से क्या जवाब आया? यदि कोई जवाब आया है तो मंत्री महोदय बतलायें। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि छोटे जो नाविक हैं, उनके सामने बहुत सी समस्याएं आती हैं। 30 लाख से अधिक परिवार इस कारोबार में लगे हुये हैं। आप उनकी हालत को देखिए। उनके शरीर पर वस्त्र नहीं हैं और आज भी उनके पास रहने के लिए झुग्गी-झोंपड़ी नहीं है। किस तरह से वे अपना जीवन व्यतीत करते हैं, यह आप देखिए। उनको कोई मदद नहीं मिलती है लेकिन जो खरबपति हैं, खरबपति हैं, वे ही सारे लाभ उठा ले जाते हैं, जैसे हर मर्ज की बे दवा है। सब चीजें उनको देते जा रहे हैं। कहीं न कहीं उन पर आपको रोक

[श्री राम बिलास पासवान]

लगानी होगी। आपके माध्यम से मैं सरकार से जानना चाहूंगा कि अभी तक उसने इस दिशा में क्या कार्यवाही की है? इस विषय पर एक बार ही नहीं बल्कि दजनों बार बहस हुई है। कभी क्वेश्चन, के रूप में, कभी ध्यानाकर्षण के रूप में कभी शार्ट-नोटिस क्वेश्चन द्वारा इस विषय पर विवाद चला है लेकिन अभी तक इस बारे में कुछ नहीं हुआ है। ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि सरकार की नीयत साफ नहीं है। सरकार आश्वासन तो देती है लेकिन जहां बड़े बड़े बिजनेसमैन का पैसा खल जाता है, तो उसका सिर झुक जाता है। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार जवाब दे और उसको निश्चित रूप से इस सदन को बतलाना चाहिये कि वह कब तक जो बड़े बड़े उद्योगपति हैं, उनसे इस उद्योग में आने से पीछा छुड़ाएगी। चार तरह के नाविक होते हैं। एक तो वे हैं, जो परम्परागत नाविक हैं लेकिन उन नाविकों की आज स्थिति बहुत खराब है। उनके पास जो नावें हैं, वे टूटी हुई हैं और आर्थिक रूप से वे बहुत पिछड़े हुये हैं। उनको कब तक आप बढ़िया मिकेनाइज्ड छोटी नावें लेने के लिए अनुदान देंगे या नहीं देंगे? फिर बड़ी-बड़ी मिकेनाइज्ड बोट्स हैं, ट्रालर्स हैं और बड़े बड़े वेसिल्स हैं। इस तरह से चार श्रेणियों में आपने इनको बांटा हुआ है। ये सभी जानते हैं कि जो परम्परागत रूप से नाविक काम करते हैं, वे मछली मारने का काम करते हैं लेकिन आज वे भूखे मर रहे हैं, उनके परिवार भूखे मर रहे हैं और ऐसे परम्परागत नाविक एक ही जगह नहीं हैं बल्कि गोवा में, केरल, तमिलनाडु, गुजरात, महाराष्ट्र, आन्ध्र प्रदेश, उड़ीसा और पश्चिम बंगाल में वे फैले हुये हैं और लाखों की संख्या में फैले हुये हैं। तो ये जो गरीब मछुने हैं, इनके लिए आप क्या करने जा

रहे हैं? आप मुख्य मंत्रियों का या सम्बन्धित मंत्रियों का कोई सम्मेलन बुलाए, जिसमें इस बात को रखें और उसके बाद कोई मार्गदर्शी सिद्धान्त बनायें या कोई कानून बनायें, लेकिन सिर्फ कानून बनाने से ही काम नहीं चलेगा, वह इम्प्लीमेंट कैसे हो, लागू कैसे हो, इस बात को देखा जाना चाहिये।

एक माननीय सदस्य ने इस बात की तरफ ध्यान दिलाया था कि सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि एक्ट तो बन जाता है लेकिन एक्ट और फैक्ट में जमीन-आसमान का अन्तर रहता है। जो भी एक्ट आप बनायें जब तक आप यह नहीं देखेंगे कि इसका पालन कैसे हो, तब तक कुछ नहीं होगा और मैं समझता हूं कि यह बिल जो हमारे महालगी साहब ने रखा है, प्राइवेट मेम्बर बिल के रूप में, यह बिल अगर पास भी हो जाएगा तो भी उसका कोई महत्व नहीं रहेगा जब तक कि उस एक्ट को जो आप बनायें, कड़ाई से लागू नहीं किया जाएगा। चाहे इस पक्ष के लोग हों और चाहे उस पक्ष के लोग हों, जब कभी भी इस मसले पर बहस हुई है और पिछली बार सब तरफ के लोग जब इस पर बोले थे, ट्रेजरी बेंचेंज के लोग और अपोजीशन के लोग बोले थे, तो सब लोगों का एक ही मान्यता थी, लेकिन जब वह चीज हाउस से चली जाती है, तो फिर सारी चीज पर पर्दा पड़ जाता है। इसलिए मैं यह आग्रह करूंगा कि इस बार कोई ऐसी बात मत कीजिए और अभी तक जो सरकार की नीति रही है जिसके कारण जो बड़े बड़े बिजनेसमैन हैं, वे फलते-फुलते रहते हैं, उसको आप बदलिये और उनको थोड़ा काटने का काम कीजिए और गरीब लोगों को जिनके बोट पर आप यहां जीत कर आए हैं, उनको आर्थिक सहायता दीजिए। अगर उस गरीब जनता की आप सहायता नहीं करेंगे, तो वह ज्यादा

दिन तक सोई नहीं रहेगी और एक दिन वह आपको उठा कर फेंक देगी।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ और सदन से मांग करता हूँ कि वह इसको पास करे।

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Sir, I think that the problems which the traditional fishermen of our country, particularly in the coastal areas, have been facing, have been properly identified, not only today but since some-time past. We have been able to measure the magnitude of the problem. So far as this particular Bill which has been moved by my esteemed colleague Mr. Mhalgi is concerned, this Bill aims at removing certain limited obstacles or certain hardships faced by the traditional fishermen of this country. There were certain guidelines issued by the Government of India in this regard. These guidelines are of the same nature as is embodied in the Bill, that there should be a limit of 5 K. M. for the traditional fishermen; there should be a limit of between 5 K. M. to 10 K. M. for the Mechanised boats; and further onwards this should be limited for trawlers and big mechanised boats. The purpose of these guidelines was to protect the interests of the small, poor, traditional fishermen of our country. This number, as some of my esteemed friends have pointed out, is more than 85 lakhs. It covers a population of about 3 crores. Now, an important social aspect is also inter-linked with it. I do not wish to go into the details. I suppose you will agree with me, the Government will agree with me, and the Planning Commission will agree with me, when I say, it will

not be possible to provide employment for all in the organised sector. I have got figures. Therefore the entire strategy of providing employment hinges around the question of providing them self-employment. Now, this question of self-employment is something which is of vital importance for us in our national life. If these 85 lakhs of fishermen are to earn their living, it is necessary that Government should take certain legal and legislative measures to protect their interests. The guidelines which have been issued indicate the Government's intentions. But our experience is that these guidelines are not properly implemented to protect the interests of these small and traditional fishermen. The question therefore arises whether further legislative measures ought to be taken to give proper effect to the spirit of these guidelines. Now, the Government's intention is also to protect their interests. Now, what is it that stands in the way of having a Central legislation on this particular subject? More so, it is the responsibility of the Central Government; this subject comes under 'Agriculture'. You find the Entry in the Seventh Schedule. Parliament is entitled to have a legislation of this nature.

I listened to what my esteemed friend, Mr. Parulekar had to say. There are certain particularities and there are certain specific angularities in respect of certain problems of these traditional fishermen, particularly in the Coastal area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may continue the next day.

18 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, February 23, 1981/Phalgun 4, 1902 (Saka)