

the total Members in the House, as many Members as want to read that and want to speak today, may take them in preference to those who want to speak tomorrow. As amongst themselves, they may adjust. It was also incidentally referred to in this debate that for the purpose of fully appreciating the fresh provisions that are sought to be made by this Bill, and to understand the working of the Corporation from the administration report, details are not given: as for instance, two crores and odd for the textiles, etc. I do not personally see what objection there can be or what confidence there is. After all, it is the business of this House to safeguard the amounts lent to this Corporation, also because of the Government guarantees and various other things on loans taken by the Corporation. Therefore, I would advise the hon. Minister to circulate to the Members details regarding the manner in which this money has been spent so as to enable them to exercise proper control and deal with this Bill properly. In view of the fact that it largely depends on the information that has to be circulated to hon. Members, I would adjourn this Bill till tomorrow.

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

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

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

FOOD ADULTERATION BILL

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur): I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to make provision for the prevention of adulteration of food be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri Santosh Kumar Dutta, Shri Loknath Mishra, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Shri Kailash Pati Sinha, Shri Hira Singh Chinaria, Shri Amarnath Vidyalkar, Shri Bheekha Bhai, Sardar Raj Bhanu Singh Tewari, Shri K. G. Deshmukh, Shri Vajjanath Mahodaya, Shri T. Madiah Gowda, Shri Halaharvi Sitarama Reddy, Shri K. Periaswami Gounder, Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi, Shri Rajaram Giridharlal Dubey, Shri Hoti Lal Agarwal, Shri Biswa Nath Roy, Shrimati Uma Nehru, Shri Narayan Sadoba Kajrolkar, Shri C. R. Narasimhan, Shri R. V. Dhulekar, Dr. Indubhai B. Amin, Sardar Lal Singh, Shri K. Kelappan, Dr. Ch. V. Rama Rao, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Shrimati M. Chandra-

sekhar, and the Mover with instructions to report by the last day of the first week of the next Session."

In bringing forward this proposal, may I be permitted to say a few words?

I do not think that there will be a single Member of this House who will not welcome the introduction of this Bill. In fact, in the past Parliament and even before that I have been asked several times as to why I have not been able to introduce this measure before today. But the difficulty was that I could not do it until the adulteration of foodstuffs and other goods came on to the Concurrent List. The moment I was in a position to bring a measure like this before the House, I circulated all the State Governments and asked for their opinions. The Members of the House know that laws against food adulteration do exist in all the Part A States, in some of the Part B States, and in some of the Part C States, but they lack uniformity, and I think in a situation like this where food adulteration is growing or has grown into a positive menace, it is absolutely essential that something should be done in this regard. And therefore, it is that I felt it was absolutely necessary for the Central Government to enact legislation.

Now, opinions have been received from all the States, and all their useful suggestions have been incorporated in this Bill. My own feeling has been throughout these years that while food laws do exist, it is the inadequacy of Government machinery that has been greatly responsible for their inability to check the menace. Not only is the machinery inadequate, but there is also, I am sorry to say, lack of integrity in that machinery. Therefore, whatever legislation we pass, the State Governments will have to see to it that this inadequacy is removed, and that, as far as possible, the integrity of the machinery is also ensured.

Some friends feel that this Bill should be circulated for public opinion. I myself feel that there is no necessity for that now since the State Governments have been consulted, and consulted over a long period, so that they have been able to give all their experiences and their considered judgment on the measure and, what is more, they have again been circulated since this new measure has been drafted. That is to say, the present Bill has been circulated to them, and

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur]

they have been asked to give their opinions before the 22nd of December, so that the Select Committee will have ample time to consider any further suggestions that they may have to make.

The important suggestions in this present measure—the most important are: first of all, the constitution of the Central Food Laboratory which I am sure the Members will welcome because under the existing laws where if a food inspector or a vendor is not satisfied with the report of the analysis of any food article that has been given to a public analyst in any State, there is no provision for analysis by a superior authority. Therefore this Central Food Laboratory will be of very great value, and it will not only carry out analysis of such foodstuffs as are given to it that have not been satisfactorily analysed, but they will also carry out analysis of samples of imported foodstuffs sent from the ports by the Collectors of Customs or by any other officers authorised by the Central Government for this purpose. They will also carry out investigations for the purpose of fixation of standards of foodstuffs. That is very important. They will also undertake investigations, in close collaboration with the laboratories of State public enterprises, for the purpose of standardising methods of analysis. Uniformity in the formulation of standards for various items of food and any permissible variations from the standards will be achieved through the Central Committee that is sought to be appointed, and State Governments will also set up their committees, and I think that a very great deal of efficiency will be brought into being by the constitution of the Food Laboratory, the Central Committee and the State committees.

One of the standing complaints against food laws has been that the penalty prescribed for offences has been too small, and that very often the courts do not even award these small penalties. For that also, some more drastic provisions have been put into the Bill.

I, therefore, hope very much that those who have put forward amendments for further circulation will be good enough to withdraw them in view of what I have said that public opinion has been elicited, and that State Governments have been circulated again. I do hope that all Members who are interested in this measure will send any suggestions that they may like to the Select Committee. There is ample

time for their suggestions to be considered, and I hope that the Bill will go on the Statute Book as early as possible in the next session of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to make provision for the prevention of adulteration of food be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri Santosh Kumar Dutta, Shri Lokesh Mishra, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Shri Kailash Pati Sinha, Shri Hira Singh Chinaria, Shri Amarnath Vidyalkar, Shri Bheekha Bhai, Sardar Raj Bhanu Singh Tewari, Shri K. G. Deshmukh, Shri Vaijanath Mahodaya, Shri T. Madiah Gowda, Shri Halaharvi Sitarama Reddy, Shri K. Periaswami Gounder, Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi, Shri Rajaram Giridharlal Dubey, Shri Hoti Lal Agarwal, Shri Biswa Nath Roy, Shrimati Uma Nehru, Shri Narayan Sadoba Kajrolkar, Shri C. R. Narasimhan, Shri R. V. Dhulekar, Dr. Indubhai B. Amin, Sardar Lal Singh, Shri K. Kelappan, Dr. Ch. V. Rama Rao, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Shrimati M. Chandrasekhar, and the Mover with instructions to report by the last day of the first week of the next Session."

There are amendments of which some hon. Members have given notices. I would like to know whether they are moving them. The first amendments stands in the name of Shri S. V. Ramaswamy.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I am not moving it.

Mr. Speaker: The second amendment stands in the name of Shri Veeraswamy.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I am moving it.

Mr. Speaker: But the hon. Member has not given any date by which the Bill should be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion thereon. By what date does he want it to be circulated?

Shri Veeraswamy: By the first week of the next session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may have it by the first day of the next session.

Shri Veeraswamy: Yes; I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the next session."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the next session."

There is one amendment in the name of Shri Jajware: Is the hon. Member moving it?

श्री जजवाड़े (सन्थाल परगना बहजारी बाग) : मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं नहीं, कहने की बात तो अलग है।

श्री जजवाड़े : अभी जैसी श्रीमती मंत्राणी जी से बात हुई

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं वह अभी नहीं चाहता हूँ, अभी मैं इतना ही चाहता हूँ . . .

श्री जजवाड़े : अध्यक्ष महोदय, . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बरा सुनिये, आप बैठ जाइये अभी मैं इतना ही जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो संशोधन आप ने भेजा है वह आप पेश करना चाहते हैं या नहीं।

श्री जजवाड़े : नहीं।

Mr. Speaker: There is one amendment in the name of Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): I am not moving it.

Mr. Speaker: There is one in the name of Shri H. G. Vaishnav.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav (Ambad): I am not moving it.

Mr. Speaker: What about Kumari Annie Mascarene?

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Tiruvandrum): I am moving it.

Mr. Speaker: But no date has been given.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: Let the date be by the first week of the next session.

Mr. Speaker: That is already there. Whether it is the first day or the first week it amounts to the same thing. So this amendment is barred.

What about Dr. Rama Rao?

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): It is already moved.

Mr. Speaker: So there is only one amendment that has been moved, for eliciting public opinion by the 1st day of the next session.

The original motion as well as the amendment are now open for debate.

Shri Raghbir Sahai (Etah Dist.—North East cum Budaun Dist.—East): I welcome the Bill that has been moved for being referred to the Select Committee, by the hon. Minister of Health. Everybody knows that adulteration of foodstuffs is a growing evil. This Bill which is intended to combat that evil has therefore to be welcomed. How far it will be able to lessen that evil is to be seen. I quite agree with the hon. Minister that this Bill was overdue, as there is great dissimilarity in the Acts on this subject in several States. Coming from Uttar Pradesh, I may inform the House that a very comprehensive Bill on this subject was passed by the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly, a couple of years back, but somehow the operation of that Bill has been withheld. I do not know whether it is due to the intervention of the Union Government. But whatever the reason might be, the fact is that the operation has been withheld. Everybody will recognise that food plays a vital part in the building up of the health of a nation. Since long, the health of the people of this country is very poor. In this connection, I may quote some figures which are very pertinent to the subject. It is said that although the birth rate of India compares favourably with that of other countries, so far as the death rate and the average expectation of life are concerned, they compare very unfavourably with those of others. The relevant figures for the various countries are as follows:

Country	Birth rate per 1000	Death rate per 1000	Average expectation of life	
			Males	Females
France	19.4	13.2	54.30	59.02
Germany	15.7	10.5	59.86	62.75
India	26.6	25.1	27.91	29.56
Japan	25.6	10.0	44.82	43.54
United States of America	24.3	9.7	59.12	62.67
United Kingdom	15.9	11.2	58.74	62.88

If we compare these figures, and study them carefully, we shall come to the conclusion that our birth rate is

[Shri Raghbir Sahai]

supposed to be the highest, but the expectation of life is the least, with the result that the death rate also in this country is the highest.

Now, we have to look into the reason for this highest death rate and the lowest expectation of life in this country. Apparently, it appears to me that the reason is the poverty of the people and the insufficiency of the nutritive value in the diet of large sections of the people of this country. That is the main reason for the highest death rate and the lowest expectation of life. Mostly, in this country, people are vegetarians; there are non-vegetarians as well, but as compared to non-vegetarians the number of vegetarians is very large. For vegetarians the main diet consists of milk and milk products because they play a very important part in the diet of these people. It is these articles of food, it is these commodities which are adulterated to the greatest possible extent. In this connection, with your permission, Sir, I would quote a few lines from the findings of the Bhow Committee Report. It was a very important Committee which submitted its Report in the year 1946, and is said to be the last word on the subject of health of the people of this country. The Report says:

"The chief articles of food which are found adulterated are milk and milk products and the edible oils".

And with regard to the extent of adulteration, the Report continues to say:

"The percentages of adulterated samples in respect of milk and milk products varied in 1937 from 100 per cent. in the case of Central Provinces—because in 1946 it was known as Central Provinces—to 15.9 per cent. in the case of Sind—which now forms part of Pakistan. "Samples of edible oils showed percentages of adulteration ranging from 80.8 per cent. in Bengal to 5.4 per cent. in Assam"

The very reading of these figures makes one shudder to think of the problem of adulteration. Also the same subject was taken up by the Planning Commission and in the course of its report it says:

"The widespread malpractices which affect the purity of food articles in the market are an aspect of the food problem which should be attended to with vigour and a sense of urgency. The various substances which are often used as adulterants and are doing serious harm to the health of the people appear to be growing. This

must be tackled on the footing of a principle of priority both by the administration armed with adequate powers and the organised force of public opinion and social action. It must be recognised that the administration of laws relative to the prevention of adulteration is at present largely ineffective. What further measures for the improvement of food laws or what further legislation in this connection by the Centre or the States would prove helpful is a matter of urgent consideration".

I welcome this Bill because the Centre is going in the right direction. As I have said, adulteration takes place mostly in milk and milk products such as ghee, which is a very essential article in the diet of vegetarians. It is our everyday experience that with milk, especially distributed in cities, the milk vendors mix arrow root, not to speak of water and with ghee they mix *vanaspati* oil which is flooding the market like anything. The idea is not to prohibit *vanaspati* or vegetable oil, but to see that *vanaspati* is not used in adulterating ghee and the whole thing passing for ghee, as is done these days.

There has been a persistent and insistent demand on behalf of the public for the colourisation of *vanaspati*, so that it can be distinguished from pure ghee. The present Bill, in so far as it goes, does not—so far as I think—make it obligatory on the part of producers of *vanaspati* to colourise it, and I submit there will be a great lacuna in the Bill if no definite and specific provision is made in this behalf. To quote the report of the latest Committee, namely, the Ghee Adulteration Committee of 1952—it has made certain recommendations and Sir, with your permission, I will only quote two of them—(1) "It was found that ghee was adulterated on a very large scale with *vanaspati*" and (2) "It is recommended that the total production of *vanaspati* in the country should be coloured orange by using carotene oil concentrates as the colouring medium in addition to the incorporation of sesame oil". My submission is that in the drafting of this Bill the recommendations of the Ghee Adulteration Committee were perhaps not noticed. My only hope is that when the Bill goes up to the Select Committee this main lacuna will be removed.

So far as the question of sentence is concerned, I think—and this is my humble submission—that the sentence laid down in the Bill does not appear to be adequate enough. It is an

offence against society and I submit that a very serious view should be taken of it. In this connection, also the Food Adulteration Committee drew attention to the desirability of deterrent punishment in respect of offences under the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act. Now, in my humble view, the option to courts to impose a sentence upto three months of imprisonment or fine or both is by no means conducive to a deterrent sentence. At least in my view, the sentence for this offence should be up to one year. It should be left to the courts, according to the nature of the offence, to determine what sentence should be imposed. It may go right up to one year. Three months, I suppose, is a very inadequate kind of sentence.

3 P.M.

The main question that arises when considering this Bill is, will the object in view be achieved by presenting this Bill, even if the provisions of this Bill are effectively enforced? I submit, it will not, because there is a paucity at the present moment of such articles as milk and ghee in an unadulterated form. My humble submission is that it should be the duty of the Government to see that milk and ghee are manufactured under their own supervision in such quantities that they can be made available to every adult in the country. Until and unless the Government takes up that responsibility, even the most effective enforcement of this Bill will not serve the purpose. I find that the hon. Minister is very attentively looking at me and listening to my remarks with very great attention. I consider it to be a compliment. My submission will be that as the Government has taken upon itself the responsibility of supplying medicines free to every resident of this country, to every citizen of this country, so it should take the responsibility of supplying pure ghee and pure milk to every citizen of this country. Until and unless that responsibility is taken up, my apprehension is that the object of this Bill will not be served.

So far as the indispensability of milk is concerned, especially for those who are vegetarians—and I submit for non-vegetarians as well—little is necessary for me to be said. I have looked at some figures and I find that even in those countries which are reputed to be non-vegetarian, milk is used in very large quantities. For instance, in Canada 56·8 ounces per head per day is used, in Great Britain 40·7 ounces per head per day, in the United States

of America, 35·6 ounces per head per day and in India, a land which was reputed to be flowing with milk and honey at one time, only 5·8 ounces per head per day. That is a reflection on our so-called veneration for the cow. We grow sometimes enthusiastic in our desire to see that the cow should be protected. But when we look at these figures, we find that it is merely a show. We have to realise that if milk is so necessary for non-vegetarian countries, how much more so should it be necessary for countries as India, which is almost a vegetarian country. With regard to the importance of milk also, the Bhoré Committee Report said:

“Milk contains proteins of high biological value and for this reason its consumption by children and expectant and nursing mothers has to be particularly encouraged. Milk is perhaps the one article of food which can be used by all classes of the population in the country in order to increase protein consumption.”

I would not weary this House by further remarks. I would only submit that I welcome this Bill, but my only grievance is that it does not go as far as the public wants it to go. I do hope that in the Select Committee those shortcomings will be rectified. I am glad to note that although as many as seven hon. Members had tabled motions for the circulation of the Bill, only one hon. Member would like to move it, while the rest have expressed their consent not to press their motions. I hope that that gentleman too would reconsider his decision and would not press for the circulation of the Bill.

सेठ बचल सिंह (जिला आगरा—पश्चिम)
माननीय अध्यक्ष जी, यह जो मिलावट का बिल (Food Adulteration Bill) हमारे सामन पेश किया गया है इस की बहुत जरूरत है, खास कर हिन्दुस्तान जैसे मुल्क के वास्ते जहां कि ज्यादातर लोग मिलावट में विश्वास रखते हैं। हम हिन्दुस्तानियों का चरित्र स्तर इतना गिर गया है कि, हर चीज में मिलावट करते हैं। दूध में क्या, घी में क्या, आटे में क्या, दालों में क्या और दवाइयों में क्या, यहां तक कि अनाज में मिट्टी और कंकर तक मिलाये जाते हैं। यह एक ऐसी प्रथा चल गई है जिस की वजह से हमारे

[सेठ अचल सिंह]

देशवासियों की सेहत का पतन होता जा रहा है। इस बिल में खास बात जो इस में सजा देन की रखी गई है वह तो है ही, लेकिन हम को यह भी प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये कि किस तरह से हमारी जनता का चरित्र अथवा स्तर उठे जिस से कि इस को वह बुरा और पाप समझे। विदेशों में दूध में पानी मिलाना कोई जानता तक नहीं है। लेकिन हमारे देश में दूध में पानी मिलाया जाना मामूली बात है। मक्खन उस में से निकाला जाता है और न जाने क्या क्या बुरे कर्म किये जाते हैं। इस तरह से दूध में, घी में और तेल में मिलावट की जाती है, जिस की वजह से हमारी भारतवासियों की सेहत पर बहुत बुरा असर पड़ता है। आप देखें कि हमारी भारतवासियों की आयु कितनी कम होती जा रही है। जब कि विदेशों में एक इन्सान की औसत उम्र ५४ या ५६ वर्ष है तब हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में २५-२६ वर्ष है। इस का खास कारण यह है कि क्षुद्र पदार्थ खाने को नहीं मिलते। एक तो गरीबी और दूसरे खाने को जो मिलता है वह अक्षुद्र मिलता है, इस लिये हमारे देशवासियों की तन्दुस्ती का पतन होता जा रहा है।

इसलिये जो यह बिल लाया गया है कि मिलावट करने में रुकावटें हों वह बहुत ही आवश्यक है और मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी इस बिल को इस तरह से बनायेगी कि जिस से इस का ठीक ठीक प्रयोग हो सके। मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारे यहां उत्तर प्रदेश में और बहुत से स्टेट्स में अडल्टरेशन ऐक्ट बने हुए हैं। लेकिन फिर भी मिलावट नहीं रुकती है। इस का कारण यह है कि लोकल सैल्फ गवर्नमेंट अर्थात् चुंगियां इस का इन्तजाम करती हैं। उन के जो इन्स्पेक्टर होते हैं वह इतने

निकम्मे और गिरे हुए होते हैं कि मिलावट को रोकने का कोई काम नहीं हो सकता। उन का माहवारी पैसा बंभा हुआ होता है दूध वालों से, घी वालों से, हलवाईयों से, मिठाई का काम करने वालों आदि से। इस कारण तमाम जगह मिलावट चलती है। इस को भी देखना होगा कि इस को कैसे रोक सकते हैं, क्यों कि यहां तो ऊपर से नीचे तक ऐसी हालत पैदा हो गई है कि किस तरह से नाजायज अथवा उठाया जाय। इसलिये मैं चाहूंगा कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी इस बात पर जरूर गौर करे कि इस को कैसे रोका जाय।

अभी हालत यह है कि जो नमूने जांच के लिये भेजे जाते हैं उन तक में गड़बड़ी हो जाती है। इस में जो पहली बार तीन महीने की सजा और दूसरी बार में साल भर तक की सजा रखी है वह ठीक है। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि आज कल स्टेट्स में ज्यादातर लम्बे लम्बे जुमाने होते हैं। दूध में पानी मिलाने पर या मक्खन निकाल कर दूध बेचने पर १०० रुपये से २५० रुपये तक जुमाने होते हैं। लेकिन जब तक सजा नहीं होगी तब तक लोग नहीं डरेंगे। इस लिये डर के साथ साथ हमें जनता के चरित्र अथवा स्तर को, उठाने अथवा जनता के बिचारों को भी सुधारना है ताकि वह इस प्रथा से दूर रहें, क्योंकि इस से न सिर्फ उन्हीं का बल्कि तमाम देश का पतन होता है स्वास्थ्य खराब होता है और उम्र में कमी होती है। तमाम बीमारियां बढ़ती हैं और देशवासियों पर तमाम मुसीबतें आती हैं। आज कल हम देखते हैं कि दवाइयों में भी अडल्टरेशन चल गया है और बहुत सी नकली दवाइयां चल रही हैं। हर किस्म को पेटेंट दवाइयां होती हैं उन की खाली शीशियों में नकली दवा भर कर असली के अनुसार पैकिंग कर के सस्ते दामों में बेच कर जनता को धोखा देते हैं। इस का बहुत बुरा असर मरीज की सेहत पर

पड़ता है। मैंने देखा कि वैपनिंसिलीन की तरह नकली चीज भर देते हैं जादि।

इस बिल का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी इन सब बातों पर विचार करेगी जिस से कि यह मिलावट की बुरी बीमारी जो हमारे देश में जो फैली हुई है, दूर हो सके।

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): This Bill—though a new one as far as this House is concerned—merely replaces and consolidates various State legislations on the subject of adulteration. In spite of several anti-adulteration Acts existing in different States, adulteration has not stopped; rather it has increased. If anyone were to ask me to tell him which articles of food are adulterated, I would turn round and ask him to tell me which articles of food are not adulterated. Go to buy milk; it is mixed with water. Go to buy oil; it is adulterated with white oil; Go to buy ghee; it is mixed with *vanaspati*; Go to buy *vanaspati*; it is mixed with something else. So, it is a matter of speculation how far this legislation, even if it is passed into law, will prevent adulteration so long as there is not a change of heart on the part of those who are engaged in the trade and so long as public opinion tolerates this adulteration.

This question of adulteration is a vast one, but I shall confine myself to the adulteration of ghee with *vanaspati*, which has become a great menace in our country. The first warning about this came from the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture presided over by Lord Linlithgow. The Commission said:

“Many complaints of adulteration of ghee have been sent to us and our attention has been directed to the increasing sale of substitutes known as *vanaspati* ghee.”

The report also expressed the fear that as a result of this adulteration the genuine product would be driven out of the market. Then, Government invited Dr. Wright to advise them on the development of cattle and dairy industries and Dr. Wright in his report gives the following estimate of the mischief done by adulteration of *vanaspati* with ghee:

“It is the opinion of some of the manufacturers that 90 per cent. of the total supplies are used in the

adulteration of ghee.....Adulteration is a very paying proposition for the business merchant.”

According to the latest figures published by Government, the production of *vanaspati* in 1951 was one lakh and 72 thousand tons. Leaving aside Dr. Wright's calculation of 90 per cent., I would assume that only 50 thousand tons, that is 29 per cent. of the total production of *vanaspati*, are used for adulteration of ghee. This means that at least this quantity of *vanaspati* is sold as ghee. The price of *vanaspati* at present is about rupee one per lb. whereas the price of genuine ghee is Rs. 3-8-0 per lb. Calculating the profit for 50,000 lbs. the amount comes to Rs. 38 crores and 50 lakhs. Now, out of the remaining quantity, many people buy *vanaspati* under the impression that it has all the qualities of ghee. As I shall presently show and as everyone knows, *vanaspati* is not in any way superior to any ordinary oil. At any rate, it has not been proved so far that it is superior.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We are not discussing the merits of the adulteration of this article or that article. The point is that adulteration has to be prevented. It may be *vanaspati* or milk or some other edibles. If every hon. Member goes into the history of the adulteration of every article, we shall never see the end of this debate. All that is sought to be done through this measure, is to enact a law which will arm the authorities with sufficient power to deal with adulteration, wherever they come across it. In this view, whatever he says, he is going to “show presently” would be entirely irrelevant.

Shri Dabhi: I would not say any more about it. My only point was that people buy *vanaspati* thinking that it has the qualities of ghee and the value of *vanaspati* sold in this manner is more than rupees seven crores. Thus, people are defrauded of a large sum of money.

Clause 2(ix)(e) of this Bill defines what is a misbranded article, that is, if false claims are made for it upon the label or otherwise. Anybody who sells a misbranded article can be punished. The *vanaspati* dealers are cheating the people by making false claims for their article. I want to illustrate how they do this.

A Bill for the prohibition of *vanaspati* was introduced in this House some-time back by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. A similar Bill was introduced by me in the Bombay Legis-

[Shri Dabhi]

lative Assembly in 1950. At that time these *vanaspati* manufacturers were so much alarmed that they began to issue several pamphlets extolling to the skies the qualities of *vanaspati*. I have with me several leaflets issued by the *vanaspati* manufacturers of India. How these people make false statements and how they make false claims, I would show to this House by reading a few extracts from one of these pamphlets. In one of the pamphlets they refer to a statement said to have been made by the hon. Food Minister, Shri Jairamdas Daulatram, on the 8th December 1949, in Parliament:

"As a result of the experiments carried on at Government laboratories and research stations, it has been proved conclusively that *vanaspati* is nutritive and wholesome."

So, this pamphlet says that Government had declared on the floor of this House that *vanaspati* was nutritive and wholesome. I say that this is altogether a false statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What is the point which the hon. Member is driving at? There is no *vanaspati* Bill before the House now—I do not know whether one is coming at a future date.

If he comes to the subject matter of this Bill, I shall allow him to proceed. If, on the other hand, he goes on referring to adulteration of this or that article and the methods adopted by them, or the false propoganda carried on by the manufacturers or merchants, I cannot permit him to do so. We are not out here to establish how *vanaspati* is adulterated, what are the proper methods to see that adulteration does not proceed and so on. That is not the subject before the House at present. At that rate we can go into the details of adulteration of every article of human consumption or use. We cannot do it on this Bill.

Shri Dabhi: May I make a submission, Sir? I am not going to point out how adulteration is carried on. Clause 2(ix)(e) of the Bill gives the definition of misbranded articles, which is made punishable.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 2 (ix) defines "misbranded".

Shri Dabhi: It is stated that if any false claims are made for any article of food, then it is an offence. I only want to show how false claims are

made by the manufacturers of *vanaspati*. They go to the extent of quoting what was not at all said by Government.

Mr. Speaker: But then such claims are made not only with reference to *vanaspati*, but with reference to many other things which are in the market. So I will not allow any discussion on that point. It is unnecessarily taking up the time of the House. He may now speak on the Bill.

Shri Dabhi: I only wanted to say that the hon. Minister never said what he is alleged to have said.

Mr. Speaker: We are not at present concerned with that. If false claims are made, it is for the hon. Minister to take care of himself and the public. What the hon. Member is going into refers to execution or administration of this Bill. It is not administration with which we are concerned at present.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Dabhi: Sir, the point which I was going to make was that though certain articles of food like *vanaspati* have no claims to nutritive value.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no purpose in violating a ruling of the Chair. I am only appealing to the hon. Member to come to the subject. The hon. Speaker told me just now that he is not allowing details to be gone into about adulteration.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Can we not cite certain commodities for the sake of illustrating our remark?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But if the whole speech is about that commodity?

Shri S. S. More: The information is very useful from the point of view of purchasers of *vanaspati*.

Shri Dabhi: What I wanted to prove was that the manufacturers and dealers in *vanaspati* make false claims about *vanaspati*'s nutritive value, though nobody has proved it. The utmost that has been admitted is that it is not injurious to health, as compared with ordinary oil and that too if the temperature is not beyond 37°C. So several false claims are made and the ignorant purchasers are made to feel that they are buying genuine ghee.

I would only give one instance of how *vanaspati* itself is being adulterated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why is the hon. Member so fond of *vanaspati*? Let him come to *towns-pati*!

Shri Dabhi: Sir, this is a new point and one which has never been brought to the notice of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Vanaspati is not the only food article. I am sure this Bill applies to the adulteration of all articles of food. What is the good of going into details as to how vanaspati can be adulterated or of saying that some people take it for ghee? If they want to deceive themselves by all means let them do so. But why should we get into all those details regarding vanaspati? Some time back there was the *Vanaspati Bill* and they wanted to introduce colouring to vanaspati and so on. But this is not the *Vanaspati Bill*. I will not allow any more reference to vanaspati so far as this Bill is concerned.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): May I humbly submit, Sir, that your ruling that any more reference to vanaspati by any other Member will be rather too much?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have said so far as this Member is concerned. He has said enough about vanaspati.

Shri Dabhi: Sir, I will only say one sentence.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nothing more. He need not repeat it. He may keep that sentence for himself.

Shri Dabhi: I am not going to repeat. I am merely going to say.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will not allow a reference to vanaspati once again. There is no meaning in it.

Shri Dabhi: Even in respect of several other articles of food which the dealers proclaim as good and healthy it has been found that they are adulterated. Take *nakli ghee* for instance. Now it is proved that it is adulterated. But thousands of gullible people thought that at least this was pure. Still these things are being adulterated. That was what I was arriving at.

Though this Bill will not I am afraid, stop articles of food being adulterated—because, as I said in the beginning of my speech, such Acts are in force in several States, but still the same thing is going on—still I would suggest certain amendments as far as this Bill goes. If we want to make at least a little more effective than the other Acts which are in force today in the States, my first suggestion is with regard to clause 2 (ix) (e). It reads "if false claims are made for it upon the label or otherwise". This clause says that if false claims are

made regarding any article of food, that article of food would be deemed to be misbranded, and the punishment is provided for those false claims. My suggestion is that it should be made clear in this sub-clause or some explanation should be added to it to the effect that when any claim is made in respect of any article of food the burden of proving that claim must lie on the person who makes that claim. Because, in these cases of adulteration, as I have already said, the dealers in different articles of food make false claims, and it is very difficult to prove that they have made false claims. So my suggestion is that if they make any claim, then the burden of proof must lie upon them to show that the claims they make are real. I would commend this amendment to the Select Committee which is going to be appointed, and I hope that in this matter at least the Select Committee would have no soft corner for those people who are in the habit of adulterating these articles of food.

I had to say several things about this but I have no time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Many opportunities will occur. The hon. Member need not despair so soon. I think the hon. Member has nothing more to say. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.

Shri Dabhi: At last I hope that the Select Committee will accept this amendment which has been suggested by me and thus save the people from being cheated by putting the burden of proving that particular claim that the article is good, upon the person who makes that claim.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I welcome this Bill. I congratulate the Government for having brought this measure although so late in the day. But, as I stated in regard to the Bill on Forward Contracts, my complaint is that the Bill does not go far enough. The Bill is such that it will not even touch the fringe of the problem. Today what do we see? In ordinary foods, for instance in ghee, milk, *atta*, in medicines, in rice, in everything I should say, we find that the articles are adulterated. Even in regard to medicines, instead of quinine we get chalk. In regard even to other kinds of medicines which are said to be patented, even there, there are spurious medicines. If this evil was rampant only in the cities, the appointment of a few more public analysts in the States, or, so far as the Centre is concerned, the appointment of a Central Committee and a Central analyst may be enough. But here what do we find? If we go to the villages, even in the villages it

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

is impossible to find unadulterated ghee today. It is impossible to find even unadulterated milk because in the villages also adulteration is practised. Previously nobody sold any milk. Now butter is taken away and the *chach* (butter-milk) is being sold in the villages which, 25 years ago, one could not dream of.

Now, my friend was speaking of *vanaspati* and the hon. Deputy-Speaker was pleased to tell him that he need not make any reference to *vanaspati*. I will not go into the details of *vanaspati*. At the same time I would submit that this Bill does not go far enough. With respect to *vanaspati*, the point is this. After all what is the difficulty? The Government themselves, the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Food, the hon. Deputy Minister of Food, all gave assurances in this House and decided that so far as *vanaspati* is concerned, they will see that it is coloured. They told us that they will ask all the eight laboratories of which they are so proud to find out some colour. They said they would ask all the scientists in India to find out some colour. I was given to understand by the greatest scientist of India that within a year, he will be able to find a colour.

An Hon. Member: Who is that scientist?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Dr. Bhatnagar.

The Government of Bombay, when it passed the Bill, gave an assurance to the local Council that they would colour the stuff. Then again the Government of Bombay also made a suggestion to the Government of India that it would be coloured in a particular way, the Punjab also passed legislation that it should be coloured in a particular way. A Ghee Adulteration Committee was appointed. I was also a member of that Committee. We made recommendations. We knew that the colour was not found in spite of the assurances of the scientists that they would be able to find one. They have not been able to find one. I cannot say that the scientists failed and there is bankruptcy of scientific knowledge so far as scientists are concerned in this matter but at the same time I know that the manufacturing interests are very very strong and so far we have not been able to find a colour. I do not know when in future we will be able to find a colour. What is the difficulty? The then hon. Minister, Shri Jairamdas Daulatram made a

speech here and those persons who are interested in this *vanaspati* published in posters that *vanaspati* is nutritious. I approached the then Minister of Food, Shri Munshiji, to take action because I knew that Shri Jairamdas Daulatram never made such a statement. The statement was ascribed as having been made in this House by him though it was never made in this House. Then many *vanaspati* factories ascribed certain remarks to Mr. Gupta, an hon. Minister of U.P. He came out in the Press and said this was all bogus and that he had never made such remarks. I approached the hon. Minister. He said he is helpless, he cannot do anything.

I am glad that the definition of misbranding is there and it may be possible to bring such persons to book but how will those persons be brought to book? We know that even in regard to small matters, in regard to an offence under section 323 I.P.C. and other sections every person in this land has got a right to go to a court and bring the offender to book. In almost all matters this is the rule. It is only very few offences in regard to which a person is not allowed to go to a court and bring the offender to book but for this particular offence, this heinous offence—supposing a person gives poison—I cannot bring the offender to book. It is the local Government, it is the State Government which may bring the offender to book. I would therefore submit that so far as this aspect of the case is concerned, I would beg of the Select Committee kindly to consider whether they can see that this ban on private complaint is taken away. When a person slaps somebody else he can be brought to book and when a man gives to another a wrong medicine, when he gives him something which is not what it is claimed to be, I think, it is a good case in which a private man should have the right to go to a court and bring the offender to book.

I was submitting that our nation lives in villages. Where are those public analysts to be found? Our experience today is that people in the towns also do not want to take *vanaspati* and yet there are no arrangements by which they can find out if there is adulteration. Now they say public analysts have been appointed. I would submit that there are no laboratories in the villages. No person can find out whether there is adulteration or not. How will these persons be protected? Government is not meant for cities alone. If you want that the

system should work you should appoint public analysts at least in each district so that the people may be able to take advantage of them. I will go further and say that this adulteration business is not confined to cities only. All the evils which are found in the cities are also to be found in the villages.

Again, my submission is we ought not to see that a law is just made. After all these laws have been in existence in the Provinces for a very long time but with what effect? These laws are not enforced. Nobody takes care to enforce these laws. Then, again, so far as these laws are concerned, wherever they have been used, they have been used for getting money out of innocent people, they have been misused, they have been abused to a very large extent. What happens? A food inspector in league with certain merchants gets hold of a sample from a railway station and then in the presence of a bogus person who is said to be a representative of the manufacturer, a sample is taken and the stuff is allowed to be sold by the consignee. He sells everything. He is thereby saved. Then a case is launched against the manufacturer. I know several such cases in which these inspectors make money. They just prosecute some people, manufacturers, etc. So far as this Act or any other Act is concerned, we should see that it is not abused. In regard to this I would beg the Select Committee kindly to consider some suggestions which I propose to make. In the first place I would like that some period should be made compulsory by which time the analysts should be able to give their opinion. Supposing a sample is sent today. Opinion is given after three months. The whole thing should be finished within fifteen days. That is my opinion.

Again, I find that a food inspector is entitled to take a sample. I find it in clause 11. I find that there are not enough safeguards by virtue of which an innocent person can be protected from the tyrannies which a food inspector is able to exercise under this Bill. For instance, when we take samples it is not necessary that the person from whose possession the sample is taken should be there. He is not asked to sign anything. This will not inspire confidence. The food inspector, in the absence of the person, takes a sample of the thing, whose possession is ascribed to him, and he sends it to the public analyst. It is not unusual to find that these inspectors themselves put in linseed and

other oils in the mustard oil sent by some manufacturers to various places and then they prosecute them. I would rather like that the provisions of section 103 of the Criminal Procedure Code, as they apply to searches, taking possession of stolen articles, etc., or taking objectionable articles in possession may be applied to this case also. When the food inspector is taking a sample of any article, it should be made obligatory that first of all he ought to inform the person against whom that sample is taken, and who is going to be prosecuted, so that he or some other authorised agent—not an ordinary agent—may be present there. Now, the practice is, he himself asks some spurious person to come and in his presence the sample is taken. The manufacturer then comes and says, this is not my authorised man. The House knows the practice of the merchants. When they send goods from Kanpur or Allahabad to Calcutta, the Railway receipt is practically negotiable, and it is transferred by one person to another and then to a third man. The money has already been taken so that the consignor is not the person fully interested when the consigned article reaches the destination. Therefore, it should be made obligatory upon any person who wants to take a sample out of the manufactured goods to see that the really authorised person or representative of the person in whose possession ultimately the goods are, is present.

Shri S. S. More: Will you please see clause 11?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Clause 11 says that three samples should be taken and one given to that man. The question, first of all, relates to the identity of that person. Usually, nowadays it so happens that the food inspector, in league with the merchants of the place, just puts up a person who is not the real representative. The merchant does not lose; the goods are sold. They go after the manufacturer, because he is supposed to have sent the goods. They prosecute the man. He says, that person is not his representative. That is the difficulty. I do not know whether the hon. Member who has interrupted has.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It says, "..... deliver one of the parts to the person from whom the sample has been taken".

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: My humble submission is this. When the sample is taken from, say, a railway wagon in Calcutta, you must ensure that the person to whom the sample

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava] is given is the right person. If a spurious person is there what happens? Even if you give a sample, what does it matter?

Shri S. S. More: Now, Dalda is being sold all over the country. How could an authorised person of the manufacturer be produced at that time?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: My hon. friend has taken another example. The example that I wanted to give is not covered by his example. So far as Dalda is concerned, the hon. Member talks to me about Dalda. What do the Dalda people do? It is mixed with marine oil. It is said to be vanaspati and it is sold to the people. No Hindu will take it if he knew that. Do you know what Mahatma Gandhi said about vanaspati? He said, it is neither vanaspati nor ghee. It is a counterfeit ghee.

Shri S. S. More: I am afraid, the hon. Member has misunderstood me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. More has been misunderstood. What he wanted to say was, a person sells Dalda in one corner of India and if you have to trace the person who sold it to him, it will be impossible to prosecute anybody. The man who is there on the spot will be taken to represent.

Shri S. S. More: That is exactly my point.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: So far as manufactured goods are concerned, who will be liable therefor? They are made in a factory. Their case is quite different. Take for instance, til oil or mustard oil.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the harm? So long, food has been adulterated. Let the prosecution also be adulterated. For some time, it is likely to hit hard strangers. But, they will pay the penalty for all the past deeds. What is the harm if the pendulum swings a little to the other side?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I want the right person to be prosecuted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nobody will be prosecuted.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Today hundreds of people are being prosecuted who are not guilty.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In which case, this Bill would have been unnecessary. If they have been prosecuted regularly, this Bill would not have been necessary at all. Many people escape.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Who is being prosecuted? The man who produces the thing is not prosecuted; the man who passed off the thing as good is not prosecuted; but the man who manufactures the oil in the factory at Kanpur or Allahabad is prosecuted at Calcutta on the basis that there is argemone in this oil. It is not proved that he is responsible for it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him prove it.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Another person is being prosecuted.

Shri S. S. More: Supposing he is wrongly prosecuted, he can prove his innocence.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am afraid my hon. friend has come out with another preposterous proposition, when he tells me that when a person is being prosecuted, he ought to prove his innocence. He should think twice before making such a proposition.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The manufacturer in Lucknow, whose article is sold somewhere in Calcutta is not so dumb or mute or helpless as not to be able to prove his case and produce evidence.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I was submitting that a sample is taken when the man is not there and he is not rightly represented.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How could he be?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Why not? This is the rule that we must have. This clause also requires that the third part of the sample must be given to him. What is the rule in regard to stolen property? The man must be there. Two respectable persons must be there. After all, what is the food inspector? He is like a sub-inspector of police. They do the same nefarious thing. It so happens that in Calcutta a sample is taken in the absence of the man. The manufacturer is either in Kanpur or Allahabad. He is quite helpless, because when the sample is taken, he puts something and himself adulterates the stuff and then demands Rs. 300, or 20,000 for a bribe. I am aware of such cases.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the sub-inspector so greedy as to ask for 20,000? I can understand 200 rupees.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It so happens. Perhaps our experiences are different. I know food inspectors and

judges who charge thousands in bribe. I know police people who charge much more than two hundred or two thousand.

I was submitting anyhow—we are not concerned with what they charge—that we should make this Bill fool-proof in the sense that innocent persons should not be troubled. When I speak about this, I shall come to the other clause also—it is a point on which I have been speaking in this House—that is offences by companies. The same old thing is repeated in this Bill also. It is not fair. My opinion is this habit of adulterated prosecution, as you have been pleased to say—I thank you for the phrase—is extremely bad. If you want to stop something, go in for the right man and punish him. You want to proceed against the real offender; but you make every man, be he a director or anybody else, who has nothing to do with that part of the business, liable. I think you will be erring in allowing such prosecutions and you will be allowing something which is like adulterated food itself.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How is it possible to find out who is the man? There are so many people.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am reminded of a story; you also know the story. The saying is:

अन्धेर नगरी चौपट राजा, टके सेर भाजी
टके सेर खाजा ।

Because my neck is fat enough, I should be hanged; I would suit the gallows. Is that possible? If you cannot find the real offender, do not prosecute anybody. You cannot prosecute innocent people for the purpose of finding out who the guilty man is.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): He may be an accomplice.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: You can make him a scape-goat also. How can you prosecute an innocent person and find a third person guilty? Have you heard anything like that? In this Bill and other cognate Acts, when you want to prosecute company people they are allowed to themselves prosecute scape-goats or other people. I do not hold any brief for company people. I want these big people to be brought to book: but not in this manner, when the thing cannot be proved against them. I was submitting that so far as this is concerned, I would rather like that some safeguards were found out by the Select Committee in taking samples etc.

4 P.M.

Then, again, we find that in clause 12 the words used are:

“A purchaser of any article of food other than a food inspector shall be entitled etc.....”

I would like that this right should be given to the members of the public whether they are purchasers or not because after all, a man pays for getting the analysis made. So, any person should be allowed to have this right, not the purchaser alone.

Dr. M. M. Das (Burdwan—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Unless he purchases, how will he get the thing?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Purchase is not the only method by which a person gets into possession of articles. There are many other modes. The only point is whether the article is adulterated or not, not how one gets it. Suppose I am given food for the purpose of being poisoned, without my purchasing it, am I not entitled to get it analysed? So, I would like the Select Committee to consider this point of giving this right to every person.

My hon. friend was speaking about *vanaspati*. I have got every sympathy with him because he was not allowed to have his full say. There are certain articles, *vanaspati* for instance, which are often being adulterated. Instead of using *vanaspati* for adulteration of ghee, people are using motor oil, white oil etc., for adulterating *vanaspati*. What is going to be done to them, I want to know.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is such kind of adulteration exempted under this Bill? This applies to it.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Supposing this Bill is not passed, have we not got provisions even today for prosecuting people? The point is: have they got the facility? Supposing in a village, this motor oil is being used for adulterating *vanaspati*, what can the villager do? Where can he go? How can he find out? For the meanest persons you must provide these facilities if you are really serious, in considering that this adulteration should not affect him. Of course, adulteration is now far too rampant to be tackled. I think it is only in a very small degree that we will be able to tackle the evil with this Bill. The real evil can be tackled only by the Government having a propaganda to raise the moral standards of people, that they should not mix these things. When we go on like this, when we allow forward contracts and allow

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

every person to gamble and allow our national character to deteriorate, I do not know what is the use of bringing this Bill. Unless people realise that they should not mix these things and adulterate, the trouble will not be solved.

It has just been said by some friend of mine that here the dietary value of food is very much less than in other countries. In other countries, 2,000 calories is the usual value of food, whereas in India some people are getting 1,000 or 1,200 calories. When even things like *chhachh* and milk are adulterated, we do not know what we are coming to. I may submit for the consideration of the Government that in regard to certain matters, they ought to take more stringent action and see that the standards of food are not allowed to deteriorate. My friend was speaking of ghee, milk etc. These are ordinary things which are adulterated, and my friends are perfectly right in pointing this out. What do we care if some patent medicine like streptomycin is adulterated? Not that it is not harmful, but at the same time it is used by a microscopic number of people. So far as milk and ghee are concerned, they are very important. In 1935 ghee was produced in the country to the tune of 240 lakh maunds; in 1940, it came down to 140 lakh maunds, and in 1945, it came down further to 111 lakh maunds.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The deficit is made up by adulteration.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Quite right, Sir. What do those who are charged with our destiny say about this? So far as the poor men in Madras, in Bengal and in Bihar are concerned, if they go on using *vanaspati*, they are bound to deteriorate in health. Government is losing a revenue of Rs. 450 lakhs, and they would not touch *vanaspati* with a pair of tongs. Government appointed a committee, and the committee submitted a unanimous report that carrotine concentrate should be allowed to be mixed with *vanaspati*, and Government brushed aside that report without saying a word about it. Every municipality, every cantonment and every local authority should have an obligation placed upon it that it shall not allow *vanaspati* to be sold unless the Baudoin test is applied.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why not the hon. Member serve on the Select Committee? There is the list here. With his number of suggestions and experience, he will be useful on the Select

Committee, and Government may be willing to include his name.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: No, Sir, I am not placed in this Committee.

Shri Velayudhan: It is rather unfortunate.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is fortunate for me, and fortunate for those who have prepared this list. Mr. Guha's name is nowhere put down. I do not mind whether I am in the Committee or not. I am here before you and I have got the right to say what I have to say. I do not care to sit on any committee.

I am glad that the Government has come forward with this Bill, but at the same time it should be enforced in such a manner that innocent people are not clapped in. The difficulty is that when an evil is very great, people do not distinguish between the right man and the wrong man, and innocent people are troubled for nothing. I would therefore like that all these safeguards and provisions which are usually found in the penal laws should be introduced in this Bill. It should be seen that the sample is taken rightly and the identity of the person who signs the report is established, and we should be able to see that the actual guilty persons are there. If ordinary things are adulterated, perhaps the harm is not very great, but there are certain things which are poisonous. If these adulterated things are taken, the consequences, I should say, will be very great. In regard to that punishment does not seem to be commensurate with the offence. I therefore think that if a person's life is endangered or other serious consequences follow as a result of taking adulterated foodstuffs, the punishment meted out to the offender should be commensurate with the enormity of the offence.

INDUSTRIAL FINANCE CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I understand from the hon. Minister that with reference to the Industrial Finance Corporation, about 200 copies of the report are now made available. Fifty copies will be placed in the Library, and 150 copies will be available in the Notice Office. Any hon. Member who wants to look into it and have a copy will be furnished with a copy.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Report No. 4?