

PROCEEDINGS  
of  
**THE TRAVANCORE SRI MULAM ASSEMBLY**  
SECOND ASSEMBLY.  
TENTH SESSION.

*Friday, the 5th December 1941/20th Vrischiga n 1117.*

The Assembly met again in the Legislative Chamber, Public Offices at Eleven of the Clock with Sachivottama Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar K. C. S. I., K. C. I. E., LL. D., the Dewan-President in the Chair.

MEMBERS SWORN.

The following members took the oath and signed the Rolls.  
Messrs.

1. K. Madhava Kurup (*Director of Registration.*)
2. K. P. Padmanabha Menon (*Electrical Engineer.*)
3. Dr. H. Parameswaran (*Controller of Yarn Supplies.*)
4. E. G. Salter (*Director of Transport*)
5. S. N. Ure (*Public Service Commissioner*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

*District Court, Mavelikara.*

26. \*MR. P. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Mavelikara cum Kunnattur*):  
Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether any site has been acquired for constructing a building for the District Court at Mavelikara; and
- (b) if not, the action taken on the same?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Legal Remembrancer to Government*): (a) No.

- (b) Steps are being taken for the acquisition of a suitable site.

*Civil Courts at Mavelikara.*

27. \*MR. P. NARAYANA PILLAI: Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they have received any representations for enlarging the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts at Mavelikara;
- (b) if so, whether any action is taken on the same, and
- (c) if not, the reasons for the same?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: (a) Yes.

(b) The High Court have carefully considered the question in all its aspects and have arrived at the conclusion that it would be premature at present to revise the territorial jurisdiction of civil courts which was revised only very recently.

- (c) Does not arise in view of the answer to part (b).

**MR. P. NARAYANA PILLAI:** May I know whether there is any objection in considering the question of re-transferring some of the pakuthies of the Mavelikara Taluk to the Munsiff's Court at Mavelikara?

**MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI:** The answer is given in part (b) of the answer.

*Sale of printed maps by the Survey Department.*

28. \* **MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN** (*Kunnathnad cum Parur*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether, in view of the notification regarding the sale of printed maps published on page 16 of the Survey Department Sheet of the Government Gazette dated the 7th Kanni 1117, wherein it is stated that the sale of Pakuthi maps (scale 16"—1 mile) has been arranged for at 14 chs. per square mile or portion thereof, sheets of Pakuthi maps representing one square mile or portion of it will be supplied separately at 14 chs. per sheet;

(b) if not, the reasons for not supplying the maps separately; and

(c) whether any question has on any previous occasion been asked in regard to this matter in the Sri Mulam Assembly by any member and, if so, what answer was furnished to such questions and what action has been taken in the matter?

**MR. K. KUNJAN PILLAI** (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): (a) The question is under consideration.

(b) This does not arise in view of the answer to part (a).

(c) Yes. *Vide* answer to interpellation No. 101 published at pages 252 in Vol. XV—4 of the Proceedings of the Sri Mulam Assembly.

**MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN:** പകുതി മാപ്പസ് പല ഷീറ്റായിട്ടാണ് കൊടുക്കുന്നത്. ഓരോ ഷീറ്റും തിരിച്ചുകൊടുക്കാൻ ഭയപ്പെടുകയോ?

**MR. K. KUNJAN PILLAI:** ഉത്തരത്തിൽ തന്നെ ആ സംഗതി ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ആലോചനയിൽ ഇരിക്കുകയാണെന്ന് പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്.

**MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN:** ഈ സംഗതി ഇതിനു മുൻപ് ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ട്രഷ്യറിയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

**MR. K. KUNJAN PILLAI:** ഉണ്ട്. ഇപ്പോഴും അത് ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ആലോചനയിലിരിക്കുകയാണ്.

*Transport Department.*

29. \* **MR. KANNANTHODATH JANARDANAN NAIR** (*Karunagapalli cum Kartikapalli*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of capital invested for the Transport Department till the end of 1116;

(b) the total amount with Government as depreciation fund and such other funds till the end of 1116;

(c) the rate of interest charged on the investment; and  
 (d) whether interest is charged and levied on the total amount invested?

**MR. E. G. SALTER** (*Director of Transport*):

- (a) Rs. 10,94,113-13-7.
- (b) Rs. 5,35,950-19-2.
- (c) 4 %.
- (d) Yes.

**MR. KANNANTHODATH JANARDANAN NAIR**: With reference to answer to part (b), may I know whether interest charged on the 5 lakhs and odd rupees is credited to the Transport Department?

**MR. E. G. SALTER**: No, Sir. No interest is allowed on the depreciation funds.

**MR. PADIYARA JOSEPH KUNJU**: മമ്മന-ൽ ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിനു ആകെ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്ന വരവെന്താണെന്ന് പ്രസ്താവിക്കുവാൻ ഭയപ്പെടാകുമോ?

**MR. E. G. SALTER**: I have no information before me.

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH** (*Vaikom cum Kottayam*): May I know what is the percentage set apart for depreciation funds every year?

**MR. E. G. SALTER**: It depends on the items to which it refers. Depreciation of rolling stock is fixed at 25%, for machinery and tools at 15 per cent. and on buildings at 5 per cent.

**MR. PADIYARA JOSEPH KUNJU**: മൂലധനത്തിന്റെ പലിശ മറ്റു ചിലവുകൾ ഇതെല്ലാം നീക്കി മമ്മന-ൽ ഏതു ലാഭമുണ്ടായിരുന്നു എന്ന് പറയാമോ?

**PRESIDENT**: That does not arise.

*Public Service Special Examination, 1117.*

30. **\*MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR** (*Tovula cum Agastisvaram*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the total number of Nadar candidates that appeared for the recent Public Service Special Examination (on 11th Kanni 1117);
- (b) (i) the names of graduate candidates;
- (ii) the names of under-graduates; and
- (c) will the Government be pleased to lay on the table the names of them in the order of their merit?

**MR. S. N. URE** (*Public Service Commissioner*): (a) 19.

(b) (i) C. Ponnuswamy Nadar.

(ii) All those mentioned in the answer to part (c) of the question, except C. Ponnuswamy Nadar, No. 6.

(c) Clerks. 20-25.

- 1 M. Brahmakrishna Nadar
- 2 A. Brahmanandaswamy Nadar
- 3 D. Devasikhamoni
- 4 K. Rajamma



[Mr. K. Narayanaperumal Nadar.]

- 5 S. Ponnnumoni Nadar
- 6 C. Ponnuswamy Nadar
- 7 K. Masanamuthu Nadar
- 8 T. A. Padmabhai
- 9 K. Rajamoni Nadar
- 10 K. Chellappan
- 11 N. Nallathampi
- 12 K. Gnanamuthu Nadar
- 13 A. Natarajan
- 14 C. Kolappan
- 15 S. Swami Nadar
- 16 S. Thankian
- 17 C. Ratnaswamy
- 18 S. Chelliah

*Clerk-typist, 20-25.*

- 1 T. Chinnakkon Nadar.

*Communal Holidays.*

31. \* MR. G. VELU PILLAI (*Karunagapalli cum Kartikapalli*); Will the Government be pleased to state whether, they have received any representation from the Travancore Advocates Association requesting Government to abolish communal holidays?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): The answer is in the affirmative.

MR. G. VELU PILLAI: May I know whether Government propose to take any action on the same?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: Government are proposing to constitute a small committee comprised of representatives of both the Houses of Legislature to consider the question of holidays with particular reference to communal and partial holidays.

MR. P. S. MUHAMMED കമ്മ്യൂണൽ ഹാളിഡേസ് എന്നു പറയുന്നതു സ്റ്റേഷ്യൽ ഹാളിഡേസ് ആണോ?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: പണ്ടു മുസുലിം, ക്രിസ്ത്യൻ ഈ സമുദായങ്ങൾക്കായി പ്രത്യേകം കൊടുക്കുന്ന ഒഴിവു ദിവസമാണ്.

PRESIDENT: Order. Order. It has been really on account of the lack of interest evinced by the honourable members of the two Houses that this matter has not been settled before. The Government's idea has been and will be to have as few sectional and communal holidays as possible because such communal and sectional holidays have often served to dislocate business very badly. For instance, during a Hindu holiday, in some offices, a large number of officers and subordinates are unable to be present, with the result that the general business suffers. In other localities the same will be the case during a Christian holiday. Therefore, it is considered advisable by Government to

have very very few sectional holidays but to have a large and representative category of public holidays. As a matter of fact I have been waiting after the decision of Government on communal holidays was announced to hear the views of this House in this matter. But this House has not taken the initiative and I am going to ask this House to select 4 members to consider the question along with 3 members from the other House, and one or two officials. They will deliberate during the next few days and finish the matter so that orders may soon be issued.

*The Transport Department.*

32. \*MR. KANNANTHODATH JANARDANAN NAIR: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Transport Advisory Committee recommended to Government that the Transport Department should be made permanent from 1st Chingom 1117; and

(b) what action was taken by them in the matter?

MR. E. G. SALTER: (a) Yes.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

*Yarn imported into Travancore.*

33. \*MR. P. NARAYANA PILLAI: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) the total quantity of yarn imported into this country during 1115; and

(b) the quantity of yarn imported during 1116?

DR. H. PARAMESWARAN (*Controller of Yarn Supplies*):

(a) 28,21,458 lbs.

(b) 25,50,352 lbs.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN (*Quilon cum Kottarakara*): May I know, with reference to part (b) of the answer, why the quantity of yarn imported during 1116 was less than in 1115?

DR. H. PARAMESWARAN: I have no information, Sir.

*Supply of cotton yarn to weavers.*

34. \*MR. S. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Quilon cum Kottarakara*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether they have received representations complaining about the insufficiency of the quantity of cotton yarn available to hand-loom weavers; and

(b) what, if any, action has been taken on the complaints referred to in part (a)?

DR. H. PARAMESWARAN: (a) Yes.

(b) Necessary arrangements have been made to ensure an adequate supply of cotton yarn to hand-loom weavers.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: May I know, with reference to part (b) of the answer, what are the arrangements that were made?

**DR. H. PARAMESWARAN:** Government have arranged for a further supply and such supplies have been received from various sources. We stand now assured of a further supply of 1800 bales till the month of July 1942.

*Control of the prices of cotton yarn.*

35. \***MR. KANNANTHODATH JANARDANAN NAIR:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they have controlled the prices of cotton yarn;
- (b) the price or prices fixed by the Controller;
- (c) whether yarn is at present sold at that price; and
- (d) what steps have they taken to assure that the consumers will get the required quantity?

**DR. H. PARAMESWARAN:** (a) Yes;

(b) \* A copy of notification R. O. C. No. 341/41/C. F. S. dated the 25th August 1941, containing the information is laid on the table;

(c) Yes; and

(d) Arrangements have been made with the Madara Mills and others in the matter for the supply of the required yarn.

**MR. KANNANTHODATH JANARDANAN NAIR:** May I know whether there are complaints from the people of Chathanoor, Paravoor and Quilon to the effect that they do not get the required quantity of yarn?

**DR. H. PARAMESWARAN:** I have no information of such complaints, Sir. We have received stray complaints and they have been attended to as soon as they were received.

**MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN:** May I know whether there have been complaints that the sale of yarn was withheld by merchants?

**DR. H. PARAMESWARAN:** Very very few complaints were received and the aggrieved party was directed to the nearest authorities concerned to get their complaints redressed.

**MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN:** Is there any instruction issued to the local authorities to attend to such complaints?

**DR. H. PARAMESWARAN:** Instructions have been issued.

**PRESIDENT:** They are not always understood by the local authorities, especially in Quilon.

*Travancore University Graduates.*

36. \***MR. G. VELU PILLAI:** Will the Government be pleased to state whether they are giving any preference to Travancore University graduates in the matter of appointment to Government service?

**MR. S. N. URE:** The answer is in the negative.

**MR. K. G. GOVINDAN (Pattanamtitta):** May I know whether Government will consider the question of giving preference to the graduates of the Travancore University in the matter of appointment?

**MR. S. N. URE:** Yes, Sir.

**MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (Changanacherry cum Peer-made):** May I know the reason why the graduates of the Travancore University are not given preference in the matter of appointments?

\* Vide Appendix I, page 103.



**MR. S. N. URE :** There is no particular reason.

**PRESIDENT :** There are only a few from our University turned out as graduates. They are now less than 150. When we get the number swelled up to 400 or 500, certainly they will be preferred.

**MR. P. SIVARAMA PILLAI** (*Meenachil cum Thodupuzha*): Sir, in other Provinces their University graduates are given preference.

**PRESIDENT :** Because they have got a sufficient number of graduates. When we also have graduates turned out from our University in sufficient numbers, steps will have to be taken to give preference to the products of our University. At present it may be premature. That is the only reason.

*Supply of electricity to Chengannur.*

37. \***MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI** (*Tiruvalla*): Will the Government be pleased to state :

(a) the action taken for the supply of electricity to Chengannur; and

(b) whether representations have been received by the Electrical Chief Engineer regarding the matter and the steps taken thereon?

**MR. K. P. PADMANABHA MENON** (*Electrical Engineer to Government*): (a) An estimate has recently been sanctioned by Government for this work, which will be taken up for execution after all the materials required for the same are received.

(b) Yes. The member is referred to the answer to part (a) above.

*Qualifications for certain appointments in the Survey Department.*

38. \***MR. S. GOVINDA PILLAI** (*Chirayinkil cum Nedumangad*): Will the Government be pleased to state the qualifications fixed for the Head Draftsman, different grades of draftsmen, Head Surveyor and different grades of Surveyors in the Survey Department?

**MR. K. KUNJAN PILLAI :** A \*statement containing the information is laid on the table.

*Surveyors and Draftsmen in the Survey Department.*

39. \***MR. S. GOVINDA PILLAI :** Will the Government be pleased to state :

(a) whether there are men without the prescribed qualifications amongst the Surveyors and Draftsmen in the Survey Department :

(b) whether persons without necessary qualifications are exempted; and

(c) whether such exemptions apply to first appointments or to future promotions?

**MR. K. KUNJAN PILLAI :** (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) The exemption applies to first appointment, but not to promotions to posts for which higher qualifications are prescribed.

\* *Vide* Appendix II, page 104.

*Under-graduates in the Survey Department.*

40. \*MR. S. GOVINDA PILLAI: Will the Government be pleased to place on the table a list of the under-graduates in the Survey Department with their qualifications?

MR. K. KUNJAN PILLAI: A Statement furnishing the information is laid on the Secretary's table.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, from the answer given to Question No. 38, it is seen to be stated that the statement is placed on the table. But the answer to question No. 40 states that the statement is placed on the Secretary's table. May I know why this distinction is shown with regard to the two statements?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, because the statement which was stated to be placed on the Secretary's table is very long it was not possible to get it printed in time to be circulated among the honourable members.

PRESIDENT: 'Laid on the table' means laid on the table of each honourable member.

*Vacancies in the Lower Division of the Public Service.*

41. \*MR. KAVIYOOR K. K. KOCHUKUNJU (Nominated): Will the Government be pleased to state the number of vacancies that occurred in the Lower Division of the Public Service during the period from the 1st Chingom 1116 to 27th Thulam 1117, and the number of appointments 'Other Hindus' got out of the above?

MR. S. N. URE:

Total number of recruitments advised to the Lower Division from 1-1-1116 to 27-3-1117	...	1,490
Number of appointments secured by members of the 'Other Hindu' Group	..	69

MR. KAVIYOOR K. K. KOCHUKUNJU: ഇതിൽ ൧൪൯൦ പേർ കാണുന്നതിൽ എത്രപേരെ നിയമിച്ചുകഴിഞ്ഞു എന്ന് ഞയവായി പ്രസ്താവിക്കാമോ?

MR. S. N. URE: They were appointments.

MR. KAVIYOOR K. K. KOCHUKUNJU: അദ്ദേഹം പറഞ്ഞത് നന്നായിട്ടാണ്. ഇതു നിയമിച്ചവരെ സംബന്ധിച്ചാണോ അതല്ല അവരുടെ ഒഴിച്ചുകളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചാണോ?

MR. S. N. URE: They were vacancies to which Other Hindus were advised.

*Cochin State and the Pallivasal Scheme.*

42. \*MR. S. GOVINDA PILLAI: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether the State of Cochin has agreed to purchase power from Pallivasal; and



(b) if the answer is in the affirmative, when will the contract come into force?

MR. K. P. PADMANABHA MENON : (a) Yes.

(b) From the date on which the agreement between the two Governments is executed.

*Supply of electricity to Cochin State.*

43. \*MR. G. VELU PILLAI : Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether they have reached at any agreement to supply electricity to Cochin from Pallivasal;

(b) if so, the conditions of the agreement; and

(c) the date when the agreement is to take effect?

MR. K. P. PADMANABHA MENON : (a) Yes.

(b) The formal agreement has not yet been signed.

(c) In view of the answer to part (b) this does not arise.

*Employees in the Transport Department.*

44. \*MR. P. S. MUHAMMED : Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement by caste of the employees in the Transport Department in the following posts:—

(i) Ministerial;

(ii) Drivers;

(iii) Conductors; and

(iv) Peons or attenders?

MR. E. G. SALTER : The State Transport Department being a commercial concern, communal representation is not the criterion for making appointments.

*Muslims in the Transport Department.*

45. \*MR. P. S. MUHAMMED : Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing :

(a) the total number of employees in the Transport Department; and

(b) the number of Muslims among them?

MR. E. G. SALTER : (a) and (b) The State Transport Department being a commercial concern, communal representation is not the criterion for making appointments?

*Members of the Varnava community in the Transport Department.*

46. \*MR. KAVIYOOR K. K. KOCHUKUNJU : Will the Government be pleased to state whether any one belonging to the Varnava community holds any post at present in the Transport Department, and if so, the number of such persons and the names of the posts they hold?

MR. E. G. SALTER : The State Transport Department being a commercial concern, communal representation is not the criterion for making appointments.

MR. KAVIYOOR K. K. KOCHUKUNJU: ഞാൻ സമുദായപ്രാതിനിധ്യത്തെപ്പറ്റിയല്ല ചോദിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത്. എന്റെ ചോദ്യം ഈ സമുദായത്തിൽപ്പെട്ട ആരെങ്കിലും ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ ഉണ്ടോ എന്നാണ്.

MR. E. G. SALTER: Yes, Sir, two conductors.

*Recruitment of Messrs. A. Muthanulingom Pillai and K. Thanu Pillai to the Public Service.*

47. \* MR. KAVIYOOR K. K. KOCHUKUNJU: Will the Government be pleased to state the communities to which Messrs. A. Muthanulingom Pillai and K. Thanu Pillai, recruited by the Public Service Commissioner from among "Other Hindus" as published in the notification in the Gazette dated 19th Thulam 1117, belong?

MR. S. N. URE:

<i>Name of candidate,</i>	<i>Community.</i>
1. A. Muthanulingom Pillai	Other Hindu (Chetty)
2. K. Thanu Pillai	do.

MR. KAVIYOOR K. K. KOCHUKUNJU: അൻപതിൽപരം സ്ത്രീകൾ സമുദായക്കാർക്ക് വെച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന രണ്ട് ഒഴിവുകളിൽ ഒരേ സമുദായത്തിൽപ്പെട്ട രണ്ടുപേരെ നിയമിക്കാൻ കാരണമെന്താണെന്ന് പറയാമോ?

MR. S. N. URE: They were the seniormost candidates in the Other Hindu group in the list for the respective appointments.

*Allegations against the Sub-Registrar, Alloor.*

48. \* MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR: Will the Government be pleased to state (a) whether (in pursuance of the statement made by the Dewan-President at the meeting of the Sri Mulam Assembly on the 13th Karkadakam 1116 in reply to the allegations made by a member of the Assembly against Mr. A. M. Chandy, the Sub-Registrar Alloor), Government have ordered a preliminary enquiry under Rule 3 of the rules dated 12th December 1896;

(b) whether the enquiry is over;

(c) the date of the enquiry;

(d) whether the officer who conducted the enquiry had submitted report to the Government and if so, when; and

(e) whether some witnesses that appeared before the officer who conducted the enquiry complained that Mr. Chandy has already spread the false news that the petition about him was dismissed?

MR. K. MADHAVA KURUP (*Director of Registration*): (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) 13-1-1117.

(d) Yes; 20-3-1117.

(e) one of the witnesses, Mr. Narayanaperumal Nadar, made a reference to the news item contained in the "Travancore Times" dated 12th August 1941 which was as follows:—"The District Registrar has reported that the allegations against the Alloor Sub-Registrar, Mr. Chandy, are unfounded."

**MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR:** May I know why Government are so slow in passing an order on the report of the Special Officer submitted to Government about the Registrar?

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI:** May I inform the honourable member that orders have been passed.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** May I know the nature of the order, Sir?

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI:** I claim notice for that.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** May I know whether after stating that an order has been passed such an answer could be given?

**PRESIDENT:** It has not been published.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** May I know whether it will not be published?

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI:** It is not yet time to be published. It will be published in due course.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** In answer to part (e) of the question there is a mention of the name of one Mr. Narayanaperumal Nadar. I would like to know whether he is Mr. K. Narayanaperumal Nadar?

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI:** I think so.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** There is another person named Narayanaperumal Nadar, whose initial I do not know, who is making reckless charges against officials without being substantiated. I only wanted to know whether the name referred to him.

**PRESIDENT:** Government are indebted to the honourable member for that information.

*Sub-Registrar, Alloor.*

49. \* **MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of years of service Mr. Chandy, B. A., has put in as Sub-Registrar; and

(b) the number of years he has spent as Sub-Registrar of Alloor?

**MR. K. MADHAVA KURUP:** (a) 20 years, 8 months, and 3 days on 1-4-1117.

(b) A total period of 7 years and 8 months.



*Sub-Registry Offices.*

50. \* MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR : Will the Government be pleased to state :

(a) the percentage of documents registered in 1116 on the day of presentation in the Sub-Registry Offices; and

(b) the percentage registered in 1116 in the Sub-Registry office, Alloor when Mr. Chandy was the Sub-Registrar ?

MR. K. MADHAVA KURUP : (a) 99.11

(b) 99.44.

*Appointments in connection with the construction of the Dam at Munnar.*

51. \* MR. A. K. KUMARAN VAIDYAN (*Kunnatnad cum Parur*) : Will the Government be pleased to state, by caste, the number of persons who applied for appointments in connection with the construction of the dam at Munnar and of the employees appointed by the Executive Engineer ?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI : The Statements required are placed on the table.

*Form of applications for appointments in the Public Service.*

52. \* MR. KAVIYOOR K. K. KOCHUKUNJU : Will the Government be pleased to state whether any changes have been brought about in the application forms for recruitment to the Public Service so that the candidates may apply for one particular appointment only ?

MR. S. N. URE : Yes. For Form No. 10 only for the present;

---

\* Vide Appendix III (a) and (b), Page 105.

Appendix I.

*Vide Answer to Question No. 35.*

R. O. C. No. 341/1941/C, F. S.

NOTIFICATION.

In modification of Notification R. O. C. No. 341/41/C. F. S., dated 28th July 1941, and in exercise of the powers conferred by Rule 81 of The Defence of Travancore Rules 1115, the Government of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to fix with effect from the date of publication of this Notification the maxima prices for sale of the different varieties of cotton yarn in the places mentioned below;—

*For Quilon and Trivandrum.*

*Out Stations.*

	Rs.	As.	P.		Rs.	As.	P.
44s	5	15	0	Per 5 lbs.	6	0	0
42s	5	12	0	5	5	13	0
40s	5	10	0	5	5	11	0
32s	4	8	0	5	4	9	0
30s	4	7	0	5	4	8	0
28s	4	6	0	5	4	7	0
26s	4	4	0	5	4	5	0
25 1/2s	8	7	0	10	8	8	0
25s	8	6	0	10	8	7	0
24 1/2s	8	5	0	10	8	6	0
24s	8	4	0	10	8	5	0
23s	8	2	0	10	8	3	0
22 1/2s	8	1	0	10	8	2	0
22s	8	0	0	10	8	1	0
21 1/2s	7	15	0	10	8	0	0
21s	7	14	0	10	7	15	0
20 1/2s	7	13	0	10	7	14	0
20s	7	12	0	10	7	13	0
2/20s	8	12	0	10	8	13	0
2/30s	10	2	0	10	10	3	0
3/20s	8	13	0	10	8	14	0

(By order)

Huzur Cutcherry,  
Trivandrum, 25th August 1941.

M. K. NILAKANTA AIYAR,  
Chief Secretary to Government.

## Appendix II.

Vide Answer to Question No. 38.

Name of post.	General qualifications.	Special qualifications.
1. Tracers	The examination prescribed in Rule 1 (a) of the Public Service Notification	Travancore Chain Survey Test and Free hand Outline Drawing Lower of the Madras Government or the old Elementary Grade.
2. Litho Draftsmen	Do.	Travancore Chain Survey Test and Free hand Outline Drawing Higher of the Madras Government or the old Advanced Grade.
3. Head Litho Draftsman As per G. O. R. Djs. No. 869/36/Genl., dated 15-6-1936)	Do.	Travancore Higher Survey Test or Higher or old Advanced Surveying and Levelling Examination M. G. T. E. and Lower or old Elementary Free hand Outline Drawing Examination, M. G. T. E.
4. Computer Draftsmen, 2nd and 3rd Grades	Do.	Travancore Lower Survey Test (Chain Survey Test)
5. Do, I Grade	Do.	Travancore Survey Test Higher or Surveying and Levelling Higher of the Madras Government or the old Advanced Grade.
6. Computer Draftsmen on Rs. 15	Do.	Travancore Chain Survey Test.
7. Field Surveyor on Rs. 14	General qualification as for item 1 above	Travancore Lower Survey Test (Chain Survey)
8. Surveyors	As above	Travancore Survey Test Higher or Surveying and Levelling Higher of the Madras Government.
9. Head Surveyors	Do.	Do.



**Appendix III (a).**

*Vide* Answer to Question No. 51.

Statement, by caste, of the number of persons who applied for appointments in connection with the construction of the Dam at Munnar.

A. HINDU	200
Brahmin	30
Nair	125
Other specified	
Hindu	9
Kammala	4
Nadar	...
Ezhava	31
Cheramar (Pulaya)	...
Other Hindu	1
B. MUSLIM	4
C. CHRISTIAN*	221

\* Details as to the particular sect are not available.

(b)

Statement, by caste, of the employees in the Dam at Munnar.

A. HINDU	
1. Brahmin	5
2. Nayar	10
3. Kammala	3
4. Nadar	...
5. Ezhava	4
6. Cheramar (Pulaya)	...
7. Other specified Hindu	6
B. MUSLIM	2
C. CHRISTIAN	
1. Jacobite	5
2. Marthomite	6
3. Syriac Catholic	3
4. Latin Catholic	2
5. South India United Church	1
6. Other Christian	4
	<hr/>
	51
	<hr/>

THE TRAVANCORE INCOME TAX ACT (AMENDMENT)  
BILL—(contd.)

Mr. S. KRISHNA AIYAR (Nominated): I rise to oppose the principle on which the Bill is based. I have to preface my observations by making two statements. Firstly, the honourable Legal Remembrancer has not based his case on fiscal necessity and secondly that this matter was considered when the Income Tax Bill of 1936 was before the Council. The identical point was mooted before the Select Committee and instead of adopting the original words 'on such lands' the words 'any land in Travancore' was substituted. I therefore want to emphasise that these matters have to be borne in mind for a consideration of the further aspects of the question.

As it is, I will not take it as a fiscal matter and it has been so stated by the Legal Remembrancer. We may go into the objects and reasons in the Bill itself as well as what was disclosed in the speech of the Legal Remembrancer. In the first place it was observed that agricultural income was not sacrosanct, that though ordinarily agricultural income is not touched, that such income has been taken into account when Sirkar lands are assessed to Government tax. He further stated, and it is also in the statement of the objects and reasons, that nobody would be taxed twice over. The second statement was that certain lands within the State called Edavagai lands do not pay any tax to Government, and so long as the holders or cultivators of those lands do not pay any tax to Government they would not be entitled to the full protection of the Government. And it was stated that these people do not pay anything and therefore it will be only just that they be brought under the provisions of the Income Tax Act. Two points now emerge for examination. One point is whether the agriculturists in Edavagai are paying their tax or is it a case of double payment when their case is taken up under the Income Tax (Amendment) Bill, and the other is whether the agriculturists under Edavagai are really paying tax to Government. It is apparent that the Legal Remembrancer and the Government would not stand for double payment. The population of the Edavagai lands might come to about a lakh. There is after all only four Edavagais, the smallest being Kilimanoor and the largest at Poonjar. In between are the Edapalli and Vanjipuzha Edvagais with three prowerthies each.

It was stated and it would be accepted by everybody that the right to assess tax is a sovereign right. It does not devolve on the Chieftains of the Edavagais. It is a right which is exercised by Government and Government alone as representing the sovereign. This matter was mooted several years ago in a case that arose at Alleppey, when it was contended that certain lands in an Edavagai were not assessed to *malavaram* by Government at any time and that the right of Government was barred by limitation. It was decided that the right to assess is a sovereign right and cannot be barred by limitation, and this decision was upheld by the High Court. So the question is how such a right is to be exercised in the case of Edavagais. In

the years 992 and 1102 when Government lands were assessed to revenue, such assessments were done in Edavagai lands as well. Government exercised their right and assessed garden lands on the same lines and under the same rules as observed in the case of Sirkar lands. Similarly when it came to a case of settlement and re-settlement of Poonjar and Vanjipuzha Edavagais recently, rules and regulations that obtained in respect of Sirkar lands were bodily adopted and taxes were fixed in the same proportion as assessed within the State except in respect of Jenmies.

To a certain extent the assessment was higher, not on account of the rules but on account of the classification of the lands so that the agriculturists in these Edavagais are suffering from a heavier burden than agriculturists in Sirkar lands. As these agriculturists are paying tax to their overlords, it cannot be said that they are not paying any tax. They are paying their taxes, and if the Income Tax Act (Amendment) Bill is applied to them, certainly it will be a case of double taxation. And that is one of the points mooted in the objects and reasons that there should not be any differentiation or distinction between agriculturists of Sirkar lands and agriculturists or cultivators of Edavagai lands.

The next point suggested was that these cultivators are not paying anything to Government. I wish to prove that they are paying their tax to Government. It has been stated that as they are not paying any tax they will not be entitled to the protection of the State. Supposing we accept the statement of the learned Legal Remembrancer that those who are not paying revenue to the State are not entitled to the protection of the State it comes to this.

**MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI :** A word by way of personal explanation. I never said anything like that.

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR :** I accept the statement of the learned Legal Remembrancer, as a possible case of doubt.

**MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI :** I have merely stated that inasmuch as they get equal protection with those who pay tax, they should not be exempted from paying tax.

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR :** It boils down to this. If they want Government protection it should be better for them to pay tax.

**MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI :** Not even that. I said that it is their duty to contribute something and not throw the entire burden on other people in the State.

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR :** I am prepared to accept even that. The rich cultivators in Edavagais are very few. The majority of them are poor. The poor cultivators will not be in a position to, and will not have to pay anything. The question would arise whether they have to pay for the protection they have been enjoying for over a century and which they are now enjoying and which they hope to enjoy.



**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI:** May I know from the honourable member the approximate number of cultivators of Edavagai lands who may have to pay tax?

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** I am not in a position to state it, but I have heard from the Legal Remembrancer yesterday that the return may be poor.

**PRESIDENT:** I do not agree with the Legal Remembrancer on that matter.

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** After examining the case of each Edavagai, probably one may be able to arrive at some sort of a figure but, as it is I am not able to state the number who might be brought under the proposed Bill.

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI:** May I know from the honourable member whether he is of the opinion that the number will be very few?

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** As I stated, I am unable to give any definite figure.

**PRESIDENT:** I take it that the number would be those who get an income of over Rs. 2000 per year.

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** No figures have yet been taken. Frankly I am unable to give any figures. But I may say that the population in these Edavagai might not be less than a lakh.

Leaving the question of protection or otherwise to itself, I am coming to a further portion of the observations I intended to make. I have already submitted that the agriculturists within the Edavagais are paying taxes. It may not be that they are paying taxes to the Government. But they are paying their taxes and when they are assessed to income tax, it will be double payment. I am using the word tax in the sense of making the payment to their overlord.

**PRESIDENT:** No payment to a land lord is a tax.

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** I shall use the word "rent". The principle is that nobody must be called upon or made to pay twice. In the Edavagais the cultivators are paying their assesment to their overlord. When they are taxed over again under the proposed Income Tax Bill it becomes a case of payment twice over.

**PRESIDENT:** May I ask the honourable member who is a very experienced lawyer as well as one who has an intimate acquaintance with the conditions referred to here, taking the case most strongly against Government, what would be the total payment made by a particular tenant to his overlord in comparison with what his neighbour has to pay to Government in the case of Government land?

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** It will be pretty much on a par. If at all, the cultivators in Edavagais may be paying more, because they are taxed heavier according to the classification of Edavagais under the recent settlement.

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI:** Are there not cases where Edavagai lands have been leased out to the so called tenants for long periods at nominal rents?

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR :** I do not accept the words 'nominal rent' though there have been many cases of land within the Edavagais having been leased out. But those lands have now been settled and assessed to revenue on the same lines and under the same rules as Government lands. So it will be equal to the assessment on Government lands. If anything, the assessment will be found to be heavier.

I was submitting that the tenants or the cultivators of Edavagai lands are already paying their assessment and that if they are asked to pay income tax it will be a case of double assessment.

I now pass on to the question whether they are paying any amounts to Government. I say that they are paying their assessment legally to Government. Now let us take the history of these Edavagais. I shall start from the smallest Edavagai and pass on to the largest Edavagai. It is well known that the Kilimanoor Edavagai, the smallest, was a grant made to the Kilimanoor Chieftain for services rendered about 900 M. E. It is a matter of history. It can be found in Sankunni Menon's History of Travancore or in any other history of Travancore. So it is a case of a grant not of sovereign rights but of the revenues derivable from those lands to the Chieftain. It is something like a Jaghir. If the tenant of the Edavagai pays the revenue into the hands of the Chief or of the Chief's people, it is a case really of his paying to the nominee or the representative of the Government. It need not be that the Government receives it direct and makes a grant of it to the Chief. It is enough if the Government authorises the Chief of the Edavagai to collect and appropriate it. So, so far as that Edavagai is concerned, Government does receive the revenue. It does not matter that the Government receives it with one hand and makes a grant of it to the Chief for other purposes.

Coming now to the next and the largest of the Edavagais, namely the Poonjar Edavagai, the Poonjar Chiefs were not Travancoreans. They belonged to a ruling family in Madura. During the days of the Mahomedan invasion of Madura they were forced to flee and they took shelter in the wild rocky lands of north-east Travancore. Even now their seal has the words "Mathura Meenakshi Theruva." Having come to these tracts, they acquired some lands by purchase from a local chief; other purchases were made from the Chengamanat Deva-swom. Thus they were holding lands under purchase from two local chieftains. It was later on in the year 931 that they applied to the Travancore Maharaja for confirmation of the lands held by them. It was in 931 M. E. that these lands were confirmed as Edavagai to the Poonjar Chiefs. The confirmation as Edavagai really means that the tax on those lands was made over or granted to the chiefs. The right to tax or to assess is a sovereign right and that right was not parted with. The right that could be parted with was only a right to the tax or the collections. It has been freely admitted by the Poonjar Chiefs in many statements made by them, in plaints, written statements &c., that in 931, Poonjar was constituted as an Edavagai. That too is thus a case of grant. It may be that in those olden days the tracts of land were not worth anything. They were jungle and forests infested



[Mr. S. Krishna Aiyar]

by wild beasts, subject only to occasional cultivation, once in 12 years. And *waram* was levied at the rate of one para of grain for one para of land. It is not known what one para of land signified in those days. It was only Dewan Ramaiyyangar who in 1059 ruled what one para signified. That apart, so far as the largest Edavagai is concerned, it is a case of grant by the sovereign and therefore that also is a case of making over the assessment of the tax to the Poonjar Chieftain. This would be further manifest when we remember that when in 992 and 1012 when garden lands in the State were settled, the gardens in the Poonjar Edavagai were also settled, by the Government. The only thing to be noted about it was that while the Government fixed the assessment, the collection was to be made by the Poonjar Chief. In many other instances as well, for example in respect of lands belonging to the Poovarani Devaswom in the Poonjar Edavagai and to the Tiruvidanad Devaswom belonging to Government, the Poonjar Chief was allowed to collect the taxes and pay them to the Sirkar. Thus then, the sovereign right of the State has not been parted with. What was parted with was only a right to collect and appropriate the proceeds or the income from those lands. Compare this with the case of the zemindaries in the east coast. There has been plenty of controversy about their being originally sovereigns. But the general view is that they were only the collectors appointed by the East India Company for the purpose of collecting revenue, and they paid a portion of the collections to the Company itself.

So, leaving the case of the smallest and the largest of the Edavagais, where I believe it has been amply proved that a grant of the assessment alone was made to the chiefs, there remain only two Edavagais, the Vanjipuzha Edavagai and the Edapally Edavagai. These chieftains, if one can use that name in respect to these Edavagais, are Brahmans. The Chieftain of the Edapalli Edavagai is a very sacred Brahmin, one of the most orthodox Brahmans in Kerala. Under the Hindu constitution obtaining from olden times Brahmans can never be sovereigns. They can only be advisers to sovereigns or teachers or priests. The Edappalli Raja and the Vanjipuzha Raja cannot therefore be regarded as sovereigns. The Edappalli Raja holds three tracts of land; Thrikkunnappuzha is only a very small tract of land about 100 or 200 acres in extent between the sea, the Kayamkulam lake and the canal. The assessment there is very small. I doubt whether the Chief gets more than four or five thousand fanams in this region, in olden days when people had not begun to cultivate those lands. Those lands were not regarded as important in anyway. They were attached to the Thrikkunnappuzha Devaswom and the Edapalli Raja carried on the affairs of that Devaswom. Similarly the lands in Kallupara. As the very name indicates, it consisted of stones and rocks.

**PRESIDENT :** You cannot draw any inference from the mere name.

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR :** It was a wilderness within recent days and within the past forty or fifty years there were not very many people cultivating lands there. I am speaking also from my knowledge.



Kallupara began to be colonised and people began to cultivate it only within the last forty or fifty years. As these lands were being managed by Edapalli for the Kallupara Devaswom, possibly they were handed over to the Chief and the taxes were allowed to be collected by the Edapalli Chief for Devaswom purposes. There is historical evidence. There may have been political reasons as well. The Edapalli Raja was wavering as to whether he should own allegiance to the Cochin or to the Travancore Maharaja. The records in the possession of Government may prove that. It was then that the settlement was made and the revenue was allowed to be collected by the Edappalli Raja. So, sovereign rights were not assigned to them perpetually. That too is not a case of assignment of sovereign rights. It is only an assignment or a grant of revenues and when a grant of revenue is made, as I submitted some time ago, it is a case of the sovereign receiving it and giving it to somebody else.

As regards Vanjipuzha Raja, everybody knows what Perumthanam means. It is still a wilderness. It is a very big forest. It is sparsely inhabited. Even now it is occupied by Malampandarams—people who are very low in the scale of humanity in Travancore, who are not able even to talk in Malayalam and who live in caves and live by hunting.

**MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN:** ഇടപ്പള്ളി രാജാവിന്റെ ഭരണങ്ങൾ പറഞ്ഞ കൂട്ടത്തിൽ വാഴക്കുളം പകുതിയെപ്പറ്റി പറഞ്ഞുകേട്ടില്ല. വാഴക്കുളം പകുതി ഇടപ്പള്ളി രാജാവിന്റെ വകയല്ലേ?

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** അതേ. വാഴക്കുളം പകുതിയെപ്പറ്റി പറയാൻ വിട്ടുപോയി. വിട്ടുപോയതിന് മാപ്പ് ചോദിക്കുന്നു.

I was submitting that Perumthanam was a wilderness and continues to be a dense forest, sparsely occupied. Cheruvalli and Chirakadavoo have begun to be improved only recently, within the past one hundred years. The number of garden lands that were settled in 992 were very very small. As regards Vanjipuzha Raja, history shows that they were of very great service to the Maharajas of Travancore in olden days and it must have been for those considerations that in the three tracts of land, then of very little use, the taxes were assigned to the Chief. It was stated by the honourable Legal Remembrancer that it might have been a question of treaty with these chiefs and treaties have to be respected. There cannot be any treaty between a sovereign and his subject. These chiefs are acknowledged to be the subjects of the Maharaja. It may be historical but we can go into the evidences and we may be able to know that it is a case of the grant by the sovereign of taxes to those who have been of service to the royal family.

Thus then, if we take up these cases individually, it will be seen that it is not a case of the Government not receiving any tax, but of the Government receiving tax through their nominees, the chieftains

[Mr. S. Krishna Aiyar]

of the four Edavagais I referred to. We may also take the case of Jenmom lands leased for money consideration and also the case of *Dnappamanams* or lands held rent-free in individual cases.

**PRESIDENT:** I am only making bold to ask the honourable member because he is so well acquainted with all the details, what will be the total amount, whether you call it rent or assessment, that the tenants altogether pay to the Vanjipuzha Chief?

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** I regret I am unable to give the answer. As the settlement in that Edavagai is not quite complete I am not able to state anything. But I understand that at present the assessment is not enough to enable the Chief to meet his expenses and that therefore he has applied that it should be taken by the Court of Wards.

**PRESIDENT:** In dealing with a certain number of representations from the Vanjipuzha Chief I seem to have noticed that it was a very very small amount that he was getting and that he could not make both ends meet with that amount.

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** The Vanjipuzha chiefs, unlike other chiefs who leased their lands, gave *karanmas* and *edakaranmas* and reserved to themselves only a peppercorn rent. That was the reason why the rental in that Edavagai is very small compared to the rentals of other chiefs.

**PRESIDENT:** So it would be correct to say that the tenants of Vanjipuzha practically pay nothing to anybody, either to the Chief or to the Government,

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** When the present settlement is complete, it will not be the old peppercorn rent that they will be paying. Under the old system it is quite true that they have been paying very little. The present Bill is to have only prospective effect and not retrospective effect.

Coming to the case of individual jenmies, their number will be very small and they may not be getting much of income themselves. There also, it is a case of grant by the sovereign. The case of *thanathu* lands is exceptional. But when these are alienated for a money consideration, tax is fixed upon them. And here the question becomes relevant. The honourable Legal Remembrancer said that the income is taken into account in fixing the assessment. These lands pay only about one-sixth or one-eighth and yet they are immune or exempt from any tax. That is an anomaly.

If then we consider all these matters, we can see how the best interests of the State or of the population would be served. Is it the perpetuation of this anomaly or is it the taking over the Edavagais by Government. I refer to the instance of the Pandalam Edavagai, a very large principality. The whole of the lands, much larger than the Poonjar Edavagai were taken over by Government; and annually about 11,000 fanams was paid to the Pandalam Raja. Similarly, the Devicolam tract, the Peermade tract and the Anjanad tract were purchased by Government. So, little by little, the tracts under the jurisdiction of these Edavagais are being taken over by Government.



Would it not be better in the interests of the one lakh of subjects in these Edavagais for the Government to take over the Edavagais themselves and administer them? There is the recent case of the Sripadom lands being taken over by Government and managed. Similarly, if these Edavagais also are taken over by Government, it will be in the interests of the Chiefs also who will be relieved from the worry of having to look after their own affairs.

**PRESIDENT:** I believe the honourable member knows that the Vanjipuzha Chief has applied for protection under the Court of Wards.

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** I am submitting that the best interests of the State and of the population as a whole will be better served by removing the anomaly of these intervening landlords or chieftains. It has been done in other cases. The Jenmi in Travancore has become extinct by the Jenmi and Kudiyan Act. In the same way if it is a case of subserving the better interests of Travancore, these anomalies, though they are historical, may be removed and the grievances of about a lakh of people remedied.

Coming back again to the two principles I started with, it was stated that it was not a case of a fiscal measure but only a measure that is demanded by justice. It may be seen from the arguments advanced by me that justice does not demand it. On the other hand if the Edavagai tenants are assessed to income tax it will be a case of payment twice over. If it had been purely a fiscal measure I would not have stood here and objected to it, because so far as fiscal measures are concerned, Government has to function and if the Government thinks that its treasury has to be enriched by any enactment, I would not certainly object to it. But on the principle on which the Bill was sought to be introduced, namely of justice, I object to it.

On the second point, the identical words were in the original Bill and those words underwent substitution and it cannot be said that those elders of ours did not grasp the essence of the question. It may be that the honourable the Legal Remembrancer has grown wiser and that the next generation will be wiser than we are. But there it is, that this point was considered by our elders when they amended the original words. On the whole I submit that the general principles of this Bill do not commend themselves to me. The population of these Edavagais have no vote and no opportunity of having their case stated before Government or before this House. It is a case really of taxation without representation. I submit that that point also may be considered by the honourable the Legal Remembrancer and the Government.

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI:** May I know from the honourable member whether there are in British India such freehold lands?

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** In British India most of the freehold lands are forest lands and it is only when they are cultivated that they are assessed.

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI:** May I know the provision of law for taxing such lands?



**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** I am unable to say anything beyond what I have stated already.

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI:** May I know whether such tenants are making double payments in the shape of rent to the landlord and tax to Government?

**MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR:** I am not aware.

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH:** In opposing the principle of the Bill I support the position taken up by Mr. Krishna Aiyar. I shall confine my remarks to the Edavagais which have been admitted to come within the ambit of the amendment Bill. The effect of this amendment is to permit the agricultural income derived from lands situate within the Edavagais to be assessed to income tax. Agricultural income is exempted from payment of income tax for sufficient reasons, because the land from which agricultural income is derived is paying land revenue or tax and, to assess it over again will be to impose a double tax.

But what is the position with regard to Edavagais? There are four Edavagais in Travancore namely, Edapally, Kilimanoor, Poonjar and Vanjipuzha. The Edavagais of Edapally and Kilimanoor are now governed by Act IV of 1068. In 1109 the Travancore Edavagais Act III of 1109 was passed. This Act was enacted, as is said therein to provide for the settlement and better administration of the Edavagais of Poonjar and Vanjipuzha.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** May I know what crops are produced in Edavaga lands? Are they pepper, or paddy or tea or rubber or all these crops together?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH:** All these crops are produced.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** I would like to know what crops are produced *mostly*?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH:** Pepper, paddy, rubber and coconut are generally grown in those parts.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** Is it the idea of the member that these crops are grown there because they form part of Travancore?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH:** I cannot answer that.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** May I know which Edavagai is producing all these crops?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH:** All kinds of produce are grown in several of these Edavagais. They are in different parts of Travancore.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** May I know which Edavagai produces such crops *mostly*?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH:** I am sorry I cannot make a generalisation in this matter.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** Am I to understand then that *mostly* rubber and tea are grown in Edavagais?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH:** There are Edavagais which do not produce these crops at all.

**MR. KANNANTHODATH JANARDANAN NAIR:** May I know whether the honourable member is aware that in Edapally Edavagai which covers something like 40 to 50 sq. miles only a very small area is cultivated with rubber and tea?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH :** I gladly accept the information supplied by the honourable member.

Sir, my point is this. By virtue of the Edavagai Act, the Government have undertaken and completed the survey and settlement of the Poonjar and a good portion of the Vanjipuzha Edavagai. Settlement is completed as regards Chirakadavu and Cheruvalli paku-thies comprised within Vanjipuzha Edavagai and the settlement as regards Peruvanthanan is nearing completion. The result of this settlement is that the persons holding lands within the Edavagais are paying tax, michavaram, rent, or pattom, whatever you may call it, at a rate equal to and often times higher than the tax due to Government in respect of Government lands. Because as per the rules passed under the Edavagai Act, the same procedure, the same rules followed in the case of settlement of Government lands conducted 30 years ago have been adopted in the case of Edavagai lands also. Naturally the assessment will be at a higher rate.

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI :** May I know from the member, what were the pre-settlement rates which the Edavagais paid in respect of one acre of land devoted for rubber or tea cultivation?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH :** It cannot be said that there were settled rates during the pre-settlement days.

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI :** After the settlement referred to, may I know the rates?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH :** The assessment may work out to Rs. 2 per acre.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI :** Does the member know that in Nanjinad, taxation on dry lands works up on an average at about Rs. 50 per acre?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH :** I am not aware.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI :** Does the member know the comparative cost of production for growing rubber and paddy and the comparative price of paddy and rubber?

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH :** I will make a study of the subject. At the moment I can only give an approximate idea regarding the matter.

Coming to the subject, I was stating that in respect of the assessment between Government lands and Edavagai lands, the settlement rules that were followed were the same. The scale of rates for dry lands and wet lands, and the scale of rates for taxable trees are the same in the case of settlement of Government lands and Edavagai lands.

In the Object and Reasons to the Travancore Edavagai Act, it is stated as follows :

"When a survey is completed the bill proposes to empower the Government to undertake the settlement of Edavagais at the cost of the proprietors of such Edavagais. The conduct of the settlement and the procedure to be followed by the settlement officers will, subject to such modifications as may be necessary in individual cases, be the same as those that are to be followed in the case of settlement of Government



[Mr. K. Dominic Joseph.]

lands. As soon as a settlement is made, the officer is required to give the particulars of settlement to the parties concerned and they are given a right of appeal. The rent to be fixed shall in no case exceed one fourth of the gross produce and the settlement will be in force for thirty years. Permanent right of occupancy, heritable and alienable, are conferred upon the tenant. The assignment of lands not occupied by any tenant is to be made in accordance with the rules in force applicable to Government lands. The bill proposes to confer the right of removing unauthorised occupation in accordance with the provisions of the Land Conservancy Regulation. The rent due to the proprietors of a settled estate may be recovered under the provisions of the Revenue Recovery Regulation for the time being in force and it is open to the Government to empower a proprietor or his agent to exercise the powers of a Tahsildar or Peishkar under the said Regulation, if they think fit to do so."

I have quoted these extracts in extenso just to show that all the powers in the armoury of Government have been unreservedly placed at the disposal of the proprietors of these Edavagais for their protection and the dues payable to the Chiefs have been increased at the instance of the Government. Government lands and Edavaga lands have been settled under the same set of rules. At present, acre to acre, the holder of land in the Edavaga is paying even more than in respect of the Government lands, because Government lands were settled more than 30 years ago.

Now, after all these to turn round and say "No, no you are not paying land revenue to Government, you must pay income tax on your agricultural income." That is indeed very hard. It is double taxation pure and simple.

I would respectfully ask whether the residents in the Edavagais are any the less the subjects of His Highness the Maharaja, the subjects of the Travancore State. Why should they be penalised? Why such invidious distinction between subject and subject?

The want of equity and the gross disproportion between the treatment meted out to the two sets of subjects will be clear by a concrete illustration. I will take two holders of land, one within the Edavagai and the other outside. Say both of them own 20 acres of lands each. After the settlement it may be taken that the two sets of land have been assessed at the same higher rate of Rs. 2 per acre. The man within the Edavaga pays Rs. 40 for 20 acres to the chief. The man holding Government land also pays Rs. 40 to Government. After a few years, an income of Rs. 2,000 is realised from both these properties. After the realisation of Rs. 2,000 as profit, the holder of the sirkar land need continue to pay only the land tax i.e., Rs. 40. What about the holder of Edavaga land? He will have to pay Rs. 40 to the Chief under whose jurisdiction he lives plus income tax on Rs. 2,000 which will come to Rs. 44. In other words, in the place of Rs. 84 that is being paid by the Edavaga holder, the holder of the sirkar land will pay only Rs. 40. We will also take it that after the lapse of 10 years the income rises up to Rs. 6,000. The difference will be that the holder in the



Edavaga land will have to pay Rs. 166 as income tax to the Sircar, whereas the holder of the Government land will continue to pay only Rs. 40 in spite of the income that is being derived from his land. The disparity will be grossly apparent from the fact that when Rs 200 and odd comes to be paid by the holder of Edavaga land as against the Government land holder who pays only Rs. 40. I respectfully ask how such gross disproportion in the matter of payment can be justified. It is pertinent to enquire how these Edavagais have been brought into existence. My honourable friend Mr. Krishna Iyer has been dealing at length about this question. Therefore I do not propose to go into that question.

Are the tenants responsible for the coming into existence of the Edavagais which are primarily grants made by the Sovereigns of Travancore. The grants carry with it the right to realise tax or rent from the Edavagais.

Recently it was reported that the Chief of Vanjipuzha Edavagai has applied to the Government to assume management of his properties. By assuming management of his properties, the Government can take steps to put an end to this anomaly once and for all. The holders of the Edavagai land should be treated on a par with the holders of Government land.

A similar amendment was introduced in the Legislature in 1102. That was not pushed through. That was because the Government realised the justice and equity underlying the contentions of the subjects of the State residing in the Edavagais. By the enactment of the Edavagai Act under the auspices of the Government, the Edavagai people are on a surer ground now, than they were then.

Let there be uniformity of law for all the subjects of H. H. the Maharaja.

I suggest that if the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, the principle underlying the Bill also may be referred for the consideration of the Committee.

**MR. E. SUBRAMONIA AIYAR (Nominated):** Sir, I wish to speak a few words on this Amendment Bill. The amendment sought to be introduced seems to be simple; but it has far-reaching effects. My friend the Legal Remembrancer was stressing on the word "such" and stated that the word is simple and all the rest of it. The simplicity lies in its operation. But the effect of that substitution will bring about serious changes. I do certainly accept the principle that the rich must pay. They should not demur to pay for the amenities of life which the State provides for them and their brethren. But when we come to that question itself my point is that all the rich people must pay. No rich person who is similarly situated like another should be exempted from the operation of an Act which will call upon him to pay. I am wholly unconcerned so far as this principle is concerned about the history of the land tenures in Travancore. Whether they fall within Edavagais or outside, I am not going to build an argument upon the word tax as we understand. If we go to the history of the tenures of other lands in Travancore, that is *panduravaga* lands, all these were resumable. Before the Proclamation of 1042 they were on a different footing.

[Mr. E. Subramonia Aiyar.]

The Government or the Sirkar was the owner of all lands and it was leased out to other persons to cultivate and take the produce. A portion went to the tenant's share and the other portion went to the landlord's share. The Sirkar's share took the form of what is now known as tax. That is all what we find if we go into the history of it. Agriculture may not be a very nice or effective means of making a large income. As a profession it may not be very good. But nevertheless when a person cultivates lands which do not belong to him, whether it belongs to the Chief or whether it belongs to the Government, a certain income is produced whether it be small or large.

One portion is given to the owner and the other portion is retained by the tenant, and that income is not taxed. What is the reason? When we come to the holders of lands within the Edavagai, do they really stand on a different footing? How do they stand differently from a *Pandarapattom* tenant? The *Pandarapattom* tenant cultivates the land, takes the entire produce and gives a portion to the Sirkar as tax. If the residue is less than Rs. 2,000 you need not tax him. Only if there is any balance after meeting all the expenses of a man's business, whether it be commerce or agriculture or any other occupation, he can be called a rich man. Then and then only you can call him a rich man. Take for instance, the case of a lawyer. So far as he is concerned, he makes an income. But in making his income he has to pay his clerk, his juniors and other establishment charges. After meeting all these expenses, if there is any balance, then only he should be taxed. Again, take the case of a big land-owner. He may be paying a thousand rupees to his manager. That is also taken into account. If there is a residue and only if that residue is sufficiently large can he be charged with income tax. If you go by the principle that the poor should not be taxed but that the rich and the rich alone should be taxed, I do not see any reason why a person who makes an enormous profit by owning lands or by farming them should escape taxation. The principle that a rich man should be exempted from taxation on the short-ground that he is paying land tax to Government is, according to me, not sound. In this connection, excepting a few cases, no holder of land, by agriculture and agriculture alone, will be able to make enormous profit. All the trouble arises, if I may say so, from rubber and tea and probably pepper. So far as the price of paddy is concerned, no man is liable to be taxed unless he has got other occupations. I do not see any reason why these few people who own large estates within the Edavagai should alone be taxed leaving aside all those *Pandarapattom* tenants who make equally large income and pay only tax to Government. I was always for a graduated taxation. In strict theory, the tax paid to Government is really a share of the produce and particularly so in Travancore. If there is a residue and if it exceeds Rs. 2,000, then assess him with tax without going into the question whether he is holding this sort of land or that sort of land. I find that on what these Chiefs receive from the tenants they are assessed. The revenue which the Chiefs receive from the holders of lands, they are also assessed with income-tax. Then you might ask the question that Government is getting tax just as the holder is getting his share.



In this connection, I would invite the attention of the House to Act IV of 1068 which says:—"The holders of land in the Estates of Kilimanoor and Edapalli shall have the same rights in respect of their holdings as the holders of land under Our Government. The rent recoverable from the holders of land in the said Estates shall be at the rates assessed by Our Government from time to time" So my point is that in effect and law the holders of land in the Edavagais are exactly in the same position as the holders of *Pandarapattom* lands. If you are going to exempt the *Pandarapattom* land holders from the payment of income tax even if their income is more than Rs. 2,000 after meeting all the initial expenses and giving other people's shares recognised by law, i. e., Government and local authorities and the rest of it, the holders of lands within the Edavagais also should be left out of account. So I would welcome a legislation which imposes tax on every person who has got an income beyond a particular limit as stated in the Income Tax Act, however that income is derived, whether the capital is land or intelligence pure and simple. In such a case, land tax, *michavaram*, custom and every other thing which the tenant has to give will have to be deducted from the gross income and the balance alone will have to be assessed with tax. In such a case, nobody can complain of it and there is no reason why a person who is born in Travancore, who is remaining in Travancore, who is making his resources in Travancore, a man of brain or industrial capacity, should not be taken advantage of by the State for the purpose of advancing the general well-being of the State. So every rich man must be assessed to tax if he makes a large income, capital labour and other expenses put together. As Mr. Sivathanu Pillai fears, the poor cultivators of Nanjinad will not be hit. There, a heavy land tax is assessed. A man may be getting Rs. 2,000 worth of paddy from the land and Rs. 300 may have to be paid as revenue. The balance is only Rs. 1,700. In such a case he will not have to pay income tax and there is no room for any complaint. The rubber and tea estate holders within the Edavagais shall have their income assessed with tax. But very large estate owners in Peermade and Devicolam will be exempted from payment of tax. I would welcome a legislation on these lines. But do not substitute the words, "Such lands" for the words "any land." Do not exempt agricultural income. I would say let us remodel the whole thing.

**MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI:** May I know whether the honourable member thinks it practicable now to inaugurate a thing like that.

**MR. E. SUBRAMONIA AIYAR:** I have given my view in the matter. And I think that it is as practicable as anything can be practicable. If land tax is practicable and if income tax is practicable, certainly the power of Government is adequate enough to make this scheme also practicable.

**MR. N. NARAYANA KURUP:** May I know whether any Government have made any piece of legislation on the lines suggested by the honourable member?



**MR. E. SUBRAMONIA AIYAR :** My honourable friend must be aware that altered conditions of affairs of many states have compelled those states to deviate from the beaten path and usher in innovations, which may seem extraordinary, even in the systems of taxation. So far as Travancore is concerned, it is a small country having large needs. It is the policy of statesmanship to see that as much is taken out of the rich as to meet those needs. The policy of the State so far as income tax is concerned changes from time to time gradually, but not revolutionarily. I request the honourable members of this House to take a farther view in the matter.

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI :** Will it not be more proper and convenient to bring the law into conformity with the similar law in British India?

**MR. E. SUBRAMONIA AIYAR :** I am not always convinced of the utility or propriety of uniformity in legislation. At times attempts at uniformity may retard progress.

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI :** May I know from the honourable member whether he is aware of the unanimous opinion of the Joint Select Committee of the Council of State and the British Indian Legislature that they were in favour of this amendment?

**MR. E. SUBRAMONIA AIYAR :** I am not aware, Sir.

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI :** Sir, the proposal before the House is to amend the clause so as to bring it into conformity with the law in British India. It is true that on a previous occasion the same question was debated on the floor of this House and the Government did not press the measure at that time. But I crave the permission of the House to examine this question on its merits and in the light of circumstances which we have to face in the years to come. Land tax in Travancore, I need hardly say, is the lowest in incidence so far as the neighbouring British Indian Provinces or other Indian States are concerned. It is, and it has been the aim of His Highness' Government to see that in respect of land, incidence of taxation on the cultivator as well as the agriculturists in the wider sense of the term, is kept at a minimum. But that does not at all mean that as years progress the same incidence of taxation should be maintained irrespective of the profits or income that might be derived by a section or class of rich land holders as distinguished from the masses. If it is convincingly proved that even among those who are tenants in the technical sense there is a section of people who though they derive considerable income do not make any adequate contribution or even any contribution at all to the general exchequer, is there anything improper or anything opposed to the well-accepted canons of taxation, in tapping those sources, especially when we are circumstanced as at present. The elastic sources of taxation mainly consist, as the Dewan-President has more than once stated, of Customs and the Excise; and for reasons which are obvious, those sources of revenue are unfortunately affected by the international situation today.

Now let us see exactly where the grievances come from in regard to a measure of this character. The protests are against the levy of income tax which is assessed only on incomes above Rs. 2,000 per annum and the complaint is from those who can well afford to bear this burden. For, honourable members will kindly remember that the ordinary holder of a land of a few acres will not be able to make any income approaching the taxable minimum. A very very large proportion of the tenants who are really small holders will not be affected by this measure. It is only the richer few who derive considerable income from large estates who will be called upon to pay. The tax free lands in Travancore, perhaps the honourable members are already aware, cover an extent of over 1,11,000 acres of which the Punjar and the Vanjipuzha Edavagais together comprise over 85,760 acres. It has been stated, and I am afraid that the statement in the bald manner in which it was put before this House was intended to elicit the sympathy of honourable members on the other side. It has been stated that this large extent of land has a population of nearly 1 lakh of people who are all tenants who will have to pay—after the present settlement is over—at the same rate as any other ordinary tax payer in respect of Government lands. May I just invite your attention to Section 5, clauses 1 and 2 of the Travancore Edavagai Act. Section 5 (2), sub-clause 1 says as follows:

"(i) for the holdings held on permanent or irredeemable titles being settled as registered holdings without the levy of any *taravila* or *tadivila* or any alteration of the rent payable to the Chief;

and sub-clause (2) reads:—

"(ii) for the holdings (not being those held on permanent or irredeemable titles or on usufructuary mortgages) with a term of more than twelve years to run at the commencement of this Act being treated and recorded as the *shanathu* land of the Chief and left to be dealt with by the parties in accordance with the terms of their contract or in such other manner as they may agree;

In the course of the learned and interesting speech made this morning by my distinguished friend, the honourable member Mr. S. Krishna Aiyar, he was asked whether the settlement did affect the long term leases, whether large areas out of these Edavagais were not held on lease for long term and whether the agriculturists of those areas will not be affected, in other words, whether the settlement was not intended to affect those agriculturists. It follows that in respect of considerable areas of the land under tea, rubber and cardamom cultivation and in the case of lands which have been leased out almost on nominal rent, the incidence on tax will continue to be the same as before although the profits derived are considerable. I have got certain figures before me from which it will be seen that the yield per acre with regard to tea is 526 pounds which will fetch Rs. 439.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: Is it the average?

RAJYASEVAPRAYANA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: It may not be the average. The average may be a little lower.

MR. J. W. TOLSON: May I know whether the amount of Rs. 439 is exclusive of the export duty?



**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI:** I would not have referred to these figures but for the fact that in the course of my reply it was necessary to do so. It will be remembered that the income tax that the Government now impose on these incomes from tea as industrial product is only in relation to 25 per cent of the total income. In other words 75 per cent of the income escapes taxation almost entirely, for, the land tax paid is almost nominal and the export duty which is levied along with the 25 per cent income tax constitutes but a small percentage of the total profits.

**PRESIDENT:** It is 98 per cent. elsewhere besides excess profits duty which is also a feature of present day taxation in British India.

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI:** Now, Sir, the question therefore is whether this state of affairs is fair to the ordinary ryot. I am speaking on behalf of the average agriculturist, for, Government are fully aware of the strain and travail which the ordinary agriculturist is put to at the present moment. In fact, Government are keenly alive to their needs and aspirations and are ever diligent in devising ways and means for promoting their contentment and welfare. It is not the poor agriculturist who raises this plea of exemption from taxation. Is this tenant poor, I ask, a tenant who holds 5,000 or 7,000 acres of land and whose estate consists of tea, rubber and cardamom plantations, which yield enormous profits when compared to the precarious income of the ordinary ryot?

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** What does the member say in respect of those who keep *Pandarapattom* lands and cultivate tea, and rubber without paying any tax?

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI:** I am coming to that. They pay land tax to the Sirkar. I am speaking of the class of agriculturists who do not pay a pie to the exchequer. Here is one class of people who do not pay any tax and here is another whom you do not assess also to income tax. The difference is fundamental.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** Is it not better therefore to abolish the Edavagais altogether?

**RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI:** We have heard my honourable friend Mr. Krishna Aiyar on the origin and history of Edavagais. Without going into those details which may or may not be controversial, we have to face facts as they are. The question is not whether Edavagais have a right to exist or whether they may not be annexed. They exist today under certain conditions and we are not concerned with the Chief's status or emoluments. We are concerned with the profits derived by the tenants and the proportion of such profits payable to Government. This Bill is pressed on the attention of the honourable members at this moment because it is felt that whereas a certain class of people do contribute to the exchequer, there is a rich minority class who derives considerable income, and who escapes the general burden of taxation. Our aim is to bring them within the ambit of this statute so that they may bear their fair share of general taxation. It is not a case where discrimination is sought to be placed against one set of people. Sir, it



has been said that profits derived are not out of these lands alone. The net profits in the land may not be two thousand or one thousand rupees but may be less. However, when computed with other income, the profits may become taxable. That is a point which deserves consideration. That is a matter which might be examined at the later stages of the Bill. My submission therefore is that Government are anxious to see that no particular class of people who are able to pay should escape taxation. Sufficient safeguards may however be provided to see that this measure does not result in any undue hardship. These are matters of detail for adjustment. With these words I would strongly recommend the acceptance of the principle of this Bill.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Viluvankod*): സർ,

ഞാൻ ഈ അമൻറുമെൻറിനെ ഹാർട്ടമായി പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു. കർഷക ക്ഷണമായിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ബുദ്ധാമുട്ടിനു ഒരു നിവാരണമാർഗ്ഗമുണ്ടാക്കി അവർക്ക് ശാശ്വതമായ നന്മയെ പ്രദാനം ചെയ്യണമെന്നു നമ്മുടെഭിവാൻ പ്രസിഡൻറവർക്കു മൂന്നു വർഷത്തിനുമുമ്പുതന്നെ ആലോചിച്ചതായി എനിക്കറിയാം. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ കർഷകർ യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ ഗവണ്മെൻററിൻറ ചില സൗജന്യങ്ങൾക്കു അർഹരാണെന്നു അദ്ദേഹം പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഉദാഹരണമായി അവകാശമുള്ള വസ്തുവിൽ ഒരു കാഴ്ച കരത്തിനു രൂപം ഡിമാൻറനോട്ടീസ് പടികൂട്ടിയപ്പോൾ വാങ്ങിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള കർഷകൻറ സങ്കടവും ഒരു സെൻറ ഭൂമിക്കുള്ള മൂന്നുകാഴ്ച കരം അതു പത്തു അവകാശികളുടെ കച്ചിലാണെങ്കിൽ പത്തുപേർക്കു ഡിമാൻറനോട്ടീസയച്ചു പത്തു പണവും ചേർത്തു ഇടയാക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള സങ്കടവും സചിവോത്തമൻ അറിഞ്ഞിട്ടു കർഷകരുടെ സങ്കടത്തിൻ പരിഹാരം ഉണ്ടാക്കണമെന്നു അദ്ദേഹം പറഞ്ഞതായി ഞാൻ ഓർക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. കന്നു വെട്ടി കുഴിച്ചിലിട്ടാലേ സമതലമാകയുള്ള അതുപോലെ ആദായമുള്ളവരിൽനിന്നും ആദായമെടുത്തു മറ്റുള്ളവരുടെ ആവശ്യം കൂടി നിറവേററണം. നമ്മുടെ ശ്രീചിത്തിരതിരുനാൾ മഹാരാജാവു തിരുമനസ്സുകൊണ്ടു ഇവിടത്തെ പ്രജകളുടെ സ്ഥിതിയെല്ലാം ഒന്നുപോലെയാക്കുന്നതിനു വേണ്ടു വഴി കണ്ടുപിടിക്കാതിരിക്കയില്ല.

ഇവിടെ റീസൊറിൽമെൻറു വളരെ അത്യാവശ്യമാണ്. അതു വടക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽതന്നെ ആദ്യം നടത്തണം. ഇതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ഞാൻ എപ്പോഴും സ്വപ്നം കണ്ടുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുകയാണ്. ഈ സംഗതിയിൽ ഞാൻ ഒരു പ്രമേയം അയച്ചു സന്ദർഭത്തിലാണ് ഈ ബിൽ ഇവിടെ വന്നതു.

MR K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN : റീസെറ്റിൽമെൻറു നടത്തിയാൽ തെക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ കരം കൂട്ടാമോ?

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI : കരം കൂട്ടേണ്ടതാണെങ്കിൽ കൂട്ടണം. തെക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ഇപ്പോൾ കറെ റബ്ബർ എസ്റ്റേറ്റുകൾ വന്നിട്ടുണ്ട്. അചർ ഏക്കറിന് ഒരു പണം കരമേ കൊടുക്കുന്നുള്ളൂ. കഷ്ടിച്ചു ൫൦ രൂപ കൊടുത്താൽ ഒരേക്കർ സ്ഥലം വാങ്ങിക്കാം. ൨,൦൦൦ രൂപാ ആദായം കിട്ടുകയുംചെയ്യും. എന്നാൽ ൨൦൦൦ രൂപ കൊടുത്തുനിലം വാങ്ങിച്ചാൽ കരവും കൂടുതൽ കൊടുക്കണം. ഇത്ര ആദായവും കിട്ടുകയില്ല. ഋണനിവാരണത്തിലൂടെ പണക്കാരെല്ലാം അവരുടെ പണത്തിന്റെ സുരക്ഷയെ വിചാരിച്ചു റബ്ബർതോട്ടങ്ങൾ വാങ്ങിക്കൊണ്ടു പണക്കാർ മറ്റു വ്യവസായങ്ങളിൽ ഏർപ്പെട്ടാൽ ആദായനികുതി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരുമല്ലോ, എന്നു വിചാരിച്ചു ഗവണ്മെന്റിനെ തോല്പിക്കാൻകൂടി വേണ്ടിയാണ് റബ്ബർതോട്ടങ്ങളിൽ മുതൽ മുടക്കുന്നതു .

MR. KANNAN HODATH JANARDANAN NAIR : റീസെറ്റിൽമെൻറു നടത്തണമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞല്ലോ. അങ്ങിനെ നടത്തിയാൽ ഇടവകകളിൽ നാനൂറു ദാഹകാലത്തേക്കു എഴുതികൊടുത്തിട്ടുള്ള ഭൂമികളുടെ കരം കൂടുകയില്ലേ?

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI : തെക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ഇപ്പോൾ ഇടവകയില്ല. മുമ്പായിരുന്നു. അതു ചരിത്രത്തിലാണ്. മാതാബവർമ്മാജാവിന്റെ കാലത്തു് രാമപ്പൻള്ളവാ തെക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഇടവകകളെ ധംസിച്ചതു കണ്ടപ്പോൾ വടക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഇടവകകളെല്ലാം ഭയന്നുപോയി. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലുള്ള സകലരും തിരുവിതാംകൂർ മഹാരാജാവാനയിനപ്പെട്ടതാണ്.

MR. M. R. NARAYANA PILLAI : വടക്കൻ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ സെറ്റിൽമെൻറു മുൻപു തുടങ്ങണമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞാത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണ്?

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI : തെക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഇടവകകളെല്ലാം പണക്കാരെക്കൂട്ടത്തു കൂടുതൽ കരാച്ചു പനിച്ചുകൊടുത്തു വടക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഇടവകകൾ ഉള്ളു. അവിടെ പല സർവെനമ്പരുകളിലും പെട്ടവിസ്തീർണ്ണമായ ഭൂമികൾക്കു കരം മുതത്താതെ വിട്ടുപോയിട്ടുണ്ട്. ദിവാൻ മി. വി. പി. മാധവറാവു വന്നു ചില താലൂക്കുകളിൽ സെറ്റിൽമെൻറു നടത്തിയെങ്കിലും പല താലൂക്കുകളിലും നടത്തിയിട്ടില്ല. എന്നാൽ സചിവോത്തമൻ സർക്കാരിനു ആദായത്തിൽ ഓഹരി കൊടുക്കാതെ കഴി

കണ ധനവാന്മാരിൽനിന്നും ആദായം വാങ്ങിച്ചു വജനാവിൽ വരുത്തു മെന്നു എനിക്കു ബോധ്യമുണ്ടു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഉത്തരവാദിത്വമുള്ള ജന പ്രതിനിധികളാലും ഈ ബില്ലിനെ എത്രക്കുമെന്നു എനിക്കു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. പിന്നെ ആക്കെങ്കിലും ഇതിൽ സങ്കടത്തിനവകാശമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതു് ഇതിൽ പ്രൊവൈസോവോമറോ ചേർത്തു ശരിപ്പെടുത്താം.

**PRESIDENT :** I know there are other honourable members anxious to speak, but as the honourable members may know, it may not be possible for me to be here until 3 P. M., because I have to be elsewhere. So I think it will be necessary for me now, with the forbearance of the honourable members to dwell on the subject for about 5 minutes, just to indicate exactly the lines on which legislation is contemplated.

It is not the object of Government hurriedly to pass legislation which may produce inequitable or calamitous results. Government have certain facts before them, which facts, again, are open to examination. But the facts are these. We find taking the Edavagai lands of Vanjipuzha and Poonjar, that there are about 33,389 acres of land within three pakuthies comprised in the Vanjipuzha area and about 46,461 acres of land similarly in three pakuthies comprised in the Poonjar area. The income of the Chief from the Vanjipuzha Edavagai is about 45 thousand rupees, and the income of the Chief in Poonjar is about 63 thousand. The net result is therefore that about 84,850 acres are yielding about 1,08,000 rupees. Now, I am again speaking subject to such investigation and corrections, as may be carried out by the Select Committee which might, if it so desires, obtain all possible facilities for getting into all the aspects of the facts. Supposing for instance adopting figures that may be regarded as average and remembering that Vanjipuzha is more hilly and mountainous than Poonjar—supposing in Poonjar one-third or one-fourth of the land is paddy land, 11,000 acres would be roughly paddy land. These would pay or have to pay Rs. 8 to Rs. 10 per acre on an average in Travancore apart from the South. A person in the adjoining non-Edavagai portion would pay about Rs. 1,65,000 whereas the Edavagai Chief gets Rs. 63,000. These facts may be open to controversy, may be completely refuted and other deductions might follow. But this aspect cannot be forgotten and that aspect has been very clearly elucidated by the Chief Secretary. Let us attend to Section 5 of the Edavagai Act. It is common knowledge that in the case of both the Edavagais that I mentioned, very large or extensive tracts of land have come into the hands of tenants on nominal or peppercorn rent. That fact has been brought home to the Government, because without betraying official confidences I might say that the Chiefs from time to time, have been in the habit of automatically passing documents and equally automatically regretting having passed those documents. Letters bringing to the notice of Government the transactions entered into by the Chief and imploring Government



[President.]

to get rid of the results of the documents passed by the Chiefs are numerous. Such a phenomenon is not uncommon elsewhere. It is nothing very peculiar either to the Edavagais of Travancore or to the Chiefs of Malabar. The same thing has happened under the permanent settlement. The position remains that there are many holders of land who pay peppercorn or nominal rent to their overlord and who do not pay any income tax on the ground that theirs is agricultural income. These are hypotheses which, investigated, may prove to be a mare's nest. On the other hand, if investigated, such facts may throw a considerable amount of light on the possibilities of future incidence of taxation. The Legal Remembrancer was perfectly right when he said that it is not essentially a fiscal measure. I do not agree, as I said, with the Legal Remembrancer in the statement that we may not be able to get considerable revenue. One lakh of rupees at this stage of the world's history is, from the point of view of Travancore, not inconsiderable. But, even assuming it is not more than Rs. 50,000 or even Rs. 30,000, it is not a question of how much money Government will get out of it but as to how far this measure will work in practice and serve two possible purposes. One possible purpose is getting the data for a revision of the whole basis of agricultural taxation, exempting those who are getting below a certain income and taxing those who get above that income. From that point of view what was hinted by the Chief Secretary might be a matter for earnest consideration by this House. Now income tax is levied on all sources taken together. Suppose a Government servant gets Rs. 150 as salary per month and gets two hundred rupees per year out of his land. The sum total will be Rs. 2,000 and therefore he may come in for taxation. It is possible I do not say it is practicable—for a Select Committee or other body to come to the conclusion that in approaching this taxation measure, you must keep all the other income on one side and that those who get not less than Rs. 2,000 from the land should alone be liable. If it is found at the same time that when getting Rs. 2,000 from the land per year he pays less than the taxes paid by his neighbour in the non-Edavagai tracts, then the equity of impost might be more apparent. I want at the same time to make it clear that it is not the policy of the Government to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. Government are aware that at a period when the country was much more sparsely cultivated and when there were large tracts of undeveloped land, enterprising persons entered upon land and improved that land and put their brains and their money and their labour into the common stock and produced great results. This Government would be the last body of persons to deny or minimise the services to the State rendered by those rubber planters, those tea planters and those cardamom planters who braving an inhospitable climate, braving malaria and many other ailments, went to those places. But at the same time the demands of the present and the likely demands of the future are exacting. We have to realise as much as possible from people who can afford to pay without at the same time taking away from them that spur to private

profit which is the foundation of what is too often anathematised as the capitalist system. Mr. Tolson spoke of the export duty. Now let us consider everything, the export duty, the likely income-tax and the amount that they pay to the Edavagai. If they succeed in proving to the Select Committee or to this House that they are relatively more heavily taxed than their neighbours, then they may not unreasonably claim exemption from this taxation. But, if on the other hand it is found after that careful investigation and scrutiny which I feel sure that a Select Committee will bestow on this matter, that there is some inequality and that there is reason for considering that the scales are weighted more against one group of people in the State than the other, then necessary steps may become necessary.

Finally I wish to say this that in regard to this measure it is introduced with advertence to possibilities in the future, some of which were adumbrated in the speech of Mr. E. Subramonia Aiyar. The practical difficulties in the way of income tax, especially with the fragmented holdings of Travancore, are very great. The Government have not been unmindful of the possibility of getting rid of the land tax and adopting a sliding scale of income tax. But the possibility of such a measure of taxation requires most careful consideration and elucidation.

Something was said as to resettlement. Does the honourable member who spoke of resettlement realise that we shall have to set apart two or three crores of rupees at the present juncture for resettlement and resurvey. Therefore, as an alternative it has to be considered that perhaps it is necessary to arrive at another method of taxation. This possibility might be explored when you are dealing with this in the Select Committee stage and also when this Bill, if it emerges into law, is implemented and worked. This is a Bill of an exploratory character. It is designed to elicit facts. It is not designed to penalise or to confiscate or to render infructuous or impotent private efforts to increase private resources. It is from that point of view that the Government would desire that this Bill should be viewed.

The House will now adjourn and meet again at 2-10 p. m.

[The House adjourned for lunch at 1-10 p. m. and re-assembled at 2-10 p. m.]

#### MEMBER SWORN.

Mr. C. Kumara Das took the oath and signed the rolls.

**MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI:** As the Bill was placed before this House, I found it rather difficult to support the principle contained in it and my intention was to oppose it. My reason was that I felt that this amendment sought to make an invidious discrimination against the tenants of the Edavagai. As has been pointed out by the Government member, I have always been for a reorientation of the



[Mr. Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai.]

policy of land tax and any step calculated towards that would certainly have my support. But my fear was that this Bill without making any such change would make a differentiation disadvantageous to a particular set of the subjects of His Highness the Maharaja.

But, Sir, after the explanation given by the Chief Secretary and also by yourself, I find that what is sought by this bill is not to make a discrimination against the tenants of the Edavagais but to remove a discrimination that is in force against the tenants of the *pandarapattom* lands. As you have explained it is within the scope of the Select Committee to go into the question and study in detail the incidence of taxation as it stands in the case of these two sets of tenants and if only the Select Committee are convinced, are they bound to take any step to impose income tax on the income derived from the Edavagai lands.

Another fear I had was that this would go hard against the middle class tenants of the Edavagais. Especially I was afraid that it might help to harass them to some extent. But when the Chief Secretary and you have made it clear that only income amounting to more than Rs. 2,000 from land may be taxed.....

**PRESIDENT:** I said that is a matter open to the Select Committee.

**MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI:** Yes, Sir. The Select Committee can so modify the Amendment Bill and change it in such a way that all those persons who derive income from land not amounting to Rs. 2,000 may be excluded from the operation of this Amendment Bill. As these two points have been made clear, I do not think there need be any fear in accepting the principle of this Bill. Therefore I support the principle of this Bill.

[At this stage, the Dewan-President vacated the Chair and it was then occupied by the Deputy-President—]

**MR. A. K. KUMARAN VAIDYAN :** സർ, ഞാൻ ഈ ഭേദഗതി ബില്ലിനെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലുള്ള സാധുജനങ്ങൾ ഭൂനികുതിക്കുപുറമെ ആദായനികുതികൂടി കൊടുത്തുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ സന്ദർഭത്തിൽ യാതൊരുനികുതിയും കൊടുക്കാതിരിക്കുന്ന സ്ഥലമുടമസ്ഥന്മാർക്കു ഒരു നികുതി ചുമത്താൻ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതിൽ അതിനെ ചിലർ ഇവിടെ ശക്തിമത്തായി എതിർക്കുകയാണുചെയ്തത്. എന്നാൽ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ധാരാളം വസ്തുക്കൾ കരമൊഴിവായി കൈവശം വെച്ചുനടവിക്കുന്നവരിലാണ് ഈ നികുതി ചുമത്തണമെന്നുദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നത്. അവരിൽനിന്നും ഒരു നികുതി ഈടാക്കിയില്ലെങ്കിൽ അത് ഹവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ആദായനികുതി ഇനത്തിൽ നഷ്ടം ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്ന ഒരു സംഗതിയാകുന്നു. ഇടപ്പള്ളി, പുത്തൂർ, വഞ്ഞിപ്പുഴ മുതലായ ഇടവകക്കാരുടെ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ അനേകം ഏക്കർ സ്ഥലങ്ങൾ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിന്റെ പല

ഭാഗത്തുമായി ഓരോരുത്തർ കൈവശപ്പെടുത്തി അനുഭവിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുകയാണ്. എങ്കിലും അവർ യാതൊരു നികുതിയും ഗവണ്മെന്റിനു കൊടുക്കുന്നില്ല.

MR. PADIYARA JOSEPH KUNJU : ഇടവകജന്മിമാർക്ക് അവർ മിച്ച വാരം കൊടുക്കുന്നില്ലേ?

MR. A. K. KUMARAN VAIDYAN : അതു നികുതിയല്ല ജന്മിഭോഗമാണ്.

MR. PADIYARA JOSEPH KUNJU : അങ്ങനെയൊന്നിൽ ജന്മിഭോഗം പറുന്നവരല്ലേ ഈ നികുതി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടത്?

MR. A. K. KUMARAN VAIDYAN : അവർക്ക് വസ്തു കൈവശം ഇല്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ട് അതിന്മേലുള്ള ആദായം ലഭിക്കുന്നില്ലല്ലോ. എന്തിനാണിവിടെ പറയാനുള്ളതു എന്തെന്നാൽ, വസ്തുവിന്മേൽ ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർക്കു ൨൦൦൦ രൂപയിൽ കൂടുതൽ ആദായം കിട്ടുന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ നികുതികൊടുത്താൽ മതിയെന്നാണ്.

എന്റെ സന്ദേഹിതൻ മി. ടി. സി. കേശവപിള്ള, റീസെററിൽമെൻറു തുടങ്ങേണ്ടത്, ആദ്യമായി വടക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിലായി രാജ്ഞാനും എന്നു ഇവിടെ പ്രസ്താവിച്ചു. അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഒരു എതിർ അഭിപ്രായം പുറപ്പെടുവിക്കണമെന്നു ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നില്ല. കൂടാതെ അതിന്റെ ആവശ്യവും ഇപ്പോൾ ഇല്ല.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI : സർ, തേയില മുതലായവ ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്ന തോട്ടങ്ങൾ വടക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂറിലല്ലേ അധികമുള്ളത്?

MR. A. K. KUMARAN VAIDYAN : അത്തരം കൃഷികൾ ചെയ്യാവുന്നതല്ല മാത്രമേ അതുകൾ ചെയ്യാമുള്ളൂ. അല്ലാത്തത് തെങ്ങ്, കമുകു, പ്ലാവ് മുതലായതും ചിലയിടത്തു് മരച്ചുനി മുതലായതും കൃഷി ചെയ്യുന്നുണ്ട്.

സർ, റീ സെററിൽമെൻറു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിന്റെ ഏതു ഭാഗത്തു നിന്നു തുടങ്ങിയാലും അതു് അവസാനിക്കുന്ന കാലത്തുമാത്രമേ ജനങ്ങളിൽ നികുതി ചുമത്താവൂ എന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

ഇടവകക്കാരുടെ കൈവശം ഇരിക്കുന്ന വസ്തുക്കൾക്ക് ആദായ നികുതി ചുമത്തുന്നത് നീതിതന്നെയാണ്. ധാരാളം പണം കെട്ടിയിരിപ്പുള്ള ആളുകളിൽ നിന്നും നികുതിയായിട്ടോ, മറ്റേതെങ്കിലും തരത്തിൽ



[Mr. A. K. Kumaran Vaidyan.]

ഈ വസൂലാക്കി സാധുക്കൾക്കുവേണ്ടി ഉപയോഗപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്നുള്ള ഒരു തത്വം ആഭരണായമാണ്.

MR. PADIYARA JOSEPH KUNJU : അപ്പോൾ ഇവിടെ ബോർഡ് വിസം കൊണ്ടുവരണമെന്നാണോ മെമ്പർ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെടുന്നത്?

MR. A. K. KUMARAN VAIDYAN : ബോർഡ് വിസത്തിനെപ്പറ്റി പ്രസംഗിക്കുകയല്ല ഞാൻ ചെയ്യുന്നത്. കർഷകരുടെ ജീവരക്തം ഉൾക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്നവർ കൈവശംവെച്ചുനടവിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന വസൂലിന്മേൽ നികുതി ചുമത്തിയാൽ അതു കൃഷിക്കാർക്കും ഉപയോഗപ്രദമായ വിധത്തിൽ വിധേയമാക്കണമെന്നാണ് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നത്. ഈ സംഗതിയിൽ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ഗവണ്മെന്റ് വേണ്ടത്ര ശ്രദ്ധ പതിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അറിവ്. അങ്ങനെയുള്ള നികുതി ചുമത്താൻകൊണ്ടു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലുള്ള നൂറു ലക്ഷം ജനങ്ങളിൽ പത്തോ പത്തോ ആളുകൾക്ക് ഒരു പാക്കു വാഷമം ഉണ്ടായേക്കാം. എന്നാൽ ഭൂരിപക്ഷം ആളുകളുടെ സുഖസൗകര്യങ്ങളെ പരിഗണിച്ചു ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു നികുതി ചുമത്താൻ ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നതിൽ നാം എല്ലാവരും ബലശ്രദ്ധയോടെ രായിരിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. നികുതി ഇനത്തിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് സാരമായ ഒരു തുക കുറച്ചുചെയ്യേണ്ടതായും കൂടാതെ മറ്റുതരത്തിൽ വിട്ടുപാഴ്ചകൾ ചെയ്യേണ്ടതായുള്ള നിലയ്ക്ക് പണം ഉള്ളിടത്തുനിന്നും എടുത്തു വിനിയോഗിക്കണമെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അപേക്ഷ. ആയതിനാൽ അങ്ങനെയുള്ള സന്ദർഭമുണ്ടാകുമ്പോൾ ഇത്തരം നിയമങ്ങൾ ഗവണ്മെന്റിൽനിന്നും അപ്പോഴപ്പോൾ അടിയന്തിരാധികാരങ്ങൾ വിനിയോഗിച്ചു പാസാക്കി പെട്ടെന്നുതന്നെ വേണ്ടി പ്രവർത്തിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അപേക്ഷയോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ ഈ ഭേദഗതി ബില്ലിനെ അനുകൂലിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. M. R. NARAYANA PILLAI : Sir, I move that the question be now put.

The motion for closure was put and carried.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI : Sir, I have very little to add to what has been stated by the Chief Secretary to Government and by the Dewan-President. Mr. Kainikkara Padmanabha Pillai stated that he accepts the principle of the bill on the understanding that the Select Committee would have the power to go into the question of imposing restrictions on the full scope of the bill. It was suggested here that only such income as is in excess of Rs. 2,000 alone should be taxed in the case of tax-free lands. That is a matter which can be considered by the Select Committee.

Various other suggestions were also made by the honourable members. But I do not think that they can be considered as suggestions on which the Select Committee should take action. If the honourable members accept the principle of the bill, I shall move for reference to the Select Committee.

MR. PADIYARA JOSEPH KUNJU : സർക്കാർഭൂമിയിലെ അനുഭവങ്ങളും ഇടവക ഭൂമിയിലെ അനുഭവങ്ങളും തമ്മിലുള്ള വ്യത്യാസമെന്തെന്ന് എന്റെ ബ്ലോക്കിൽ മി. എം. ശിവതാനുപിള്ള ചീഫ് സെക്രട്ടറിയോടു ചോദിച്ചപ്പോൾ "I am coming to that" എന്നു പറയുകയും ചെയ്തു. ഒന്നും പറയാതിരിക്കുകയും ചെയ്തതിനു മുമ്പ് എന്തു സമാധാനം പറയണം!

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : It is absolutely irrelevant. He has nothing to do with that question.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : I would like to know whether the bill would cover the products raised on sirkar lands.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI : The scope of the bill cannot be enlarged, but the Select Committee can narrow it down by adding a proviso to some clause limiting the income to certain kinds or amounts. If we have to include other lands also, the bill will have to be re-drafted. The Select Committee cannot say that not only the lands mentioned in the bill, but others also will come under the purview of the bill; I do not think it can do so. But the Select Committee can take away certain portions from the purview of the bill.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : Supposing I move an amendment in the Select Committee that lands in which ginger, pepper, or rubber are grown should also be included in the bill. Would such an amendment be permissible?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI : That is a hypothetical question. Even if the question were permissible, I cannot guarantee that the honourable member will be in the select committee to move that amendment.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : Sir, since the bill restricts the scope of land tax, I want to know whether an amendment such as the one I have referred to can be brought within the scope of the bill.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI : That is a matter which the select committee will be competent to decide. The opinion of the member in charge of the bill will not be sufficient. What I say is that the ordinary rule relating to consideration of the bills by the select committee is that they should not widen the scope of a measure; they have powers to curtail it. If the scope of the bill is widened by the amendment proposed, then the select committee may come to the proper decision that they are not competent to consider that amendment. I may also add that the question of bringing in the income derived from such lands could very profitably be discussed by this House at the next session or in Karkadagom.



MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: Am I to understand that it is the Legal Remembrancer's opinion that the bill will affect only Edavagai lands?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: The bill does not say so. There is no reference to the Edavagai lands. But in the course of discussion we were using the expression "Edavagai" constantly.

Not a single word about Edavagais has been mentioned in the Bill. The word was used constantly for reference during discussion.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: Are there extensive lands that are tax-free other than Edavagais?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNAPILLAI: Yes. There are rent free lands, Venpattom lands. It is open to the select committee to exclude them or include them. Moreover in order that agricultural income may become assessable the income derived from that source should exceed a particular amount. All these are matters which could be settled at the committee stage.

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN: കരം ഒഴിവാച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ഭൂമിയിൽ നിന്നും ആയിരം രൂപ വരവുണ്ടെന്നരിക്കട്ടെ. ആ തുകയ്ക്കും ഈ നിയമം ബാധകമാകുമോ?

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: നേരം വെളുക്കുന്നതുവരെ 'രമായണം വായിച്ചിട്ടു ഏതോ ചോദ്യം ചോദിക്കുന്നതുപോലെയുള്ള ഒരു ചോദ്യമാണിതു. ഇതിനെപ്പറ്റിയെല്ലാം സെലക്ടർ കമ്മിറ്റിക്കാർ തീരുമാനിക്കുന്നതാണ്. ആ സംഗതി പിന്നെയും പിന്നെയും കത്തുവിണ ഗ്രാമഫോൺ പ്ലേറ്റു ചോലെ ഞാൻ ആവർത്തിച്ചു കൊണ്ടുനിൽക്കുന്നുണ്ട്.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that the Travancore Income Tax (Amendment) Bill be read in the Assembly.

The motion was put and carried.

SECRETARY: The title of the Bill shall be "The Travancore Income Tax (Amendment) Bill."

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: I beg to move that the Travancore Income Tax (Amendment) Bill be referred to a select committee consisting of the following members:—

- Messrs. E. Subramonia Aiyar
- K. Dominic Joseph
- E. E. Pandarathil
- S. Govinda Pillai
- N. V. Joseph
- Padiyara Joseph Kunju
- K. Kunju Panikar
- H. O. L. Marikkar
- Thamarapallil Kochuthommen
- Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai
- N. Ramakrishna Pillai

M. Sivathanu Pillai  
 J. W. Tolson  
 G. Velu Pillai  
 P. Vivekanandan and  
 S. Krishna Iyer

**MR. A. LAKSHIMINARAYANA AIYAR:** (*Financial Secretary to Government*): I second it.

The motion was put and carried.

The bill was referred to a Select Committee.

### THE TRAVANCORE MERCHANDISE—MARKS BILL.

**MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI:** I rise to introduce the Merchandise Marks Bill and beg to state that the same be read in the Assembly.

**MR. A. LAKSHIMINARAYANA AIYAR:** I second it.

**MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI:** Sir, I may be permitted to add a few words in support of the principles contained in the Bill. The honourable members of this House might remember that during the last session when we had passed a large number of commercial bills the Dewan-President had stated that in order to have a complete round of commercial laws there should be an enactment relating to Merchandise Marks. The bill was then under preparation. But as the same bill was being considered by the Indian Legislature at that time, this Government thought it advisable to wait till that Legislature passed the measure. It will be found by the honourable members that there are important amendments made to the Travancore Penal Code and the Sea Customs Act. There are also various other provisions as explained by me in the statement of objects and reasons dealing with false marks and trade marks. I may add that the subject of Trade Marks has been comprehensively dealt with by the Trade Marks Bill passed by this Assembly and this bill only supplements what has already been done by the Legislature in respect of commercial bills.

The question that the Travancore Merchandise Marks Bill be read in the Assembly was put and carried.

**SECRETARY:** The Title of the Bill shall be "The Travancore Merchandise Marks Bill."

**MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI:** I beg to move that the Bill be referred to a select committee consisting of the following members:-

Messrs. S. Chattanatha Karayalar  
 K. G. Govindan  
 S. Govinda Pillai  
 K. C. Karunakaran  
 T. C. Kesava Pillai  
 T. T. Kesavan Sastri.  
 N. M. Muhammed, Abdul Kadir



[Mr. Puthupalli S. Krishna Pillai]

Messrs. N. Narayana Kurup  
 K. Narayanaperumal Nadar  
 Sry. T. Narayani Amma  
 Messrs. N. Ramakrishna Pillai  
 M. Ramiah Pillai  
 Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai  
 J. E. A. Periera and  
 J. W. Tolson.

MR. A. LAKSHMINARAYANA AIYAR: I second it.

The motion was put and carried. The bill was referred to a Select Committee.

#### THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD.

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

“That the question whether the Economic Development Board should continue to work on its present constitution be taken up for discussion.”

Sir, the idea of Government in placing this motion before the House is to elicit the views of the honourable members in regard to the possibilities, and the ways and means, of making the Economic Development Board function more purposefully, usefully and to the greater benefit of the country at large. The Board consists of 32 members and there are no standing committees to which subjects are assigned. As questions arise, as notice of motions come, *ad hoc* committees are formed and they go into the questions and report on them, after due consideration and investigation. The Board has to meet four times in the year and during the meeting, all the members are present, so much so the scope and opportunity for detailed discussion is denied. Consequently all details in regard to the schemes are not fully dealt with and examined, but the general purpose alone being agreed upon, and only a resolution, accepted in pursuance of each recommendation, is sent up to Government for their consideration and approval. The difficulty therefore is that with a Board consisting of 32 members, the usefulness of such an institution is considerably reduced.

Government have from time to time pointed out the necessity of constituting standing committees and working through them so that what might be called a full meeting of the board may not be necessary at all times. In constituting the Board, the term of which has recently expired, the Government deliberately insisted that it should function through sub-committees. Each such committee should consist of 3 or at the most 5 members. It was stated that the object of the Board must be to help Government to bring about well conceived schemes of important economic planning concentrating attention on a few most urgent and important problems.

From the nature of the present constitution of the board, more prominence is given to questions of the hour, and matters of immediate moment and anything like a well conceived scheme of economic

planning could not be sent up from the Board except on a few stray questions. The Government again insisted in the same G. O. that the Board should not fritter away its attention on a large number of questions. I am sorry to say that, owing to pressure of existing conditions and the importance of day to day problems, it has not been possible to restrict the scope of the board to what the Government actually required of it, that is to say, not to fritter away its attention on a large number of questions. Nor is it possible, as Government had pointed out, to pick out a few among the whole lot of questions submitted to the board, such as are considered to be most urgent and important. All problems of immediate moment are of great importance from the standpoint of one group or individual member of the board representing a particular interest. That is the difficulty with which we are faced. The term of the Board reconstituted in 1937 having now run out, and Government having arrived at a provisional conclusion that the board to be useful must reduce its membership and, if possible, a certain number of standing committees should be constituted, so that the Board will restrict themselves to very important problems which come within their purview, it is suggested that a body consisting of say 12 or 15 members would be sufficient. They can form into small sub-committees. For example, a sub-committee each can be formed for agriculture and co-operation, for banking and industry, for marketing and rural re-construction, for development schemes and economic planning. Something on these lines may be constituted by Government with a reduced number of official members, keeping in view a large number of non-officials in such bodies. The board must have power to co-opt experts as they come to different questions falling within their purview: such experts can either be officers or otherwise. Each sub-committee should function in this manner and report to a general meeting to be held, not 4 times a year, but once or twice, and then formulate schemes for submission to Government. In such a situation, the Board will not have necessarily to confine its attention to matters of immediate moment. Such is the present idea of Government. As I said, it is only a provisional conclusion arrived at. It is subject to modifications as this honourable house thinks fit. It is with this view that this motion has been presented for discussion.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** May I know whether any one of the recommendations of the Board has ever been acted upon by Government?

**MR. A. GOPALA MENON:** I might say for the information of the House that a number of recommendations of this Board has been accepted by Government and acted upon.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI:** Could the member name some of the recommendations so adopted?

**MR. A. GOPALA MENON:** Marketing of coconut products is one. Rural re-construction scheme is another.



MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: As for that matter the rural reconstruction scheme was brought into being even before the existence of the Economic Development Board.

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: There is a standing committee of this Board which attends to the working of the scheme.

[At this stage the Dewan-President resumed the chair]

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN: റസല്യഷൻ അക്സെപ്റ്റർ ചെയ്ത ഏകിലും അതിനെപ്പറ്റി എന്തെങ്കിലും പ്രവർത്തനം നടത്തയിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: ഈ ചോദ്യത്തിൽ ഒരു മറുപടി പറയുക വിഷമമാണ്. ഗവണ്മെന്റിന് ഒരു എക്കണാമിക് ബോർഡ് മാത്രമല്ലാ ഉള്ളത്. ഓരോ കാര്യങ്ങളിലും ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും അനുദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും നിയമസഭയുടെയും മറ്റു പല സംഘടനകളും ഗവർണ്മെന്റിനെ ഉപദേശിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. ആരു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടാണ് ഗവർണ്മെന്റ് ഓരോന്നും ചെയ്യുന്നതെന്നു പറയാൻ വിഷമമാണ്.

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORATHARAKAN: : മെമ്പർമാരെ വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് വലിയ പ്രയോജനമില്ലെന്നു ഗവണ്മെന്റിന് ഇപ്പോൾ ബോധ്യം വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: ഇപ്പോൾ ഞാനിവിടെ അങ്ങനെയൊന്നു വിചാരിക്കുന്നതു്.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know the amount that was set apart for the Economic Development Board for the year 1116?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: Rs. 11,726 and odd.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know the amount utilised in the shape of T. A. for the members of the Board out of that amount?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: That is not much, Rs. 3,364—Chs. 13—C. 14.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: May I know whether any Development Department has sent up any proposal for the consideration of this Board?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: Such proposals are bound up with Government proposals, and so it is not easy to say whether the Department itself has moved in the matter or not.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: May I know whether Government have forwarded any proposal for the consideration of the Board?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: Yes.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: May I know the nature of the proposals sent? Will the honourable Member give some examples?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : I am afraid I have not got a separate list of proposals forwarded by Government for consideration.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : Is the member sure that any proposal was sent by Government ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : I have not got the list of subjects which Government actually forwarded. But many schemes such as Banking and Rural Re-construction schemes were discussed at the instance of Government.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : May I know whether 32 was the number of members suggested by the original G. O. or whether it was subsequently increased ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : Government ordered the appointment of more members from time to time.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : What I wish to know is whether that was the number in the G. O. originally constituting the Board.

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : The original G. O. relates to the year 1921.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : What was the number then ? Was it not 11 and then subsequently raised ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : According to the needs of the time and according to the pressure brought to bear upon Government, that number had to be increased.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : I suppose the Director of Public Instruction is a member of the Economic Development Board also.

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : Yes, sir, at present.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : May I know whether the members of that Committee ever travelled for T. A. alone ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : Not that I am aware of. T. A. came incidentally.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : It is a matter for sincere gratification to find that an opportunity has been afforded to the Legislature to express its considered views on the question of re-organisation or re-constitution of the Economic Development Board. The Economic Development Board was constituted for the first time by virtue of the G.O. dated 20th June 1921 and reorganised last in the year 1937. Thus we find that the Board has been in existence for the last two decades and that it has all along been traditionally keeping up its present constitution without any innovation except in regard to the increase in the number of its members from time to time. During this pretty long period of its existence, the Board has passed many hands in the sense that it has been tacked on to several Departmental Heads but not as adjunct to any particular Department. The first President of the Board, as I understand, was the Conservator of Forests. From him it devolved upon the Director of Agriculture and then again upon the Conservator of Forests. Afterwards it passed on to the Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner and lastly to the present President, the Director of Public Instruction. Thus it is not known



[Mr. Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai]

to the public or to this House as to what principle or policy has been followed by Government in regard to the appointment of its President. From what I have already submitted it can be seen that the Economic Development Board has no independent existence and that nobody was likely to take any special or permanent interest in the matter, the more so because of the honorary character of its Presidentship without any allowance or pay for the additional work.

MR. M. R. NARAYANA PILLAI: May I know what amount the member is proposing as allowance?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: I do not wish to answer that question.

The number of members was enhanced from time to time according to the exigencies of each occasion. The number, I believe, was 7 at one time according to the G. O. of 1921, and 13 at another time and 25 a third time according to the latest reorganisation. Now I am given to understand that it is between 30 and 32. From the Administration Report for the year 1115 it is seen that there are only 30 members. The Board as constituted at present is purely an Advisory Body without any executive functions. As evidenced by the Administration Report for the previous years, the Board used to pass several resolutions and submit the same to Government. But Sir, I was not able to see from the documents that have been furnished to us by Government what action Government have taken on those resolutions, or at least how far Government have appreciated them. Most of the resolutions passed by the Economic Development Board related to the agricultural problems. Instances are not rare in which the very same resolutions had come up for discussion at the meetings of both the Economic Development Board and the Agricultural Board. The two Boards constituted by Government, viz., the Economic Development Board and the Board of Agriculture had to pass the very same resolutions. According to me it is a waste of public funds and public time. I am constrained to observe that in spite of the honest and repeated attempts made by Government and also by the present President in this direction, nothing substantial has been achieved so far as the results of the working of the Economic Development Board. One of the most important items of work now with the Board is to award grants to certain organisations started in the name of rural reconstruction. I may say without any hesitation that much criticism is levelled against the present system of awarding grants by the Economic Development Board. In my opinion the amount that is being annually spent by way of awarding grants to several organisations has not served any useful purpose and in or at least in some cases such grants are being misappropriated for their other needs by the individuals to whom the grant is given. It cannot but be so because even the President is not given powers or facilities to effectively control the organisations which are given such grants and to see that the money given by the Government is utilised for the purpose for which it is intended. In short I may be

permitted to submit that the name Economic Development Board itself is a misnomer in as much as there has been no economic policy or Development. I would venture to offer certain suggestions for the re-organisation of the Economic Development Board so that it may be made more useful or purposeful as the President has rightly stated on the floor of the House. As the present Board is quite unwieldy, I would suggest that it should be made a compact Advisory Body consisting of only experts on several subjects relating to the economic policy and undertakings of Government as a whole. Since there is at present a Board of Agriculture, a Co-operative Advisory Board and a Board of Industries, an unwieldy body like the present Economic Development Board would be a superfluous one.

**PRESIDENT :** In the course of the discussion it is open to the members to suggest the amalgamation or fusion of any existing bodies and also to suggest methods and means whereby non-official expert opinion can be made to be operative in such bodies in addition of official experts.

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI :** Sir, my submission is that I have no objection at present to allow the other boards except the Board of Agriculture to continue as they are just at present. My only submission is that the proposed re-organised Development Board must be only a central compact body consisting of experts only.

**MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI :** May I know the approximate number?

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI :** According to me the number should not exceed 12. Even there, my submission is that it is not necessary that heads of development departments should be ex-officio members of the Board because Government are in a position even otherwise to ascertain the views, of these Departmental heads on different matters that come up for final decision before them.

**MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI :** Then who are the expert available?

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI :** I don't think that only heads of departments are experts in such matters. There are ever so many other experts in different branches. According to the new rules of re-organisations the Dewan or the Chief Secretary should be bound to preside over the deliberations of the proposed re-organised Development Board so that they may be in direct touch with the trend of discussions at the meetings of the Board and also of the view points expressed by the members at such meetings. In other words my submission is that the Board may be enabled to function as a part of the Secretariat. Sir, in that case I am sure that the recommendation of the Economic Development Board will not be slightly brushed aside or allowed to remain without any action being taken. The reconstituted Economic Development Board must be of such a nature as would be in position to give useful advice to Government on major Economic problems and undertakings of Government and thus to make the Board more purposeful and useful. These are my suggestions and if such a



[Mr. Puliyoor T. V. Velayudhaan Pillai.]

board is constituted I fully believe it would be of substantial use to the general public and in any event I am not prepared to allow the Board to function on its present constitution.

**PRESIDENT :** Government will be very much grateful, if the functions and constitutions of some Body will take the place of the present Board or Boards and such functions are also indicated in this debate:

**MR. M. R. NARAYANA PILLAI :** Sir, I agree with the proposals of the honourable member who brought forward this motion. With reference to the last speaker— I mean my honourable friend Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai— I cannot agree with his suggestion that only experts should be asked to serve as members of the Board. I am not in a position to agree with that because the Board should function more as a liaison agency between the public and the Government.

**MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI :** Is not this Legislature such an agency?

**MR. M. R. NARAYAN PILLAI :** Sir, I am speaking about the functions of the Board and not of the Legislature. With regard to the Chief Secretary being made the President of the Board, I cannot agree with that suggestion either. The reason is that the President has to forward the recommendations of the Board to the Government, and the Chief Secretary is the officer on behalf of the Government to consider those recommendations. I know instances when officers like a late Conservator of Forests were Presidents of the Board and the resolutions passed by the Board presided over by the Conservator was not given effect to when he reached his office. He would simply refuse to take action on them for many reasons, therefore an officer of Government or a head of a department should not be made the President of the Board. The present president of the Board is the fittest person to be the president. He is an authority on the subject of economics and he has travelled wide and knows the conditions outside.

**MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI :** Even after he retires should he be the President?

**MR. M. R. NARAYANA PILLAI :** There is no harm in that.

**MR. P. SIVARAMA PILLAI :** Sir, the Economic Development Board has been in existence for more than twenty years. In the G. O. re-constituting the Board in 1937, the Government observed as follows:—

“Government consider that the Board should be reconstituted so as to make it a really representative organisation, representing the economic interests in the State and comprising only those who can advise Government with authority backed by experience. It should function through sub-committees each of which should consist of three or, at the most, five members. Its object must be to help Government in bringing about well-conceived schemes of economic planning spread over a few years. The Board should not fritter away its attention on a large number of questions, but should pick out a few which are considered most urgent and important. Each one of these problems should be left to a sub-committee of the Board, instead of the whole Board, sitting over it. There cannot be more than three or four such problems in any one year.”

Accordingly the Board was reconstituted with 15 non-official members and 10 official members. This new Board has now been functioning for more than four years. We find that during this period the Board has discussed various matters of economic importance and made recommendations to the Government. I understand that the Government has accepted and acted upon some of these recommendations. Thus it has been functioning as a poor advisory body. Among the functions of the Board has been included co-ordination of the work of the several development departments. But I do not know how far the object of the Government has been realised so far. The heads of the Development Departments should take more interest in the working of the Board and the carrying out of the schemes recommended by the Board.

But, Sir, the utility of the Board would have been much more if it were given a hand in and a supervision over the actual working out of the schemes by the various development departments. The Board as at present constituted is too large. So it should be made a more compact and homogeneous body consisting of the heads of Development Departments and a few real experts. The number should not be more than a dozen. Such a compact body will be able to meet more often than at present and effectively plan for the future.

I believe that an amount of duplication and overlapping of functions of several bodies like the Board of Agriculture can be avoided by the amalgamation of these two Boards. It is just the proper time for us to consider whether all these Boards should continue to work on the present line.

**MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI:** Sir, I do not think that there has been much difference of opinion as to the work turned out so far by the Economic Development Board. The very fact that Government have thought it proper to move a motion to enable this House to discuss the question fully shows that the turn out of work by the Board has not been satisfactory. The President himself has expressed in very decent language that the work has not been quite what it was expected to be. Therefore the present constitution of the Board and the work turned out so far, I do not think, will get the approval of anybody either of Government or the non-officials. The President in moving the motion has placed before us a rough skeleton of a programme for the future. I may say, Sir, that I am generally in agreement with the programme as chalked out by him. If I have understood him correctly the future programme is to reduce the number of members and make the Board a more compact body with a constitution having a non-official majority and work it through certain sub-committees. I think, that this is the sum total of his proposals. I may say, Sir, that I am generally in agreement with the programme stated by him.

It has been said here that the committee must be a committee of experts. It has also been said here that the departmental heads might not necessarily be in the committee. I cannot possibly conceive of a



[Mr. Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai]

committee of experts in Travancore excluding departmental heads. For example I do not think that we can have a great expert in Agriculture than the Director of Agriculture. Or for that matter there may not be a better authority on industrial matters than the Director of Industries. Naturally the heads of departments are the best experts available to Government for any purpose. If the Committee wants to be a committee of experts the departmental heads must be given a place in it. I would go a step further and say that even if it is not a Committee of experts the departmental heads will have to be there. I have one particular point to emphasise viz., the necessity for the co-relation and co-ordination of the departments. I think the departmental heads should be members of a body like this. To me the conception of a board is more of an executive nature. It should not merely be a Committee of experts working in a laboratory and giving out formulas for the economic development of our State. When expert advice is necessary competent hands can be co-opted and their advice availed of.

Another point which I want to emphasise is this. My friend Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai was saying that he is for allowing the other boards to continue. I am definitely against this. The moment we reconstitute the Economic Development Board and make it efficient, I think we can immediately do away with the Agricultural Board. There is a co-operative advisory committee now, but I am afraid that the members are not correctly informed about that. It is not a standing committee. It has been established only for a period of 3 months. The present committee may recommend a standing committee. However when the reconstituted Economic Development Board comes into being I think a permanent co-operative Advisory Committee would also become unnecessary. Sir, in this connection I would go a step further and say that the Public Works Advisory Committee can also be done away with. The functions of all these committees can be fulfilled by the sub-committees of the newly constituted Economic Development Board. Therefore in my opinion a compact, efficient and ever vigilant board is the only necessary institution.

Sir, a suggestion has been made here that the Dewan or the Chief Secretary must preside over the deliberations of its meetings. It has got its own use. If the departmental head or the Chief Secretary comes into close contact with the deliberations of the Committee and happens to know the opinions expressed there certainly it would make matters easy for carrying them out. But I would consider that a separate president is necessary for this Development Board. Sir, the objects with which this development board was formed needs no revision. It is exhaustive and the scope of work is quite wide. Its first object is "to discuss all questions of policy relating to the working of the various development departments". The second function is "to make suggestions to Government in regard to the agricultural, industrial and other matters of economic importance and to co-ordinate the

work of the several development departments". Thirdly it has "to discuss important proposals or schemes sent up by each individual development board or Government." These three functions are certainly wide enough and is more or less exhaustive for all practical purposes. But it is clear that none of these functions have been quite satisfactorily carried out. The first of these three objects is perhaps the only item attended to, namely, sending up recommendations to Government. Even there, we are told, that even though Government found their way to accept some of the recommendations sent up to them, when it came to a question of carrying them out only very few of the recommendations were given effect to. About the third point, I would ask the president whether there has been any single instance of work of this kind done by the Economic Development Board. Government or the various development departments have very few occasions to refer any matter of importance to the Economic Development Board. So far that clause has never been put into operation. Coming to the second aim viz., to co-ordinate the work of the several departments I have to say something about this point.

Throughout my life as a member of the Assembly I have felt that much remains to be done in this direction. We have got the Department of Industries, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Co-operation and the rural development activities—though it has not become a department with a departmental head. Thus we have got various departments. All these departments are necessary for the development of the country. But, unless they are inter-related and some effective correlation is made between these departments, they are not going to give substantial development to the economic condition of this country. Two years ago Government set apart 50 thousand rupees for rural uplift work in the Budget. In the general discussion of the Budget I said that it was not going to make any substantial contribution towards the rural uplift of the country unless a co-relation was effected between the several departments contributing to rural uplift and the whole thing was brought under one officer. Now, Sir, take for example the question of manure. In the case of manure co-operation between the Fisheries Department, the Agricultural Department and the Forest Department is necessary. So, again take for example, the cottage industries. Co-operation between the Agricultural Department, Co-operative Department and Industries Department is necessary. Again take the question of irrigation. Co-operation between Land Revenue Department, Agricultural Department and the Department of Public Works is necessary. Thus we find when we go deep into any problem an inter-relation between several Departments is necessary. Without provision for that I do not think that this is going to have any great influence on the economic condition of the country in general. Of course, the Industrial Department may be able to show some work; the Agricultural Department may be able to publish a spectacular administration report. But the ordinary citizen will not be benefited to any considerable extent.



[Mr. Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai]

The essential object of the Economic Development Board must therefore be to co-ordinate the work of the several Departments—I believe that can be achieved only by the appointment of an efficient Development Commissioner, if I may call him so. There must be separate heads of the Departments for co-operation, of Agriculture, Industries etc. But in addition to their own individual work these departments must work as a correlated whole. The only effective method of fulfilling the aims of the Economic Development Board is to co-relate these departments, and that can be done only by bringing them under an officer of high status whom I may call the Development Commissioner.

To me, therefore, Sir, whether the Chief Secretary presides or the Dewan presides is not exactly the most important question. I would urge that the President of the Economic Development Board must be the Development Commissioner.

Now, to summarise my remarks, I would suggest that the Board must be reconstituted so that the heads of the various development departments are given places in that. Substantial weightage must be given to the non-official element. The Board should be placed under a Development Commissioner who would co-relate the activities of the various Departments. A programme should be chalked out. The Committee will carry out its different functions by constituting themselves into small sub-committees.

MR. T. G. KESAVA PILLAI: സർ, ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെപ്പറ്റി രണ്ടു വാക്കു പറയണമെന്നു ഞാനും വിചാരിക്കുന്നു. ഞാൻ എക്കണാമിക്സ് ബോർഡിനെ ഒരു പ്രതിനിധിയാണു്. കഴിഞ്ഞ കാലങ്ങളിലെ പ്രവർത്തനം നോക്കുമ്പോൾ ബോർഡുമുഖേന വളരെ പ്രയാസപ്പെട്ട കാര്യങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റി ചർച്ച ചെയ്യുവാൻ കഴിഞ്ഞു എന്നും കാര്യങ്ങൾ വളരെ ഭംഗമായി നടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടു പോയി എന്നും പറയുവാൻ കഴിയും. ലാൻഡ് റവന്യൂ കമ്മിഷണറായ ഒരു കെ. ജാർജ്ജ്, രാമചന്ദ്രറാവു മുതലായവരുടെ സാന്നിദ്ധ്യവും ഉപദേശവും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്ന ആ കാലത്തു ബോർഡ് പ്രയോജനകരമായ പലതും പ്രവർത്തിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. എക്കണാമിക്സ് സംബന്ധിച്ചു് വളരെ വൈദഗ്ദ്ധ്യം സമ്പാദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ഇന്നത്തെ അദ്ധ്യക്ഷനും ബോർഡിൽ വിചാര്യേറിയ സേവനമാണു് നടത്തിയിട്ടുള്ളതു്. എക്കണാമിക്സ് ബോർഡിൽ നിന്നും ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ പ്രമേയം മാത്രമെ ഗവൺമെന്റിൽ അയക്കാവൂ. ഏതായാലും വളരെ പ്രയോജനമുള്ള ഈ ബോർഡിനെ നിർമ്മാൽ ചെയ്യരുതെന്നും കഴിയുന്നത്ര പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു കൂടുതൽ പ്രയോജനപ്രദമാക്കിത്തീർക്കണമെന്നുമാണു് എനിക്കു പറയാനുള്ളതു്. ഗവൺമെന്റു കർഷകരുടെ കാര്യത്തിൽ എപ്പോഴും സദൃശ ശ്രദ്ധോടു കൂടിയാണു് ചെരുമാറിയിട്ടുള്ളതു്. എന്നാൽ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകൾ തമ്മിലുള്ള സ്വരച്ചേർച്ചയുടെ കുറവുകൊണ്ടോ എന്തോ ചില

കുഴപ്പങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടാകുന്നുണ്ട്. ഈ ബോർഡിനെ ശക്തിപ്പെടുത്താമെങ്കിൽ ഇത്തരം കുഴപ്പങ്ങൾ പരിഹരിക്കാവുന്നതാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഒരു എക്സിക്യൂട്ടീവ് ബോഡിയാക്കി എക്സിക്യൂട്ടീവ് കൗൺസിലല്ല—ഇതിനെ രൂപാന്തരപ്പെടുത്തി ഗവൺമെന്റിന്റെ നിയന്ത്രണത്തിൽ പ്രവർത്തിക്കുവാൻ വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്യണം

MR. THAMARAPALLIL KOCHU THOMMEN (Tiruvalla) : അതുകൊണ്ട് ഉത്തരവാദിഭരണം ഇവിടെ ഏർപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്നാണോ മെമ്പർ പറയുന്നത്?

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI എഡിക്ട് ചെയ്തപ്പോൾ ഭാഷയിൽ സംസാരിക്കാൻ പാടില്ല.

സർ, ഉത്തരവാദിഭരണം വേണമെന്ന് ഏറ്റവും സന്തോഷത്തോടെ മിക്കൊരുത്തരും ചോദിക്കുന്നു. ഞാൻ ചെയ്യാൻ ആർക്കാണ് കഴിയുക. തെക്കൻ തിരുവിതാംകൂർക്കാണ്. ചെയ്യാൻ കഴിയാതെ ഉത്തരവാദിഭരണത്തോടു കൂടുതൽ ആഗ്രഹമുള്ളതു്. ഗവൺമെന്റിനോടുത്തു് ഉത്തരവാദിപ്പെട്ട ഒരു ഉപദേശകക്കമ്മിറ്റി, വേണമെന്നാണ് ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞതു്. പി. ഡബ്ല്യു. അൻഡ്യാർട്ട്, കോപ്പറേറ്റീവ് ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ള അഡ്വൈസറി ബോർഡുകളെല്ലാം കൂട്ടിച്ചേർത്തു ഒരൊറ്റ ബോർഡാക്കുവാൻ വിദഗ്ദ്ധന്മാരും ഫൈനാൻഷ്യൽ സെക്രട്ടറി, ചീഫ് സെക്രട്ടറി തുടങ്ങിയ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും മെമ്പറന്മാരായി വേണ്ട ഉപദേശങ്ങൾ നൽകുവാൻ ബഡ്ജറ്റ് മിനിറ്ററിനു മുമ്പ് ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ മിനിറ്റുകൾ കൂടുവാൻ വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്തു്, ബോർഡിനെ കൂടുതൽ പരിഷ്കരിക്കണം എന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: Sir, I am sorry I cannot entirely agree with the statement made in this House that the Economic Development Board has not been functioning very satisfactorily. To say that it has not been functioning as satisfactorily as it should have functioned, is entirely different from saying that it has not functioned satisfactorily.

The first Economic Development Board was constituted during the Dewanhip of Mr. P. Raghaviah with a view to advise Government about matters connected with Commerce and Industry. One such was the Thuckalai Sugar Factory when Mr. Ananda Rao took it up. The Board told Government very clearly that the terms put forward by the applicant were wrong on business principles and should not be accepted. But what was the result? A few months afterwards Mr. Ananda Rao's proposals were accepted in their entirety. That is one of the many things that I wish to bring to the notice of this House. Similarly I may mention that in the first Economic Development Board, the Board protested against Government granting mining



[Mr. M. L. Janardana Pillai]

leases for Ilmenite and monozite. The Board on its own initiative informed Government that this should not be allowed. But what was the result? Immediately afterwards a number of licencees obtained licenses. The E. D. Board was told by Government that it was only an advisory body. The question naturally arises why should it be called an advisory body when that body's advice is not at all accepted. That is one side of the picture.

The other side of the picture was put forward by Mr. Kainikkara Padmanabha Pillai who said that the Board had ample opportunities of doing good work and that the G. O. constituting the Board covered every possible field of human activities. Paragraph 3 refers to the consideration of important proposals and schemes sent up by individual departments and Government and making recommendations thereon. But lower down in the rules Government say that the Government shall not initiate any new economic policy without consulting it. But what was the state of affairs in actual practice may be Government asked the Board's opinion on some proposals but, invariably Government never consulted the Board before initiating any new economic policy. Nor did the heads of departments ever care to consult the Board.

**MR. PUTHUPPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI:** May I be permitted to suggest another reason why in practice it was not being done? Almost all the heads of the Development Departments are members of the Board, such as, the Director of Agriculture and the Director of Industries. Before Government sanction any scheme their opinions are being taken then and there.

**MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI:** Of course, they are members. But that is quite different from saying that the Board should consider important schemes before Government should initiate new economic policy. The members should certainly be given an opportunity of considering important measures connected with Agriculture, Industry and Economics. I will just mention some of the subjects on which the Board sent up recommendations to Government. They sent up proposals concerning shipping facilities, trade agencies, compilation of statistics and rationalisation of the coir industry. In these matters naturally only a few of the members were taking interest because they were personally well informed on these subjects. Then came another set of subjects on which also the Board sent up its proposals to Government, such as the consolidation of Agricultural holdings, use of hand-pounded rice, conservation of grazing ground, hire-purchase system for Agricultural implements, conservation of monsoon water, enquiry into the forest policy of the State, special allotment for minor irrigation works, etc. The E. D. Board which should deal with the industries and commerce of the country, and which according to the Government order ought to consist of people with expert experience in industries and commerce, finally descended itself to discussions of these

questions which could very appropriately be discussed by the Agricultural Board. In my opinion the E. D. Board should confine its attention entirely to the commerce and industry of this State, especially as we shall soon be confronted with postwar problems relating to commerce and industry. The E. D. Board should in my opinion be a compact body of experts, not more than 4 or 5, and that their recommendations must produce tangible results at the hands of Government. This principle has yet not been acted upon. It is due to the fact that it is an unwieldy body. Therefore I would suggest for the consideration of this House and the Government that a full time officer, you may call him Development Commissioner or by any other name, should be the President of the Board, and the number of members should not be more than 4 or 5, and they should all be men who have got expert knowledge in the industries and commerce which they represent. The recommendations of such a small body must certainly be given weight to by Government. Otherwise the usual method would be followed and the men who are working in that Board will lose heart. Formerly, in this Board, Mr. Lampard was a member; in the second Board, Mr. Pollard was a member; and in the next Board, Mr. Hill was a member. Sometimes even useful recommendations of those Boards were often check-mated and nullified by discussions initiated on such questions as hand-pounded rice &c. If the Government are serious of re-constituting the E. D. Board it must deal with only questions relating to commerce and industries, and a gentleman having expert knowledge and long and practical experience in industries and commerce and with the requisite academical qualifications should be appointed to be the head of this Board. If such a man could not be had here, I personally would not have any objection to importing an outsider. The E. D. Board should function in the same way as the Tariff Board in British India functions. If such a re-constitution is not made, after 5 or 6 years the same cries will be heard on the floor of this House.

**MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM:** May I know why the member desires to exclude agricultural subjects from the E. D. Board?

**MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI:** According to me, those subjects could be discussed in the Agricultural Board.

**MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH:** Is it the member's opinion that agriculture does not play an important part in the development of the country?

**MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI:** It does, but it need not play any important part in the Economic Development Board.

**MR. N. NARAYANA KURUP:** Sir, I too desire to make a few observations on this motion. It has been found by experience that the E. D. Board as constituted at present is an unwieldy body which has not been able to do better work for the Economic Development of the State. There is no doubt that an Economic Development Board is necessary for our State. I suggest that the number of members should never be more than 15. It is a matter for consideration whether it should be an



[Mr. N. Narayana Kurup.]

expert committee on the lines suggested by Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai or a committee, as suggested by an honourable member, to take up the functions of all the committees in the State, such as the Text Book Committee, the Public Service Advisory Committee, the Agriculture Board and other committees. I cannot in fact, conceive of such a committee. We cannot amalgamate such committees, the amalgamation of which will look like a mixture of water, milk and gram. The Agricultural Board and the E. D. Board which do more or less similar functions may be amalgamated. I am therefore in perfect agreement with the scheme suggested by the President of the E. D. Board in his speech.

**MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI:** Sir, in order to make certain definite recommendations to Government, I may be permitted to move a specific motion containing such recommendations for the acceptance of this House. I move that the E. D. Board be re-constituted:

(a) by reducing the number of members to 12, of which not more than 4 shall be officials;

(b) by amalgamating with it the Agricultural Board: and

(c) by co-opting from time to time such members as are in the opinion of the Board necessary in connection with the matters that may be under the consideration of the Board.

Sir, I move this motion for the consideration of the House.

**MR. P. S. MUHAMMED:** മി. വേലായുധൻപിള്ള അവതരിപ്പിച്ച ഈ മോഷനെ ഞാൻ പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നതോടുകൂടി എക്കണാമിക്ക് ഡവലപ്പ് മെൻറ് ബോർഡിന്റെ പ്രവർത്തനത്തെപ്പറ്റി രണ്ടു വാക്കുപറയണമെന്നു വിചാരിക്കുന്നു. ബോർഡ് അതിന്റെ ആരംഭഘട്ടങ്ങളിൽ കുറച്ചുകാലം വളരെ നല്ല പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങൾ നടത്തിയിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നാണ് എന്റെ വിചാരം. ഇത്ര അധികം മെമ്പറന്മാർ അതിനു ആദ്യകാലത്തുണ്ടായിരുന്നില്ല. പത്തൊമ്പതിനൊന്നോ മെമ്പറന്മാരേ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നുള്ളൂ. അപ്പോൾ ബോർഡുമൂലമേന കാരുമായ ചിലനാർദ്ദ്രശങ്ങൾ ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു എനിക്കറിയാം. അന്നു മെമ്പറന്മാരായിരുന്നവരിൽ പലരും കാരുമായ ചില അഭിപ്രായങ്ങൾ രേഖപ്പെടുത്തുകയും ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ട്. ആദ്യകാലത്തു ഗവണ്മെൻറ് സ്വീകരിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതും സ്വീകരിക്കാതിരുന്നിട്ടുള്ളതും ആയ ബോർഡിന്റെ ശുപാർശകളെ പ്രത്യേകമായി വേർതിരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതു നോക്കിയാൽ അപ്പയിൽ പലതും ഗവണ്മെൻറ് സ്വീകരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു കാണാം.

**MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM:** On a point of order, Sir, I wish to know whether Mr. Gopala Menon's motion or Mr. Velayudhan Pillai's motion is now before the House.

**PRESIDENT:** You must now take it that as a result of Mr. Gopala Menon's motion, a proposal which may be regarded as an amendment has been brought forward. And it is open to the House to consider the amendment and the proposal together, but the voting might be taken separately.

**MR. P. S. MUHAMMED:** അന്നു ഓരോ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിനും ഓരോ ഉപദേശകസമിതികൾ ഉള്ളതുപോലെ ഈ ബോർഡ് ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിന്റെ ഉപദേശക സമിതിയായിത്തീർന്നിരിക്കുകയാണ്. ഇപ്പോൾ മെമ്പറന്മാരുടെ സംഖ്യകൾ വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചു. അതു ഈ ബോർഡിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശസാധ്യത്തിനു പ്രതിബന്ധമായിത്തീരുകയും ചെയ്തു. ഈ കാര്യം ഗവണ്മെന്റ് മനസിലാക്കി അതിനു പരിഹാരം ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്നതിനു വേണ്ടിയാണ് അതിന്റെ പ്രസിഡന്റ് ഈ മോഷൻ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചത്. കാര്യമായ പ്രവർത്തനത്തിനു മെമ്പറന്മാരുടെ സംഖ്യ കുറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുകയാണ് നല്ലത്. പത്തൊ പതിനൊന്നോ മെമ്പറന്മാരിൽ കൂടുതൽ ഒരിക്കലും നന്നായിരിക്കുകയില്ല. അതിന്റെ പ്രസിഡന്റ് ഒരു ഹൂൾ ടൈം പ്രവർത്തനമായിരിക്കണമെന്നു പറയുന്നതിനോട് എനിക്കു യോജിപ്പില്ല. പല കമ്മിറ്റികളുടെയും പ്രസിഡന്റായിരിക്കത്തക്കവിധത്തിൽ ഒരു ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനെ നിയമിക്കുക എന്നു പറയുന്നത് ഒരു വലിയ സംഖ്യ ചെയ്യാക്കുക എന്നു പറയുന്നതിനോടു തുല്യമായിരിക്കും. നേരേമറിച്ചു ഇന്ന് ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിനോട് ബന്ധമുള്ള ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകളുടേതിൽ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഒരാളിനു ഒരു അലവൻസ് കൊടുത്തു നിയമിക്കുന്നതായിരിക്കും ഏറ്റവും പ്രായോഗികമായിട്ടുള്ളതു. അഗ്രികൾച്ചർ, ഇൻഡസ്ട്രി, കോമേഴ്സ്, കോവാപ്പറേഷൻ, റൂറൽ വീ പബ്ലിക് ഷൻ ഇത്രയുമായിരിക്കും ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ബോർഡിന്റെ പരിധിക്കകത്തു വരുന്ന സംഗതികൾ. ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകളെല്ലാം ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്നില്ലായിരിക്കണം ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ബോർഡ് തുടന്നു കൊണ്ടുപോകേണ്ടത്. എന്റെ സ്റ്റേഫിതൻ മി. ജനാർദ്ദനപിള്ള ഇൻഡസ്ട്രിയും കോമേഴ്സും മാത്രമേ ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ബോർഡിൽ ഉൾപ്പെടുത്താവൂ എന്നു പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അങ്ങനെയാണെങ്കിൽ ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ബോർഡു തന്നെ നിരത്തി ട്രാൻസ് പോർട്ടിനും പി. ഡബ്ലിയു. ഡിക്കും മറ്റും ഉള്ളതുപോലെ ഇൻഡസ്ട്രിക്കും കോമേഴ്സിനുംകൂടി ഒരു അഡ്വൈസറി ബോർഡു ഏർപ്പെടുത്തിയാൽ മതിയാകും. ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ബോർഡു കാര്യമായി വല്ലതും പ്രവർത്തിക്കണമെന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ ഇന്നത്തെ നിലയിൽനിന്നും അതിനെ പരിഷ്കരിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്.



MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN : സർ, എക്കണാമിക്സ് ബോർഡിലെ എണ്ണ കറയ്ക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായത്തോടു് ഞാനും യോജിക്കുന്നു. എന്നാൽ അംഗങ്ങളെ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കുമ്പോൾ പ്രാപ്തിയും യോഗ്യതയും ഉള്ളവരായ ആളുകളെ മാത്രമെ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കാവൂ എന്ന് എനിക്കഭിപ്രായമുണ്ട്. ഏതെങ്കിലും തരത്തിൽ പ്രയോജനപ്പെടുന്നുണ്ടെന്നു ഗവണ്മെന്റിനു ബോദ്ധ്യപ്പെട്ടാൽ ബോർഡിന്റെ നിശ്ചയങ്ങളും അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളും, സാധാരണപോലെ ചവറുകട്ടയിൽ തള്ളുകയില്ല. യോഗ്യന്മാരായ ആളുകൾ ആഡംബരത്തിനുവേണ്ടിതന്നെ ആയാലും എന്തെങ്കിലും തീരുമാനം ചെയ്തു ഗവണ്മെന്റിലേയ്ക്കു അർച്ചാൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റിനു അതെല്ലാം സ്വീകരിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലല്ലോ. ൧൭-ൽ കൂടാതെയും ൧൦-ൽ കുറയാതെയും ഉള്ള അംഗങ്ങൾ ബോർഡിൽ ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നതു നന്നായിരിക്കും. സാമാന്യം എല്ലാ വിഷയത്തിലും പ്രാവീണ്യവും വൈദഗ്ദ്ധ്യവും ഉള്ളവരുടെ ഒരു സമിതിയായിരിക്കണം ഈ ബോർഡ്. അദ്ധർ ധനപരിപോഷണവിഷയത്തിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റിനെ ഉപദേശിക്കുകയും സഹായിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യാൻ ഉള്ള കഴിവും മനസ്സും സൗകര്യവും ഉള്ളവരായിരിക്കുകയും വേണം. കൃഷിവിഷയത്തിനു അഗ്രിക്കൾച്ചറൽ ബോർഡുണ്ടെന്നും അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ബോർഡിൽ അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഒന്നും പറയേണ്ടെന്നും മി: ജനാർദ്ദനൻപിള്ള പറഞ്ഞതിൽ എനിക്കു അതൃപ്തമില്ല. ആലപ്പുഴയിൽ താമസിക്കുന്ന അദ്ദേഹത്തിനു കൃഷിവിഷയത്തിൽ അത്രക്കുള്ള താല്പര്യമേ ഉള്ളൂ. കൃഷിസംബന്ധമായ കാര്യങ്ങൾക്കും മറ്റുള്ള ഉപദേശസമിതികൾ നിറുത്തി ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ബോർഡിനെ വേണ്ടവിധം പരിഷ്കരിക്കുന്ന പക്ഷം പ്രവർത്തനസൗകര്യം കറെക്കൂടി ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നതാണ്. ഒരു കമ്മീഷണറെ നിയമിക്കുക എന്നു പറയുന്നതിനോടു് എനിക്കു യോജിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. പല ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റ് മേധാവികളുമായി യോജിച്ച് ആലോചിച്ച് പ്രവൃത്തിക്കുന്ന ആ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥൻ ഒരു ഫഷ്ട്ഗ്രെയിഡ് ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനായിരിക്കണം. ആ നിലയിൽ ഒരു ഫഷ്ട്ഗ്രെയിഡ് ഉദ്യോഗംകൂടെ തൽക്കാലം സൃഷ്ടിക്കേണ്ടആവശ്യം ഞാൻ കാണുന്നില്ല. അതിന്റെ ആവശ്യവുമില്ല. ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ളവരിൽ കൊള്ളാവുന്ന ഒരു ഫഷ്ട്ഗ്രെയിഡ് ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനെക്കൊണ്ടുതന്നെ ഇക്കാര്യം വഹിക്കാവുന്നതാണ്. അദ്ദേഹത്തിനു ഒരു അലവൻസ് കൊടുത്താൽ മതി. ഇങ്ങനെ ഉപദേശകസമിതികളെ വളർത്തുന്നതുകൊണ്ടുമാത്രം ഒരു പ്രയോജനവുമില്ല. അവരുടെ ശുപാർശകളെ ഉടനടൻ മുന്നകിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് സ്വീകരിക്കുകയോ അല്ലെങ്കിൽ തള്ളിക്കളയുക

യോ ചെയ്യണം. തള്ളിക്കളയുന്നെങ്കിൽ അതിനുള്ള കാരണവും പറയണം. അങ്ങനെ ചെയ്യാൽ ആവശ്യമില്ലാത്ത ശുപാർശകൾ ചെയ്യുകയും അംഗീകരിക്കുന്നവയെ ശരിയായ പ്രവർത്തനത്തിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരികയും വേണം. അതിനാൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ പ്രവർത്തനത്തെ ആശ്രയിച്ചാണ് ഡവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ബോർഡിന്റെയും മറ്റുള്ളവയുടെ സമതീകളുടെയും പ്രവർത്തനം ഇരിക്കുന്നത്. ആഗ്രികൾച്ചറൽബോർഡിന്, കന്നുകാലിതീറ്റിക്കുള്ള മേച്ചിൽസ്ഥലങ്ങൾ പതിച്ചു കൊടുക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള അധികാരം റവന്യൂഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ ഇരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ടി കന്നുകാലി തീറ്റിസ്ഥലങ്ങൾ പതിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുന്നതിനിടയാകുന്നുണ്ടെന്നും അപ്രകാരം മേലാൽ സംഭവിക്കാതിരിക്കാൻ വേണ്ടി ആഗ്രികൾച്ചറൽ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിലേക്കു വിട്ടുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നു തീരുമാനിച്ചു ഗവണ്മെന്റിലേക്കു ശുപാർശചെയ്യുകയുണ്ടായി. ബോർഡിനു ഈ കാര്യത്തെപ്പറ്റിയുള്ള അനുഭവങ്ങൾ വ്യക്തമായി മനസ്സിലാക്കാൻ കഴിഞ്ഞതിനു ശേഷമാണ് ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു തീരുമാനം ചെയ്തതും ഗവണ്മെന്റിലേയ്ക്കു ശുപാർശചെയ്തതും. എന്നാൽ അതു ഇതുവരെ നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തിയിട്ടില്ല. ഇപ്പോൾ എന്തെങ്കിലും ചെയ്യണം, എന്തെങ്കിലും പറയണം എന്നുള്ള ഒരു നിലയാണ് ബോർഡിനുള്ളത്. ഗവണ്മെന്റും ഉപഭോക്തൃസമിതികളുടെ ശുപാർശകളിൽ വേണ്ടവിധം ശ്രദ്ധപതിച്ചു കാണുന്നില്ലെന്നു പറയാതെ തരമില്ല. ഇത്തരം ബോർഡുകളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളമുള്ള ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ഈ നില മാറ്റണം. ഉപഭോക്തൃസമിതികൾ വേണ്ടത്ര പ്രയോജനപ്രദമാകുന്നില്ലെങ്കിൽ അതിനു മേൽപറഞ്ഞ കാരണങ്ങളിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റിനെയാണ് കൂടുതൽ കുറപ്പെടുത്താനുള്ളത്. ഇത്രയും സംഗതികൾ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവന്നുകൊണ്ട് ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപഭോക്തൃസമിതി അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു.

**MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI:** I beg to move an amendment to Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai's resolution to the following effect:—

“But the President of the Board shall be a full-time officer for three years and the number of members shall not be more than 6 excluding the President.”

**PRESIDENT:** Does the member want to support the same by argument.

**MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI:** Not necessary Sir.

**MR. D. FRANCIS (Kalkulam cum Vilavancode):** Sir, எக்கனോമിക് டெவலப்மென் டு போர்டு முன்னிட்டு அவர்கள் அவதரிப்பித்த பிரமேயத்தை அனுசூலிக்கிறேன். அதில் பெண்பர்களாயிருக்கக் கூடியவர்கள் எக்ஸ்பெர்ட்ஸ்களாயிருக்கவேண்டுமென்று சில மெம்பர்கள் சொன்னதை யும் ஆமோதிக்கிறேன். ஆனால் எக்ஸ்பர்ட்ஸ் என்பவர்கள் யார்? அதில்



[Mr. D. Francis.]

எல்லாம் எக்ஸ்பர்ட்ஸ் என்பது அறியவேண்டும். கைத்தொழில், கிருஷி, கச்சவடம் முதலியவற்றில் நல்ல ஞானமுடையவர்களாயிருக்கவேண்டும்.

விழுந்து கிடக்கிற ஒரு கட்டிடத்தை, திரும்பிக் கட்டுவதற்கு ஏதெல்லாம் வேண்டும், உத்தேசம் எவ்வளவு துறை வேண்டும் என்பதைப் பற்றி அறியவேண்டிய ஞானம் உடையவர்களாயிருக்கவேண்டும். ஒரு ஆற்றிலோ, குளத்திலோ ஒரு பெரிய உடைப்பு விழுந்தால், அதைச் சரிப்படுத்துவதற்கு எவ்வளவு பணம் சிலவாகும் என்பதையும் தெரியக்கூடியவர்களாயிருக்கவேண்டும். இந்த போர்டின் முக்கிய கருத்து தாழ்ந்தவர்களை உயர்த்தவேண்டுமென்பது. அதனால் தேனி வளர்த்தல் (Bee keeping), கோழி வளர்த்தல் (Poultry farming), நெசவு (Weaving) முதலிய பல வேலைகளைப்பற்றியும் நல்ல அறிவுள்ளவர்களாயிருந்தால் நல்லது. எக்கனாமிக் கண்டிஷன் (Economic condition) நன்றாய் அறிந்தவர்களாயிருக்கவேண்டும். அபிஷியல் மெம்பர்களில் (Official members) எக்ஸிக்யூட்டிவ் இன்ஜினியரும் (Executive engineer) ஒரு மெம்பராயிருக்கவேண்டும். பொதுவாக வெகுகாலம் business men ஆகயிருந்தவர்களை தெறிந்தெடுப்பது நலமாயிருக்கும். அனேகம் வேலையாளர்களை வைத்து நடத்துகிறவர்களும் அதில் ஞானமிருக்கிறவர்களும் இப்பொழுது இருக்கிற பிரஸிடெண்டு தகுதியான ஆள்.

இவ்வளவும் சொல்லிக்கொண்டு பிரமேயத்தை பலமாய் அனுசுலிக்கிறேன்.

**SRV. T. NARAYANI AMMA (Nominated):** Sir, I wish to offer a few words on this motion. I am emphatically of opinion that the work of the Economic Development Board should be continued but on a different constitution. The present board inspite of its very restricted scope of work has undoubtedly done some good work. But there is considerable scope for better work being done. My suggestion therefore is that the President of the Board may be asked to prepare a scheme on the recommendations made in the proposal of Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai. The Board must be made as useful as possible. It must be able to deal with all aspects of the nation-building activities and such a board can undoubtedly do much useful work, for further utilising the natural resources of the State and further promoting the cause of the economic development of the State. I wish only to add that when I say that the Board must be re-constituted, I mean no disparagement whatever to the very good work done by those who have hitherto guided the destinies of the Board. All that I wish to say is that it can be and ought to be made more useful.

**MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI:** Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai had moved a resolution in respect of the Board. I wish to suggest a few amendments to that:

- (a) The number of members shall not be more than 15 of which the majority shall be non-officials;
- (b) All Boards now attached to separate development departments shall be amalgamated with it;
- (c) The Board shall work through sub-committees.

Mr. Janardana Pillai has already moved that the President of the Board shall be a full-time officer.

[At this stage the Dewan-President vacated the chair and it was occupied by the Deputy President.]

MR. D. C. JOSEPH (Nominated): Sir, I wish to make a few observations. Government could readily admit that an institution like the present Economic Development Board could satisfactorily discharge its work to the satisfaction of the needs of the people in different parts of the State. But the number of members of the Board should be restricted to workable limits. I dare say that the Board which has been in existence for over 20 years has done very useful work in all directions and helped Government a great deal. Several recommendations of the Board have been acted upon by Government. Several problems relating to commerce and the general economic well being of the people at large have been successfully tackled.

My suggestion at this juncture is that the Government must reduce the number of member in the Board so that it may not be unwieldy. There should be a full-time officer also as President for the Board. Then it could function more effectively.

The strength of the Board could be reduced to 15 members. Just as there is a controller of yarn, another officer can be appointed to function over the Board, and several important departmental boards like agriculture and industries can be amalgamated to that body.

MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI (Nominated): ഗവണ്മെൻറ സംഘടിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള കമ്മറികൾ എല്ലാം പ്രാധാന്യം അർഹിക്കുന്നതാണ്. അഡ്വൈസറികളും ബോർഡുകളും അതതു കാര്യങ്ങളിൽ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു വേണ്ട അറിവുകൾ നൽകുന്നുണ്ട്. പല ഡിർപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറുകളുടെയും ഭരണവിഷയകമായി സംഘടിതങ്ങളായ ബോർഡുകൾ പ്രയോജനപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്നുള്ള സംഗതി ഗവണ്മെൻറുശ്രദ്ധയിൽപ്പെട്ടിട്ട് വളരെ നാളുകളായി. പ്രസ്തുത ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറു ബോർഡിന്റെ പ്രയോജനം വളരെ വലുതാണ്. ബോർഡിന്റെ ശുപാർശകളെല്ലാം സ്വീകാര്യങ്ങളായിരുന്നുവെന്നു പറഞ്ഞാൽ എല്ലാ ശുപാർശകളും അതേപടി നടപ്പിലായി എന്നു ഞാൻ സമർത്ഥിക്കുന്നില്ല. രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ പുരോഗമനം സാമ്പത്തികാഭിവൃദ്ധിയെയാണുശ്രയിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത്. അതിനു പര്യാപ്തങ്ങളായ നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങളും പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങളും നിർവഹിക്കാൻ ബോർഡിനു സംഘടിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നാണ് എന്റെ വിശ്വാസം. കാർഷികവും വ്യാവസായികവുമായ ശ്രേയസ്സിനെ സംസ്ഥാപനം ചെയ്യാൻ ബോർഡിന്റെ സേവനം ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു സഹായമായിരിക്കുന്നതാണ്. ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറുബോർഡിന്റെ നേതൃത്വത്തിൽ വളരെ പ്രശസ്തമായ നിലയിൽ നടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന എക്കണാമിക്സ്ജേർണൽ എത്രയോ വിജ്ഞാനപ്രദങ്ങളായ



[Mr. T. T. Kesavan Sastri.]

ബലവനങ്ങൾ പ്രസിദ്ധീകരിച്ചിരുന്നു എന്ന് പറയേണ്ടതായിട്ടില്ല. ഈ ബോർഡിന്റെ അതായത് അംഗങ്ങളുടെ എണ്ണം കുറയ്ക്കുകയോ കൂടുതൽ പരാഷ്കാരങ്ങൾ വരുത്തുകയോ ചെയ്യുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് തരക്കേടില്ല. എന്തായാലും ഇതിന്റെ പുനഃസംഘടന ആവശ്യംതന്നെയാണ്. ഈ ബോർഡിന്റെ അദ്ധ്യക്ഷൻ ഒരു സാമ്പത്തികവിദഗ്ദ്ധൻതന്നെയായിരിക്കണം. ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ അദ്ധ്യക്ഷൻ ഇതിനു സർവ്വഥാ അർഹനും പ്രാപ്തനും തന്നെയാണ്. ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ ബലമായി അനുകൂലിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM: Now that we are considering the amalgamation of the Economic Development Board and the Agricultural Board, I would suggest that the amalgamation of the Economic Journal and the Travancore Information may also be taken up.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is there any other Honourable Member wishing to move any other specific motion. Mr. Gopala Menon, do you wish to speak anything more?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: I have only to offer a word of explanation. It was far from my mind to convey that the members of the Board have in any way been wanting in capacity or ability to discharge their duties. I thank Mr. Janardana Pillai and Mr. P. S. Mumamed for giving explicit information on the point and supplementing what I have said with regard to the work of the Board. That is all I have to say.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Now I shall put the propositions to the vote of the House. The first proposition is that "the number of members shall not be more than 15 of whom not more than 5 shall be officials."

The motion was put to vote and carried.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: With regard to parts (b) and (c) of my motion, there is no amendment.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The next proposition is that the Economic Development Board shall be amalgamated with the Agricultural Board. The Board of Agriculture has got its own constitution. The constitution of the proposed Board having been fixed, amalgamation will be an anamoly. That I think will be unworkable.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: The purpose of the motion is that hereafter there shall not be any Agricultural Board.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: That is one of the recommendations contained in the motion.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Then you will have to say that the Agricultural Board as such shall not function.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: That will be the real effect.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The second proposition before the House is that "the Board of Agriculture shall be amalgamated with the Board to be constituted, i. e. the Economic Development Board".

The motion was put and carried.

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT :** The next proposition is that "the Board shall have power to co-opt any member for the purpose of any subject which might come up for consideration before the Board".

The motion was put and carried.

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT :** The next proposition put forward by Mr. Kainikkara Padmanabha Pillai is that "a Development Commissioner shall be appointed who shall be the President of the Board".

The motion was put and lost.

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT :** The next proposition moved by Mr. Padmanabha Pillai is that "the Board shall work through several sub-Committees".

The motion was put and carried.

**DEPUTY PRESIDENT :** That disposes of the motion moved by Mr. Gopala Menon.

The business for the day being over, the House will now adjourn and meet again at 11'o clock to-morrow.

The House adjourned at 4.30 P. M.

V. S. ARUMUKHOM PILLAY,  
*Secretary to the Sri Mulam Assembly.*



