

**RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT TO EXAMINE THE CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL UNREST.**

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE (Bombay):**  
Sir, I move:

"This House is of opinion that Government should appoint a Committee consisting of not less than 15 members of Parliament representing all political parties and groups to examine the causes of the present industrial unrest as well as the attitude and policies of the employers and Government in the light of the declared objectives of the Second Five Year Plan and to recommend to Government measures which should be taken for improving industrial relations on the basis of the directive principles of the Constitution and in consonance with social justice and democracy."

Sir, I believe not much persuasion is needed in an enlightened House as this to make it agree that there exists in the country grave industrial unrest. Comparative figures of trade disputes of the last two years amply reveal the degree of mounting unrest. In 1956, there were 1,203 disputes. In 1957 there were 1,248; add to these the figures in Kerala, Mysore, Rajasthan and elsewhere, the figure would come up to 1,630. This is an increase of 427 disputes. In 1958 the situation appears to have deteriorated still further. In addition to general disputes, there have been several strikes, notably the 80 days' strike in West Bokaro Collieries, the strike in the Bangalore Hindustan Aircraft Factory, the much-publicised strike in the Jamshedpur steel mills, strikes in the ports and docks all over India, the four-month old strike of the Premier Automobiles and crowning these all, the Bombay general strike. In addition, a dispute is still hanging before the Pay Commission and its findings are anxiously awaited.

This is in regard to disputes. A deeper cause of unrest lies in the mounting figures of unemployment. One of the objectives of the present Second Five Year Plan is to provide additional employment for 6.5 millions, as the pruned Plan stands today. But after two years of the Plan period, we find that the number of unemployed registered with the employment exchanges, has increased from 7,53,000 and odd in April 1957 to 9,36,000 and odd in 1958, that is to say an increase of about 1,83,000 in one year only. Add to this a large number of those who, out of disgust, do not register with the exchanges at all and you get an idea of the alarming situation on the industrial front.

A still deeper cause lies in retrenchment and lock-outs and closures. It came first at the hands of the Government itself. Towards the end of 1956, it came down on its Defence installations and lately again, they repeated the performance in the D.V.C. The employers in the private sector, feeling inspired by the lofty example of the greatest single employer, followed it with vigour and imagination. They were not content with mere retrenchment. They started closing down factories, and where workers demonstrated on one count or the other, they locked them out. Yet another contrivance in their armoury was in the shape of "leading or playing off".

In the textile industry alone, over a lakh have been rendered idle. Government acknowledge the number at 54,000. I am told this is because the number of *badliwallas* and those led off is not accounted for.

Bombay which is my constituency and also my home State, is hit the hardest. Out of the 32 mills closed down, 27 or 28 are in Bombay. Seventy per cent. or more of the labour in Bombay mills comes from Maharashtra and principally from the Konkan part

[Shri Lalji Pendse.]

of it. This part, devastated by the recent floods lies prostrate and every morsel is a boon to it. Its only occupation is wage earning, mostly in the textile industry. Thus, textile industry is Maharashtra's back-bone. The closure of mills has, therefore, shaken its very foundation as Konkan lives on the money orders sent from Bombay. Commerce, which accumulates surplus value, is out of its reach. You can imagine its misery, Sir, due to the closure and lock-outs of the mills.

Jute is another industry where about a dozen of the mills have been closed down. In addition, women workers who are the most helpless stratum of society have been made the targets of retrenchment. There are other occupations also. Manganese mines, engineering concerns, as also a large number of employees in the export-import business, have been hit hard under retrenchment. *Biri* making industry in Bhandara and Gondia districts of Bombay State render fabulous profits. The monuments of these profits can be seen in Bombay in the shape of huge estates in the city. Now, Sir, after the inclusion of those districts in the bilingual State of Bombay, the Government of the State tried to fix the rates for *biri* making and the bosses either migrated to the adjoining areas in the State of Madhya Pradesh in order to avoid paying revised rates, or closed down their factories. The workers who suffered privation number about 30,000. The State Government is a helpless spectator to the starvation of workers.

This is the nature and the magnitude of the unrest markedly perceptible since the inauguration of the present Five Year Plan. What corollary can there be is a moot point, which shocked even the hon. the Labour Minister. In his inaugural speech before the Nainital Labour Conference, Sir, the Labour Minister observed thus:

"Our minds are greatly exercised in recent months, about the shrinkage of the volume of emp-

loyment, which has occurred in the textile industry and in some other industrial establishments. It is easy to imagine the sufferings and the hardships entailed for the workers who have been thrown out of employment as a result of closures, total or partial, and large-scale retrenchments. It is however, difficult to comprehend"—and these words of the hon. Minister may please be noted—"why the wheels of industry should slow down in this manner, in a developing economy with a rising tempo of investment. When there are circumstances which affect the market as a whole, measures have to be taken at the highest level on behalf of the whole community."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue at 2:30 P.M. The House stands adjourned till 2:30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Sir, I was referring to the Labour Minister's statement on unemployment in the face of a developing economy. Sir, if the Labour Minister could not discover the reasons singly—it is said in his speech there—we in this House and the other House should do the job collectively. As the supreme tribunal under the Constitution, I submit, Sir, that it is the duty and the joint responsibility of these Houses jointly to probe into the whole problem and recommend measures to scotch the unrest and improve industrial relations. This to my mind is a condition precedent to the success of the Plan. That is the burden of my Resolution. It seeks to appoint a committee of enquiry and nothing more. Sir, the present unrest is not due to an alround crisis in industry or economy as such a crisis does not exist. It is

something much more deeper and dangerous because, Sir, the causes which created the unrest appear to have been clearly worked out by agencies whose motives are patently anti-Plan and, therefore, anti-national. Even the Labour Minister has no doubt about it. In his Nainital speech, I referred just now to, he makes further observations. Says he:

"Very often the malaise is confined to certain industrial units and has its origin in neglect and mismanagement extending over a long period. It is our business to see that the conditions of these concerns are not allowed to deteriorate so far that the work has to come to a standstill. Preventive action should be taken in time to avoid this. For this purpose, a system of advance intelligence is to be built up and we must place ourselves in a position to take steps to arrest the decline when abnormal systems have developed".

The suggestion of the Labour Minister to have a system of advance intelligence is a further justification of the demand for a committee as my Resolution suggests.

Sir, I have said a minute ago—in fact an hour and half ago—that the unrest has been cleverly worked out with a view to defeating the objectives of the Plan. I say so because hardly had the Plan been put into operation, cries of recession and "the Plan in crisis" began to be raised; revision of the Plan was demanded, measures of taxation were opposed and began to be circumvented and, contrary to the expectations of an ex-Finance Minister, capital began to go underground causing money stringency. If the money stringency was real, how are the various State loans over-subscribed within the shortest possible time? Then, Sir, mill after mill began to work out losses. It is of interest to note that mills under a specific type of management only have registered losses and have declared lock-outs. Not one of the standard type of mills

has retrenched any workers nor has any sustained losses. It would be fruitful to closely examine the working, the systems of borrowing, the system of block sales of these mills. Again, Sir, it is anybody's knowledge that their transactions are fictitious and have some kind of kinship with the *hundi* market in Bombay. It is a common belief that underground money operates through such *hundies* and the amount involved is said to be in the neighbourhood of Rs. 300 crores, just the amount for which the Plan had to be pruned. I hope the investigations of the Income-tax Department, which was persuaded to attach account books of some ten or twelve such *hundi* dealers, would reveal many more secrets. My only anxiety is that the Revenue Board acts promptly and vigorously. If it does, it is possible to detect some kind of collaboration between these mills and the *hundi* market and unearth the hidden money so badly wanted for creative purposes.

Then, Sir, there is another method by which losses are worked out. That method is in determining the cost of production. Thanks to the corruption rampant in some of the Government agencies, it becomes easy. There is a saying: "*Hara note kya nahin kar sakta?*" I know of a certain mill in Bombay which during the control days could secure from the textile control machinery any inflated figure of the cost of production. But whatever the manipulated costs, markets were not going to pay the excess: cloth was sold below the cost and the mill was made to sustain losses, till finally it was taken into liquidation. One would wonder why this process? But the answer is very simple. By running the mills at a loss, the shares go down in prices and the subscribed capital shrinks. The mill is then sold out at a 'pittance' and is purchased by the agents of the same group of management. This is defrauding the common investor, cheating Government of the taxes and the workers come in for wage reduction or unemployment.

[Shri Lalji Pendse.]

As this atmosphere was being created, the 15th Labour Conference met in Delhi last year and resolved among other things to constitute wage boards in three industries including the textile industry. The Federation of Chambers of Commerce came out vigorously against the decisions and soon after the Bombay Millowners launched an offensive against the boards because they were to determine the minimum wage. They sought to torpedo the decisions of the conference on closures and rationalisation and recognition of trade unions. As a counter-blast to the wage boards, they notified their intention to effect a cut in the dearness allowance to the extent of one-third. Thus we found a system of two-pronged operations; the vanguard enforced closures and the rear-guard attacked the decisions. Tatas believe in straight deal and they rejected the decisions outright. The Premier Automobiles refuse to recognise the union and pay bonus, although it is common experience of motor owners that the Fiat 1100 fetches extra handsome money over and above the prices. Thus, Sir, it is not merely the recession but the decisions and the conventions of the Labour Conferences drawn on the basis of the planned objectives against which the capitalists as a class have raised their standard of revolt. As a plan of their strategy, they sabotage production by lock-outs and closures, bring about unrest by attacking wages and the rights of free trade unionism and torpedo the main objectives of the Plan, namely, additional employment and proportional distribution of the increase in national wealth amongst those who create it.

Sir, it is significant to note in this connection that the national income increased by 18 per cent. in the first Plan, but how was it distributed? The share of wages from national income in factory industries went down from 42 per cent. in 1950 to 33 per cent. in 1954, while the share of profits went up from 58 per cent. to 67 per cent. during the period. Sir, there is a loose

talk about increase in wages. It is easy to dismiss the fallacy by quoting two sets of figures. A worker whose wage was about Rs. 40 in 1939 gets today Rs. 101 including the dearness allowance, whereas the all-India index of wholesale prices during the same period has risen four-fold from 100 to 408.8. That speaks for itself. How does the Government then react to this malaise and what is its role? Firstly, in the face of the defiance by the employers of the objectives of the Plan and the decisions of the tripartite conference they remain bystanders and passively watch the malady, on the other hand when the workers try to assert what is given to them by the decisions *lathis* and bullets are showered on them. The latest feature is the employment of the army. The armies are not thought of for driving away the intruders from Pakistan or from Portugal; they are only used against unarmed workers, the creators of national wealth. It conforms to this:

अजापुत्रवर्ति दद्यात् देवं दुर्बल-घातकः

But does mere killing resolve the contest? You had it in Bombay two years ago and in Ahmedabad a year ago. There you killed a hundred and odd but was the natural urge for a unilingual State killed? It burst out only recently. Killing does not end a grievance; on the contrary it only multiplies it. But no wisdom dawns on those who are destined to be cleared out of the decks of history, but it is a little digression, I admit. Sir, this state of affairs must end and the sooner the better for the success of the Plan and for the implementation of the Objectives it sets out. I cannot do better than remind the House of the warning given by the hon. the Labour Minister and it is for this reason that I thought it urgent to place my Resolution before the House and I do hope that it will be passed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"This House is of opinion that Government should appoint a Committee consisting of not less than 15

members of Parliament representing all political parties and groups to examine the causes of the present industrial unrest as well as the attitude and policies of the employers and Government in the light of the declared objectives of the Second Five Year Plan and to recommend to Government measures which should be taken for improving industrial relations on the basis of the directive principles of the Constitution and in consonance with social justice and democracy."

**SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have read the Resolution that has just now been moved by a very distinguished member the communist Party who happens to belong to a community to which the greatest leader of the Congress organisation—I mean Lokmanya Balgangadhar Tilak—belonged and therefore I am surprised to learn from the wording of the Resolution that the only conclusion that he has drawn from all this industrial unrest is this that the Government and the employers are the villain of the piece and the employees are absolutely saintly persons, angels, and there is nothing to be said against them. Now, this partisan view is a view which I have never liked and I have hated it and I have criticised it. Even the other day, I criticised Dr. Kunzru who ordinarily and generally takes a non-partisan view of things but then that day, when he took a partisan view I criticised him then and there. Similarly, this Resolution also takes a partisan view of things. I wonder why it was admitted and how it was admitted. It should not have been admitted as a matter of fact, much less debated and discussed.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal):** If it were not admitted you would not have had the chance to speak now.

**SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:** Now, imagine the audacity of the mover; the only thing that has got to be corrected and set right is the Government and the employer and there is no fault of any

kind whatsoever that lies at the door of the employees. This is a very narrow way of looking at things. I do not like industrial unrest as a matter of fact and therefore I would not be happy if there is industrial unrest in any part of the country, not to say, in the region from which my friend, the mover of the Resolution, hails or in any other region. Even in my homeland, home country, home province of Uttar Pradesh I would not like . . .

(Interruptions.)

**Dr. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh):** India that is Bharat that is Uttar Pradesh.

**SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:** I accept Dr. Gour's interpretation of Uttar Pradesh; that is, India that is Bharat, that is Uttar Pradesh, if that interpretation gives him satisfaction.

**SHRI LALJI PENDSE:** Bharat does not exist outside the States.

**SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:** We sent up the greatest fighters for freedom and leaders from our Uttar Pradesh and therefore I am not ashamed of the fact that India is equated with Uttar Pradesh.

**Dr. R. B. GOUR:** Just now you said that Balgangadhar Tilak was the greatest man; he does not belong to Uttar Pradesh.

**SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:** I am not going to waste time in arguing with my friend Dr. Gour. As I said, the Resolution is a travesty of facts and a bundle of untruths, half-truths and mis-statements because, as you see, all the blame lies with the Government and the employers, and nothing is said so far as the employees are concerned. To look at this thing from that angle is a very sad state of affairs and I hope that either the Resolution will be properly modified or it should be thrown out.

**Dr. R. B. GOUR:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this Resolution that has been brought before this House is

to my mind most important; it touches a most important problem and deals with the most important difficulty that has arisen in our country. Obviously we as trade unionists and they as Government, and, if I could add, even the employers have all agreed at the various tripartite meetings—and these tripartite meetings have come to occupy a very important position in our national life, in our labour life—that we have got to stick to certain tenets of behaviour, certain codes of conduct and we shall have to see that industrial relations are normal as far as possible. Because where on the one side there is a profit motive and on the other there are difficulties from the point of view of wages and earnings, obviously, there are bound to be differences and clashes. But the country as a whole and the Indian Labour Conference, in particular, have accepted certain codes, certain modes of behaviour on the part of both the employers and trade unions. The problem is—and also the Government have accepted certain obligations more or less administrative—to see that these things are maintained, these decisions are implemented in right earnest.

Now, I am not going to take the time of the House by dealing with this question in great detail and I am not going to cover the entire canvas that this question embraces. I am going to confine myself to the most important industry, the iron and steel industry. That has been given the top priority in this country in the Five Year Plan. Let me draw the attention of the House to a fact, a very recent occurrence. One thousand one hundred and thirty-five workmen have been laid off in Burns, Howrah. It is a fabricating plant, owned by Shri Biren Mookerjee, a leading iron and steel magnate in this country. Now, Sir, the Indian Standard Wagons will be facing a similar lay-off within a week or ten days. The question is, here is an industry which has been given top priority in this country. Here is an industry which is being given top

facilities and here it is that the industrial relations are the worst in the country. Here it is that attacks in the form of lay off and closures, are being seen rather frequently. Why? Here I want the pointed attention of the House to be drawn to the fact that employers as a class are violating the decisions and the codes that we are adopting in this country; employers as a class are trying to ignore the various decisions that this country has been taking, the various decisions that the Indian Labour Conference has been taking. Employers as a class want to violate and flout the laws, the labour legislation in this country, and I am afraid Government themselves when they take the shape of employers behave worse than ordinary private employers. Therefore, the matter is really urgent, the matter is really serious and the House must be possessed of this matter and take hold decision in order to see that the country does not face this kind of avoidable unrest. I can understand an unrest on the border created by Pakistan which we cannot avoid, because we are not in Pakistan. I can understand an unrest on the borders of Goa, because that is created by Portugal. But I cannot understand an avoidable unrest. We have the path of planned development, when we have decided that wages are going to be given good and serious consideration, when we have decided there are going to be certain norms for wages, when we have decided on a certain procedure when an industry faces difficulties of the type of capital or expansion or balancing equipment, whatever it is. The question is that employers as a class do not want us to go forward with these. The employers are bargaining. Here are the steel magnates in this country who, let me remind this House, do not want that steel should be in the State sector, who want it as their entire monopoly. For them the State plants at Bhilai, Durgapur and Rourkela are an eyesore and Shri Biren Mookerjee has said openly so many times, "Hand over the steel to us."

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No names please. You may refer to a particular concern or the generic term of the employers, but not names.

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** But it is the employer himself who is the institution. We have to give the names. It will be difficult for us to . . .

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** They are not in this House to defend themselves.

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** Anyway, the question is this that steel magnates are creating a problem for us. I should like to draw the attention of the House to what some of us may consider as a matter of opinion, to the recent happenings in Jamshedpur. The TISCO management, the TISCO employers, the Tata Iron and Steel Company, are the darlings of this country. They have been given many concessions.

**SHRI V. PRASAD RAO** (Andhra Pradesh): Darlings of the Government.

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** Obviously, darlings of the Government and they have been given many concessions.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** And patrons also.

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** Yesterday the hon. Minister of Transport and Communications told the House that they are the most respectable gentlemen also to have been offered the chairmanship of the Indian Air Lines Corporation and he had the courage to say they are the most respectable gentlemen. Let us see how they are trying to behave with the codes, with the laws, with the conventions, with even the ordinary problems that are arising in Jamshedpur in the industry. May I say that the provision in the Industrial Disputes Act to have the work committees elected is not there merely as a dead letter? Is it not a fact that the works committee in TISCO is not yet elected? Is it not a fact that as early as October 1957 the pointed attention of the Labour Commissioner was drawn to the fact that

the works committee should be elected? It was not done. Is it not a fact that Tatas who parade as the model employers in this country are not really so, and so many things, their doings are not brought to light? Is it not a fact that in Jamshedpur there was no organisation and even national leaders of the type of Subhas Chandra Bose were put to a lot of harassment in that area? Is it not a fact that it was on the strength of the Swaraj Party in the Central Legislature that they got concessions from the then British Government and it was the very leaders of the national movement that were put to harassment in that area? Is it not a fact that they have harassed terribly one gentleman, who tried to organise the labour, Manek Homi, to live the life of a cripple there. Is it not a fact that they did not give rest to Professor Bari who tried to organise the labour and help the movement there? Therefore, to say that they are the model employers and to say that the working class is the wicked class, as my hon. friend, Mr. Saksena, tried to make out as a point . . .

**SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:** I never said that—that the labourers are wicked as a class. I never said so. Please do not impute motives.

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** Even now, there is a union which could command 27,000 signatures. They submitted a memorandum to the Prime Minister, to the Union Labour Minister, to the Bihar Labour Minister, and that memorandum was not considered. Was it according to law? Was it according to any code of discipline? Was it according to any principle or any method of dealing with trade unions? Is it not a fact that the labour unions met, as early as November, the Prime Minister himself? And is it also not a fact that in October, November, December, January, February, March, April, they were all trying to peacefully agitate, put the problem before the Government, put the problem before the various authorities? And if they are refused even

[Dr. R. B. Gaur.]

a reply to their letters, if they are refused to even get an interview, if they have refused even to consider the matter, if they have refused the matter even to be referred to a court, what else is it? It is a disgraceful situation in our country that today after eleven years of freedom a union or a worker has to go on strike even to get the right of being heard accepted. That is the position in Jamshedpur. The "model employers" of Jamshedpur have refused even to listen to the unions and they do not know what is in the 1952 Resolution of the Bihar Labour Advisory Committee, that any registered union, whether recognised or not, can deal with individual cases and you have got to reckon with it. But they refused it. The Bihar Government was possessed of the situation, the Bihar Government knew that here is a union which claimed a following of 27,000 in TISCO out of a total strength of 28,000 workers. Here is a union whose 19,000 verified membership has been accepted by the verifying officer of the Labour Department of the Bihar Government itself. Was there not, therefore, a *prima facie* case for holding a ballot in Jamshedpur and according to the 1952 Resolution of the Labour Advisory 3 P.M. Committee of Bihar? Then why was it not done? There is a State Government in this country which flouts its own decisions. There is a State Government in this country which does not take care of its conventions and codes. There is a State Government in this country which does not want to listen to the labour and dances to the tune of the employers. Could such a situation lead to industrial peace? Could such a situation lead to normal industrial relations? Could such a situation lead to what you call harmonious and peaceful economic development under the Second Five Year Plan? Here is a very important situation. The Bihar Government, I must say, has totally ignored its responsibility, has totally ignored its duties towards the labour, has totally ignored the rules

and regulations, the codes and conventions that we have laid down in this country, which it itself laid down in Bihar. The Bihar Government has totally sided with the employers, has been the tool of the employers in Jamshedpur.

Sir, such is the position. Now, you say that it is your theory, it is your preaching that modern state-craft of your conception is something in the nature of a balancing force between two contending classes, capitalists and labourers. May I know, if you have stuck to that conception whether your State or your State Government has played as a balancing force between the capitalists and the labour or it has sided with the capitalists? Even if one State Government does it, it is a matter of shame for this country. Even if one single incident of that type has taken place when you have openly sided with the employers and tried to crush the labour, it is a matter of disgrace for us. That is a very important point. You have got to take this matter in your hand. Each defaulting employer must be taken to task, each defaulting State Government must be taken to task, and defaulting Labour Department officials must be taken to task. Otherwise your codes will remain only on paper.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: When you refer to labour, may I know if you mean the AITUC?

DR. R. B. GOUR: I would request my hon. friend not to try to create a quarrel between the INTUC and the AITUC. I will give you instances of INTUC unions who are facing difficulties at the hands of your administration. Please do not create those problems.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: We are discussing the Bihar strike.

DR. R. B. GOUR: INTUC is there in Calcutta tramway strike. You cannot try to create that sort of



discrimination. Kindly don't do it. We know that game and that is also the game of the employers.

Sir, this is the position. If a worker has committed a mistake out of ignorance, out of lack of information, out of lack of knowledge of the law, do you deal with him sympathetically? No. He is dismissed summarily under the standing orders, and the reason is misconduct. Here is an employer, here is a State Government, here is a State Labour Department, here is an official, who do not implement the law or the code. No action against them. Well, it is a very serious problem which you must consider. The Labour Ministry of the Government of India says, "well, labour is a State subject, we cannot intervene". Why does not the Defence Ministry say the same thing? Why should not the army say the same thing? The Labour Ministry refuses to intervene in Jamshedpur. But the Industry Ministry cannot say that. They give them a lot of concessions. The Finance Ministry cannot say that. They give them a lot of concessions. And the Defence Ministry cannot say that they cannot allow the use of the army. After all what is this Labour Ministry for? Is the Labour Ministry there only to sit tight, only to make speeches, only to deliver sermons to us?

Sir, I should like to know why the army was parading the streets, under which law, under which section of the Criminal Procedure Code. Sir, the other day you know we had a question here in that connection. This is the problem. This is the problem that Government gives us only words of consolation but gives them all help to sabotage all its decisions. That is the main problem, and therefore the question is that these employers will have to be asked to see the situation in its proper perspective. They will have to be dealt with properly, and the responsibility is on the Government and precisely on the Labour Ministry to see that these decisions that we have taken are implemented in right earnest, in the spirit in which

they are taken. That is why I commend this Resolution to this House. The matter is not such a simple thing that it could be brushed aside as the problem of this or that unit, this or that industry, this or that province, or this or that party. It is a national problem, and it must be dealt with nationally.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Resolution that is now before the House. This Resolution merely wants that the Government should appoint a Committee of the various political parties and interests to go into the question of industrial relations and to see to what extent they can be improved, so that the even economic development of our country which is at the heart of everyone of us is properly maintained, and we may have the maximum benefit out of the good relationship that can be created between the employers and the employees.

Sir, there is not the slightest doubt that today the most important task before our country is to increase production to the maximum extent and it should be the responsibility of the Government of India to see that any impediment whatsoever in the path of maximisation of that production is removed forthwith, and that is the objective behind this particular Resolution.

Sir, the Labour Minister the other day is reported to have said that the relationships between the workers and the employers in this country are fairly good, and that they are not such as should cause anxiety to the country or to the Government. I do not wish to go into the correctness or otherwise of this particular statement, but I would only like to say that there are so many problems in the industrial relations which have still not been clearly clarified, and the result has been that at last there is discontent in the minds of the people. There are, Sir, the questions of wages which might create certain difficulties not only with reference to the question of social justice but also with reference

[Shri Rohit M. Dave.]

to the problem as to what we have to do with production and whether equal distribution is a part of the very process of production or not. But the Government of India seems to have come to the conclusion that any increase in wages at this stage might result in the lack of capital formation to the extent that is desirable in the country, and therefore for some time to come they would like to see that the wages problem is kept in abeyance. We have got the Second Pay Commission which is going into this question, and almost all the wage issues seem to be postponed from time to time so that it may be possible for the Government to know the views and the findings of the Second Pay Commission and after that the adjudication officers and others might have the benefit of those recommendations and thereby the wage question might be tackled seriously. That is the impression of those who are working in the trade unions that whenever the question of wages comes, howsoever justifiable the claim might be, that claim is being postponed from time to time with a view perhaps to having the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission before the Government and the country. Whether this particular impression of the trade-unionists is correct or otherwise, is again a problem which is one of opinion. But that is clearly the impression which is gathered by the trade union workers. But apart from wages, there are so many other issues dealing with industrial relations which have to be properly investigated and on which the Government's policy has to be properly formulated.

One of the most important questions is that of the adjudication machinery. We are having conflicting opinions regarding the part the adjudication machinery can play in improving and maintaining healthy industrial relations. There is one point of view which seems to suggest that the adjudication machinery, because of its legalistic approach and because of the fact that it encourages the trade-

unionists as well as the employers to take a legalistic approach to Industrial relations, is hampering the development of healthy industrial relations. The other point of view seems to suggest that under the present conditions, the adjudication machinery is absolutely necessary and that industrial relations cannot be left to the trial of strength between the trade unions on the one hand and the employers on the other. The Government of India seems to be following both these policies, or at least, they seem to be allowing the State Governments to follow one policy or the other according to circumstances. What the character of the circumstances is and what exactly the terms are by which one or the other policy is being followed in various cases is a matter again which is of opinion. But, here again, there is a clear impression in the minds of the trade-unionists that the Government of India is following both these policies which are inconsistent and which create confusion in the minds of the people. The Labour Conference has gone into this question again and again and certain recommendations have already been made. Certain codes of behaviour have been prescribed and certain decisions regarding the way in which industrial disputes might be dealt with, have been taken. But, here again, when it comes to the question of implementation of these recommendations, we find a divergence. In some cases, the recommendations are adhered to, but in other cases, they are not adhered to and thereby, again there is a confusion in the minds of the people, especially among the working classes and the trade union workers as to what exactly the policy of the Government in this matter is, whether they want the adjudication machinery or not. If they want the adjudication machinery, the working class expects the Government to utilise that machinery impartially whenever any occasion arises for the intervention of that machinery. But so many times, in spite of the clear merits of the case and in spite of strong pressure from the working class, the adjudication

machinery is not availed of and the trade-unionists and the employers want to try their strength in industrial disputes resulting in loss of production. I have in my mind the Premier Automobile case in which, in spite of the fact that there was considerable opinion among the working class in the City of Bombay that some adjudication machinery should be brought into existence which could settle this dispute in a short time so that the production might again start, the whole issue was allowed to hang fire and the trade-unionists and the employers were allowed to have their trial of strength. In certain other cases, even on very superficial grounds, the adjudication machinery is at once brought into operation. It is, therefore, necessary that a high-power committee should go into this question and come to a definite decision one way or the other and lay down certain objective norms which the Government should follow in order to see that production is maintained and healthy industrial relations are established—industrial relations in which the worker has a very dignified and a legitimate place.

Then there is the question of rationalisation. This question also has been discussed again and again and has been investigated by various committees. The Labour Conference has gone into it and certain recommendations have been made. Yet, we find here again that the principle is not applied uniformly and consistently. So many times, the question of rationalisation has been allowed to be made a matter of trial of strength between the trade-unionists and the industrialists, with the result that again production suffers and a consistent policy on rationalisation does not emerge. We have got cases in which, for instance, the textile mills are being closed down. Whether they are closed down because of the obsolete machinery or because of the reluctance on the part of the employers to carry on their activities or because of bringing pressure on the workers to see that they

agree to a decrease in wages or a lower dearness allowance, is a matter which again and again comes before us in the industrial field and no consistent policy is being followed and there is a trial of strength between the trade-unionists and the employers. At times, the Government does intervene and even when it does, there is always pressure brought on the working class to accept certain reductions in their total emoluments, so that a particular unit might be carried on. Here again, it is necessary that a high-power decision should be taken once and for all as to what exactly is the policy of rationalisation, what the conditions are under which this rationalisation will be permitted irrespective of the circumstances of each individual case, and as a matter of general objective policy. The same is true of the increase in productivity also. There again, the matter is entirely left to the tender mercies of the trial of strength between the trade-unionist and the working class on the one hand and the employers on the other.

All these are issues which have already been debated by the various interests that are interested in this particular industrial relations field and they have always tried to evolve certain formulae. But it has been found that those formulae have not been properly adhered to, and some high-power decision regarding what should be done in each particular case has become absolutely imperative if these activities are to continue and if industrial relations are to improve.

It is because of this that this Resolution recommends to the House that a Committee might be appointed which might go into all these questions and make recommendations so that all these burning issues of industrial relationship might be settled once and for all, objective norms, might be laid down and the Government will be expected to apply those norms irrespective of the merits of individual cases, so that a rule of law, instead of a rule of trial of

[Shri Rohit M. Dave.]

strength as it exists between the working class on the one hand and the employers on the other, might be established.

DR. P. J. THOMAS (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, there is no doubt that at present industrial relations have become the burning topic, as the previous speaker said, and I am glad that at last a Communist Member has brought forward this Resolution on the subject. But I am afraid I cannot agree with him in regard to the characterisation of this problem. He spoke about the wickedness of industrialists and said that the Government had not been playing its part and so on. I am afraid it is a rather wrong diagnosis of the situation. What has happened during the last few months? Evidently, Sir, the industrial relations in this country are at their worst among the organised classes of workers and in organised industries. Now, Sir, in the small scale industries workmen are getting very low wages. They are not organised and so they cannot get their wages increased; poor agricultural workers are hardly able to get gruel; I must say that there people are too good. But what do we find in the case of big industries? The labourers in those industries are organised and very noisy. What is the reason for that? The Congress Party, when it came into power, as far as I remember took very great care to study the whole question and gave the most generous terms to the labour in this country. Various kinds of regulations were made and much was done with a view to safeguarding the interests of the labouring classes. As a matter of fact, the organised labour today is in a fairly good condition, and if that condition is to be improved any further, this country must have much higher productivity. Because ours is a very poor country, our level of production is very low, large numbers of people are either unemployed or under-employed, and there are millions of people who can hardly get gruel for their food. We

must see that such people are in a position to get something, first. We cannot suddenly make or convert the organised labouring classes to be princes or high class people or favoured classes, as we have been trying to do. They must take things slowly. That can be done only by building up our industrial equipment and raising the level of our production. What has been happening in other countries, whether communist or capitalist? Take for instance Germany. The German Government told their labourers that they cannot have any immediate rise in their wages. They took various active measures and their production increased tremendously during the last ten years. Today, the labouring classes are getting very decent wages. As a matter of fact, they are higher than in most parts of Europe. Even in Soviet Russia in the earlier years there was not enough food to eat, people were made to work hard and then there was more of everything. As a matter of fact, the condition of labour improved in those countries only after a large increase in production. But, Sir, in this country I must say that the Government, the Congress Government, began by giving rather generous terms, to the labouring classes. Well, that probably was right. I am not against that. But to go further now and to allow them to create all this trouble and spoil our Plan is absolutely wrong. It is not the employers, as the mover claimed, but rival sections of the labour who today are disturbing our Plan. The organised labour under the influence of various parties started fighting. What has happened in the last three or four months? The whole country knows it. What happened in Jamshedpur in May last? There have been dock workers' strikes and other strikes. There was political rivalry between the different trade unions, and the whole thing was political and not at all economic. Now, were they working for higher wages? No. There were other cases, chiefly. Some of the dock workers are getting really Rs. 30 or Rs. 40 a day. And

even in Cochin where I come from some are getting Rs. 15 or Rs. 16 a day, and even they struck work. Well, I am not at all against these labouring classes getting even higher wages. But we have first to raise national income; then only can the whole country become prosperous. And if you want that the Five Year Plan should make any progress, you must certainly create that atmosphere for its progress, and that is by creating industrial peace

Now, Sir. I want to elaborate a little more some of the points that I have mentioned just now. I know of a factory in Kerala where a generous European employer gave workers who were formerly getting eight annas per day, Rs. 3 per day. Many were girls. And what happened? Some of these girls, now so well-dressed one day found that the tea given in the canteen did not contain sufficient sugar. They went on a token strike that very day. And there have been many strikes for similar purposes these days. At another factory, some workmen were transferred to another section. On that ground much trouble was given to the management, and hundreds of people went to jail. Well, this is the way in which our industrial relations are maintained. Then in Quilon some factories had to be closed down and there was similar trouble and the Government had to intervene and there was some shorting. All these things, of course, must stop. But, incidentally, may I say that the Communist Government in this case learnt wisdom earlier than some of the Congress Governments in the past? The Communist Government found out that unless there was industrial peace, there could be no further industrialisation in Kerala, and in Kerala particularly the unemployment problem is so acute. Wherever you go, you will find crowds of people who are unemployed. But how can industries start under such conditions? So the Communist Government wanted to reduce some of

these difficulties, and they even agreed to give some special terms to an outside industrialist. I support it strongly, because in a country like ours where the unemployment problem is so very serious, we must give some assurances to the employers so that workers may not go on strike over such minor things like having more sugar in tea and so on. And such things are going on in this country. There are very many cases like that all over.

Therefore, although I agree that there is necessity for study of industrial relations, I certainly feel that a committee of the kind that has been suggested by the mover of this Resolution will not be of much use. In my opinion, if we care for the real interests of the Five Year Plan, not the so-called interests, we require now industrial peace, and there should be some kind of stay in the matter of wages for some time. Ultimately, of course, we can increase them.

Sir, this is a country where a large number of people are getting hardly gruel. Many are getting only two or three annas per day, and these upper classes of labourers are getting Rs. 3, Rs. 4 or Rs. 5 per day, and their cry for more is absolutely immoral and unjustifiable, and I strongly object to such a thing happening in our country. We do want that they should wait until the level of the entire economy comes up. So, in my opinion, the purpose of the whole Resolution has got to be restated. A committee can be appointed. But unless we go into the fundamental issues, I am afraid any committee will not be of much use. Sir, I do want that this question of industrial relations should be studied. Probably a committee is required, a committee of competent people, not merely of politicians and trade-unionists, but of people who are impartial. Only such people can properly go into the matter.

Sir, may I point out again that this is the time when the public of our country must be awake? Otherwise,

[Dr. P. J. Thomas.]

when such things are going on, how is it possible for the Five Year Plan to make any progress? There have been so many strikes lately in Jamshedpur and other places and we have lost so many labour days and so much property has already been destroyed and so much money has been lost. By doing these things we are really putting off the day when we can have better living conditions for our people. I agree that there are certain employers who are avaricious. But our Plan is suffering because of there being rival sections among the labouring classes. And such rivalry must certainly be discouraged. Even if it means processes which are slightly undemocratic. I would support them, because democracy in this country has lately become rather a laughing stock. Politicians in this country feel that because people have got votes and they are organised, therefore we must give them whatever they want. But our poor agriculturists and cottage workers who are not at all organised, whatever be their grievances, are nowhere. So this kind of democracy is certainly of doubtful value and ultimately it may even lead to some military rule. If you really want to retain democracy, you must be careful about that, and the care for that must come not merely from politicians but from the public of the country. The whole public must be awake at this juncture. Therefore, I would call upon the public in this country to be awake, to watch the whole process and to tell the Government, and political parties and also the trade unions to be careful in the matter and avoid such important things happening in future.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have heard the mover of the Resolution with undivided attention and I tried to understand the import of his Resolution to the best of my ability but I find that the Resolution which appeared to be innocent is full of potential mischief in the sense that it has got a political string about it. The so-called indus-

trial unrest which has been pointed out—and the causes therefor being placed on the employers and the Government—is something which is not comprehensible to me. The industrial unrest is created by whom? The political leaders and the leaders of the unions should ask the question themselves and find out whether this industrial unrest is not the political creation of the various parties who lead the destinies of the labour in the unions and who make the labour unions as the handmaid of their politics.

AN HON. MEMBER: Particularly the Communist Party.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: I have to point out here that the mover of the Resolution who is a known Communist, a man who has spent a large part of his life in the trade union movement, has to see whether this country—Dr. Thomas has very kindly pointed out—is not suffering due to the over-liberal treatment given to the industrial labour and the wide cleavage between the industrial labour and the non-industrial labour. This he has to weigh if he really wants social justice in consonance with the directive principles of the Constitution and if he has value for democracy. The democracy in this country must be worked out in the interests of all. Where the majority of the people, nearly 80 per cent. depend for their livelihood on agriculture—and all these people have an average income of Rs. 300 annually, the majority of them, over 40 or 45 per cent—we should see whether the so-called industrial unrest is working adversely against the interests of the majority or whether the industrial labour is taking a lion's share because it is an organised movement. It is very harmful for the democracy of this country. In spite of the zeal of the Labour Minister—because he himself is a very prominent worker—when the labour laws came to be enacted in the industrially advanced State of Bombay in 1938, the labour leaders from the Opposition always called them as Black Laws, they protested against

them, but they took all shelter and advantage under those laws. Now they have a firm footing because they have a number of laws in their favour. None of the industrial leaders, those who are leading the unions, has ever thought of the destinies of the poor agricultural labour. They don't consider it as part and parcel of this country even though they know that this is a predominantly agricultural country and the destiny of this nation depends largely on their welfare. (Interruptions) This is very natural with the doctrine of Communists because they always move through the smaller section and then disturb the bigger section. That is their doctrine. Now as the 20th century democrats, they are always talking in the name of democracy and also industrial unrest. The whole country knows who has created **unrest** in the industrial sector in spite of the decent wages they have got. I don't hold a brief for the capitalist or private sector of this country. They have their own profit motives, they are also responsible for certain conditions which are created in this country but the recent phenomenon in this country is that the capitalists and industrial workers are working hand in glove. They are depriving this nation of Rs. 15 crores by way of excise duties which are exempted on the industry. There, in spite of the protestations of the labour that the private capitalists are accursed persons, they have come to their help and they deprived the nation of Rs. 15 crores. Is this not an unrest which is created in the non-industrial sector? So, even if an unreal thing is talked many times, then it assumes the character of reality. This is the doctrine of Goebbels. They go on talking that the industrial labour is always suffering, that they are labouring under a number of difficulties, etc. The mover of the Resolution should see what are the labour laws and policies in the country from which he draws inspiration. I have got a book called 'Labour in the Soviet Union' by Solomon M. Schwarz.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO (Andhra Pradesh): Is it an American book? Where is it published?

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: It is a Cresset Press publication. It says:

"Two themes dominate the history of Soviet labour policy during this period. The first is the gradual change from a free labour market based on contractual relations into a system of official control over labour allocation and working conditions. . . . The second and far more controversial theme is the past history and present level of the value of real wages in Russia."

In spite of the tall claims and assertions of the Communist friends that there is equality between the various labouring classes, still we see that the average labourer or the lowest paid gets Rs. 75 and the highest paid gets Rs. 35,000 in Russia even today. This is the equality which they see in places where the working class democracy is functioning. That is called the Working Class State of Soviet Russia but there is very little to draw any inspiration from that country. Even then the theme of the labour law is to suppress the liberty of the labour to a very substantial extent and they do not allow the labour to have that sort of freedom which they enjoy in this country. Here freedom is always misused and it is used in such a manner that it destroys the fabric of the whole community, the community at large, which expects the nation to develop quickly, which expects the nation to solve its food problem.

There are a number of problems which an undeveloped country like India faces but the political leaders who have a command over a small group and even all the Leftists who oppose the Congress for one reason or other fall into this net and they get themselves involved in that far-flung snare which is cast by the Communists. Even the friend who has commented on adjudication and conciliation machinery—Mr. Rohit Dave—has completely ignored the picture

[Shri Sonusing Dhansing Patil.] that this vast country needs relief in another direction. There is too much of relief for labour. Of course, the country is so poor that even if the labour gets whatever they ask, it may not be sufficient. I grant it. It may not be a fair or living wage but at the same time taking into consideration the overall poverty of the country, whatever the industrial labour gets is far in excess of the legitimate than what other working classes are getting. The capital that is invested in this country in the various factories which are over 7000 in number is to the tune of nearly Rs. 700 crores. About 17 lakhs of people are employed in them or a little less. The discipline and the industrial establishments standing orders, the various machineries set up by way of works committees, the formula which is evolved by the tripartite machinery, the conciliation and adjudication machinery that is intended both at the Centre and at the State levels and the workers' gradual and progressive participation in management—all these factors go to show that the problem of the labour is very satisfactorily being solved.

DR. R. B. GOUR: In words.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: They have been provided with industrial housing when thousands or lakhs or even crores of people are without houses in the rural areas. They have been provided social security measures like provident fund, workmen's compensation, maternity benefits and labour welfare measures. All these things go to show that in this country, under the name of labour, only industrial labour is attended to. No other labour has got any place, it would seem. No doubt, there are labour laws which are trying to give some relief to agricultural labour also, even though the date for that has been postponed to April 1959. Still one does not know how much the country will be able to go in the matter of agricultural labour. I have been touching on this point and I

repeatedly harp on this wide cleavage that the Government is creating for one reason or the other. In the industrial development of this country, a wide cleavage between industrial labour and non-industrial labour is created. I am afraid it will be very difficult for Government to put its finger correctly and say where to stop and where to start. This the Government has to confess ultimately and most painfully. And in the other House the Prime Minister confessed that we are now faced with the food problem and that agricultural production is the main problem for this country, because it goes to the root of the economics of our country.

So, I have to submit that non-industrial labour constitutes the largest group of the population and that must be first provided for and given conditions which will be worthy of human beings. They are now living an almost sub-human life or existence. If that is forgotten and in the name of industrial unrest some committee is going to be appointed, it will only be the voice of a few organisations which do not care what happens to the others, and that will be a sort of self-centred policy. Of course, it has a political motive behind it, but I will not unnecessarily read motives behind this Resolution. As the Communist philosophy goes, under the name of social justice and democracy, the Communists are working in this country. But wherever there is any unrest, according to the policy of the Communists, they always thrive. They thrive on unrest and wherever there is unrest, it is a vantage ground for their propaganda to attract people to their line of thinking. The Resolution, as a matter of fact, cuts at the root. But the so-called ostentation or show of making social justice and democracy must be put up as it is. Or else it will be going against the spirit of the Resolution which was passed in Amritsar. So this is the line of action that the Communists are following, as one of their friends Mr. V. B. Karnik has succinctly pointed out. That is the present policy of the Communists. And this Resolution is the outcome of



that policy so that the whole blame may be thrown on the employers and the Government.

I do not deny that some employers are not actuated too much by the profit or avarice motive. Some of them do create certain conditions in which, naturally, the workers are driven to the extreme side. But the protection of the labour laws is there, the various machineries for conciliation, the various tribunals, are there set up and there is the three-tier system for labour. These are sufficient to give to labour the security and social justice which are expected from the employers. The employer is not a free person. He can be fined. If all these things are taken into consideration, I think it will be found that the purpose of this Resolution is not so much to remove unrest by appointing a committee of Parliament, but to throw the blame on the employers and to open an avenue for discussion so that the Government and the employers could be shown to be responsible. The Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948 which is improved after the adoption of the goal of a socialist pattern of society, is sufficiently clear and it is a clear indication and inkling into the mind and policy of the Government.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not think there can be any two opinions about the desirability of industrial peace. We are all interested in it because industrial peace alone will enable India to become an industrialised country. It will enable India to produce more and it will enable India to raise her economic standards. On the face of it, Sir, this Resolution appears to be a very innocuous one. But unfortunately, coming as it does from a Member of the party in opposition, one could suspect what his motives are, and if there was any doubt about those suspicions, they have been perfectly obliterated by some of the very violent speeches that have been made against employers. Now, if there is any sincerity behind this Resolution, that there should be greater industrial peace as between

the employers and the employees, it should recognise the existence of the employers as a responsible class. I am afraid this has not been done. Industrial peace requires two parties—the employers and the employees. Both sides are expected to be very responsible and both sides are expected to be very gentlemanly in their behaviour. I am afraid, as an educationist, I know how students are exploited by political parties. And as an Indian I know how the poor labourers are exploited by political parties for their own purposes. It may be politically desirable. I do not want to argue or enter into that question. It may be that politically Communism is a better system. But I would prefer to look at it only from the economic standpoint. Can it be seriously argued that labourers in the Communist countries today are really better off than labourers in countries like the United States of America, or Canada or Australia or even England or Western Germany? On the face of it, apart from political considerations, one could see how these countries look after their labour much better than the Communist countries.

DR. R. B. GOUR: What is their percentage of share in the national income? Please examine it from that point of view.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I am looking at it from the point of view of the economic welfare of labour. After all, the total income of the employer does not go into his own pockets. A large part of it goes into the pockets of the Government. As a matter of fact, a very important industrialist in Bombay said openly that he was working for eleven months in the year for the Government. Now, nobody has any quarrel about that, because the Government requires the money to spend it for the betterment of our country. We do not grudge it.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Work for the Government and rob the income-tax.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: May I crave your protection Sir? The other party have had their say. They might as

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

well listen to me with a certain amount of patience.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): They do not want to hear the truth.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Not truths but half-truths.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: I leave aside the highly developed countries of the West. Take a poor country as an example. Take our poor country as an example. I understand that the house of the Tatas was attacked very severely on the floor of this House just a little while ago. I have not the slightest reason to believe that the Tatas are the only good industrialists in India. I am perfectly certain that the industrialists generally are perfectly prepared to do today their bit by their employees. I think the employers today are enlightened enough to realise that without the full co-operation of labour, their brains and their money are not going to do anything. Labour is an important factor in producing wealth and every successful employer realises that simple economic truth and, therefore, it is to the interests of the employers to see that the employees are better-paid, better-fed and better-housed. I shall only take the example of Tatas for the simple reason that I happen to be a little more acquainted with their activities than with the other industrialists. Take, for example, the Tata Mills in Bombay. My friends on the Opposite side are perfectly welcome to come and visit that mill any time they like and they will find that the arrangements made for the well-being of the employees, of the labourers there are excellent. In fact, they are the best in Bombay. Take, for example, the creche and the canteen. So many people have told me that there is nothing to beat these arrangements anywhere in Bombay, probably not anywhere else in the whole of India.

Take another Tata concern, the Swadeshi Mills. Recently, they have built quarters for their labourers. It has cost them eight lakhs of rupees. I do

not think I have seen better labourers' quarters anywhere in India than that building. I know as a matter of fact that the instructions of the Chairman were not to grudge money but to produce a building which will really satisfy the needs of the labourers and that they can lead a comfortable happy life in that delightful building. That building is very near my Institute. I pass by it every day. It is a delightful building and it is a standing monument to what good industrialists can do, wish to do and have done for the betterment of the labourers. Take a third example, Jamshedpur, which I understand has been figuring rather prominently this afternoon in this House.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: It was under fire.

PROF. A. R. WADIA: Unfortunately, I missed it. However, I wonder whether my friends have read a little brochure produced, of course, by the Tata Iron and Steel Company, "The Story of a Strike". I think that, if they forget their politics and read that little brochure just as a statement of facts, they will be struck by one interesting fact or several interesting facts. First of all, Jamshedpur was nothing but a jungle at one time. Today it is the finest industrial town in the whole of India and perhaps in Asia as well. Do they know, the Members on the other side, how grateful the labourers really are to the founder of that industry? Do they know that every morning, man and woman labourers go to the statue of J. N. Tata, offer flowers and then go to work? I am glad to see that there is so much of goodness in human nature that they can appreciate what has been done for them. This industry has been thriving partly because the labour has been well treated, well looked after and partly because the employers have been following a very enlightened policy. They have had thirty years of peace and it is because of that that the Tata Iron and Steel Company has become such a flourishing concern. I am not one of those who believe that iron and

steel are the most important things in life but in an industrial society, they are important. Where was the iron and steel industry in India before the Tatas founded it? They have flourished, yes, but, has not India flourished thereby? Has not the Government added to their revenues thereby? Has not labour received benefits thereby? These are very simple facts which you ought not to forget, very simple economic facts.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Only the Tatas have suffered?

**PROF. A. R. WADIA:** No. Why should they? They have had their share.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I thought everybody benefited and Tatas suffered.

**PROF. A. R. WADIA:** And the surplus went to the Government. Nobody grudges that. That is a matter of policy and nobody resents it.

Now, Sir, as was very beautifully pointed out by my friend, Prof. Thomas, the real weakness of our labour is that it is not united. Trade-unionism is a necessary thing for the development of the labour movement but the trade unions have to be strong and united. If you have got too many trade unions, they will quarrel among themselves and that is what is happening today and that is what the authorities in Jamshedpur did not want. This is the reason why they courted the anger of the Communists. Now, I do not wish to say about the things that were done in Jamshedpur which necessitated the interference even of the Government for the successful running of the very vital industry in our country. Now, a strong trade union is necessary. One strong trade union in any industry is necessary because all cases of dispute can be settled between these two parties, the employers on the one hand and the employees represented by their trade union on the other hand. If any agreement is arrived at, it is expected that the employers will honour it; it is equally expected that the employees

will honour it too; but if you have got rival trade unions, the chances are that what one trade union accepts the other trade union will try to oppose and say that they were not a party to the agreement, that they are not bound by the agreement and so on, with the result that there will, of course, be disunity. Therefore, if Mr. Pendse is really serious in moving this Resolution, he ought to make it clear that what is necessary is to build up healthy relations between the employers and the employees. Make it perfectly clear but not with the reservation that the employers as a class must go, must disappear. That may be politics but that is not economics.

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** What do you mean by socialism?

**PROF. A. R. WADIA:** Socialism means the well-being of all. America is a socialistic country in spite of what you say. England is a socialistic country. Look at the people there. They will not become Communists. They will not sacrifice their liberty; they will not become slaves of the Government.

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** Wait for a few years.

**PROF. A. R. WADIA:** That is all right. It may be that the destiny of the world will be to reduce human beings to slaves. That is a different matter. I am not an astrologer to say as to what will happen twentyfive or fifty years hence. I am talking of the present. I am talking as a humble student of politics and economics. That is the position and it is because of these mental reservations behind this Resolution that I oppose it.

**SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the two cases submitted by two professors. I hope Prof. Wadia would give us a chance to debate on Communism by himself bringing forward a non-Official Resolution on the good and bad effects of Communism. Because the Resolution happens to be sponsored by a Communist, he seems to think that it is something very dangerous. Another friend of ours, Mr. Patil, says that

[Shri J. V. K. Vallabharao.]  
this Resolution has got sinister motives.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: I have not said that. I said 'political'.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO: Political motives? Yes, my politics according to you is sin. Sir, in this Resolution, we have not asked for anything very serious. We only ask fifteen Members of Parliament, Members like Prof. Wadia, Members like Mr. Patil, Members like Mr. Dave,—you may exclude one or two of us if you are . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Or even like Mr. J. R. D. Tata.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO: . . . afraid; what we want is Members of Parliament, not Communist Members alone should go into the whole industrial unrest whether it be in Jamshedpur or, as you like, in Kerala or in Bengal. Let us go into all these and examine why this industrial unrest is developing. If you think that this industrial unrest is due mainly to the Communist Party and not to any other thing, I do not believe it. The Prime Minister made many statements; all the newspapers every day are featuring the industrial unrest, like firing in Barbil, tramway strike in Calcutta, some firing in Bombay on industrial workers and so on. What is the reason? Why?

4 P.M.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): Let us get at the root of it.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO: Yes; let us get at the root of it in a Gandhian way if you like. What we want is a Committee to go into the entire question of industrial unrest. No doubt we have got our own views about it and you may agree or you may not agree with them. You may not agree with Lalji Pendse. Mr. Sak-sena said that the employers and the Government had been blamed. We never pinned the responsibilities on them; we said, you also examine their

conduct. Mr. Wadia just now said they have done excellent work; they have done so much. Well and good. All that we have said is let there be a Committee to go into the whole question.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): Why could not we start the enquiry from Kerala side?

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO: Hold it; I do not object. It is you who object.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Do not forget Coimbatore on the way.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO: All of us are agreed that there is industrial unrest. Well, that is the reason why we gave notice of this Resolution. My friend has explained in detail certain aspects of the question and I do not want to discuss those aspects once again. Now, consider this for a moment. We all expected that we were going to increase employment in the country and we were going to have better production results according to the schedule of the Second Five Year Plan. What is happening? Thousands of workers are thrown out of jobs. Many industries are closing down: many mills are closing down; many mines are closing down. You have so many programmes of social welfare and development plans, and what is happening? 30,000 women workers were removed one fine morning from the jute industry. Why? Are these industries closing down? Who is responsible for this? Have they not got profits? Have they not got resources? What is the reason? Is it not necessary for you to enquire into it? Is it not necessary for you to enquire why so many workers are thrown out of jobs? I do not mean non-technical workers; take technicians even. Many engineering industries are closing down in Calcutta city. Small foundries are closing down. What is the reason? Where are these workers to go? Are they not the sources of tension which you say is being created? Why is it you are unable to check this state of affairs? Are there any causes which we cannot control, for which

we need special legislation here? That is the main question.

The second thing is this. Everyday there is a dispute in a mill. For example, the other day there was a dispute for wage increase in a mill in Bihar—Katihar—and the dispute was referred to an industrial tribunal and there are also workers of the I.N.T.U.C. union; it is not a Communist union alone; it is not the red label union. The Town Congress Committee, the I.N.T.U.C. and the local municipality there are all interested in the working of the mill. The dispute was referred to a tribunal. The moment it was referred to a tribunal, the mill-owner said, nothing doing; the mill is closed; you go to hell with your tribunal. Now, what is going to happen to the workers? The Bihar Government tried to intervene but nothing happened. The local Congress Committee leaders wanted to do satyagraha; nothing moved. The mill is closed and 3,000 workers are on the street. Who is responsible for such industrial unrest? They were not Communists.

Let us take another instance in the South. Tomorrow the Commerce and Industry Minister, I was told, is flying to Coimbatore to enquire into an industrial dispute, a dispute created by a very big man who is the owner—I do not want to name him because the Deputy Chairman does not want it—of the Kaleswar Mills. The dispute arose there and the I.N.T.U.C., the A.I.T.U.C. and the H.M.S. are all interested in the solution of the dispute. The Government referred the dispute to the tribunal but the Kaleswar Mills put up a notice board saying that the mill is closed. Now, who is flouting the authority of the Government? Who is creating industrial disputes? I want to know it. The Communists may be doing elsewhere according to you but here in these specific cases what is happening?

Another thing is the partiality shown to monopolist concerns. Because of that another type of unemployment is

arising. For example, in the engineering industry three big units monopolise the entire raw material; they have all the concessions from the Government. They get all the quotas and so the smaller units get defunct and they sustain losses. Here is a case of industrial unrest, not created by the labour, not created by the employer but by the policy of the Government which refuses to help smaller units and hence the question of Government also comes here. For example, in the great land of Uttar Pradesh small units are closing down. Small foundries are closing down; we have received a number of representations from Gorakhpur where the Communist Party is not strong, from Lucknow from where great Congress leaders have come up and from Allahabad. The small foundries are closing down because they could not get enough quantities of brass or steel. But steel and brass are lying in huge quantities elsewhere without being used but getting rusted. The monopolist concerns get priority of quotas and there it gets rusted but here the foundries are not getting it and the workers are unemployed. Here it is a case of smaller units going down because of your partiality to the bigger ones.

Take the case of manganese. What is happening in the manganese industry? One big huge monopolistic concern captured the entire high grade manganese ore, the C.P.M.O. but the smaller units which have got 20, 30 or below 40 per cent, ore are closing down. Why? Because the monopolistic concern is in possession of the high grade manganese ore and unless and until that manganese ore is blended with the low grade ore there is no market for the low grade ore. The high grade ore is not released with the result that nearly a lakh of people are starving. Though the number of workers involved is only 30,000, their families are there and nearly one lakh people are starving. There is great industrial unrest created because we are showing partiality to the bigger units. Why don't you come out and say this much of high grade ore has to

[Shri J. V. K. Vallabharao.]

be compulsorily given to the low grade mine owners? Now, this problem of unemployment and industrial unrest, where does it come from? Not from the Communists or China or elsewhere as our friends here tried to make out, but it came as a direct result of the partiality that you are showing to certain persons and hitting your own concerns with the result that your own people are unemployed and industrial unrest is created. This is the problem we are facing today. You may not accept it when I say this, but at least why don't you accept to have a Committee to go into it?

Another thing that I would like to stress is about this code of discipline. I have nothing to say against the professions or the good objectives with which certain professions are made and I have no quarrel with the hon. Labour Minister who incidentally also happens to be the Planning Minister. The other day we sat at a tripartite meeting about the jute industry. The I.N.T.U.C. leaders who are dead against the Soviet Union, who are dead against the Communist Party, people like Dr. Maitreyee Bose and others, all sat together; and what were the conclusions arrived at? How the workers are treated, how the jute bosses are flouting even the minimum rules of the Factories Act, how they are not even keeping muster rolls, how they are even refusing to pay compensation to the workers, how day in and day out they are throwing out thousands of women workers, how they keep thousands of workers as *badlis*? That is the cause for the great industrial agitation in Bengal. The Labour Ministers were there; the labour leaders were there. There is no dispute among different workers' organisations, no minute of dissent, except from one great organisation and that is from the great "liberal patriotic organisation of employees" who said, "no, no" to every proposal of Government and workers. We would like to know, is it not high time for us to enquire into it?

I would very much like to go into the case of the great house of Tatas because Prof. Wadia referred to it. I am reminded of an old saying and a very common saying in my language:

"Ma Tatalu Netulu Tragaru Mutulu Vasana Chudandi".

That is, "our grandfathers used to drink ghee, why don't you smell our mouths?" You say Tatas have founded it. Very good, we welcome it. But is it the reason why the workers should be criminally treated there? Because you are the premier industrialists in this country, have you got a right to misbehave? I have no quarrel with them. Fifty persons of my family are working there for the last twentyfive or more years as workers in the Tata Company. They are all Congressmen. They themselves feel, what is it that is going on? I have no quarrel with the Tata house, but my quarrel is with the labour administration of that particular area. What is happening there? You may say today they are drawing—my friend and my 'guru' Dr. Thomas said—Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 a day. I do not know how his statistics work, whether they come from the *Eastern Economist* or from some other source which is invisible to us. But as a humble student of economics—when he says that wages of Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 a day seems to be much more . . .

DR. P. J. THOMAS: Dock workers, may be superintendents of docks and others, but not exactly workers.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO: What I say is that you will be surprised to know that in the Tatas' Jamshedpur Works, the minimum wage is much less than that of a backward jute mill worker of my area. That is only Rs. 60 including D.A. My friend, Mr. Michael John, will, I hope, corroborate my statement though he may not like my organisation. He himself had to openly say the other day in Jamshedpur: "I will not tolerate this state of

affairs. Now, I must wage a struggle against Tatas." What is the reason? Whatever may be the merits, whether the present state of affairs, the industrial unrest, emanates from the Communists—as they think it should always be—or from the policies of the Government or it emanates from the negligence of the employers, I hope all of you agree that it has got to be enquired into by 'respectable' Members of Parliament, of all parties, independent groups or professions. We have said all parties. So, I hope the House will accept this Resolution.

**SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA** (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, so far as this Resolution is concerned, a reference to unrest in the industry effecting the Second Five Year Plan is made. I agree with this feature of the Resolution. There is no denying the fact that there is industrial unrest in the country. As a trade-unionist, working in the field I have to face the troubles almost daily. I have to appear before the tribunals and before the conciliation machinery and fight the employers up to the Supreme Court. The employers in innumerable ways are troubling the workers. They do not implement the awards; they do not follow the laws; and the workers are put to unnecessary troubles and harassment. There is also no denying the fact that these bad relations between the employers and the workers are to a great extent responsible for low production, for strikes and for other things. But admitting all this, I have not been able to understand how the appointment of a Committee consisting of fifteen Members of Parliament is going to solve the problem of industrial unrest.

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** You suggest measures.

**SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA:** I am going to suggest. At present the labour is organised almost industry-wise. In the cement industry, in mining industry—coal mines, manganese, iron ore and other

ores—in the textile industry, steel industry, electrical industry, Defence industry, almost in every industry we are now organised almost industry-wise. Whichever industries remain, I think, we are doing our bit and in due course those too shall be organised industry-wise. Experience shows that every industry has got its own problems. Not only that. The same industry in different States has got some peculiar problems. The mining industry has got its own problems. And if this Committee were to undertake a survey of all the circumstances and troubles and the factors which are responsible for industrial unrest, I feel it may be a very difficult task for a Committee of fifteen Members of Parliament to do. I do not say that I am giving the final opinion on the subject. The system which has so far been adopted by the Government may be lacking in details. There may be some other things wanting in it. But then the procedure which has been adopted by the Government so far of conducting conferences industry-wise, of calling conferences of the representatives of all the parties, of labour unions belonging to different groups, the employers and even the representatives of the management—which has been done this time in Calcutta—I believe, offers scope where all the pros and cons of the industry, all the troubles, all the causes which create unrest in the industry and the remedies for creating a better atmosphere in the industry could be discussed. These conferences offer very good scope, and these conferences can deal in a better way with the problems of a particular industry than the sort of Committee which is sought to be constituted under this Resolution. I may cite an example. Very recently on the 5th and 6th of August, this very month, a conference was held in Calcutta for dealing with safety in mines, mines of coal, manganese and iron-ore etc. During those two days the conference worked tremendously, it split itself up into three sub-committees. Those sub-committees dealt with the labour side, with

[Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal Malviya.] safety in mines, and the amendments which were necessary in various legislations. They dealt exhaustively with everything, and I am fully satisfied with what they did, and fortunately the decisions taken were unanimous. So far as the labour was concerned, we the INTUC people, Communists and other friends, all were represented, and the managers were also represented. It was a very good feature and fortunately we came to a unanimous decision in the conference. It has given me a light, and on the basis of what has happened in Calcutta on the 5th and 6th of August, I boldly suggest to my friends to adhere to that procedure. Of course whenever any particular problem arises, if a committee is necessary for that problem, then we can suggest that a committee be appointed.

So, Sir, in brief, I submit that though I agree with the other parts of the Resolution, I do not see my way to agree that a Committee of Members of Parliament is going to serve the purpose, the great purpose, which is sought to be served by my learned friend in this Resolution. It is a great object, and nobody will deny that peace is required in industry for purposes of the success of the second Five Year Plan and for the progress of the country.

Now, Sir, there have been differences and some industrial unrest in certain parts of the country. Mostly it is industrial, I must admit that, and we must find out ways to combat it. But the problems are absolutely different everywhere. My problem was, very recently the employers introduced Gorakhpur labour system to crush us. A Committee of fifteen Members of Parliament—I am doubtful if it will prove of any help. We all of us have decried the Gorakhpur labour system, and we will go on fighting that system and we hope to succeed. The problems differ industry-wise, not industry-wise only but place-wise also. Even in one given

place, if there are ten factories, the problems differ factory-wise. I am, therefore, of the opinion that a Committee of this sort may not be very helpful. In many cases the unrest is political. Sir, I was in Ahmedabad when the doffers' strike took place and the mills closed down, and I had occasion to study the problem personally. The doffers had got a few days ago an award against them. The Textile Labour Association promised them to go on appeal. But to my surprise—and the surprise was greater because those people happened to be the members of the union, paying subscription—they went on strike. Sir, I do not want to waste time and I will submit that my conclusion was that it was a political strike and that it had nothing to do with the industry. The same thing happened in Jamshedpur. There may be defects in the labour union, the union which has been working, and here I may say very clearly that I do not come in for the support of the employers at all; I must submit, however, that there was a political motive behind it and such a great trouble took place there.

So far as the workers' rights are concerned, whatever they may be, either wages or some other things—may be our organisation, may be other organisations—nobody will deny that they have got an absolute right to agitate for their rights. Now, there is an instance of Kerala. I do not know the contents of the agreement which has been arrived at between the Government and a particular industrialist with regard to some industry, especially affecting the labour relations. I have got my knowledge confined to the newspapers only. If the reports were true, I submit, Sir, that the agreement which had been arrived at between the employers and the Government concerning the labour was anti-labour. I would only submit that the Government could have done better. They could have consulted the labour, and they could have called a conference of all, and along with



the employers and themselves they would have got the labour representatives there and would have taken their opinion also. The same agreement endorsed by the labour would not have raised any voice in the country. But then, because the labour was ignored in that agreement, I also join with the multitude who have opposed that agreement. With these words, I support the spirit of the Resolution to a certain extent, but oppose the appointment of the Committee which has been proposed in this Resolution.

श्री ५१० ना० राजभोज (मुम्बई) :

उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे इस बारे में ज्यादा कुछ नहीं कहना है। मेरे स्थान से यह जो प्रस्ताव लाया गया है उसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं थी क्योंकि हमारी सरकार मजदूरों के बारे में बहुत कुछ काम कर रही है।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) in the Chair.]

यह कमेट्री क्या करेगी जब तक कि ट्रेड यूनियन्स सरकार से सहकार नहीं करते? जब तक कि आपस में मेल-मिलाप नहीं होता तब तक कुछ भी होना बहुत मुश्किल है। सरकार क्या इन लोगों के लिये कुछ कम कर रही है? सरकार की तरफ से मकान बनाने की योजना है, इसके अलावा इश्योरेंस की, मेडिकल रिलीफ की योजना है और अनेक सोशल सिक्योरिटी के कानून हैं तथा योजनायें हैं। सरकार लेबर को बहुत सी सहूलियतें दे रही है, जैसे कि लेबर रीजिनल कमिश्नर्स हैं, लेबर आफिसर हैं, लेबर कोर्ट हैं, लेबर कालोनो हैं, डिस्पेंसरी हैं, लेबर वेलफेयर सेंटर्स हैं और बोनस है। तो जितनी भी चीजें हो सकती हैं वह हमारे लेबर्स के लिये हो रही हैं। दुनिया में इतने सारे सवाल हैं कि सब के ऊपर ध्यान देने के लिये सरकार को टाइम नहीं है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि उनके लिये और नहीं होना चाहिये लेकिन हमारी कुछ ऐसी पोलिटिकल पार्टियां हैं जिनका बावर्चीखाना उनमें असंतोष फैलाने के बिना चलता ही नहीं है। उनको कुछ न कुछ

अपने बावर्चीखाने के लिये खाद्य चाहिये और वह राज्य में असंतोष फैला कर, मजदूरों में असंतोष फैला कर प्राप्त करते हैं। ऐसे कई प्रकार के लोग हैं जो कि मजदूरों में असंतोष फैला कर अपनी लीडरशिप कायम रखना चाहते हैं और इसीलिये उनको रात दिन इससे बिना नींद नहीं आती है। जैसा कि अभी मेरे भाई श्री सोनूसिंह धनसिंह पाटिल ने कहा, लेबरर्स को बहुत सी फैमिलिटीज हैं, उनको एवरेज में ७५ से १०० रु० महीना तनखाह मिलती है जब कि हमारे जो दूसरे लैंडलेस लेबरर्स हैं और मजदूर हैं वे इधर उधर धूमते हैं और उनको २० या ३० रु० महीना मिलना बहुत मुश्किल होता है। तो उन लोगों को किसी न किसी ढंग से, ट्रेड-यूनियन के नाम से, इस नाम से, उस नाम से, असंतोष फैलाना है और हमारे जो लोग हैं वे भी इससे डरते हैं कि ये असंतोष फैलाने लिये जायेंगे। सरकार की पालिसी भी कुछ गलत है कि उनसे डरते हैं। देश के कितने सवाल हैं जिनको हमें हल करना है। देश में सामाजिक अन्याय होता है तो उसे दूर करना है। लोकतंत्र के लिये और पंचवार्षिक योजना के लिये काम करना है। हमारा जो स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग है वह बहुत कम है, रहन सहन का दर्जा हम लोगों का कम है तो उसके लिये इंडस्ट्रीज को बढ़ाना चाहिये और सब को आगे बढ़ा कर देश की उन्नति करनी चाहिये। तो ये कई सवाल हैं लेकिन इसके बारे में वे लोग कुछ नहीं बोलते हैं? जब लेबर का सवाल आ जाता है तो जरूर बोलते हैं और इस पर आ जाते हैं कि स्ट्राइक करो, मार-पीट करो, यह जलाओ वह जलाओ। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि जमशेदपुर में क्या हुआ। जमशेदपुर में यह हुआ कि वहां हिंसा का अवलम्बन करना पड़ा। मजदूरों में अशान्ति फैलाना यही उनका काम है। इसी वास्ते मेरा कहना है कि लेबर काफरेंस में या दूसरी जगह अगर शान्ति और शिष्टता से काम लेंगे तो सब कुछ ठीक हो जायेगा और उन सब का दुख

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]

निवारण भी हो जायेगा। लेकिन जब यूनियन को रिकगनीशन नहीं मिलता तो हिंसा की, स्ट्राइक आदि की बातों से असहिष्णुता फैलाते हैं। इसलिये, वाइस-चेयरमैन महोदय, मेरी प्रार्थना है कि उनका यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि इस ठहराव को लाने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी। होना यह चाहिये कि किसी न किसी ढंग से लेबर के लिये पूरा काम करें। लेकिन बात यह है कि हिंसा का अवलम्बन कर के ये लोग औद्योगिक अशान्ति लाना चाहते हैं और फिर डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स आदि कांस्टीट्यूशन और सेंकेंड फ़ाइव ईयर प्लान आदि बातों की पुकार करते हैं। उनका कहना है कि सरकार सोई हुई है सब सोये हुए हैं, सिर्फ यही जागते हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि सरकार बहुत काम कर रही है। आप लेबर मिनिस्ट्री की रिपोर्ट पढ़िये। उसमें दूसरे नम्बर के विभाग में इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस के बारे में लिखा है। उसमें लिखा है कि स्ट्राइक से कितना नुकसान हो गया, कौन सी कम्पनी के मैनेजर को पार दिया गया, आदि आदि बातें बताई गई हैं। और साथ ही साथ सरकार ने क्या प्रयत्न किया, कानून की मशीनरी कैसे चलाई और अब क्या क्या हो रहा है और क्या क्या स्कीम्स हैं, यह सब वहाँ बताया गया है। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि मेरे मित्र इस बात पर जरूर ध्यान देंगे। औद्योगिक अशान्ति को दूर करने का एक ही तरीका हो सकता है और वह यह है कि इंडस्ट्रियल टार्गेट को पूरा करने का सब के सब प्रयत्न करें और छोटी छोटी बातों में अपने दिमाग न बिगाड़ें। सब लोग मिल कर औद्योगिक कानून को यशस्वी करें और देश का उत्पादन बढ़ायें। देश का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये आप जितनी कोशिश करेंगे उतनी ही, मेरे ख्याल में, सब चीज़ें ठीक होंगी। मैं तो यही चाहता हूँ कि कामगारों का, मजदूरों का हिस्सा सब से

ज्यादा हो लेकिन जब तक उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ेगा तब तक यह कैसे होगा। देश की उन्नति आयोजना के पूरा होने पर है, जो हम लोगों की योजना है उसको यशस्वी बनाने में ही हम लोगों की भलाई है। इसी वास्ते मेरी आप से और सब से यही प्रार्थना है।

अभी बम्बई में थोड़े दिन के पहले प्रीमियर आटोमोबाइल्स में एक बहुत बड़ी स्ट्राइक हुई थी। समिति वालों ने, ट्रेड यूनियन वालों ने और सब पार्टियों ने बहुत जोर लगाया कि सारे बम्बई में स्ट्राइक हो और वह हुई लेकिन उससे देश के प्रति, आयोजना के प्रति जो नुकसान हुआ वह किसका हुआ।

श्री ज० बी० क० बल्लभराव : आप वहाँ...

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : आप जरा सुनिये। मैं भी लेबरर हूँ और लेबरर्स की बस्ती में रहता हूँ। आप तो खाली एयरकंडीशन में इधर उधर मौज करते हैं और बोलते हैं। तो बम्बई में यह हुआ। अब आप देखें कि केरल में क्या हो रहा है। वहाँ बिरला जी की एक रेयन यार्न की फैक्टरी खुल रही है लेकिन उसके लिये कितनी कंडीशंस लगा रहे हैं, लेबर को स्ट्राइक नहीं करनी चाहिये, यह नहीं करना चाहिये वह नहीं करना चाहिये। तो इनके खाने के दांत अलग हैं और दिखाने के दांत अलग हैं। इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि उनकी जो पालिसी है उसकी वजह से बम्बई में स्ट्राइक हुई। वहाँ दूसरे मजदूरों की सिम्पैथी चाहिये थी, लेकिन उससे देश की आयोजना के प्रति कितना नुकसान हुआ? तो बात यह है कि देश का नुकसान हो जाय, मकान जल जाय, कुछ भी हो लेकिन अपनी लीडरशिप कायम रहनी चाहिये।

हमारी सरकार ने लेबर के बारे में क्या किया है वह मैं आपको बताता हूँ। हमारी सरकार लेबर के बारे में प्रगति करना चाहती है। आप देखिये कि इंडस्ट्रियल डिस्पूट्स के फिगर्स क्या हैं। १९५७ में अबतक

तक कुल १६० है जब कि १९५१ में १०७१ था। फिगर्स इस तरह हैं :

१९५१ में १०७१, १९५२ में ९६३, १९५३ में ७७२, १९५४ में ८४०, १९५५ में ११६६, १९५६ में १२०३ और १९५७ में अक्टूबर तक १६०।

तो इंडस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट्स में कितना फर्क हो रहा है और कितनी प्रगति हो रही है। ३६ करोड़ लोगों में उन लोगों की मेम्बरशिप २०,१२,४६२ है। इतना होने पर भी ट्रेड यूनियन के नाम से लोगों को बहकाते हैं और स्ट्राइक कराते हैं।

तो मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि यह जो ठहराव है इसकी कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है और मेरे ख्याल से यह ठहराव फेल होने वाला है, यह फेल हो जायेगा। न मालूम कितने प्रकार की कमेटियाँ अभी भी कायम हैं लेकिन उनसे क्या किसी प्रकार की उन्नति हो रही है? हमको तो देश की भलाई के ऊपर अपना ध्यान लगाना चाहिये। हमारे मालवीय जी ने कहा कि यह ठीक है कि ऐसी एक कमेटी बने। मेरा कहना है कि न मालूम कितनी कमेटियाँ बनी हुई हैं और न मालूम कितने कानून बने हैं और बन रहे हैं। जितने कानून इन लोगों के लिये बन रहे हैं उतने शायद दुनिया में और किसी के लिये नहीं बन रहे हैं। तो फिर मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्यों यह कमेटी बननी चाहिये। हमें तो इस वक्त उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहिये और इसके लिये काम करना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे श्री सोनूसिंह पाटिल ने इस बारे में बहुत अच्छी तरह से सब कुछ बता दिया है। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर भी यही चाहते हैं कि देश में अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये ज्यादा से ज्यादा कोशिश करनी चाहिये और उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहिये और सब भाइयों को जुट कर, मिल कर देश की उन्नति के लिये ऐसा करना चाहिये। हम चाहते हैं कि सब को पेट भर अनाज मिले और पूरा कपड़ा मिले। लेबर की भलाई हम भी चाहते हैं और कई प्रकार के

लेबर एक्ट बने हुए हैं। सरकार कई प्रकार से इनकी उन्नति कर रही है और इनके लिये शान्ति से और प्रेम से सब कुछ करने की सरकार सब प्रकार से कोशिश कर रही है। झगड़े से, जलाने से, मार-पीट से और लोगों को बहकाने से कुछ नहीं होगा। मैं भी एक रेवोल्युशनरी टाइप का आदमी था लेकिन सब बातों को देख कर मेरे दिल में शान्ति हो गई है। डेमोक्रेसी के इन ११ वर्षों में बहुत काम हुआ है और हो रहा है और जो कुछ बाकी है वह भी हम करेंगे। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की जो पालिसी है वह भी यही है कि मजदूरों को, हरिजनों को, इंडस्ट्री में लगे लोगों को, वर्कर्स को, सब को एक बराबरी पर लाना है और उसके लिये काम करना है।

जो कई प्रकार के लैंडलेस लेबरर्स हैं, इंडस्ट्री के लेबरर्स हैं और दूसरे लेबरर्स हैं उनके हित में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ठीक काम नहीं करती है और उनमें अनरेस्ट पैदा करती है। इसलिए मैं इस ठहराव के विरुद्ध हूँ। आप अपनी पार्टी के नाम से, पोलिटिकल दृष्टि से, अपना उद्देश्य सिद्ध करने के लिए इसको लाना चाहते हैं। आप हर बात को लेकर जिस तरह झगड़ा मचाना चाहते हैं वह गलत चीज है और आपको चाहिए कि ऐसा काम करें जिससे लेबर का भला हो, देश का भला हो। इसी वास्ते, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं यह जो ठहराव मेरे मित्र लाये हैं उसका समर्थन नहीं करता क्योंकि इससे कोई लाभ नहीं होगा। हमारे भाइयों ने बम्बई में क्या हालत पैदा की आप जानते हैं और आज अहमदाबाद में जो वारदातें हो रहीं हैं, आग लगाई जा रही है और ला एंड आर्डर को तोड़ा जा रहा है, उससे एक खतरनाक स्थिति ये लोग पैदा करना चाहते हैं जिससे जनता का जीवन दुखमय हो जाय। बम्बई में देखिये, अहमदाबाद में देखिये, जमशेदपुर में देखिये कि क्या हालत है। ये लोग जो आग लगाते हैं अपने को कहते हैं कि हम साधु

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]

आदमी है, उनका यह ढोंग रचना ठीक नहीं है। बम्बई में चाह्वाण साहब ने ला एंड आर्डर स्थापित करने के लिए पाबंदी लगाई तो ये लोग कानून को तोड़कर जिस तरह शांति भंग करना चाहते हैं उस से देश का भला नहीं होगा। उनकी अपील पर लोगों को ध्यान देना चाहिये क्योंकि असंतोष फैलाने से देश की उन्नति नहीं होगी। हमारे श्रम मंत्रालय ने लेबर के लिए, मजदूरों के लिए बहुत कुछ कानून बनाये हैं और बना रही है। उनको देखते हुए मैं इस ठहराव का समर्थन नहीं करना चाहता।

अंत में आपने मुझको भाषण करने के लिये जो मौका दिया उसके लिये धन्यवाद देता हूं।

श्री देवकानन्दन नारायण (मुम्बई) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने इस प्रस्ताव को कई दफे पढ़ा और खूब ध्यान से पढ़ा और उसके बाद बहुत से जोशीले भाषण सुने। परन्तु मुझे यह कहना होगा कि समझने की कोशिश करते हुये भी मैं उसे बहुत कम समझ सका। इसलिये भी मैंने यह कोशिश की कि जिस प्रस्तावक भाई ने यह प्रस्ताव पेश किया है वे बम्बई से आ रहे हैं और वे मेरे एक पुराने दोस्त हैं, परन्तु जितनी ज्यादा समझने की कोशिश मैंने की उतना ही कम मैं इसको समझ सका। आप देखिये, आखिर उद्देश्य इस प्रस्ताव का यह दिखलाया है कि हम इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस इम्प्रूव करना चाहते हैं, यानी, सुधारना चाहते हैं। रिलेशंस की बुनियाद ही ऐसी है जिसमें दो फरीका की जरूरत होती है, यानी दो फरीक जब झगड़ते हैं तब उनको आपस में एक जगह लाने की कोशिश की जाती है। और इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस के बारे में तो मेरे इन भाइयों की ऐसी राय है कि वहां गुड रिलेशंस रह ही नहीं सकते क्योंकि जिस प्रस्तावक भाई ने यह प्रस्ताव पेश किया है, या जिन्होंने इसका समर्थन किया है वे तो

‘क्लास कान्फ्लिक्ट’ में भरोसा करते हैं, वे तो यह मानते नहीं कि कभी इन दो क्लासेज—मालिक और मजदूर—में गुड रिलेशंस पैदा हो सकते हैं। जब वे इस बात को मानते ही नहीं कि मालिक और मजदूर में कभी गुड रिलेशंस, भले सम्बन्ध, रह सकते हैं तो मैं समझ नहीं सकता कि वे इस प्रस्ताव को किस तरह से पेश करते हैं कि हां, रिलेशन्स भले हो सकते हैं। अभी कुछ दिनों से कुछ नया प्रकाश मेरे भाइयों की बुद्धि में, दिमाग में, पैदा होने लगा है, एक नयी रोशनी पैदा हुई है जिससे ये मेरे भाई अब डिमोक्रेसी में भी भरोसा करने लगे हैं, डिमोक्रेसी के साथ साथ पीसफुल मीन्स में भी भरोसा करने लगे हैं।

ड० राज बहादुर गौड़ : आप सोशलिस्ट पैंटन पर भरोसा करने लगे तो हम डिमोक्रेसी में भरोसा करने लगे।

श्री देवकानन्दन नारायण : बड़ी अच्छी बात है, बड़ी खुशी की बात है। मैं आपकी तारीफ करूंगा उस दिन जिस दिन आप क्लास कंफ्लिक्ट को तोड़ कर क्लास रिलेशंस भले बनाने की कोशिश करने लगेंगे, किन्तु आज मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि आप इन बातों को मानते हैं। अभी आपको दुनिया को सिर्फ दिखलाना है कि आप डिमोक्रेसी को मानते हैं, अभी आपको बतलाना मात्र है कि आप पीसफुल मीन्स मानते हैं, अभी आपको दिखलाना है कि आप क्लास कंफ्लिक्ट को नहीं मानते, आपका इन बुनियादों पर विश्वास नहीं है। इसलिये मैं इस बात को समझ नहीं सकता कि ये मेरे भाई जिन्होंने यह प्रस्ताव पेश किया है, वे किस तरह से इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस इम्प्रूव करना चाहते हैं या कर सकते हैं।

दूसरी बात है इंडस्ट्रियल अनरेस्ट। इंडस्ट्रियल अनरेस्ट हां है थोड़ी बहुत, परन्तु मेरे ख्याल से हिन्दुस्तान में आज और जगहों में जितनी ‘अनरेस्ट’ है उसको देखते

हुये इंडस्ट्रियल अनरेस्ट बहुत कम है। आप चलिये और देश में फैली हुई बेकारी को देखिये। गांवों की गरीबी को देखिये। दस नौकरियों के लिये हजार अजियां आती हैं, उसको देखिये। क्या ये तमाम बातें अनरेस्ट की नहीं हैं? क्या आपकी इंडस्ट्रीज में इससे बढ़कर अनरेस्ट है? मैं नहीं मानता क्योंकि इंडस्ट्रीज में लगे लोगों को जितनी अच्छी तनखाहें मिल रही हैं उतनी देश में लाखों करोड़ों को नहीं मिलतीं। मैं यह नहीं कहता इंडस्ट्रीज के मजदूरों को अधिक तनखाहें न मिलें। मिलती हैं और जरूर मिलें। परन्तु अनरेस्ट की जब बात की जाती है तब सिर्फ जो चालीस लाख लोग, ज्यादा से ज्यादा, इंडस्ट्रीज में आज काम करते हैं उनकी बात तो कही जाती है लेकिन जो करोड़ों अभाग्य गांव में रहते हैं जिन्हें आज मजदूरी तक नहीं मिलती है, जो बेकारी की वजह से गांव-गांव घूमते हैं, उनका आप जिक्र तक नहीं करते। इसमें भी आपका कुछ न कुछ मतलब है, और वह मतलब यही है कि ये आर्गेनाइज्ड इंडस्ट्रीज जो हैं—और वे कुछ खास जगहों पर ही पनपती हैं—इनमें आप सहज पहुंच सकते हैं, लेकिन गांवों में अभी आप पहुंच नहीं सकते, इसलिये आप ऐसी जगह ढूंढते हैं जहां आप अपने मजहब को बढ़ा सकें। फिर आप इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस सुधार कैसे सकते हैं यह मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं। आप मालिक-मजदूर को एक दूसरे का दुश्मन मानते हैं। आज तक का हम लोगों का तजुर्बा यह है कि जहां आप पहुंचे हैं वहां अनरेस्ट पैदा हुई है। मेरे भाई, प्रस्तावक महोदय, बम्बई से आते हैं और बम्बई राज्य में ही अहमदाबाद है और वहां का ४० वर्ष का इतिहास आपके सामने है। लेकिन गत ४० वर्षों में बम्बई के मजदूरों को आपकी दोस्ती की वजह से क्या नुकसान सहना पड़ा और दूसरी ओर अहमदाबाद के मजदूरों को कितना फायदा हुआ हम लोगों की दोस्ती से, इसका नमूना देख लीजिये।

आये दिन बम्बई में, स्ट्राइक होती है और अहमदाबाद में मजदूरों को अधिक से अधिक बोनस मिलता है और अधिक से अधिक उनके झगड़े आपस में मिटाये जाते हैं। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं, क्या आप दावे के साथ कह सकते हैं कि आपने सारे देश में आज तक एक भी यूनियन ऐसी बनायी जहां आपने मालिक और मजदूरों में 'रिलेशंस इम्प्रूव' किये हैं। सारे हिन्दुस्तान में कहीं भी आपकी ऐसी यूनियन नहीं है जहां आपने मालिक और मजदूरों के बीच रिलेशंस इम्प्रूव किये हों या मजदूरों का फायदा किया हो। एक नहीं है। फिर आप दावा करते हैं कि इंडस्ट्रियल 'रिलेशंस इम्प्रूव' करने के लिये एक कमेटी कायम हो, तो आपको इस बात पर भरोसा करना बहुत मुश्किल होता है।

एक बात प्रस्तावक महोदय ने यह कही कि मेरा मतलब प्रस्ताव लाने का यह है कि दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में उत्पादन बढ़े। बड़ी अच्छी बात है यह भी एक नया प्रेम पैदा हुआ है—Now love for the Second Plan. इधर दुहाई देते हैं सैंकंड फाइव इयर प्लान की ओर उधर विरोध करते हैं सैंकंड फाइव इयर प्लान का कामों का। मुझे बताइये, कौन से सैंकंड फाइव इयर प्लान के काम में हमारे भाई आज मदद कर रहे हैं—क्या अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़ाने में कोशिश कर रहे हैं, क्या विद्यार्थियों में काम कर रहे हैं, कौन से काम कर रहे हैं?

**श्री लालजो पेंडसे :** आप क्या करते हैं? फूड प्रोडक्शन के लिये आप क्या करते हैं?

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण :** मैं उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये ही काम कर रहा हूं, मेरे साथ चलकर देखिये मैं क्या कर रहा हूं। आप क्या कर रहे हैं द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के अले के लिये जिसकी आप दुहाई देते हैं?

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

मैं आपसे भाषणों से और आपकी करतूतों से दिखला सकता हूँ कि आपने द्वितीय पंच-वर्षीय योजना को नुक्सान पहुंचाया है बजाय फायदा पहुंचाने के। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वैसे उत्पादन की निगाह से देख जाये तो जब से हमारी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना शुरू हुई है तब से हमारा उत्पादन बढ़ा है, इंडस्ट्रियल उत्पादन, टेक्सटाइल उत्पादन बढ़ा है। फाइव इयर प्लान के अन्दर हमारे जो टार्गेट्स हैं उनमें हमारा उत्पादन कुछ आगे बढ़ गया है। हमारा शूगर प्रोडक्शन बढ़ा है, हमारा सीमेंट प्रोडक्शन बढ़ा है, हमारा आइरन प्रोडक्शन बढ़ा है। मैं नहीं समझता कि इंडस्ट्रियल अनरेस्ट, जितना भी हमारे विरोधी भाई बतलाते हैं और दिखाते हैं, अगर इतना होता तो यह उत्पादन कैसे बढ़ता? उन्हीं के कहने के माफिक हम और हमारी सरकार उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, बढ़ा रहे हैं और सब जगह अनरेस्ट कम करना चाहते हैं।

मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि आज उत्पादन बढ़ रहा है, बढ़ा है और सिवाय आपके राज्य के शायद केरला के, सारे हिन्दुस्तान में बढ़ा है। अगर आप लोगों को आखें हैं तो सैकेण्ड फाइव इयर प्लान की जो इन्वेन्शन् रिपोर्ट्स हैं उनको देखिये। हां, एक बात जरूर है और वह यह है कि मेरे भाई को इस बात का शायद दुःख है कि बम्बई में जो होता आया है वह अहमदाबाद में क्यों नहीं हुआ।

DR. R. B. GOUR: I draw the attention of the hon. Member that the P.M. . . .

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: Let me have my chance. You had your chance.

तो मैं यह कहने जा रहा हूँ कि बम्बई के अनुभव को सामने रखते हुये उनको इस बात का दुःख है कि वे जो कुछ बम्बई में कर गये वह अहमदाबाद में क्यों नहीं हो पा रहा है। परन्तु आपको याद रखना चाहिये कि वहां पर हमारे भाइयों की यूनियन न होने के कारण, वहां पर जो कुछ दंगल हुआ, जो कुछ हिंसा हुई, जो कुछ मारपीट हुई, उसमें मजदूर शामिल नहीं हुये। इस कारण वहां पर ये जितना नुकसान चाहते थे उतना ये नहीं कर पाये।

डा० राज बहादुर गौड़ : क्या अहमदाबाद में जो कुछ हुआ वह आपकी वजह से हुआ ?

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : मैं यही कह रहा हूँ कि आप लोगों ने अहमदाबाद में जो कुछ करना चाहा उतना नहीं हुआ। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अहमदाबाद में जो कुछ आपने करवाया वह हजार सुना बढ़ गया होता अगर अहमदाबाद के मजदूरों में आपका कोई असर होता। आपका मजदूरों में कोई असर नहीं था इसलिये वहां दंगल लूटमार आपके हिसाब से नहीं हुई।

डा० राज बहादुर गौड़ : खुदा का शुक है कि आपका असर भी वहां पर नहीं है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : वह तो बाद में देखेंगे, हमारा है कि आपका। अगर वहां पर आप लोगों का असर होता तो सारे शहर में आग लग गई होती। लेकिन वहां पर एक भी मिल बन्द नहीं हुई। सारे मिलों में काम होता रहा और मजदूरों ने शांति रखी।

इस प्रस्ताव में एक और बात है जिसका मुझे बहुत डर है क्योंकि मैं तजुर्बा कर चुका हूँ। इसमें यह बात रखी है कि एक कमेटी

बनाई जाये। मुझे कमेटी से कोई डर नहीं कोई रंज नहीं। पार्लियामेंट में कमेटी बनाई जाती है। जब पार्लियामेंट कोई कमेटी बनाती है तब उसमें दोनों पक्ष के लोग लिये जाते हैं। परन्तु इस प्रस्ताव में खासकर यह लिखा गया है “ए कमेटी आफ आल पोलिटिकल पार्टिज”। खुदा बचाये। मैं तजुर्बे से देख चुका हूँ कि आल पोलिटिकल पार्टिज कमेटी ने बम्बई में किस तरह सत्यानाश किया। आल पोलिटिकल पार्टिज कमेटी ने बम्बई में दो वर्ष में जो सत्यानाश किया उसका मुझे तजुर्बा है, इसलिये मैं आल पोलिटिकल पार्टिज के नाम से घबराता हूँ। और मेरे भाइयों का खास बनाया हुआ यह नुस्खा है।

**SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHA RAO:** Ban all parties and leave Congress only. Then he will be satisfied.

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण :** तो ये मेरे भाई चाहे कितने ही चिल्लाये, सूर्य को कोई भी छ्पा नहीं सकता है। अगर कोई उसके सामने भीत खड़ा करे तो भी सूर्य का प्रकाश दिखाई देगा। यह साफ बात है इसलिये मेरे भाई इतने चिढ़ते हैं।

**SHRI V. PRASAD RAO:** On a point of order, Sir. I don't understand what is the relationship between the hon. Member's allegation . . .

**SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN:** I am talking in conformity with the Resolution. I am criticising the proposal of all Political Parties' Committee. I am opposing it tooth and nail because I know the experience of “all political parties committee's” devastation that was brought about in Bombay.

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** He wants the retention of bilingual Bombay for industrial peace.

**SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN:** I have been looking at it when you have been talking.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU):** The hon. Member must bring his remarks to a close.

**SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN:** I am sticking to the words of the Resolution only. I am not going outside the Resolution.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU):** You have exceeded your time.

**SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN:** I shall finish in two or three minutes.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU):** I cannot extend the time.

**SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN:** So many people disturbed me. What am I to do? You are not giving me protection.

(Interruptions)

**SHRI D. A. MIRZA:** May I suggest that we adjourn at 5-30?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU):** There is a meeting.

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण :** मैं एक दो मिनट और चाहता हूँ। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि इस प्रस्ताव का उद्देश्य साफ नहीं है क्योंकि इंडस्ट्रियल अनरेस्ट थोड़ा बहुत हर वक्त रहता आया है और जब तक मेरे भाई मौजूद हैं तब तक अनरेस्ट रहने वाला है।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU):** You have said that.

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण :** इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें थोड़ी सी इंडस्ट्रियल अनरेस्ट से डरना नहीं चाहिये क्योंकि गावों में, शहरों में, घर-घर में थोड़ा बहुत अनरेस्ट हुआ ही करता है। इसलिये अनरेस्ट का भूत खड़ा करके अगर कोई हमको डराना चाहे तो हमें नहीं डरना चाहिये।

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

दूसरी बात जो कही जाती है वह यह है कि सैकेड फाइव इयर प्लान को बढ़ाने के लिये यह सब कुछ किया जा रहा है तो मैं इस बात का कतई नहीं मानता हूँ। मैं साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव में जो कुछ लिखा है मैं उन बातों को भरोसे की नहीं मानता। मुझे इसमें सच्चाई साफ दिखाई नहीं देती है। मुझे इसमें कई और उलटे उद्देश्य दिखाई देते हैं। मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ और यह प्रस्ताव इस सदन में गिरा दिया जाना चाहिये।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I don't know as to why this innocent Resolution of ours, constructive also, should have caused so much anger in some speakers opposite. We have been treated to a speech by Shri Deokinandan Narayan. I can understand his unrest at heart because he is one of the Maharashtrians who has fallen by the wayside in Maharashtra's political life.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: Could you follow my Hindi?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not pay any heed to it. I should have thought that he would take it in good grace; but then we heard a previous speech by Mr. Rajabhoj. That was more entertaining than illuminating and we quite enjoyed the whole thing. He has given us entertainment in an otherwise stale debate. Again I heard a speech by Prof. Wadia. He is a very learned man and of course he never misses an occasion to say very good words and sing hallelujah to the Tatas whenever he gets an opportunity but this time I was a little surprised when he was suggesting that the U. S. was a Socialist country. I confess, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that I lack that kind of learning and knowledge—that kind of erudition . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I did not understand him to say that U.S. was a socialist country.

He said that in the U.S. the standard of living of the common man was very much higher than in the socialist countries. Am I right?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can understand a statement of that kind even though that can be discussed but he discovered socialism and I tell you—I frankly confess—that I lack that kind of erudition which discovers the Eisenhower and Dulles socialism. Let heavens alone save our education from such learned men.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): What about democracy in the USSR?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Another educationist has risen but we all expect to hear her next day. Now serious things have been said here by hon. Members opposite. Here is a Resolution in which we say 'appoint a Committee'. We never said that the Opposition or the Communists shall be the majority in that Committee. We want a Committee of Members of Parliament representing all parties. I take it that the Congress Party, by reason of its strength here, would occupy a majority position in that Committee. Why are they afraid of going into such a Committee? In that Committee, we, Communists, and others, of the Opposition, will naturally be in a minority. We give them their due—the majority position. Even so, it seems they are utterly afraid of facing an enquiry of this kind. Why? What makes them afraid? I can understand the feelings of Mr. Patil who spoke there trying to find inspiration behind the Communist Party. I don't know if he was feeling the warmth of Tatas' money that got into the election pockets of the Congress Party. Between the pocket and inspiration, I think there is more tangible evidence to give as far as material support that came to the Congress Party is concerned. The inspiration that he talked about, when he talked about us, is only one of the usual things that have been said without any substance.



5 P.M.

Therefore, I think this way or this approach is very unhelpful. Let us discuss the problem. We have posed the problem to you. We have a case to make before the Government and the country, that the policy of the Government and of the capitalist class stands in the way of the good industrial relations which are required for the development of the country's economy. No doubt, we may make mistakes. But we have a strong case to make and we propose to make this case before Parliament, and we propose to make it also before the Committee if you appoint such a Committee. We can compare notes and come to conclusions. That is our approach.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Well, it is time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They have been frightened. Let hon.

Members go home with their fright; but let them get rid of the anger and annoyance for which there is no place so far as this Resolution is concerned.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): When we resume the debate on the 5th September your speech will be continued.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That follows as a matter of procedure.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday the 25th August 1958.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday the 25th August, 1958.