

## RESOLUTION RE NATIONALISATION OF MANGANESE INDUSTRY

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I move the following Resolution:

"This House is of opinion that the manganese industry should be nationalised."

The object of my Resolution is to bring before this House the conditions prevailing in the manganese industry and the condition of the 75,000 workers who are engaged in this industry throughout the country and other factors which are playing their part which bring us to the irresistible conclusion that the remedy for the ills of this industry and the labour engaged in it is the nationalisation of this industry.

Sir, I will give a brief survey of the industry in support of what I have to establish here. Sir, this industry is about 50 years old, having been started in the year 1900, and up to the year 1932, India was producing on an average, 40 per cent of the world's produce of manganese, and up to that time she was holding the monopoly in the world trade in manganese. Later on, this pattern changed with the entrance of Russia into the market and in the year 1951-52, India produced only 23 per cent of the world's production. The Gold Coast produced 16 per cent, the Union of South Africa 12 per cent, Cuba 3 per cent and the rest of the world, including Russia, 43 per cent.

So far as our country is concerned, we have been going on increasing our production of manganese. For the period 1929 to 1933, our average production has been 5,59,000 tons; for 1939-1943, it was 7,72,000 tons, for 1952 it was 12,92,000 tons and for 1953 it was 14,63,000 tons. And most of this production, over 90 per cent of it, has been exported by us. The figures available to us show that in the year 1950, we have consumed only 69,000 tons of our manganese and that is not even 10 per cent of our production.

We have consumed only 6 or 7 per cent of it and all the rest has been exported—to America, England, West Germany, Japan, France and other countries.

Sir, this industry is controlled primarily by foreigners and there has lately been a mushroom growth of small producers because the industry afforded very good prospects of profits, manganese being available almost on the surface or after quarrying only for a small depth. The result has been that this easy beneficiation of manganese has produced many producers which is the cause of all the troubles in this industry and the deplorable condition of the labour engaged in it. I will just give a few reliable figures from the Report of the Madhya Pradesh Government published in the year 1950 in which the prices and the wages for that year and the nearabout period are given. The price at that time was, of course, Rs. 50/- a ton and the labour cost including tools and administration cost was not more than Rs. 4/4/-. The freight to ports was Rs. 10/8/- and other charges at the port came to about Rs. 1/13/- 3 P.M. Thus, Rs. 16/- and odd was the price at the port whereas they were getting Rs. 50/- or so per ton for this produce. That brought to them more than 300 per cent profit. Naturally this created very small producers who cared only for profits. They never cared either for the mining conditions, the geological conditions or for the conditions of labour. The result has been that the exploitation, despite the warnings of the Government, has not been on proper lines and labour has been the worst sufferer in this. Unfortunately labour was mostly unorganised. Organised labour in other industries like coal, etc., could draw the attention of the Government and as far back as 1946-47 could secure for themselves wages, bonuses, welfare funds, etc. But this labour has not been able to do that. The wages that have been given to them now by private agreement, of course, in the presence of the Government, are very low. I know of

Madhya Pradesh only where an agreement has been arrived at and the wages have been fixed for males at Rs. 1/2 and for females at Re. 0/14 per day. This is the lowest in comparison to the other industries. I will just give you the comparative figures. All told, a manganese mine worker in Madhya Pradesh was getting Rs. 1/5 per day; a coal worker was getting Rs. 2/12 per day; a worker in the gold mine in Mysore was getting Rs. 2/5 per day; a cotton textile worker in Nagpur Rs. 2/10 per day; an iron and steel worker in Bihar was getting Rs. 2/10 per day. A cement worker was getting Rs. 2/3 per day.

Thus, it will be seen that the manganese worker has been the worst sufferer. It is gratifying to note that the case of the manganese mine worker has also been referred to the Tribunal and something may come out of it.

My objective today is not to get increased wages for the workers; my objective is to show that the industry is making huge profits, unimaginable profits and that it deserves the attention of the country. Something has got to be done to see that not only the worker gains but also the society gains and the industry prospers.

I have got information about two English companies which are working manganese mines in this country. One is what is popularly called the C.P.M.O., Central Provinces Manganese Ore Co., Ltd. This company has been working almost from the beginning with a capital of 10 lakhs of rupees only. The surprise is that this company is registered in England and its capital is also in pounds sterling. It is not in rupees. Another company is the Shivrajpur Syndicate, Ltd., of which the Managing Agents are Killick Industries, Ltd., Bombay. This company started with a capital of Rs. 5,25,000 and the paid up capital in 1952-53 was only seven lakhs of rupees. I am quoting these figures from the Investor's Year Book by

Kothari, 1952. If you look into the profits you will find that in 1953, the C.P.M.O. gave a dividend of 50 per cent; it declared five lakhs of rupees as dividend. The other company, namely, the Shivrajpur Syndicate, Ltd., gave a dividend of 50 per cent. A sum of Rs. 3,49,850 was declared as dividend and the company appropriated for itself an amount of Rs. 4,50,380 as the managing agency commission. This is the rate of profit figure which we get relating to these companies. Of course, these companies are doing something for the workers; they have got a little housing; they have got recreational facilities, some hospitals, schools and so on are provided by these companies.

I have said, Sir, that a worker, at any rate today, is not getting more than Rs. 5/- per ton as wages. Taking all other expenditure, by no stretch of imagination can the cost per ton of manganese go beyond Rs. 40. The price of manganese today is something different. It is not the price of 1948 which was Rs. 50/- per ton. Now it runs into hundreds. It must be about Rs. 240/- per ton for first class manganese. I will give you the figures for the crisis period. In 1954 the crisis overtook the manganese industry and hundreds of small manganese mines were closed. The prices ruling then were as follows: I quote these figures from the Government reports. They are weekly reports and it will take a long time for me to read all those. I shall only give the average prices. During January it was Rs. 198/6/2; in February it was Rs. 176/1; in March it was Rs. 182/-; in April it was Rs. 181/-; in May it was Rs. 153/14/11; in June it was Rs. 190/15 and in July it was Rs. 175/-. These are the available figures. It may be taken for granted, Sir, that the prices might have gone a little higher now.

But certainly there was no reason for them to close down the mines. The only thing due to which these mines were closed was that they wanted to sell in the market their low-grade material at a very high price

[Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal Malviya.] which was not acceptable to the foreign market. This was the only reason why all these mines were closed down during the crisis of 1954, and these manganese mine-owners laid off thousands of workers during that crisis. Only in Madhya Pradesh about 25 to 27 thousand workers were laid off. At that time the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act was in force and the employers were bound to pay to these workers the lay-off relief which was available to the worker on the expiry of one year's service only. These employers played a mischief on all the old workers who were working with them from a long time, for 5 years, 6 years, 10 years and 15 years and they were all made temporary. They were recruited afresh and after 11½ months they are renewed now so that none of the workers comes on the permanent list. This is the tragedy of the worker who is working day and night in manganese mines and this is the behaviour of the employer. The profit is only imaginable. I cannot give an accurate calculation of the profits of the manganese mine-owners. If I give the figures the House may not believe them but certainly they are unbelievably profitable. The profit is astounding which they are getting. I draw the attention of the Government to this factor. This is a factor which is very important for the consideration of the Government. Are you going to allow such huge profits and allow the workers to live in such wretched conditions in an industry which does not require much capital, the produce of which you get at the surface without much effort and where labour is easily available. Women also work there and there is no legal obstruction because it is on the surface. So everybody can work. Do you allow these workers to be laid off like this as I have just suggested, Sir, and not take any step to give them relief?

One more point I want to stress with regard to foreign firms. The foreign firms did not retrench people. There was one factor which may

kindly be noted down. It is this. The company is registered in a foreign country. They have got their own other firms. What the constitution and the nature of those firms there is I am not able to tell. But the information is that when the rate of manganese in this country was more than Rs. 200/-—and it was for years going on at this rate—it was being sold to that firm in that country on a long future contract basis at a very low price of Rs. 140/- or Rs. 150/-. So, no doubt they saved at the time of crisis. The labour was not retrenched by them but then it is worth noting as to where these profits went. The country has suffered definitely in income-tax and otherwise also and it deserves the attention of the Government and the Government should make thorough scrutiny of these foreign firms and may deal with this point which I have just raised in the way in which they would like to do it. They say that there was a crisis. Of course, there was a temporary crisis—according to me it was not—but I may accept for the time being that there was a crisis. Deputations were sent to the Government. The Government came to their rescue. They abolished the export duty altogether. They also reduced the railway freight inside the country. The crisis has passed long ago. What about the export duty now? What about the railway freight now? The concessions are still continuing. They won't pay anything to the workers out of the saving made out of these concessions. It is all going to their safes.

So this point is also one of the factors which has driven me to the conclusion that these profits had not gone to improve even the living condition of the labourer. I have myself visited many of the manganese mines in Madhya Pradesh and a few mines in Orissa, and have seen the living conditions there. As the foreign delegation which visited some of the mines has said, the houses are not fit even for pigs. In a small hut made of bamboo or of some leaves how many of the workers are living! No care is

taken of the labour, no hospitalisation, no recreation, and of course they don't get proper wages. That I have already said. It is not for me in this House to argue on that issue because it is already before the tribunal. So I don't argue on the point of wages, but the appalling conditions of the labour and the profits of the industry definitely remind us of our own duty. We have declared ourselves a welfare State. We have now as our ideal a socialistic pattern of society. We have also got now several Constitutional amendments. We are also taking authority to take over some of the industries, if necessary. This is an industry which is out and out depending upon export. Only 6 to 7 per cent. of the produce is consumed in our country and the rest, over 90 per cent, is being exported and in that export by private owners slur has been brought to our country. I may just cite an instance.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: I will try to be brief. It was an incident of last year. I do not know the name of the proprietor. I tried to know but I could not get that information, but this is a fact that one shipment of manganese was returned by Canada and our country suffered a lot in reputation. Are we going to allow people to sully our reputation like this? When an industry or produce is wholly dependent upon export, should we not take notice of this industry and try to nationalise it?

Now, one more point and it is this. A ferro-manganese plant is being installed now by one of the foreign private concerns. The idea has been given by the Government of India and research is being carried out by the Government in Jamshedpur. The point is, why should not the Government work it out themselves? To start with I would suggest that these smaller mines may be taken over as early as possible. They must be nationalised.

So far as the bigger concerns are concerned, I would request the Government to make a thorough enquiry with regard to their constitution, with regard to their profits and with regard to their relationship and connections with foreign countries and foreign markets, to study the situation and take all necessary steps. I am sorry I have not been able to put forth all the facts which I have collected but as the time is short, I cannot help it. I will therefore again request the hon. Minister to see that necessary enquiries are made with regard to this industry, especially with regard to foreign capital and with regard to the dealings of foreign concerns. By nationalising this industry, the Government will be able to protect the rights of the workers, the Government will be able to save the reputation of the country so far as export is concerned; the Government will be able to establish this industry on a sound footing; the Government will be able to earn more foreign exchange; the Government will be able to produce more and meet foreign competition in a better way. I think the only way is nationalisation of this industry and I request the hon. Minister to consider it. With these words, I move my Resolution.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved.

"That this House is of opinion that the manganese industry should be nationalised."

SHRI S MAHANTY (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to lend my support to the Resolution moved by my friend, Mr. Malviya. But I do not support the Resolution on the ground that the manganese industry is fetching huge profits and therefore the State should nationalise it, nor on the ground that the labourers engaged in the industry, do not get a fair deal. They are no doubt two very important reasons in themselves but my support to this Resolution emerges from a more fundamental reason and it is this: no other country in the world except the U.S.S.R. possesses manganese deposits to the extent as

[Shri S. Mahanty.]

India possesses. If we refer to the many authoritative publications issued by the Government as to the manner in which these huge deposits of manganese are being exploited which has got a tremendous industrial value so far as the Steel industry is concerned, then I am sure there will be no manner of doubt left in this House that this manganese industry should be nationalised forthwith.

If we refer to the recommendations of the first Five Year Plan, with all humility and with all respect to the hon. the Minister for Natural Resources and Scientific Research, I must say that the Government have not paid any attention to the recommendations of the first Five Year Plan so far as the manganese industry is concerned. One of the most important recommendations of the First Five Year Plan in respect of the manganese industry was that the ore should be converted into ferro-manganese and manganese chemicals instead of being exported in the raw form. What happens when manganese is exported in the raw form is this. Manganese of low grade is usually not quarried by the mine operators. Only manganese of high grade is quarried and exported at prices which were fabulous three years back, when America was stock-piling for manufacture of atomic energy purposes. It was not Rs. 240/- as was pointed out by Mr. Malviya. At that time manganese was, so to say, the white gold in the mineral market of the world. In this context I will refer to a very authoritative publication. I am quoting from Vol. II, Part I of the Census Report of Orissa, 1951. This is what has been said in respect of manganese deposits in Orissa. It has been said that the ore bodies are worked at present not for the extraction of the metals contained in them, but for exporting them in raw condition. Moreover the haphazard manner and the crude methods which characterise the present-day mining in Orissa, amount to serious loss of national resources. The ores which are rich in mineral contents are taken

out while those containing lesser percentage of minerals are left to waste. It should not be forgotten that unlike forest and agricultural products, minerals once extracted will decrease in the total quantity of that particular wealth and therefore as far as possible even the poorer grade of ores should be utilised in full. This requires technical knowledge in which our mine-owners are so deplorably ignorant. Unless the more enlightened type of lessees come in the future, there will be justification in considering the controversial issue of nationalisation of at least a few key minerals which are the assets of the nation. Therefore, you will find that this demand for nationalisation of manganese mines is not being voiced only by a member of the Government Bench or by us but it has been voiced by a competent authority which went into this question.

The other aspect is this. You will find, Sir—it pains me to say that some of the State Governments do not follow any ethical standard or normal practice in granting these leases. They make a commerce out of it for their own election funds. The mine-owners also earn huge profits and in the bargain a great national asset goes to waste.

In this context I will quote from the reply of the Orissa Chief Minister given on the floor of the Orissa Legislative Assembly when he was asked to indicate the royalty that the Government was charging on manganese and the profit that the mine-owner was getting out of it. The Chief Minister was reported to have said that the Government was getting eight annas per ton in the shape of royalty whereas the mine-owners made a profit between Rs. 48/- to Rs. 186/-, according to the percentage of the manganese content. So my plea is this: here is a great national asset and neither the Government stands to gain anything, nor the people gain anything because, as has been very ably pointed out by the mover of this Resolution, the labourers in this particular industry

practically get less than nothing while the profit of the mine-owner varies from Rs. 48/- to Rs. 186/-.

Now, if we look at the Indian manganese industry we find that the Tatas consume only an insignificant percentage of the total manganese quarried in the various manganese mines of India for their own steel making process. The rest is usually exported to countries outside.

Now, in doing so, the mine-owners have left out the lower grade minerals. They do not take to any beneficiation process. They do not take to the manufacture of ferro-manganese, but they export it in the raw form. It should be remembered that it is not like forest wealth, that if the trees are cut and logs are exported, then ten years after there will again be more trees to export. It is not like that. Once it is quarried, once it is exported, it is denuded for ever. Now, the limited issue to be examined by the Government is: is there any justification to allow this kind of exploitation of a great national asset for a song? I am quite well aware of what the hon. Minister might say: "if we go to nationalise we shall have to pay, the State Governments will have to pay a quantum of compensation which their exchequers might not permit." But, Sir, I will say that the chief architect of the amendment of article 31 of the Constitution, the Prime Minister of India, is also the Minister for Natural Resources and Scientific Research.

**SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA:** Compensation will be very little in this case.

**SHRI S. MAHANTY:** I am coming to it. That is number one. Therefore, now I am sure the chief architect of that amendment will never hesitate to nationalise the manganese industry. Then, in the second place there will be the quantum of compensation. Of course, it shall have to be left to the legislatures and if the legislatures are ever asked to fix a quantum of compensation for the manganese mines,

well, speaking for myself, I will say that there is no reason whatsoever why manganese mine-owners should claim any compensation. They have not invested a single pie. By a crude method they have quarried all these mines, this huge national wealth, and they have minted all their millions. Therefore, there is no reason whatsoever—either politically, or ethically, or even economically why the manganese mine-owners will claim any compensation. Therefore, I do not see any merit in the contention that we cannot nationalise this industry because it might entail upon us payment of compensation which the State Governments might not give.

Then, the second reason is that the Five Year Plan, a major policy statement; made certain recommendations about the mining industry. I have pointed out earlier one of the important recommendations in the earlier part of my speech. These are the three specific recommendations which were made by the Planning Commission in respect of the manganese industry. In the first place, the Commission recommended that, as no reliable estimates are available of reserves of manganese ore, an investigation should be carried out of the deposits in Madhya Pradesh and of certain deposits in Orissa, Bombay, Mysore and Madras. Secondly, the ores should be converted into ferro-manganese and manganese chemicals for export purposes instead of being exported in the raw form. Thirdly, investigations regarding the beneficiation of low grade ore or for the recovery of manganese ore to the utmost should be undertaken. Measures should also be taken to control and eliminate the wastage of ore in mining. I am sure when the hon. Minister gets up to reply, he will also confess that the Government has done precious little in the matter. I am not suggesting thereby that the blame rests at the door of my friend Mr. Malaviya—not the mover, but the hon. Minister—because primarily it is the responsibility of the State Governments, because mining is in the Concurrent List. The Central Government

[Shri S. Mahanty.]  
is there to indicate broad lines of principle. It is for the State Governments to implement it. I am well aware of the anxiety of the Ministry of Natural Resources to improve these matters; but the company that the hon. Minister keeps at the State level, I think he has grown despondent of it—in a much intenser form than ourselves. Now, therefore, we are left with the conclusion that so long as it is in the hands of the private operators and so long as the mine-owners have considerable sums to pay to the Congress election funds, there is no hope of improvement in this particular field of mining.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): What a nice relevance!

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Whenever it is not for Mr. Saxena it is always irrelevant. Earlier I said how the political party in power is making a commerce of it. \* \* \*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will have to rule out all those imputations. Those imputations against the Orissa Government will be expunged.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, it is my painful duty to walk out of this Chamber and I will also request my hon. friends to leave this Chamber.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can state facts here, but not make imputations or insinuations against any Government whose spokesman is not here.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, if you are going to convert this into a school, I am not going to stay.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not make such imputations.

(At this stage Shri S. Mahanty left the House.)

श्री टी० बोद्रा (बिहार): उपसभापति जी, इस रिजॉल्यूशन के लाने में मैं अपने मित्र माननीय मालवीय साहब का तहेदिल से सपोर्ट करता हूँ।

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

पहला कारण तो यह है कि उन्होंने सच्ची बात कही है कि ये जो मँगनीज माइंस के प्राइवेटर्स हैं वे लोग बहुत ह्यूज प्रोफिट्स करते हैं। दूसरा कारण यह है कि उन्होंने बतलाया, जो कि बिल्कुल सच है, कि वहाँ मँगनीज और को तोड़ने में, उसको जमीन की सतह से निकालने में, जो लोग काम करते हैं उन लोगों की दशा बहुत खराब है। इसकी मुझे अच्छी तरह जानकारी है क्योंकि हमारे जिले में भी मँगनीज और है और वहाँ काम करने वाले आदिवासी हैं। मालवीय साहब ने उन लोगों की जो दशा बतलाई है वह बिल्कुल ठीक है। जो औरतें हैं उनको १४ आना मिलता है और जो पुरुष हैं उनको १ रु० २ आना या १ रु० ४ आना मिलता है। इतना उनको उस वक्त मिलता है जब कि वे सुबह से शाम तक कड़ी मेहनत करते हैं और बीच में उनको खाने की छुट्टी भी नहीं मिलती है। यहाँ तक कि उनके रहने के लिए जो झोंपड़ियाँ हैं वे भी देखने लायक ही हैं। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी ने मँगनीज एरिया का दौरा किया होगा और देखा होगा कि वहाँ काम करने वाले जितने आदिवासी और कुली हैं उनकी दशा कितनी खराब है और किन हालतों में वे रहते हैं। हमारे दोस्त श्री महन्ती ने अभी कहा कि मँगनीज एक ऐसी चीज है जो कि दुनिया के सभी हिस्सों में नहीं पाई जाती है। यह हमारी खुशकिस्मती है कि हमारे देश में काफी मात्रा में मँगनीज के डिपॉजिट्स हैं।

मैं इस प्रस्ताव का स्वागत तो करता ही हूँ पर साथ ही साथ यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि भारत माता की आजादी की रक्षा करनी है, यदि मदर इंडिया के इंडीस्ट्रियलाइजेशन को डेवलप करना चाहते हैं, यदि भारत को ऐसा देश बनाना चाहते हैं जो कि सब किस्म की मशीनरियों में सेल्फ सफिशेंट हो जाए तो हमको यह देखना पड़ेगा कि सिर्फ मँगनीज इंडस्ट्री को ही नेशनलाइज करने का रिजॉल्यूशन लाया जाए बल्कि और भी जितने खनिज पदार्थ हैं, जैसे कॉपर, सीमेंट, लौहा, चूना,

बॉक्साइट, एस्बस्टस, वर्गों, उन सब को नेशनलाइज करना होगा। आज हालत यह है कि इन चीजों पर बहुत ब्राइबरी होती है और कर्प्शन का बाजार गरम रहता है। इन माइंस में अजीब तरह की बातें होती रहती हैं। जैसे कि मैंने सवेरें कहा कि किस तरह से कांस्ट्रक्टर माइंस की लीज हासिल करता है, उसी तरह से मॅंगनीज का कांस्ट्रक्टर भी जब लीज लेने के लिए जाता है तो उसे पहले डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट के पास जाना पड़ता है। वह अपने माइनिंग आफिसर को तहकीकात के लिए भेजता है, लोकल इन्क्वायरी के लिए भेजता है। माइनिंग आफिसर कुछ सिफारिश डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट के पास भेजता है। डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट कमिश्नर आफ दि डिवीजन के पास भेजता है। कमिश्नर के पास से जब वह रिक्मेंडेशन गवर्नमेंट के पास जाती है या किसी स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के पास जाती है तब लीज वहां से सॅक्शन होती है। उप-सभापीत जी, मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस दरमियान जो बातें होती हैं यानी जब से एक कांस्ट्रक्टर लीज के लिए दरखास्त देता है और जब तक गवर्नमेंट से वह सॅक्शन नहीं हो जाती, उसके दरमियान जो बातें होती हैं, बहुत अफसोस जनक हैं। "सर्च लाइट" पत्र जो हमारे बिहार का एक प्रमुख पत्र है, कल हमने उसमें पढ़ा कि "मुरली हिल" में चूना और सीमेंट के लौज के लिए एक खास मंत्री ने दो लाख रुपया लिया और उसको राष्ट्रवाणी प्रेस में दान करवाया।

मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि किस तरह से एक कांस्ट्रक्टर को लीज हासिल करने के लिए रुपया देना पड़ता है। इन माइंस में आदिवासी मुंडा, उरांव, सिड्थल्ड कास्ट और बॅकवर्ड कास्ट के लोग अपना पेट भरने के लिए काम करते हैं। माइंस का प्रोप्राइटर धार्मिक आदमी है धार्मिक वातावरण में पला हुआ है लेकिन जब वह देखता है कि उसको एक लीज लेने के लिए इतना रुपया देना पड़ता है तो उसकी सहानुभूति इन जनसाधारण और कुलियों के लिए जितनी होनी चाहिए उतनी नहीं हो पाती। वह देखता है कि

उसको इतना रुपया लगाकर, इन्वेस्ट करके, कंपिटल नष्ट करनी पड़ती है और इसतरह से वह गरीब मजदूर की ओर ध्यान नहीं देता और उसकी मजदूरी ऊंची नीची चलती रहती है। कांस्ट्रक्टर भी मजदूरों को मजदूरी देने में कंजूसी करता है। यही हालत सब माइंस की है। आज जितने भी इन माइंस के कांस्ट्रक्टर हैं वे सब इसी तरह की बातें अपने मजदूरों के साथ करते हैं। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत कुछ कहना चाहता था किन्तु इस समय मैं ज्यादा उन बातों को नहीं कहूंगा। मुझे इस बारे में काफी जानकारी है। अन्त में, मैं यह आशा करता हूँ कि उड़ीसा के तीन जिले, मध्य प्रदेश के तीन जिले और बिहार के छः जिले ऐसे हैं जहाँ कॉपर, बॉक्साइट, कोयला, लाइम, एस्बस्टस अर्थात् अनेक प्रकार के मिनरल्स पाए जाते हैं। इन १२ जिलों में सब तरह के डिपॉजिट्स मौजूद हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि आप चाहें इस सदन में कितने ही प्रस्ताव इस तरह के पास करें, या स्टेट असेंबली में करावें मगर मजदूरों की हालत वैसे ही रहेगी और माइंस की भी हालत ठीक नहीं हो सकती है। यह चीज रिजोल्यूशन पास करने या पास न करने से नहीं होगी बल्कि इसका उपाय तो यह है कि उड़ीसा के तीन जिले, मध्य प्रदेश के तीन जिले, छोटानागपुर के पांच जिले और बिहार का एक जिला, ये सब मिलाकर १२ जिले हो गए, अगर इन सब का एक अलग भारखन्ड का सूबा बना दिया जाए तो ये सब कठिनाइयां दूर हो जाएंगी या फिर इस क्षेत्र को सेंट्रली एडमिनिस्टर्ड एरिया बना दिया जाए जिससे कि यह दिन पर दिन तरक्की कर सके। अगर इस तरह की बात कर दी जाए तो इस समय जो ब्राइबरी और कर्प्शन इन माइंस एरिया में दिखाई देती है और मजदूरों की जो दिक्कतें हैं वे सब दूर हो जाएंगी।

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore):  
Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wish to say a few words on this Resolution, both on the merits as well as on the scope of the Resolution.

First of all, Sir, I am not quite clear about the intentions of the mover and

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]  
 his supporters as to whom they would expect to take over this industry. Should it be the Central Government or the State Government? That is an issue which unfortunately is not clarified by this Resolution. Generally speaking, when hon. Members talk of nationalisation, we take it that they mean that the Central Government should take over the industries concerned. With regard to this particular industry, my fear is that that may not be possible unless all the State Governments agree to it.

Sir, I may say that I have some knowledge about the industry in the sense that I have seen some of the mines in the Mysore State. And I have also this knowledge that there is a school of thought in certain States in favour of the States taking over the manganese industry. And therefore there is this doubt created in my mind as to the intentions of the mover of this Resolution as to whether he would desire this industry to be taken over by the State, and made a State concern—in the respective States—or whether he would like the Centre to take over the entire manganese industry, or whether he would like a third procedure to be adopted, i.e., the Centre as well as the States jointly taking over this enterprise, as indeed it has been done in the case of certain industries. So, until and unless we have a very clear picture of the Plan, it becomes very difficult for us to support this Resolution as it stands.

The second point that I wish to deal with is the larger question of nationalisation. If this industry or any other industry is located in certain specified areas, then the problem is easier of solution, but so far as the manganese industry is concerned, it is spread over the whole land, and even in particular States it is not located in any particular place. It practically envelopes the whole State, and the quality of the ore differs from State to State and from one part of the State to another part of the same State. The labour force employed is very large. I am entirely in agreement with the hon.

the mover of this Resolution about the conditions of labour in most of the places where this industry is thriving. I know that the industry has passed through very fine days, very flourishing days, and the people who had control of this industry made fairly good fortunes, but I cannot say that the industry is thriving now as well as it used to be before. For all these reasons, it becomes very difficult for the Government, either at the Centre or in the States, to take over this industry. For the moment I am not thinking of the financial commitments that the Government will have to meet if it ever launches on this scheme of nationalisation. But here I would like you to permit me to refer to the general principle. There are so many industries which are yet to be developed in the land. I suppose I need not enumerate them. We are dependent largely on imports for even our ordinary requirements in various directions. I may perhaps refer here to the raw film industry, of which India is the second biggest consumer in the world. Why should we send out of the country crores of rupees for importing raw films? Apart from such big industries, even in connection with a mining industry like this, I think it means—I have not got the figures; possibly the Government will have the figures—that we have got to sink quite a large bit of money. I would like this House to consider whether we should now invest what little resources we have on an existing industry and take it over or should try to start with those resources new industries which are vital for the industrial development of our country. After all, our resources are not inexhaustible or unlimited. When this is the position, whether we should divert our funds to the taking over of any existing concern is a matter of policy. It is my view—and this is not the first time I am expressing this view—that it would be very unwise on our part to invest such funds as are at our disposal on an industry which other people are looking after and probably looking after better. This is a fundamental question of policy on which I

hold slightly different views from those of some of my hon. friends. Apart from this, my point is whether we could do this so successfully as those who are now engaged in it.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Why not?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am going to answer that question. I am not referring merely to the question of personnel. I think it is fairly well accepted by now that, when we take up a large industry like this, it is very difficult for us to find adequate personnel to look after it, to administer it and to run it. Even for all the industries already nationalised, the usual complaint is that we have not got the right personnel, and now when all our resources are being directed towards securing and training of proper personnel for our existing industries, is it possible for us to get proper personnel for taking over the entire charge of this huge manganese industry? Whether we can manage it with greater efficiency is a debatable point, because I have had it on the floor of this House and of many a legislature in the country that some of the Government-managed industries are not being run as efficiently as the privately-owned industries, and that, while the privately-owned industries are making profits, the Government-owned industries are not making similar profits. The privately-owned industries have got so many handicaps such as the obtaining of licences, payment of income-tax and so on, and yet they make profits, whereas the Government-owned industries do not have any of these handicaps and yet they do not make any profits. If it is a question of our taking over any industry in the national interests whether we make profits or not, then we ought to do it. I have no doubt in my mind that we should take over those industries where the paramount interests of the country are involved, but in this case it is very difficult for us to say such a situation has arisen.

Another aspect is that labour is not being treated fairly.

4 P.M.

I entirely agree with the hon. the mover and the other friends that the labour in this mining industry, as in some of the other industries, is not being treated properly. What is the solution in such a case? Am I to take it that it should be taken as a general rule that wherever the labour is not being treated properly, the Government should take over the industry? I don't think anybody ventures on such an astounding proposition. That is a good argument for initiating measures to improve the conditions of labour. Take, for instance, the very familiar plantation labour. We are fairly well aware of the conditions of the plantation labour. I have seen it myself that in years gone by they used to be wretched; they used to be very bad. But now with the various pieces of labour legislation and other measures which the Government have taken, I can say that there has been perceptible progress and improvement in the condition of the plantation labour. I don't say this is so in every place but I have seen Coorg and Mysore—and I speak from knowledge of these two places—and there it is vastly improved. I think the plantation labour is as good and is looked after as well as any other labour that we can think of in the country. Therefore, the proper remedy for this admitted disease is to improve the conditions of the mining labour and it is very easy to do it in the present times because of the better means of communication that we have. I know some of these manganese mines were located in very inaccessible places and it was difficult for people even to go and properly inspect them but now, with all these added facilities that we have got, it is quite easy for us to introduce good living conditions and provide them all the amenities which are required for the labour. Therefore, I personally feel that the time has not yet arrived when we should ask either the Union Government or the State Governments to take over the industry.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: When will it arrive?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: As the Special Marriage Act has arrived and the Hindu Marriage Act has arrived after so many years. We are prepared to make provision for divorce, we can make provisions for union also. Here for the moment we are a little divorced and we shall establish the union when we attain majority.

So I think it would be wrong for us unnecessarily to divert our energies and resources towards a project like this and it would be very difficult for the Government to manage the same. I cannot speak for the State Governments. I am only referring to the Union Government with which we are concerned today. My fear is that whatever the State Governments may be thinking of—not that we should discourage them from taking over the industry if they so choose—as the Union Government is at present today, I am afraid it would not be a good thing, it would not be in the best interests of the industry for the Union Government to take over the entire manganese industry.

There is one more point and I have done. That is about the criticism levelled against some of these manganese industrialists who had behaved in the past regarding exports. I have also heard a number of complaints that while the sample showed that the ore contained a certain percentage of manganese, the despatches did not come up to the standard, and there was a lowering of the standard. I entirely agree with the hon. the mover that this is a thing which does no credit to the industrialists and it does also harm the prestige of this country. There is no doubt about it and therefore there are other ways of securing this end. Take the question of cloth or of carpets and druggets and other industries. It is possible for us to secure the quality and see that no sub-standard goods are exported from this country and therefore I think that again is another argument for us to press upon the Government to see that all the manganese that is exported is up to the specification that

is guaranteed to the purchasers at the other end. I hope that the hon. Minister will kindly apply his mind to this and evolve a certain machinery or scheme to ensure that nobody exports any sub-standard manganese outside the country.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support this Resolution for two or three reasons. I am whole-heartedly for nationalising the manganese mines. For, a beginning has to be made somewhere and this industry at present seems to be more suitable because the margin of profit there being a little higher, even if the Government in its first experiment incurs some loss or does not make very high profits, it will be able to equalise both sides of the budget. Sir, I would like to support this Resolution especially because it will be an opportunity for the Government to show to the other mining industries as to how and in what way the labour should be treated and what suitable conditions should be created for the labour. Example is always better than precept and for that reason, if the Government began with this industry, then Government, which should have begun with the coal industry according to its industrial policy, will be able to take that up. I don't agree with the speaker who preceded me when he said that there would be difficulty in getting the finance and that Government, with the limited finance it has available for starting other industries, should not commit itself by taking up this venture. When the Government is going to start various Industrial Corporations, Finance Corporations, Development Corporations and all kinds of Corporations to finance small scale industries, is it possible that the Government would find any difficulty in getting finance for this particular industry? Now that the Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Bill will soon become law, what little difficulty there would have been in this respect would, I think, be cleared and this is just the time when Government could make up its mind in this respect.

Secondly, as has been already pointed out, this industry is mainly in the hands of foreigners and it is necessary that they should be given some time to wind up and the Government could ask them to withdraw their capital on a sliding basis or according to terms as it thinks best. With regard to States' interests coming in conflict with the Union Government's interests if it is nationalised, I think the speaker who preceded me has himself given a reply that the Government, as in some other industries, e.g., the newspaper industry, could go into partnership with the State Governments and even then it could be called nationalisation of the industry because the State Government and the Union Government need not be considered as two distinct entities and need not be classed in the same class as private individuals. From that point of view, I think it is necessary to make a beginning in nationalisation with this manganese industry.

Then the other point that has been touched is about the way in which the marketing of this particular produce is carried on and in which it has brought discredit to the country. I happened to speak when I was out of the country a few months ago to some of our Indian merchants and they mentioned about our trade relations abroad and when we were discussing with other friends, they mentioned particularly this manganese industry and said that the people would not have any dealings with our Indian merchants for manganese because the lumps supplied would contain pure manganese sheets at the top and inside was all powder! So it was not only that these agents lose their customers over this particular item but they were distrusted with regard to other items also. As this is a commodity which is mainly required and bought by people abroad, it is very necessary to keep a high standard through Government agency. Rather than supervise these sales by private agencies, it would be much better and easier if this industry were to belong to Gov-

ernment and Government sold the product.

There is another factor. When the prices were very high, some of the small manganese mine-owners who did not have contacts abroad would enter into agreements with some intermediate countries who purchased the manganese at a price which was uneconomic to this country, kept it in their own countries and acted as intermediaries and later on sold it at a high profit. If on the other hand, the industry had belonged to the Government, this situation would not have arisen and the entire profit would have gone to the Government coffers as Government could have waited till the market was favourable.

Sir, I do not want to go into all those points that have been already covered by other hon. Members. I would only say that from all these points of view, particularly from the point of setting an example of good and improved working of these mines, it is very necessary that Government should begin with the nationalisation of this industry.

One last point, not particularly with reference to the nationalisation of this industry, but with regard to the mining industry in general. I think it is necessary that Government should follow a uniform policy with regard to the giving of prospecting licences and final working licences, either through the Union Government or the State Government. What happens at present is that in respect of certain minerals, the final authority is left with the State Government or it is done with the recommendation of the State Government. The result of this dual control is confusion sometimes, due to lack of correct information at the top. And sometimes it takes months, if not years to get correct information, such as the situation and areas of leases, etc. And sometimes it is not discovered that permission had been given for an area much in excess of the area that is permitted under the rules

**THE MINISTER FOR NATURAL RESOURCES (SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am thankful to my hon. friend Shri Malviya for having raised this important question of manganese, although any reference in the context of this nationalisation question is not a very happy one under the present circumstances. I do not want to make any political speech, because as I have understood the speeches of hon. Members and the policy of the Government, there is no difference on this question of nationalisation of industries in a general way. It is a question of viewing the whole matter in the background of our objectives, both immediate and far-reaching. In this connection, I would very briefly like to remind the House of the 1948 Resolution of our Industrial Policy. I will only quote the very relevant sentences from that Resolution, in order to remind the House of the background on which we have been functioning so far as our industries, especially the mining industry, are concerned. The Resolution says:

"In the present state of the nation's economy, when the mass of the people are below the subsistence level, the emphasis should be on the expansion of production, both agricultural and industrial, and in particular on the production of capital equipment goods satisfying the basic needs of the people and of commodities the export of which will increase the earning of foreign exchange. There can be no doubt that the State must play a progressively active role in the development of industries; but the ability to achieve the main objectives should determine the extent of the State's responsibility and the limits of private enterprise. Under present conditions, the mechanism and the resources of the State may not permit it to function forthwith in industries as widely as may be desirable."

That is the background which I wanted to remind the House of. There

is no question of difference on the various points raised whether it be the welfare of labour or the satisfactory standard of wages to the labour or any of the other points. I concede that if all the industries, whether it be the mining industry or the others, are handled by the Government on a State-control basis, the conditions, both of the wages and the welfare of labour, would certainly improve in the way that we all aspire for. That is the goal and I have no doubt that we are approaching that goal and as our policy with regard to the socialistic pattern of society materialises more concretely, we are likely to give effect to that policy in a more satisfactory manner.

Sir, there are certain points which I just want to submit to the House in connection with the speeches made by hon. friends here. I will start with the last speech and I will only briefly refer to it, giving specific answers to the points raised.

My hon. friend Dr. Seeta Parmanand raised the question of foreign concerns and of asking them to go in a specified time. I may remind the House here that we have already carved out a policy in this connection. The rules which have been framed according to that policy are that no permission for prospecting or licensing for mining will be given to any foreign concern in future, if Indian talent is available—both capital and the talent, I mean technical talent—in this country. If they are available in this country, we do not want to encourage foreign concerns unnecessarily to come here to handle these industries.

**DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND:** What is the definition of a foreign concern?

**SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA:** Well, foreign concerns are those concerns which are not incorporated in our country. That is the most important thing for us to bear in mind. If my hon. friend considers that any man who is from outside, who has not been born in this country, necessarily should not be connected with any concern or company

which we support, I would not agree with her.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: It is all right, but what about the capital?

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: I would not agree with her. There may be stray cases of foreigners and if they want to join certainly we should not put a ban on such foreigners or on foreign capital coming into the pool of Indian capital and on foreigners coming into the pool of Indian companies. Anyway, that is not very relevant here.

I entirely agree with her about the general policy and, as I have said, our policy is not to encourage foreign companies or foreign people to handle such industries where we can conveniently do so. And so far as foreign concerns which are already doing mining in manganese or, for the matter of that, in other ores, are concerned, if it is a legacy from the past, then of course, we have to be cautious in carving out a policy. We have got to wait if they are here as a result of an agreement which we consider fairly legitimate and not different from or against the interests of the country. We do not want to create an impression that foreigners are not wanted here to help us. As the House is fully aware, it is the policy of the Government to invite foreign help, both with regard to capital and technical knowledge, to expand our production. The object is also to upgrade our technical knowledge. The object is to multiply industries, all those industries that we can develop with the help of the raw materials available here. So long as we keep those objectives before us and are on that path, we should not go right or left and get lost in just attempting to stick to slogan—ideals, although, as I said, the ideal of nationalisation has already been accepted by us and we are progressively attempting to march towards it.

Mr. Dasappa very relevantly raised the question of the export of

undesirable quality of manganese and of sub-standard ores in the name of standard ores. It is right, Sir, that a number of cases have been brought to our notice and some complaints also have been made from time to time.

I learn that we are taking all reasonable steps. It is really deplorable that some of our export traders have not been as careful as they ought to have been in this respect. I only hope that things will improve.

I am sorry Mr. Mahanty has left the House; he was rather excited. There was not much ground for his having to leave the House, but I shall refer to certain points which have been raised by him. He has referred to the recommendations of the Planning Commission with regard to the survey and prospecting of manganese ore in the country and the production of ferro-manganese and the beneficiation of manganese ore. All these three points are very important and relevant to the manganese industry. So far as the survey and detailed prospecting of manganese ore is concerned, we have progressively handled this problem. The detailed survey of the manganese ore of the central part of our country has more or less been completed and the ores have now been discovered more and more. We hope that as the first Five Year Plan ends and the second begins, we will have sufficiently covered this routine survey and prospecting of manganese ore. Already, we possess a lot of information in this connection and we have not lagged behind in our programme. In regard to ferro-manganese I would like to proceed in this matter rather cautiously. Excessive conversion of manganese into ferro-manganese has many aspects to be considered. There are other countries also which produce manganese. We do not hold the monopoly in manganese any longer. If we instal very huge plants for ferro-manganese and adopt a policy of producing a lot of ferro-manganese, the question of disposal of that ferro-manganese will arise. We must not forget that ferro-manganese can be

[Shri K. D. Malaviya.]  
 more conveniently and more economically produced by more industrially advanced countries. If we decide upon a policy of installing huge plants for the manufacture of ferro-manganese, then perhaps we may face difficulties in the disposal of the ferro-manganese produced in our country. Therefore, we have to go cautiously about this matter. Government in the Commerce and Industry Ministry is actively considering what quantity of ferro-manganese we can and should manufacture in this country. We are not sleeping on this matter.

With regard to beneficiation, we have done a good amount of work. Beneficiation, as the House is aware, is just upgrading or improving low grade manganese ore which is dumped today at the mouth of the mines in the process of selecting better quality of manganese ore for export. Best quality of manganese ore is one which contains 48 per cent and above of manganese dioxide. This is considered to be first class quality manganese ore. In the process of mining, all sorts of manganese is mined which may be 48 per cent, 45 per cent, 40 per cent, 38 per cent and so on. The better quality manganese ore is exported as it has had a ready market so far. The low grade manganese ore is not exported as it has not got a ready market. Therefore, the problem before us is to upgrade that quality by washing or by separation of unwanted things in it, by magnetic separation or by other processes. Each sample of manganese ore has got to be tested from the point of view of the specific type of plant which will be required to beneficiate that. We have covered a good amount of work in this connection. Each mining field has got to send a sample and that has to be categorised separately from the point of view of the specific plant which will deal with that. We have covered much of that programme. One or two beneficiation plants have already been put up in Madhya Pradesh. I forget the name of the place; I was trying to recollect but

I could not get it. One or two more plants are to be set up soon and we have a plan to organise the smaller manganese mine-owners and to supply them with beneficiation plant at nominal charges to help them in upgrading their manganese ore. This is the way in which we propose to help the small mine-owners and that will also be the way to control and regulate the development of their manganese mines.

It is not right to say that the manganese industry or its export is being controlled by foreigners. No, we control it. We enforce certain rules which cannot be contravened. We have lately revised those rules with a view to bringing each mine-owner to follow certain pattern of procedure. They have got to keep a trained man to see how it is run, how much has to be left, how much has to be improved and what is to be done and what is not to be done in the whole process of mining. It is wrong therefore to say that we do not control the manganese industry; we are completely controlling it save investing our own money or labelling it with the words "State control" so far as investment of money or control of labour is concerned.

With regard to the profits made by the export of manganese ore there is a little misunderstanding. Usually the export of manganese ore brings good profit to the trader, but the present prices of manganese ore are not as quoted by my hon. friend Mr. Malaviya who gave a lot of information on this and made valuable suggestions. The cost of high-grade manganese ore which contains 48 per cent and above is between Rs. 125 and Rs. 135 per ton today. It has slightly increased; there was a period of bad depression for our trade a few months back when, as the House is aware, we removed the export duty. This gave an impetus to our export trade. The reason for the falling down of our export was that manganese from Brazil, Africa and the U.S.S.R. came into the market, and, therefore, prices fell on account of a lot of ore in the market. We do not now hold any

monopoly of manganese ore. Ore of 42 per cent and below sells at between Rs. 90 and Rs. 105 per ton; 38 per cent and lower fetches a price of Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 per ton. The profit margin has very much come down. The railway freight, export duty, the sales tax and the transport charges all take a big chunk out of this.

With regard to improved methods of mining, I entirely agreed with Mr. Mahanty when he raised this point. It is certainly causing some anxiety to us, but, as I have said, we have introduced certain rules and regulations which will compel all mine-owners now to improve their methods of mining.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. HEGDE in the Chair.)

We must see that the process of improved control of mining results in the least amount of low grade manganese ore being left untreated. Whatever low grade manganese is there has to be improved after a few years of collection.

As I said, our policy is towards nationalising our basic resources, firstly because they are a valuable asset; we must conserve them; we must have a regulated policy to exploit them. Secondly—and I concede this point that if we want to uplift the condition of our labour, both from the point of view of their welfare and wages, if we want to standardize the conditions in mines and if we want to expand production—the best method is to nationalise the industry. We are going towards that goal, but to say that priority ought to be given to manganese ore now, under the present circumstances, is perhaps not a very proper thing to do. We have got many more important things to nationalise today. For instance, there is the oil exploration and exploitation which will require perhaps hundreds of crores of rupees. Then there is the synthetic petrol project which may require a hundred crores of rupees.

Then, there is the question of generation of power, the question of utilising the phenomena of nuclear fission for producing atomic energy. Then, there is the fertilizer industry and so many basic industries, for example, the tools industry, which will lead to the multiplication and expansion of our industries. The policy of the Government is to tackle at first on a national basis such industries which will themselves produce and also multiply other industries. We want to start from the beginning and not start from the end. Exploitation of the manganese ore industry is not of such importance that we should employ all our energy, invest our money and incidentally also pay big compensation. I agree that there may not be large compensation, but to run all these mines will mean a colossal amount of money. On the background of a policy of mixed economy we have also to create conditions for a good number of industries to remain with the private sector to develop. Now if you go on taking over just because of sentiment, industries which are not likely to give effect to our true policy of nationalisation and thereby create unnecessary flutter and confusion in the minds of people, it will not be a wise policy. Therefore, Sir, I feel that this Resolution on nationalisation of manganese industry should be withdrawn by my hon. friend, especially on the background of what I have submitted here. This can be postponed for some future date when it will be convenient for us to consider and act according to the wishes of the House.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: I am grateful to the hon. Minister for throwing light on the subject, which is the subject of the day. I am gratified on many of the points, but I am not convinced yet on some very important points. One of the points which I had raised was with regard to the small mine-owners who had neither capital with them, who had neither resources.....

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: I am sorry I forgot to mention one point. I invite

[Shri K. D. Malaviya.]  
my hon. friend to give to the Government any suggestion by which these small mine owners can be organised in such a way that they can improve their lot. I myself made an attempt and requested them to organise themselves with a view to getting legitimate help from the Government, but the difficulty is that all these small mine-owners would not agree to combine themselves. If my hon. friend can persuade them to agree to any reasonable proposal, I am willing to co-operate with them to improve the lot of small miners.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: I am very thankful to the hon. Minister for the suggestion, but I may also tell him that because I am working among the labour and they do not look upon the labour and the labour workers with favour—neither do they want to take them into confidence—it is very difficult for a man like me to persuade the employers or the mine-owners to accede to such a request. It is only the Government which can, by persuasion or by enactment, compel them to form a sort of a united body or a corporation where they may work together. My object in bringing this Resolution was to show that the conditions in the industry under which the labour is working are deplorable indeed despite so many attempts which have been made by the organisations, the workers and the Government. Government has done its level best. I am gratified at the attempts which the Government have made in improving the conditions of the workers. The regional labour commissioner, the conciliation officers, they are there and they are doing their level best. But still much has got to be done, and at least with these small mine-owners it is very difficult to deal. There is no alternative with us except to request the Government to bring them round, to compel them to form their own corporation or corporate bodies, several corporate bodies in different areas and work together, and they must be compelled to take a Government representative in that

body and one or two labour representatives. Then I think the conditions may improve and the evil day may be postponed for some time. We have now started working with the immediate objective of a socialistic pattern of society and we cannot postpone the improvement of the workers' conditions and they have got to be improved. It cannot be delayed any more. In other fields the conditions are much improved, but in this particular industry I am sorry things remain as they were five or seven years back. The assurance is there and I am gratified at the assurance, but I will make this request to the hon. Minister that he will—of course I have said that I am unable to persuade the employers—persuade the mine-owners to form themselves into a corporate body. I will request the hon. Minister to make another attempt to bring them round to make a sort of a corporation with labour and Government representatives in it because the Government has got to look to the safety of the property and the labour representatives are entitled to it as they have got their interest in the industry. So I will request the hon. Minister to keep this in view and take up the matter as early as possible and call a meeting of the representatives of the industry and labour—of course, Government will be there—and find a way out of this muddle. Nationalisation of this industry is not difficult. I am convinced that the capital investment is not large.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: Capital is not the only problem. The other headaches are there.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: So far as the foreign concerns are concerned I am willing to agree to the suggestions which have been made by the hon. Minister. So far as others are concerned, nationalisation seems to be the only remedy for the ills which have crept into the industry.

Sir, I do not want to go into the details, as I want to give some chance to the other Resolutions to be moved

and considered. And therefore, I request the hon. Minister kindly to call a conference or a meeting, or to set up a sort of a committee to enquire into the conditions obtaining in this industry and remove the difficulties facing the labourers. I hope that the hon. Minister will certainly find out some way to improve this industry and to improve the labour conditions, and ultimately to find out a better method for exporting our material to the foreign markets in an improved condition, so that the slur which we have got in the past from foreign countries may not come to us in future.

With these few words, Sir, I would like to withdraw my Resolution.

The \*Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

\*For text of Resolution, *vide* col. 4877 *supra*.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. S. HEGDE): Now, there are three other Resolutions on the agenda standing in the names of (1) Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand, (2) Shri S. N. Mazumdar, and (3) Shri Gopinath Singh. All the three hon. Members are not in the House. As such, these Resolutions lapse.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 18th April 1955.

The House then adjourned at forty-two minutes past four of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 18th April 1955.

Editor of Debates,  
Rajya Sabha Secretariat