

In recent months, a domestic agitation which influences our foreign relations, has demonstrated how utterly irresponsible and mischievous this outlook is. I refer to what is known as the 'Jammu agitation' which has demonstrated to what lengths irresponsible behaviour, harmful to the nation, can go. This agitation has not only injured our cause internationally but has made the very solution, which it seeks, much more difficult of attainment. It has been a challenge to the authority of Parliament and an attempt to upset by unlawful and often violent means the decisions of our Parliament. It has been a matter of peculiar regret that those whose primary duty it must be to uphold the Constitution, and have respect for the laws made under the Constitution, should be guilty of inciting people to violate those laws. I am not merely concerned with the moral aspects of this matter but also with the evil consequences, both national and international, that flow from it.

The world is full of problems and a tortured humanity seeks anxiously for some relief from its fears and burdens. In this tragic drama, a measure of responsibility comes to us in this great country. We have enough of our problems here and they consume our thoughts and energy, but we cannot isolate ourselves from the great brotherhood of the nations and from the common problems that affect humanity. Whether we wish it or not, fate and circumstances have cast this responsibility upon us and we must discharge it. In the matter that we, in common with other countries, discharge it will depend whether our generation and the next will live in peace and bring about the progressive happiness of mankind or suffer irretrievable disaster. That responsibility we can only discharge if we are united and hold together, remembering always our high ideals and objectives and not allowing ourselves to be swept away by the fear or passion of the moment.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, yesterday in anticipation of the statement I requested you if it would be possible

to find some time, probably tomorrow, to have some useful discussion on the statement that was expected today. I am sure the hon. Members here would be quite willing to sit either this afternoon or tomorrow afternoon if the Prime Minister is willing to have a discussion.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, may I signify our general appreciation of the Prime Minister's statement? We hope the Prime Minister will give full and courageous expression to the deepest urges of the Indian people for the establishment of world peace, now that new possibilities have opened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the House had consultations with the Prime Minister but before tomorrow evening it will not be possible for him to have any time for this.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Why not tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Till tomorrow evening he is busy and after that we adjourn.

Mr. Vaidya on the Tea Bill.

THE TEA BILL, 1952—continued

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair.*)

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA (Madhya Bharat):

श्री कन्हैयालाल डी० वैद्य (मध्य भारत): उप सभापति महोदय, इस बिल पर जो वाद-विवाद हुआ है, उसमें विरोधी पक्ष की ओर से जो बहस की गई है वह एक सिद्धान्त का वाद-विवाद बन गया है और कम्युनिज्म (Communism) गान्धीज्म (Gandhism) के आदर्श पर मानों इस हाऊस (House) में कोई चर्चा हो रही है, ऐसा कल से दिखायी दे रहा है। मैं इस समय अपनी ओर से कोई अधिक बात तो इस विषय पर नहीं करना चाहता हूँ, किन्तु इतना स्पष्ट कर

[Shri Kanhaiyalal D. Vaidya.]

देना चाहता हूँ कि अपोजिशन (Opposition) की तरफ से जो वाद-विवाद उठाया गया है वह कहां तक उचित है। वे ज़रा अपने पिछले इतिहास को देखें। इतिहास इस बात को लिखेगा कि जब इस देश के स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम में जनता और हमारे इन बेंचों पर बैठे हुये लोग संलग्न थे तो विरोधी दल के लोगों ने इस दश में स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के उस अवसर पर किस प्रकार के काम किये। मैं उन बातों को दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ, केवल उनका ध्यान इतना ही दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है कि कार्ल मार्क्स के द्वारा प्रतिपादित सिद्धान्तों पर आधारित आइडियोलोजी (ideology) के अन्तर्गत वे अपने जीवन काल में कोई ऐसा कार्य करके नहीं दिखा सके जिससे संसार के किसी देश का कल्याण हुआ हो। जब कि हम सोभाग्यशाली हैं इस राष्ट्र का निर्माण करने में हमने महात्मा गान्धी के नेतृत्व में और उसके उत्तराधिकारी, हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री जवाहरलाल जी के नेतृत्व में, उनके जीवन काल में ही वास्तव में कुछ ठीक कर दिखाया हो। आज हमारी सरकार ने संसार के सामने महात्मा गान्धी के अहिंसात्मक सिद्धान्त के आदर्श की रूपरेखा रखी जिसके लिये आज संसार हमारे देश की ओर देख रहा है। मेरे मित्र इस बात को भूल जाते हैं कि जिस आइडियोलोजी पर विश्वास करके आज वे चल रहे हैं उसका क्या दुष्परिणाम होगा। अभी हाल ही मेरे भाषण के पूर्व यहां माननीय प्रधान मन्त्री ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है उससे इस हाऊस को और मेरे इन मित्रों को यह मान लेना चाहिये कि संसार को आज शान्ति की

आवश्यकता है न कि हिंसा और युद्ध की। जिस रास्ते पर वे संसार को ले जाना चाहते हैं उससे कभी संसार को शान्ति नहीं मिल सकती है परन्तु जिन आदर्शों पर चलकर हमने स्वाधीनता प्राप्त की है उनका अनुगमन करने से हमें तथा संसार को शीघ्र शान्ति मिल सकती है। विरोधी दलों द्वारा हमारे आदर्शों की आलोचना की जाती है और कहा जाता है कि हम इन बेंचों पर बैठे हुये लोग पूंजीवादी व्यवस्था के समर्थक हैं। परन्तु मैं तो इस सदन में पिछले दिनों भी कह चुका हूँ और आज फिर कहता हूँ कि हम लोग देश के अन्दर एक आर्थिक और सामाजिक क्रान्ति लाने के लिये कटिबद्ध हैं और जो लोग आज विद्रोह की भावनाओं को फैलाकर हिंसा को उत्तेजना देना चाहते हैं उनको छोड़कर हम शान्तिमय उपायों द्वारा एक ऐसे जनकल्याणकारी राज्य तथा ऐसे समाज की स्थापना करना चाहते जिसमें तमाम वर्ग भेद मिट जायं। हमें चाहिये कि इस सदन में जो वाद-विवाद होते हैं उनमें हमेशा व्यर्थ के प्रश्नों पर बहस करके वातावरण को न बिगाड़े।

मैं टी बिल (Tea Bill) के विषय में एक दो बातें रखना चाहता हूँ। कुछ मित्रों ने यहां आदर्श की बातें रखीं, और इस बात पर भी जोर दिया कि महात्मा गान्धी इस विचारधारा के विरोधी थे कि हम इस प्रकार के मादक द्रव्यों का प्रचार देश में करें। जहां तक सरकार की नीति है वह भी इस सिद्धान्त से बन्धी हुई है कि मादक वस्तुओं को प्रोत्साहन नहीं देंगे, और शराबबन्दी के काम को हमारी सरकार ने इसीलिये महत्व दिया है। इस दृष्टि से मैं समझता हूँ कि जहां तक सरकार की इस

तरह की नीति से सम्बन्ध है, वह चाय के प्रचार के लिये अपनी नीति को इस सिद्धान्त पर निर्धारित करे। जहाँ तक कि टी इन्डस्ट्री (tea industry) के राष्ट्रीयकरण का प्रश्न है उसे व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से देखना चाहिये। इस देश के अन्दर जब अंगरेज़ राज्य करने के लिये आये तब अफीम उद्योग जोगों पर था। मैं आपको अपने प्रदेश मध्य भारत के बारे में बताता हूँ वहाँ अफीम के उद्योग के लिये एक केन्द्र था जिससे जनता तथा सरकार की आमदनी में अच्छी वृद्धि होती थी। तो यदि आप इस हाऊस में इस बिल का इस तरह से स्वागत करते हैं और कहते हैं कि हमारे देश को आर्थिक रूप में विदेशी सिक्का इस चाय के व्यवसाय से मिलता है तो मैं आपका ध्यान इस ओर खींचना चाहूँगा कि अफीम के स्वदेशी उद्योग से भी इस देश को एक बहुत बड़ी रकम मिलती थी जैसा कि अंगरेज़ी राज्य के पूर्व के जमाने में होता था। मैं नहीं समझता कि यह बिल सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर इस देश के हित में है या अहित में, यह तो इस सदन का दृष्टिकोण होना चाहिये। करोड़ों रुपया बल्कि अरबों रुपया आज अफीम उद्योग से इस देश को विदेशों से मिल सकता है और मैं नहीं समझ सकता कि चाय के उद्योग का हम इस हाऊस के अन्दर जब विदेशी सिक्के की प्राप्ति के लिये ही समर्थन प्रदान करते हैं तो क्यों न इस अफीम के स्वदेशी उद्योग का प्रचार करें जिससे हमें विदेशी सिक्का मिले। किन्तु हमारे यहाँ अफीम के उद्योग को कुचलने की नीति चली आ रही है क्योंकि अंगरेज़ी राज्य के जमाने में यह उद्योग विदेशियों के हाथ में उसी तरह नहीं था जिस तरह कि

चाय का उद्योग। तो यह जो स्वदेशी उद्योग था उसको कुचल करके अरबों रुपये की हानि इस देश को हुई है। उसको ही आप पुनर्जीवित करें तो आपको बहुत धन दूसरे देशों से मिल सकता है और कोई कारण नहीं है जब कि आपकी सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट (Central Government) का एक सेंट्रल एक्साइज़ डिपार्टमेंट (Central Excise Department) अफीम चोरों को पकड़ने के लिये काफी खर्च पर चलाया जा रहा हो और आज फिर भी अफीम चोरी से तैयार किया जाता है और अफीम चोरों के व्यवसाय का तो हमारे प्रान्त में क्या सारे देश के अन्दर एक जाल बिछा हुआ है। जहाँ करोड़ों रुपया इस व्यवसाय के द्वारा वे प्राप्त करते हैं और चोरी छिपे एक बड़ा उद्योग चलता है तो मैं इस सदन में इन बातों की चर्चा करते हुये गवर्नमेंट का ध्यान उसकी ओर खींचूँगा और कहूँगा कि सरकार इस प्रश्न पर गंभीरता से विचार करे। इस सदन में आज इम विषय में जो चर्चा हुई है कि चाय का ज्यादा प्रचार किया जाय, हमारी गवर्नमेंट की इस नीति का हमें समर्थन नहीं करना चाहिये। मैं इस समय यह भी निवेदन करूँगा कि अगर चाय पीना बुरा है और आप उसे आज रोकने में असमर्थ हैं तो कम से कम ऐसी व्यवस्था तो करिये जिससे जिन लोगों को चाय पीने को मिले उनका स्वास्थ्य खराब न हो। जैसा श्री मिश्र जी ने बताया कि चाय का प्रचार कम होना चाहिये तथा श्री रामराव ने रेलों की स्टालों पर मिलने वाली रद्दी चाय की चर्चा की, मैं उसके सुधार की आवश्यकता पर जोर देता हूँ। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश के अधिकांश होटलों

[Shri Kanhaiyalal D. Vaidya.]

आदि के अन्दर जहाँ चाय बिकती है वहाँ डस्ट (dust) के रूप में चाय उद्योग द्वारा सप्लाई (supply) होती है और वह चाय लोगों के स्वास्थ्य को नुकसान पहुंचाती है और इससे देश का बड़ा भारी अहित हुआ है। आप एक ऐसी नीति के समर्थन के लिये इस राज्य की व्यवस्था को चला रहे हैं कि जिससे जन-कल्याण हो, और मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि यदि इस देश की जनता स्वस्थ नहीं है तो यहाँ स्वस्थ दिमाग भी कैसे पैदा हो सकते हैं। इसलिये गवर्नमेंट की नीति इस प्रकार की होनी चाहिये कि यदि वह इस तरह की बुरी चीजों की रोक थाम करने की स्थिति में नहीं है तो कम से कम वे चीजें तो शुद्ध रूप में मिलें जिनसे जनता के स्वास्थ्य पर बुरा असर न पड़े। जहाँ आप इस इंडस्ट्री को नियंत्रण में लेने का प्रारम्भ करने जा रहे हैं वहाँ इस बात की भी कोशिश कीजिये कि देश की जनता को इस देश की वही चाय शुद्ध रूप में मिल सके जिससे जनता के स्वास्थ्य को नुकसान न पहुंचे।

जहाँ तक इस इंडस्ट्री में काम करने वाले मजदूरों का प्रश्न है इसके पीछे एक बहुत बड़ा काला इतिहास है और मिश्रा जी न उस पर काफ़ी प्रकाश डाला है। इस विषय में मैं बहुत कुछ कह सकता हूँ। यदि आप राष्ट्रीयकरण करना चाहते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ सबसे पहले आपको उन मजदूरों का ध्यान रखना है जिनकी हड्डियों की बुनियाद पर यह चाय का व्यवसाय कायम हुआ है और वह जीवित है। यदि आप इन मजदूरों को भुला देंगे जिनके शोषण के बल पर यह व्यवसाय चमका और जो हजारों लाखों आदमी इस व्यवसाय के

अन्दर काम करते हैं यदि वे अकाल मृत्यु को प्राप्त हुये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम उनके प्रति बड़ा अन्याय करेंगे। जहाँ तक मजदूरों का सम्बन्ध है बिल में एक वाक्य इस विषय का लिखा है कि :

“Securing better working conditions and provisions of amenities and incentives for workers.”

केवल इतना कह देने से मैं नहीं समझता कि इस टी बोर्ड (Tea Board) की जो लम्बी चौड़ी धाराएं हैं उससे इन लोगों को व्यवसाय द्वारा रक्षण मिल जायगा। इस बिल में मैं समझता था कि इस विषय में कुछ विशेष व्यवस्था इन मजदूरों को रक्षण देने के लिये रखी जायगी न कि इस बोर्ड के भरोसे ही सारी चीजें छोड़ दी जायेंगी। बोर्ड तो इंटरिस्टेड (interested) होगा चाय के व्यवसाय को और अन्य बातों को सुधारने में। जैसा कि अभी माननीय सदस्य ने बताया है कि प्रचार तो यहाँ तक होता है कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से सीलोन में भी इंडियन टी खरीदने की बात कही जाती है। चाय के प्रचार के साथ सरकार को अपने को जोड़ना नहीं चाहिये। जहाँ तक उद्योग का प्रश्न है, जहाँ तक उसके व्यवसाय का प्रश्न है, उसके लिये सरकार को चाहिये कि उसकी व्यवस्था तथा आर्थिक स्थिति में जो सुधार करना हो करे, किन्तु जहाँ तक चाय के प्रचार का सम्बन्ध है वहाँ पर सरकार को अपना नाम उस प्रचार में जोड़ना नहीं चाहिये और मैं समझता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्यों ने जो बातें इस हाउस में इस विषय में कही उन पर माननीय मंत्री महोदय ध्यान देंगे। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 217.]

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must confess that it is somewhat beyond my capacity to do full justice to the speeches made on the floor of this House by the hon. Members in regard to this motion. I shall try to reply to the points raised by them, but I find that the big guns that boomed yesterday and this morning are not merely silent now but have evaporated away.

Well, Mr. Mazumdar, was the star speaker in this debate and I am happy to see that the House has complimented him on his well-documented and well-marshalled speech. It is undoubtedly, Sir, a matter for gratification to see some debate of this calibre and there has been some evidence in that direction, both in this House and in the other. I do wish Mr. Mazumdar all success in this new method that he has adopted to deal with Government Bills.

I must also confess that in attempting that new method, he has also introduced an element of plausibility to cover the defects which are partly factual and partly statistical. Nor has he missed the central theme of the Opposition—the Communist Opposition—to all measures brought forward by Government during the last twelve months or so, namely, that Government is allowing the foreign interests, especially the British interests, to function in this country at peace. In one sense Mr. Mazumdar had an advantage. He blazed a trail so powerful and so blinding that all the other Members, even on this side of the House followed that trail like lambs.

Sir, it is said—my knowledge of history is not as sound as that of professors of history who speak in this House—but it is said that it was the policy of the architect of the Soviet Republic to see that the Communists, when there were five people opposing them, allied themselves with four and destroyed the fifth.

Then, align with three and destroy the fourth and so on. I think, Sir, these Communist tactics and dialectics are so well known to our capitalist friends in this country that they are adopting similar methods of directing their opposition now to British and American interests and, for that purpose, they are prepared to march hand-in-hand with Indian capitalists. Sir, it might be that it pays both ways. I have heard it often said that Communist elections, Communist propaganda is financed by Indian capital. I do not know how far it is true; quite likely that the Indian capitalist also will walk into the trap. I would ask hon. Members on this side of the House, those who are not interested in Communist propaganda to be rather wary and to see that they do not walk into the trap, a trap which is just opening its jaws wide open and one would inevitably walk into it because we still suffer from the hangover of the past. Maybe, Sir, that Tea does inebriate; it does not seem to help us to get over the hangover of the past. You have got to choose some other beverage to get out of it. We think, Sir, this side of the House, needs quite a lot of sedative to help us to forget the hangover of the past and when some Communists try to raise this bogey of British Imperialism still dominating us in this country, well, there we are; we have to follow the footsteps and the sentiments sounded by them. In one sense, Sir, I am rather tired of hearing this for the last twelve months; absolutely tired of hearing every time any Bill is brought, 'the British interests', 'the British interests', it appears to me, like 'King Charles Head' every time a Bill is brought before this House and I do propose, Sir, to a very large extent to ignore the criticisms that were made on this Bill, which related to British interests as such but not to the future of Tea industry. There are certain factors which I have admitted; I have admitted that 80 per cent. of control not ownership, is still in British hands. I have also indicated that if I attempt any change in ownership it may not be to the benefit of the industry because I do not want this speculative element

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]

to come into it nor am I prepared to accept the advice given by the more intelligent person in this House, Mr. C. G. K. Reddy, of nationalising the industry merely because there are obvious difficulties in the matter of allowing Indian interests to purchase those Estates. But, having admitted that there are certain facts and situations, the facts have to be dealt with in the proper place and at the proper time. I propose to say no more about it in spite of the very valuable time that my hon. friend, Mr. Mazumdar, spent in this House on the subject of British interests.

My hon. friend, Mr. Mazumdar, Sir, whose speech I did not have the good fortune of listening because I had to go out to some other business and my colleague had taken very careful notes, raised some other points, as I said, partly pertinent but certainly plausible. He devoted considerable attention and time to dealing with Governmental policy in regard to labour interests seeking thereby to suggest that he was the protector of labour and Government was not; that he was representing labour and Government was anti-labour. Sir, I entirely repudiate this claim for any such position. The Britishers were exploiting labour economically. I acknowledge that tea garden labour in Assam and every other part of India has been exploited by the British interests for economic reasons and I charge the hon. Member opposite that he is exploiting the labour for political reasons and I think, Sir, a person who is exploiting labour for political reasons is no more free from the accusation of exploitation than the Britishers are. The purposes are different, I agree, but the purpose is nonetheless even more, I should say one that deserves condemnation. The whole idea of the Communist activity amongst labour is to exploit them politically. I am not unaware of it, Sir; I have been associated with Communist leaders who had something to do with labour movement in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940 and 1941. In every case, I found it is a question of exploitation pure

and simple of labour and my hon. friend had been following those facts and statistics, half made up and half imaginary, half unreliable, merely.....

(Interruptions by Shri S. N. Mazumdar.)

I refuse to yield.

.....to substantiate the point that he had made that labour is exploited by British interests and Government are content to leave it at that and he comes out as the saviour of labour. Well, Sir, if the hon. Member's idea is that he should create an atmosphere outside as if he is the sole spokesman on behalf of Tea Estate Labour so that they will fall like a ripe plum into the hands of the Communist Labour Union, I am afraid my hon. friend is mistaken.

Sir, the next thing is that my hon. friend shed quite a lot of crocodile tears on the Indian tea garden owners. He said, "the Minister said they are all marginal and sub-marginal. We cannot save them. The Indian tea gardens are all marginal and sub-marginal". Sir, the assumption is perfect and then the conclusion is that the Indian tea garden owners cannot be saved by Government and he comes out as the saviour of the Indian tea garden owners as well along with being the saviour of labour. I think, Sir, I have also studied some logic sometime ago. There are two types of logic. His logic is not ordinary logic, not logic to be believed by people who hold true the traditions of Karl Marx but, nevertheless, it is logic but I think the syllogism of it is completely wrong. I do maintain, Sir, that may be there are some gardens which are sub-marginal. After all, it is a matter of relativity. What is marginal, what is sub-marginal is a matter which must be decided on the facts of the situation. It may not be possible to save them. I had indicated to this House that Government have under contemplation measures by which they could save the Indian tea garden owners; if legislative measures have got to be enacted, we will undertake them; if it is possible to help them by other means, we will try to help

them. I do not admit the principles put forward by hon. Member somewhere there—I forget the name—who said that the Industrial Finance Corporation should do it. I do not think it can do. The Industrial Finance Corporation, with its meagre assets, is already overburdened with other things and there is no point in your smashing that organisation by assigning a whole basket of matters. But, something has got to be done; some other organisation has got to be started and I did indicate, Sir, to the House, even before the hon. Member came out with his prolific suggestions that we intend doing something on those lines and we shall do it, Sir, notwithstanding the fact that it suits the Communists and does not suit us and I hope that the Indian tea garden owners will not be foolish enough to accept my hon. friend opposite as their saviour because that way help won't come to them.

Well that, I think, Sir, more or less completes the picture so far as my friend is concerned. I do agree, Sir, that it was a carefully prepared speech, facts were marshalled, statistics were brought to support the facts but all of them had no basis in reality. I say they were just twisted in order that he may make out a case. I will give him full marks for being the Deputy Leader of the other side and for his speech but I am not prepared to accept whatever he has said.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Can you deny that these figures are from official reports?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Then you can quote statistics from somewhere else and build up a statement.

Now what is the story that he gives? "There is British exploitation. The British must be expropriated". The story is the story of the stoppage of labour. He thinks that whatever he says must be accepted and he must be in a position to go back to the tea garden labour union. The story is that I am the oppressor of the Indian

gardener and he is the saviour. Well, I am not prepared to admit that story and to believe that story. I believe that we the Congressmen have a record of having served the interests of the common man and the country and we are not going to yield to that hon. Member that place to say that he is the saviour of the country. I see that the exploitation of the British is less harmful than the exploitation of the Communists for political purposes.

SHRI B. GUPTA: May I know whether this kind of speech is really helpful? He should meet our point.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Then, Sir, my hon. friend Mr. Govinda Reddy came out with fairly helpful suggestions. Sir, I welcome those suggestions because I do not claim, Sir, any perfection for this Bill nor do I say that I am going to solve all problems connected with the tea industry with this Bill. But this is one step towards the right direction, and I am very grateful to hon. Members like Mr. Govinda Reddy who understood the limitations of the Bill but nevertheless supported the Bill regarding its right direction.

Now, Sir, the guns of the Opposition boomed and boomed and boomed but there was nothing in it because it was an empty shell. The shots go in the air and do not hurt anybody. I always enjoy to hear Mr. Bhupesh Gupta because it reminds me of those days when I read the history of the Demosthenes and Cicero. I find a replica of those in the booming of the Opposition Member but to no purpose. Some people were found willing to provoke him into further booming. I shall not do so. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has made no points except saying something over and over again. Let Mr. Bhupesh Gupta read his speech. There are the same old things in that speech 'Anglo-American domination, selling away this country to somebody else.....

SHRI B. GUPTA: I asked you to control the Britisher's profits. The hon. Minister should not treat us in this cavalier fashion. He should deal with the Opposition seriously.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: When Mr. Bhupesh Gupta makes a speech marshalling different facts those facts suit him only whereas Mr. Mazumdar's marshalling of facts is such that there are points in themselves requiring answers and I try to answer his points. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's speech is a diversion for my worry and for the work that I have to do daily. Therefore I only hear him but I can do nothing more. I cannot answer a point which has not been made. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's speech is illusive. I cannot grasp. I may probably use the words of my hon. friend who sits very near him. I agree that the less intelligent than Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is a man who is the Minister trying to meet points of this nature.

Mr. Rama Rao started by saying "a cup that cheers but not inebriates". This is not a cup unfortunately with which one can get away from the hangover of the past. I am told that lime juice is one that helps to wipe off the hangover of the past. He wanted some sort of an intellectual lime to get away from the hangover of the past. Even he confessed that he is a 'fellow traveller'. Well, I think, Sir, that the Communist is slightly better than a 'fellow traveller'. The Communist has the courage of conviction whereas the fellow traveller has not that. I would rather deal with the Communists than with their 'fellow travellers'.

SHRI RAMA RAO (Madras): Socialist ideals.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I know he is a good man. The hon. Members were speaking about the British influence in commercial fields. The British influence in the intellectual field is also fairly strong as my hon. friend Mr. Rama Rao is so obsessed with the ardent duty of quoting the English prose of the 19th century and when he does so he forgets everything else. It is only its beauty and verbiage that carries him in its momentum to a thing which is neither logical nor predestined, where he wants to go. Well,

this is journalistic adventure in the arena of tea and when journalists have no leading article to write they will write something about other things, and Mr. Rama Rao had to say something and he has said it. Unfortunately Mr. Rama Rao has condemned a constitution which he had no time to read. That is sometimes the case that journalists are saying that the press is so overwhelmed. Perhaps they are so overwhelmed that they sometimes say things which they do not mean and sometimes mean something which they do not say.

SHRI RAMA RAO: You cannot dismiss yourself cheaply, Sir.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Then I come to Mr. Kishen Chand's speech. I am rather fascinated by Mr. Kishen Chand's speech because he balanced himself on two desks and it is a feat in which I rather envy him but I am afraid that his intellectual feats are beyond balance. He would support the principle of the Bill but he won't support the purpose behind it. Well, he said one thing with regard to which I am very grateful to him. He gave an idea as to how this Board is to be composed. I think he must have spent the whole of last night over it. He gave me a formula that 40 per cent. should be represented by the tea planters and tea labour, 40 per cent. by somebody else and 20 per cent. by somebody else. But I had been proposing that so far as the labour and the tea planters are concerned I was thinking of a little higher representation but anyway I am grateful for any suggestion of a concrete nature that comes from hon. Members. Of course he said that the present time is opportune for nationalising the tea industry. Why it is opportune and how we could do it he did not suggest.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take the lesson from Iran.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I have no intention of flattering anybody by imitating.

Then, Sir, Prof. Mookerjee gave the history behind this industry and the

special features which were very helpful. The one suggestion he did make was in regard to the I.T.A. about which I have dealt. It could not take up any more as it had already many laying ducks. It cannot manage any more. We have some other body for this.

Mr. Misra was helpful. He could have been a little more effective but I am grateful to him for all the suggestions that he made. He also raised the question of the venue of tea auctions which was also raised by other Members.

Sir, I would ask hon. Members, when considering the question of having all tea auctions here to consider the very valuable point made by my hon. sister at my back, Mrs. Das, that is, the question of warehousing facilities. They are inescapably interlinked. Supposing we decide, by a stroke of the pen, that all auctions of tea are to be conducted in Calcutta, when we have such a lot of stock on hand, what can we do without warehousing facilities? It is not a question of prestige. When we do have some auctions conducted in Calcutta, it is not very difficult to have the whole of them here, provided it is proved that the auctions conducted in London are operating to the detriment of the economy of our country. I do not see that we have had any proof. And it is only partial; it is not complete. If all the auctions were conducted in London, the hon. Minister's case would be strong. We can't do it here. We have so many bottlenecks, especially warehousing. Again if we had all the auctions held in Calcutta, the prices may be depressed further and the planters will come forward and say: "Please do not have the auctions all in the same place". It will be easier in the case of the tea industry in Cochin where the quantum of production is small. In fact the bulk of the tea produced in Cochin and in Nilgiris is auctioned in Cochin; of course, the higher grade tea goes abroad. So it is really not a matter of prestige, but a matter of convenience. It would, at the present moment, be inconvenient and detrimental to the tea

industry to abandon, or abolish by law, the auctions that are held in London.

Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Mr. K. S. Hegde for his support. Of course, he tried to answer the Opposition, but that he does as a member of the Party. It is for him to do that, but so far as the general support he gave to the Bill is concerned, I am grateful to him. He also high-lighted the point that the Congress Party do not yield to any other political or pseudo-political organization in so far as the labour interests are concerned. Primarily we are here to serve the common man and labour happens to be the bulk of that category. There is no use somebody trying to run away with our clothes even when they happen to be on our body. Well, Sir, the trouble about it is this. I have been around the country recently and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will know that the people are not entirely behind him. I visited about 80 villages and I found—this is what they did—they put up their flags on tamarind trees.

SHRI B. GUPTA: When you went to Calcutta the British merchants rallied round you. We know that. We saw the people behind you. They were all white.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Well, Sir, if my hon. friend descends to abuse, well, I can't meet him on that ground.

Then, Mr. Chandra Gopal Misra or Gopal Chandra Misra mentioned.....

SHRI B. GUPTA: Try to get the names at least properly.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I am trying.....

SHRI B. GUPTA: You should know the names.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please do not disturb.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Mr. Chandra Gopal Misra—really, it does not matter what we call him. We may call him Gopal Chandra Misra.

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]

It would be equally good and he would not be offended. He is a gentleman of 78 and if for nothing else, whatever he says is entitled to our consideration, because of the range of his experience. But I am afraid he took away the ground from under my feet when he said that tea is bad; Tea Board is bad; Tea Bill is bad; Tea plantations are bad and everything connected with tea is bad. Then there is no common ground. He is 78, strong, virile, and vehement in his speech because he never drank tea. But I hope nobody will take his photograph and say: "Here is a man who never drank tea and so, don't drink tea". On the other hand,.....

SHRI C. G. MISRA: I used to drink tea sometimes when offered by my friends, but when I came to know that it was bad, I gave it up 30 years back.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Unfortunately there are some people like myself—I do not know many of the good things of life—while there are some people who taste these good things and ultimately give them up. That is a sort of *vanaprastha*. Having been a tea drinker before and now given it up, he feels that he is as good as a prohibitionist. All the same I have no doubt that his view is entitled to consideration. But so long as I am destined to hold charge of this Commerce and Industry portfolio, every article that sells is valuable to me; every article that gets foreign exchange is valuable to me. And if I can see more of that article, I will do propaganda, even though my friend the Professor from Assam does not like the word 'propaganda'. He feels it is something commercial, something Philistine. As I said, it is merely a matter of language.

SHRI C. G. MISRA: I beg to suggest that Government should try and obtain medical opinion on the merits and demerits of tea. This is my humble suggestion, Sir.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Maybe, he is perfectly right, but tea is not as bad as opium and we do not

propose to bring it under the Narcotic Drugs Convention. In spite of the fact that it contains caffeine, I do not propose to obtain medical opinion against tea, because I do want to sell it.

That takes me along to Prof. Bhuyan who wanted me to be liberal in permitting the opening of tea gardens. There is no difficulty at all. There is no restriction by the Indian Tea Licensing Committee. They have not even taken advantage of the permit system. It is just like export quotas. Our export quotas go up to 470 million pounds but we only export up to 420 million pounds. The restrictions really do not operate in practice. I shall certainly be willing to give instructions to the Tea Board to be as free as possible and to permit the expansion of gardens.

Sir, Mrs. Das with her intimate knowledge of the tea gardens in Assam gave some valuable suggestions and she referred to the Tea District Labour Act of 1932. I can concede that the Act of 1932 requires serious reconsideration. The circumstances are not exactly what they were at that time. It is really an Act relating to immigrant labour in the tea Districts of Assam. I shall certainly have this legislation examined and get into touch with the Assam Government if any changes in the Act are found necessary from the point of view of the Government of India Act. The other matters which she mentioned is the question of warehousing—whether we cannot get additional warehousing in Calcutta. The problem in Calcutta is overcrowding and I am not hopeful of anything big being done by way of additional warehousing immediately, but we shall persist in our attempts. She also mentioned about the transport bottleneck, a point also made by the hon. Mr. Misra—the younger Mr. Misra. He mentioned about the high rates of freight and some kind of concession which would operate to the benefit of the tea growers. That is a matter which has to be looked into. That is a problem which we have constantly been faced with. Every time the Railway administration do give us some concession, but it may be that they do not go far enough.

Sir, I am happy to see my hon. friend Mr. C. G. K. Reddy. I am grateful to him for the speech that he made, which, however devastating in its appearance, left no sting behind. It is a very general dissertation on the British element in this country which I have dealt with before. But it does not proceed from that very purposive and definite and fixed idea out of which it emanates from the hon. Members on his right. He is slightly more intellectual than purposive.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Certainly I have a purpose.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: It is relative. I think sometimes purpose is subordinated to the intellectual exhilaration that it provides my hon. friend.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: The hon. Minister is trying to divide the Opposition!

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: "Divide and rule" is not British: it is Kautilya's.

SHRI B. GUPTA: The hon. Minister has learnt it from the British.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: It is Indian. I did not go to Europe for education.

SHRI B. GUPTA: But the hon. Minister was in Lever Brothers. He got it right at home.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Let us not mention names. I could perhaps mention names equally unpalatable to the hon. Member.

SHRI B. GUPTA: The hon. Minister is not sparing. He need not bother about it. We do not have unpalatable names.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Now, to come to Mr. Reddy, he would insist upon my answering all his points, because last time my hon. colleague did not answer all his points, according to the hon. Member. I have got his speech here on the Industries

Development and Regulation Amendment Bill and all his points. I hope my hon. friend does not mistake me when I protest against what he said about officers of the Ministry playing the part of agents of the British. I know practically all the officers in my Ministry, and I could not think of anybody playing the part of an agent of the British in the organization. I would beg of the hon. Member not to make that statement, because it hurts people who are really doing a good job of work, and who are as patriotic as any of us. Possibly the Minister is pro-British and they have to carry out his orders, but I do not think anybody is doing that to favour anybody because it is a British firm. They have an objective view. Maybe, they are wrong. Maybe, they may differ from me. Maybe, my officers and I may differ from the hon. Member.

SHRI B. GUPTA: The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: The hon. Member sometimes has the capacity for making most reasonable remarks.

My hon. friend Mr. Reddy—to go back to him in spite of the irrepressible Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—referred to two cases, the Metal Box Company, and Balmer Lawrie's Tribeni Tissues. In one case, I have complete knowledge of the position. It is a matter that I have looked into very closely. The facts as given by my hon. friend are not quite correct. There are not very many units in this country which produce goods of the quality that the Metal Box Company produces. That is in spite of all my attempts to increase the allotment for other people. In spite of that, they are not able to manufacture goods of the quality which the Metal Box Company produces. The system of allotment is this: it is not by an outright allotment either on the basis of the rated capacity or otherwise, but on the basis of nomination. We cannot very well go and tell somebody to market his article in a container which is not attractive, merely because he or somebody has got to be

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]
 kept in business. I have been trying to get all these people together so that at least there will be ten or twelve different firms who can produce goods of quality. Our difficulty was to get together all these people. They are not prepared to come in together and improve their quality. I do not think any blame attaches to this company merely because more nominations come to it. Today the position with regard to tin-plate is such that we can supply anybody what he wants. But if other people will not take advantage of it, we cannot help. So, I think there my hon. friend is not quite correct.

With regard to Balmer Lawrie, some more information was given by my hon. friend himself after my answer. I do not think that the fear that he entertains would be substantiated. In fact there is no denying that the set-up of the cigarette industry is such that the dice is loaded on one side. But I do not think this would be the means of the dice being loaded further. I do not think that the Development Wing are at all responsible for the business of this concern. Of course when we have to deal with foreign concerns—British, European, etc.—what we want is labour to be employed, production to be maintained, and certain conditions to be fulfilled, and all these things are being rigidly adhered to. I would beg of the hon. Member to draw my attention to any case where any special preference is given to any foreign unit as against an Indian unit. On the other hand, a member representing an Indian commercial organization told me: "Your Ministry is going a little too far and a little too fast in this direction of equalising the position". He may be right, or he may not be right. At the present the Ministry might be charged with perhaps showing more zeal in one direction rather than in the reverse direction. I know that I can depend on my hon. friend to be fair, but I would ask him to exercise his usual fairness even in this regard.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: My intention was only to warn the hon. Minister

against complacency—against what I fear to be his complacency.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I am grateful for such warnings at all times. After all, one has always to be prodded, to be kept away from lapsing into a mood of somnolence, which, I think, is more or less akin to complacency. But I think he is doing me less than justice if he feels that I am complacent. If he says that I am less intelligent, that is between me and my Maker.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Not at all.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I have that intelligence which my Maker has endowed me with. But I must persist in telling the House that my zeal is not much less than anybody else's in the direction of improving the economy of this country. The only trouble is that my hon. friend looks at isolated cases, but I have got to take a panoramic view. My ultimate purposes are such as my hon. friend is not burdened with. When my hon. friend comes to my seat—it may be that I will not be in the House at that time: I certainly hope to be dead—but when he comes here to this seat, he may think, "After all, this fellow had not been doing badly". I leave it at that.

The hon. Member thinks nationalisation is called for. We agree to differ. I do not think it is called for. But on one question I would like to deal with the hon. Member. I think I can deal with him without giving any offence. He mentioned that the nomination of the firms was a retrograde step. That is the trouble. That is where his friends on his right score. Their purposes are clear and definite, and they ruthlessly proceed to their objectives. They will make use of the interests if they want to make use of them. If they want to drop them, they will drop them. Neither sentiment nor any intellectual, rational approach to a problem deters them from going ahead to get what they want. Means do not at all matter. Ends are what they have in view. My hon. friend is

an intellectual, and that is why at one step he says, "Nationalise", at another he says "Do not allow the interests to come in", and at the third he says, "These interests must be represented, because this is democracy". I humbly differ, because democracy is a thing which, as I said in the other House some time back, is not democracy for vested interests. Democracy is democracy for the adult voter, the common man. When you say that democracy is made up of representation for the various degrees of interests, they may have categories undoubtedly, but it is not democracy. Of course it may be a type of functional Government; maybe a guild system that obtained in the mediæval age, but it certainly is not democracy. That is a thing that is usually flung at our heads by the Chambers of Commerce. They say: "Well, in this age of democracy, in this age of adult suffrage, you deprive the Chambers of Commerce of their own". Well, I do not think that is democracy—a few people joining together for the community interests. Oftentimes, their interests are against the Government, against the labour and the forces that keep them together disappear after some time. Well then they quarrel among themselves and there are the competitive forces that come into play. Well, if the hon. Member means they are the democratic forces, then the Chamber of Commerce.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I am sorry, Sir, he is not being very fair to me. I have said that the composition of the Board should be such that there should be weightage against the vested interests. That must also be taken into consideration.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I am proceeding to that. Well, Sir, he referred to the Coffee Board. What is the Coffee Board today? The Coffee Board is a Board representing producers, big producers mostly. They fix the price. They have got the Price Fixing Committee. They fix the price on the basis of the least economic units. The coffee producer gets four or five times his cost of production and that is the position that my hon. friend wants to crystallise here.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I am sorry, the hon. Minister is mistaking me. It is rather unfair to me. I have said: "You compose the Board in such a manner that you give a weightage against the vested interests. I hold no brief for the Coffee Board. The present composition of the Coffee Board is definitely detrimental to the interests of the consumer and the people. You change the composition but do not change the system of representation."

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: You cannot have categories. After all these people are representing their bodies and what I propose to do is this. I have mentioned it at the outset; I suppose my hon. friend was not in the House. I do not know who the people are who represent labour. Maybe, I may nominate Mr. Mazumdar because I know he is interested in labour. But beyond that I have no knowledge. The rules provide for representation of the relevant bodies in each category. There are panels to be sent for consideration. Now, Sir, what will happen if I get the Board crystallised in the manner in which it now runs? I have got to over-rule what they do. In fact a regular tug of war goes on between the Government and the Board. So, as I said, I would like to have the necessary rules framed and if my hon. friend has any suggestions to make, they will be considered and if any changes could be made, I shall make them. That will give the picture of the composition. He finds, Sir, that I have changed away from the old system but I have done so merely because it is in the interest of the industry itself.

Sir, I believe, I have more or less tried to deal with some of the salient points touching the Bill. Well, the general scope being limited, I must confess, Sir, that at the moment I am not prepared to go any further. But I have to consider perhaps whether we should have a little more power compelling the States to do particular things. The Board will have to be a little more active than it was in the past, and we do want the Board to take a lively interest in the industry.

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]

I shall not hesitate, Sir, to say that there are certain States which are standing in the way of progress. And I have to justify every power that I take. And I can certainly assure the House that the ultimate objective is retarded by lack of power.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the control by the Union of the tea industry, including the control, in pursuance of the International Agreement now in force, of the cultivation of tea in and of the export of tea from, India and for that purpose to establish a Tea Board and levy a customs duty on tea exported from India, as passed by the House of the people, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. Clause 2. There is an amendment.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, I move:

"At page 1, line 14, after the words 'tea industry' the following words be inserted:—

'and should institute a national enquiry to find out how the domination of British capital in this industry is acting to the detriment of India's national interests and to exercise the control in the light of that enquiry with a view to safeguard national interest.'"

Sir, I want to speak on this amendment.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI:

I may tell the House here that hon. Member's amendment can mainly find a place in any other portion of the measure but not in this particular clause, i.e. clause 2, because there is an obligation laid upon the use by item 52 of List I in the first Schedule of the Constitution. We have to use the wording of that particular item and we cannot go

beyond it. The Declaration here follows the pattern laid down by the Constitution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How is it relevant?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, it is quite relevant and I have no objection to its being placed in any other place, if the Government is willing to accept the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyway, it cannot be under clause 2, because it is a Declaration which is to be made according to item 52 of the Seventh Schedule.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Then it may be included in some other clause.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is for you to find out. It is not for the hon. Minister or for the House to suggest where it is to be included. Anyway, it cannot be under clause 2.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: However, Sir, may I make my observations?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only as regards relevancy. It is not relevant. I rule it out of order.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Madras): Still he can speak on it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not on the amendment.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Still he can move and speak on it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But I have ruled it out of order.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: The clause itself is under discussion, and he can speak on it.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, as regards control I have already made my observations. I feel that it is absolutely necessary to institute a national enquiry into the different aspects of the tea industry. The acceptance of this proposition in the form of an amendment will give the Government

a chance to prove the sincerity of their professions. I have listened to the bellicose speech of Mr. Hegde and the cynical speech of the Commerce Minister. It shows that they find themselves in a tight corner and see that the mask is taken off their policy and that is why they take up this offensive tactics in defence. I do not want them to commit themselves to anything beforehand. Let there be an enquiry about which there have been demands from numerous organizations from public platforms, even in this House and in the other House and from all sections of the labour movement. Let there be an enquiry and let the facts be found out. Then there will be no scope left either for my hon. friends to challenge my figures or for me to go on saying that these figures are absolutely correct. If the enquiry is conducted in a proper manner, the real facts will come to light and then Government can take proper steps. So, I insist that the Government should accept this either in the form of amendment or in any other form. Accepting this proposition should prove their sincerity.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I have dealt with this suggestion before and there is nothing more to add to it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are no amendments to clause 3.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are three amendments to clause 4 by Mr. Mazumdar.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, I move:

"That at page 3, line 5 be deleted."

"That at page 3, line 6, after the words 'internal traders of tea' the

words 'including small traders of tea' be inserted."

"That at page 3, after line 12, the following Explanation be added, namely:

Explanation.—In appointing persons who are in the opinion of the Government capable of representing persons employed in tea-estates and gardens, care will be taken to see that at least one representative from each of the four Central Labour Organisations, namely, the A.I.T.U.C., U.T.U.C., H.M.S. and I.N.T.U.C., will be included in the list of such persons'."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendments moved:

"That at page 3, line 5 be deleted."

"That at page 3, line 6, after the words 'internal traders of tea' the words 'including small traders of tea' be inserted."

"That at page 3, after line 12, the following Explanation be added, namely:

Explanation.—In appointing persons who are in the opinion of the Government capable of representing persons employed in tea-estates and gardens, care will be taken to see that at least one representative from each of the four Central Labour Organisations, namely, the A.I.T.U.C., U.T.U.C., H.M.S., and I.N.T.U.C., will be included in the list of such persons'."

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I am not going to take much of the time of the House, but on amendment No. 1 I would like to say a few words. So far as my information goes, there is no necessity to provide for tea growers and manufacturers separately, because the growers are the manufacturers of tea. As regards the blenders, I think they are included in (d) dealers, including both exporters and internal traders of tea.

As regards amendment No. 2, I would mention that small traders should be specifically mentioned because the small traders are very much affect-

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]
ed due to the recent slump in tea prices. They have their specific grievances and specific problems and therefore it is absolutely necessary that they should be given separate representation.

As regards the explanation, if tea garden labour is to be properly represented, then it is absolutely necessary that representatives of the four Central Labour Organisations should be associated with it. They may be nominated by the Government, but at the time of the nomination, I demand that the Government should consult each of the four labour organisations. Another point also comes to my mind. In making the nominations, I want that there should be no discrimination against any labour organisation. I have my apprehensions regarding that point also because my hon. friend has said that the Communist Party has insignificant influence among the tea garden labour. I challenge that statement. It is the Communist Party of India who took the initiative in organising the tea garden labour movement and succeeded in securing some rights for them. If in some places the trade unions under the influence of the Communist Party have lost some influence, it is because of the repressive policy carried out against them. Still I am not going to quarrel over representation. Our stand is that for the proper safeguarding of the interests of labour, we are prepared to join hands with all those who are really interested in labour. That is why we want that the representatives of the four Central Labour Organisations should be included.

SHRI S. P. DAVE (Bombay): I want to oppose the last of the amendments, which is introducing a novel feature in regard to the representation of labour. The policy of the Government has so far been to give representation to the most representative organisation in a particular area or industry or region. I do not mind whether it is the A.I.T.U.C., the U.T.U.C., the H.M.S. or the I.N.T.U.C. Personally I belong to the I.N.T.U.C. I would have no quarrel

with the Government nominating that Union's representative in a region where that institution has the most representative character. Merely to assert that the I.N.T.U.C. exists at a particular place or industry without having any membership and claiming representation on that basis is something ludicrous and absurd. Whom do they represent? Sir, the Government reports are there and they will show as to who represents the tea workers in the Assam gardens, in South India and other places, in whatever regions the tea gardens exist. Let the most representative union be asked to represent the workers. That is the general principle that the Government of India has been following both nationally here and in the international conferences. In the I.L.O. it is those people who represent the Indian workers who are the most representative of them. It is a well-known fact that the I.N.T.U.C. has a membership of over 1½ millions, and they have sent their delegation there. This amendment is against the accepted policy of the Government.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: So far as the first amendment is concerned, there are about three big manufacturers and quite a large number of small manufacturers. I think under the new provisions of excise duties there are about 300. So, there is no use my hon. friend thinking merely of Liptons or Brooke Bonds. There are other people as well, and they have to be given representation.

So far as the question of big traders and small traders is concerned, it has also been a matter of policy with the Government to give representation in all bodies not only to the big people but also to the small people. I think in the Import Advisory Council and in the Export Advisory Council the Federation had about 8 seats or something but it has come down to 2, because the Secretary of the Federation happens to be a Member of Parliament. The bigger people are getting smaller representation.

With regard to the explanation, Mr. Mazumdar will perhaps remember that

in the reply I gave in the other place I had proposed to ask the relevant bodies to send up a panel of names from which to choose the labour representatives will be fairly easy.

These are bodies that are actually associated with the tea labour. If anyone is not associated with the tea labour, then the point of my hon. friend is quite right that a body should not get representation merely because it is a body which is representing labour as such. That might come in under the general category. I might nominate a person as a Member of one of these bodies who has not got any representation in tea labour and put him as a general category but so far as tea labour is concerned all bodies which are in the tea industry will be asked to send representatives and I shall not make any discrimination. I gave that assurance that the panel will come from the Unions concerned from each area and we shall take any other person if by chance anyone is left and we feel that it is necessary in the omnibus category (h). I think the hon. Member will accept the explanation which I have given in the other House and I hope he would not press his amendment.

So far as the first amendment regarding the manufacturers of tea is concerned, there will probably be two seats, one for a bigger man and one for a smaller man and I shall see to it that some trade union is included. We found a great deal of difficulty because small traders are not organized. We shall make an attempt to bring in a small man because we know the difficulties of small men. I accept the principle of it but I don't think it is necessary to accept the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 3, line 5 be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 3, line 6, after the words 'internal traders of tea' the words 'including small traders of tea' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That at page 3, after line 12, the following Explanation be added, namely:

Explanation.—In appointing persons who are in the opinion of the Government capable of representing persons employed in tea-estates and gardens, care will be taken to see that at least one representative from each of the four Central Labour Organisations, namely, the A.I.T.U.C., U.T.U.C., H.M.S. and I.N.T.U.C., will be included in the list of such persons."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 5 to 9 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we come to clause 10.

Motion moved:

"That clause 10 stand part of the Bill."

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I move:

"That at page 4, line 36, after the words 'incentives for workers' the words 'ensuring a minimum living wage, security of service, full trade union rights and stoppage of evictions of labourers' families from the gardens and estates' be inserted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment moved:

"That at page 4, line 36, after the words 'incentives for workers' the words 'ensuring a minimum living wage, security of service, full trade-union rights and stoppage of evictions of labourers' families from the gardens and estates' be inserted."

The clause and the amendment are for discussion.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I again say that the acceptance of this amendment or otherwise will prove the sincerity of the Government as regards this provision regarding labour. I would be prepared to give credit to my friend the Commerce Minister for human tears for labour if this amendment is accepted and put into practice. Tea garden labour is in a special position. They are composed of aboriginal people and they are living under slave labour conditions. They are isolated from the public and till now Trade Union organisers have no right of access to them. The right was given under the Plantation Labour Act but the Act has been put in cold storage. When the union organisers went inside the gardens—it was even admitted by the Rege Committee—they were assaulted by the hirelings of the planters. This scandal should be removed. This is a blot on the face of Mother India, that a large number of people are working under conditions of slave labour. They must have trade union rights, security of service and stoppage of eviction. The plantation labour is recruited on the basis of families and they live for generations there. They are given houses. I have not the time to dilate on this but if anyone of the family is unfortunate enough to incur the displeasure of the manager or to take initiative in any trade union organisation, at once on the slightest excuse, he is dismissed and immediately he is asked to leave the garden which means eviction of the whole family and that

is going on still. A case has been filed before the Industrial Tribunal in Darjeeling where for the supposed fault of one member of the family, the whole family was asked to leave the garden. If they are not willing to leave the garden, force is applied on them. Legal enactment is absolutely necessary in order to stop this eviction of families.

As regards assuring minimum wages, even now, after all the inquiries, the total earnings of labour does not exceed Rs. 21 per month including all the concessions and it is known that in the tea gardens due to malnutrition and illhealth, absenteeism is prevalent and so they cannot work even for 20 days in a month. So their wage is very low. For this reason it is absolutely necessary that there should be minimum living wage. A minimum wage was fixed but recently it has been revised and there has been 20 to 40 per cent. cut in the wage of the labour. So I again say that my hon. friend the Commerce Minister waxed eloquent on political exploitation of labour. As he had no arguments to answer my facts and figures, he resorted to this calumny but what I am interested in is the benefit of the labour. If my friend comes forward and accepts this amendment, then I shall be prepared to give him credit for human tears for the labour.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: My hon. friend said that it is a question of sincerity. The trouble is my hon. friend has not been long here and has not looked into the Minimum Wages Act, the Employees Insurance legislation and the Plantation Labour Act. Actually, if we have to include these, then we have to say notwithstanding anything contained in these Acts etc. We are not supposed to give the Board powers to supersede the existing enactments. The law will take its own course because we have the legal enactment practically for everything here and there is no point in adding to the functions of the Board where generally the Board has powers. Obviously I cannot accept the position that I am to accept whatever my hon. friend says

even though it is not entirely relevant just because I am sincere. The relevancy of any particular provision has got to be given some consideration and I do maintain that these provisions are there in the existing enactments and if only they are properly utilised, then all these conditions will follow. There is no point in putting it in here where legally you cannot put it in unless you say 'notwithstanding anything contained in those Acts, the Board shall be entitled to this and that.' You are not contemplating giving this Board any power in supersession of the powers that are enjoyed by the Government under the various Acts, either by the States or the Central Government. I maintain that you cannot possibly put in even though I stand the risk in the eyes of the hon. Member of being 'proven insincere'—I would not like it and it is not a thing one likes it but the point is my hon. friend probably has not considered whether it is relevant to the clause or not.

SHRI B. GUPTA: May I know if there is any law stopping eviction?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, I submit it is relevant because.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is all right. The amendment is admitted. Shall I put it to the House?

The question is:

"That at page 4, line 36, after the words 'incentives for workers' the words 'ensuring a minimum living wage, security of service, full trade union rights and stoppage of evictions of labourers' families from the gardens and estates' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 10 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 10 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are no amendments to clauses 11 to 51.

Clauses 11 to 51 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

SHRI B. GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, when we listened to the speech of the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry we felt he was more concerned with his anti-Communist assignments that emanate from quarters which can easily be imagined than with the portfolio of his Department. He did not care to answer any of the points we had raised—and we had raised many points. Instead of doing that, he sought to pour ridicule, indulge in rather cheap sarcasm and demonstrated a kind of cynicism which is understandable from those people who journey from big business into politics. Now, it is very difficult for us to think that these measures, even though in principle we support them, would be utilised for the benefit of the country, or of the labourers or of the tea industry. We heard a speech by the hon. Member Shri Hegde and he cared only to attack us and this has revealed the actual state of affairs in the Congress mind. He did not miss an opportunity of returning to the old anti-Communist vomit and he again tried to say things which are not history. He said the Communist Party did this and that during the war. But he forgot that four Communists.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, please come to the Bill.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I am coming to it, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All this is not necessary. Please speak on the Bill. Let us have something on the Bill.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, if it is not relevant.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will have other occasions.

SHRI B. GUPTA: If Mr. Hegde has been relevant in saying the most irrelevant things and if you pronounce me irrelevant, then I shall not answer him, since that is your ruling, Sir.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Please pronounce the name correctly.

SHRI B. GUPTA: The hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry should have taken our suggestions a little more seriously. We know that we have disagreements in many fields and on many matters; but at the same time, there has also been sufficient evidence in this House in the course of this debate that we on this side of the House have got a *modus vivendi* with some Members of the other side of the House. May be their accents are different, may be we do not use the same words; may be that some Members on the other side of the House have been accustomed to using words which they have got from the ministerial benches, may be that we take our words from the vocabulary of Indian patriotism rich, varied and glorious as it is, that we possess. But at the same time we have agreed on many points. It has been found necessary by all Members on both sides of the House that there should be control of the British, that there should be nationalisation of the British interests in the tea industry, that the British domination should be checked and controlled for the betterment of the industry and for the wellbeing of our people. I take it as a sign of a great beginning. I do not wish to provoke Congressmen because I believe and I sincerely say it that today or tomorrow, they will begin to see the light and they will be more pronounced than they have been in the course of this debate. But the hon. Minister did not care even to respect the feelings of his benches, and that has surprised me most. He treated them, those hon.

Members who spoke in the interest of the country as if they were children. He patronised them, he patted some on the back as if he was talking to the employees of a company as the chairman of the board of directors. He forgot that he was talking in the Indian Parliament. He forgets that points raised seriously have to be seriously answered. I think the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry has got sufficient education, and he cannot by any stretch of imagination, be regarded as an unintelligent person. But the trouble is that his intelligence has been much misused and misplaced. Therefore we have had an exhibition, we have had a demonstration, of misplaced and abused intelligence. But I think he should take counsel from his followers and he should have treated them a little seriously. He says no suggestions have come. Whenever we talk about the British, some people get irritated on the Congress benches—not all. Whenever we ask them to take control of the wrongful British possessions, to take control of the British interests in these industries, some people feel the pinch very much—not all. That has been our experience. But we know that the time will come when people who are becoming articulate on the Congress benches will compel the Minister to change his ways.

This Bill will be passed now, we know, and though it contains some provisions which can be used to some extent for the benefit of the industry and the people, this can only be done if the Minister in charge of this particular department loves the people more than he hates the Communist Party and the working class. This is what I want to make clear here, because he is so much vitiated in his thoughts, he is so vitiated in his ideas. Even when hon. Members make suggestions, suggestions that transcend all party considerations, which beckon to the people to act together, he reacts to them in a manner most unworthy of the Minister of a great country, most unworthy of a great people. Now, we want him to change his ways.

I have mentioned Mossadeq as a very weak person and he is doing things in his own way. If we had been there we would have done things in a different way. But it seems our Ministers, at least the Ministers for Commerce and Industry, is more cowardly than Mossadeq.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Mr. Gupta, please withdraw the word "cowardly."

SHRI B. GUPTA: He is not half as bold as Mossadeq.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please withdraw the word "cowardly."

SHRI B. GUPTA: I withdraw it Sir, if that is your ruling. I withdraw the word and say that he is not half as bold as even little, weak-kneed Mossadeq in this matter. And that is where the trouble is. This is not the way you are going to help us. Several things have been said. He refers to Communist traps and says that the industrialists are falling into the Communist trap. I should have thought the capitalists are a little more intelligent, more shrewd and a little more worldly wise. They do not walk into traps so easily as you imagine. But if the capitalists are making some demands now, if Indian businessmen are demanding certain measures and offering certain suggestions, it is because the crisis has hit even them. Today they want to get their grievances redressed by the Government in which at one time they had pinned their faith. But now the hon. Minister turns against even the capitalist class and he delivers a regular lecture to them.

I do not know whether the capitalist class will provide him with cash for fighting the election but I do know, Sir, that the Indian capitalist class will press on these demands in their own way because it is to their interest.

Now, about labour and other things, he has said that we have gone to the labour with certain political motives. We have nothing, no other interest

apart from the interests of the working class and the people and we would not be what we are if we had not been serving their vital interests. He has said that he has seen that we have no following. I have seen him. He went to Calcutta and did not dare to appear on any public platform but was surrounded by Britishers, Members of the Chambers of Commerce and did a good bit of hobnobbing with them. I invite him, throw a challenge, let him come to Calcutta and face any public meeting and say what he has been saying here and he shall be able to see how the people ~~to~~ react to it. He says nationalisation is something which is not important, not necessary. Very well. If you think that the country does not want it, come out on this question, hold a referendum on it and if the country says, the people, including the Congressmen say, that nationalisation is not necessary, we shall retrace our step, we shall come here and apologise to this House. I know even a Congressman in the villages, in the districts, in the tehsils, when he is called upon to express an opinion freely and secretly will unquestionably and unreservedly declare that the British interests should be taken over. Don't raise the question of technicalities. We know there are difficulties; we sympathise with those people who are overwhelmed with those difficulties but the time has come when they must make attempts to reorientate our outlook. Time has come after five years from August 1947.....

(Time bell rings.)

.....to do a little bit of heart-searching.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, leave two or three minutes for the Minister. We have to close at 12.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Now, Sir, the hon. Minister spoke in a provocative manner. Provocation is his....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: And you more than that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Mr. Saksena.

SHRI B. GUPTA: I do not speak provocatively; it is the Congress Members and still more the hon. Minister. Therefore, I am trying to talk, not to provoke.

(Time bell rings.)

The hon. Minister's assurance is nothing until and unless this mentality is given up, until and unless he rises above these things

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time is up.

SHRI B. GUPTA:and nothing will have come out of it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any reply?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: No, Sir, I referred to the hon. Mr. Gupta, as having modelled himself in Cicero; I forgot he could play the part of Mark Antony. I think he acted as Mark Antony would have acted under present circumstances.

There is a story. Two children quarrelled and one beat the other. The other child said "Come to my house. My father will beat you". This is what Mr. Gupta says: Come to Calcutta. I will throw stones and show black flags.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Not at all.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I might go to Calcutta, but, that has no relevancy to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE VINDHYA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (PREVENTION OF DISQUALIFICATION) BILL, 1953

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS AND STATES (DR. K. N. KATJU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to declare certain offices of profit not to disqualify their holders for being chosen as, or for being, members of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Vindhya Pradesh, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

Sir, it will be idle for me to pretend that this Bill has not been a matter of controversy in the other House and I imagine that hon. Members know all about its various provisions, and the various points which have clustered round it, but, it may be useful if I were to attempt to give, in a very short compass, the main points which arise because, there has been a great deal of dust which has been raised and which may cloud the issue unless we take care to see what the matter actually is.

Now, the Vindhya Pradesh Assembly consists altogether of 60 Members and at present there is a casual vacancy and the present strength is 59. Now, in April 1952, the Vindhya Pradesh Government thought.....

(The Vice-Chairman, Mr. K. S. Hegde in the Chair.)

.....it proper to form District Advisory Councils for the purpose of associating Members of the Legislature in the various ameliorative activities in every particular District.

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH (West Bengal): Were all those 60 Members associated like this?

DR. K. N. KATJU: All; every one and they made no distinction of party or group. In Vindhya Pradesh, they have eight Districts and in each District Advisory Council, Members chosen to the Vindhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly from that District, whether they were of this party or that, whether they were of the Scheduled Caste or