

it may make it better. But by restoring the old position I am not making any concession as regards representation so as to alter the complexion of the Licensing Committee. For that, I may have to come with an amendment of a much wider character.

Sir, I move.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR : Why not defer this Bill ?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI : It does not suit us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tea Control Act, 1938, as passed by the House of the people, be taken into consideration.

. The motion was adopted,

Clauses 2, 3, 4 and 1 and 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 : The question is :

That the Bill be passed. The motion was adopted.

THE RUBBER (PRODUCTION AND MARKETING) AMENDMENT BILL, 1952

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to move :

That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

Sir, this is a very simple measure. This is in response to a demand from the Madras Government that instead of one member of the Rubber Board which the Madras Government now nominates, they want the representation to be increased to two. And in ; 20CSD

framing the amendment the Government of India have taken care to see that one of the two shall be a non-official. There is nothing behind this. It is a very simple measure, and it is brought merely because the Madras Government felt that they would like to have more than one member there and the Government of India felt that it was reasonable.

Sir, I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

BABU GOPINATH SINGH (Uttar Pradesh):

बाबू गोपीनाथ सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में मुझे कुछ निवेदन करना है। प्रिंसिपल एक्ट (principal Act) के सेक्शन चार की ओर मैं सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। इस बिल में जब आप इंडियन रबर बोर्ड (Indian Rubber Board) के संगठन के सम्बन्ध में विचार करेंगे तो आप देखेंगे कि वहाँ १४ प्रतिनिधि पूंजीपति वर्ग के हैं, सरकार के ९ प्रतिनिधि हैं और श्रम वर्ग के केवल ३ ही प्रतिनिधि हैं। अर्थात् जब कि इस में १४ प्रतिनिधि मालिकों के हैं, तो केवल ३ प्रतिनिधि मजदूरों के हैं। पूंजी वर्ग के लोग इस बोर्ड में भांति भांति रूप में आते हैं। कहीं से यह प्रोड्यूसर्स (producers) के नाम से आते हैं, कहीं से ग्रोअर्स (growers) के नाम से आते हैं, कहीं प्लान्टर्स (planters), एक स्थान से यूनाइटेड प्लान्टर्स के नाम से और कहीं मैन्यूफैक्चर्स (manufactures) के नाम से आते हैं। फिर कहीं डीलर्स (dealers) के नाम से आते हैं और कहीं प्रोड्यूसिंग इंडस्ट्री (producing industry) के नाम से आते हैं।

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar) :

रुवाजा इनायत उल्ला : कहीं कम्यूनिस्ट के नाम से तो नहीं आते हैं ?

BABU GOPINATH SINGH :

बाबू गोपीनाथ सिंह : आप तजवीज कर दीजिये कि कम्यूनिस्ट भी हो जायें वे खुश होंगे, मगर मैं आप की तजवीज की हिमायत नहीं कर सकता। मेरा कहना केवल यह है कि किसी चीज के उत्पादन में मजदूरों का उतना ही प्रधान अंग माना जाना चाहिये जितना कि मालिकों का होता है। सन् १९५१ में इस बात के समझाने और कन्विन्स (convince) कराने की जरूरत नहीं रही कि मजदूरों की प्रधानता उत्पादन में उतनी ही है जितनी कि पूंजीपति की होती है। अब यह बात नहीं मानी जा सकती है कि उत्पादन में मालिकों का ही ज्यादा हाथ होता है।

हम को मजदूरों के हितों की रक्षा करना आवश्यक है और इसके लिये जरूरी है कि हम इस बारे में सतर्क और वाचफूल (watchful) रहें। हमारा और सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है कि देखते रहें कि मजदूरों के ऊपर किसी प्रकार का अन्याय तो नहीं हो रहा है। जिस बोर्ड में २६ आदमी हैं, उसमें १४ प्रतिनिधि तो मालिकों के हैं और केवल ३ ही प्रतिनिधि मजदूरों के हैं, तो यह अन्यायपूर्ण बात नहीं तो और क्या है ? इस का मतलब यह भी हुआ कि गवर्नमेन्ट और मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधियों को मिला कर भी, मालिकों के प्रतिनिधियों की संख्या ज्यादा है और इस बोर्ड के मेजर फ़ैक्टर (major factor) के रूप में रहते हैं।

इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि आनरेबिल मिनिस्टर इस बात का आश्वासन दें कि आगे जो जगहें केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधिकार में हैं, उनमें, मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधियों को रक्षा जायेगा

और भविष्य में गवर्नमेन्ट इस तरह का कम्प्रे-हेंसिव (comprehensiv) बिल लायेगी जिससे मजदूरों और मालिकों के प्रतिनिधियों में समानता हो जाय। इस मामले में मुझे और ज्यादा नहीं कहना है।

[For English translation, See Appendix II, Annexure No. 34].

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI : Sir, if I am able to catch the gist of what my hon. friend said, I think he is dissatisfied with the present representation on the Rubber Board. What he was saying was that there must be a labour representative on the Board. But the present amending measure is only in regard to accommodating the Madras Government because they have got only one member representing them and now we are increasing it to 2. We are also saying that one shall be an official and the other a non-official. If a labour representative comes on the Board, nobody would be more glad than myself. I do hope that my hon. friend would induce the Madras Government to nominate a non-official who is a labour representative.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) : Why does not the hon. Minister amend the Act ?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI : Yes, Sir. People from the other side can make suggestions. We can hear the suggestions. But we can only take what we can digest. I am afraid this suggestion we cannot digest.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar) : If the hon. Minister appreciates the viewpoint placed before the House just now by an hon. Member here, why should he not bring a comprehensive Bill in which representation to labour may be given due weight ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There is one amendment.

BABU GOPINATH SINGH : I am not moving.

Clauses 2, 1, the Title and Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI : Sir, I move that the Bill be passed.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I did not want to speak on this Bill at all because I do not know very much about rubber and things like that. But I must take this opportunity of requesting the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry to be a little more responsive to the criticisms that are being levelled against the Bill or against him. I think I am voicing the opinion of many Members on this side that the manner in which he tackles the Opposition is really most unfortunate. He seems to speak from great heights and it is most annoying to see him speak in that manner. I would like to say something about an hon. Member's suggestion about the inclusion of a labour representative. Now, Sir, the suggestion has been made and the amendment was also moved. (*Some hon. Members* : Amendment was not moved.) It was given notice of and we would have expected that some sort of an assurance would have come from the hon. Minister piloting this Bill that the Government would consider the suggestion and do something about it. Instead of that comes from the hon. Minister a very unsatisfactory—I would say very annoying—answer that this suggestion does not suit him etc., etc. and we will ask the Madras State etc. So I should like to take this opportunity of not only pressing that this matter may receive the Government's attention but also would earnestly request the Minister-in-charge of any Bill, especially the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry to be a little more—shall I say—responsive to criticism so that we will feel from this side of the House that the Government is indeed democratic, the test for which is that the Government tries to meet the points

that are made by the Opposition I must most emphatically protest against the manner in which he has been tackling the Opposition and the criticism that has been levelled against all the measures that he has been bringing before this House.

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not able to disagree with my hon. friend but at the same time I wish to make one suggestion. In the earlier days whenever the hon. Minister was not inclined to disagree with any suggestion that was made but a suggestion which can be enforced only by a State Government, it used to be the practice for him to send round the suggestion together with the opinion expressed by the Central Minister to the concerned State Government with the hope that the State Government would try to consider that suggestion as well as the view held by the Central Minister and if possible would give effect to it. I hope that my hon. friend the Minister-in-charge would pursue that practice.

Secondly, Sir, now that this point has been raised, I should also express a sense of dissatisfaction at the nonchalant manner in which my hon. friend seeks to deal with the Opposition. A suggestion was made just now but in reply he simply said that it does not suit them. Well during my experience in the Opposition for many years I have never had from a Cabinet Member any answer comparable to that to a suggestion made from the Opposition. We do not lose anything. My hon. friend does not stand to lose anything by spending a few seconds more and expanding his answer in such a way—cushion it—that it will make the people on the Opposition feel that the Government is responsive. You may have in the Government an awful majority but nevertheless there is a potential Opposition which seeks to replace the set of people on the Treasury Benches at a proper time. Therefore they should, I think, and it would be a good thing indeed for my hon. friends on the Treasury Benches to have that feeling in their mind that some day the Opposition—even if it does not come, to contain the same people

[Prof. G.Ranga.] that we have today but anyhow apart from the personal side of it— would come to replace them. There should nevertheless be an Opposition in the parliamentary system of Government. Therefore they should try to deal with the Opposition as they would expect to be dealt with if they were in Opposition.

That is the atmosphere, Sir, in which I hope my hon. friend the Minister in charge of this Bill should try to approach us.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : I would suggest, Sir, that the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We are at the third reading stage of the Bill. If you have got something relevant to the Bill, you can say that.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Let the hon. Minister for Industry and Commerce tell the House as a possible concession that he has no objection to asking the Madras Government to nominate a labour representative on this Board ? What does he lose by that ? Also in his method of answering, let him be a little more courteous. I would suggest to him that he should give an assurance to this House that while this motion will be taken and ultimately passed, he will use his good offices with the Government of Madras to see that a representative of labour, instead of an official, is nominated to this Board. That is all.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, I share the sentiments expressed by the previous speakers. It is really agonising to listen to the hon. Minister brush aside our suggestions. The various suggestions made from this side of the House may not be the dishes he likes but I can tell him that these dishes are better than the crumbs of the British. You have our dishes. If you want to be healthy, try to live on our dishes rather than on the crumbs that have been left for you by the British.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If you are speaking on the Bill, you can speak. But if you are going to repeat the same thing, I cannot allow it.

SHRI S. MAHANTY : Now so many speakers have spoken

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am sorry I cannot allow it any further.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am sorry that I have offended anybody in my answers. Perhaps that is my way of speaking. At the same time, I am glad, because it was rather a dull debate and I felt enlivened by hon. Members opposite. With regard to the remarks that fell from Mr. Ranga for whom I have great personal respect, I regret that he has made those remarks about my answers. Naturally, Sir, when you ask me to drop the Bill, what can be the answer ? "It does not suit me to drop the Bill." In this context it is neither impolite nor disrespectful to the Opposition, but my hon. friends must also realise that we have also tempers, though we do not abuse all the same. Mr. Rajah and Mr. Reddy call us names.....

(Shri CG.K. Reddy rose.)

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI : We are here to be called names by the Opposition. Whenever the Opposition chooses, it can call the Government names. Speaking about my replies I am not speaking from any height. I do not come from the tableland of Mysore but it is very much lower.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : With your permission, Sir. (Left the Chamber.)

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI : I think it is very unfortunate and I can understand. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may be getting up everytime saying anything that he is tempted to say. But that does not annoy me. That is the experience of Government in this House and elsewhere. Regarding the Government treatment of the Opposition, I think we are treating the Opposition very fairly. We are listen-

ing to their suggestions and we give a reply whenever a point has been raised on which we feel we should give a reply and we do not reply if we feel that it does not call for a reply.

In regard to giving this assurance, how can I ask the Government of Madras to do this ? We asked the Madras Government, "Please give us two members, one nominated non-official." They said, "Yes." Hon. Members suggest that a labour representative should be taken. Well, if the Madras Government so chooses, it is for them to do so. It will be impolite and disrespectful if I were to ask them to do this. Well, Sir, when the Act is amended, it will be the proper time if someone were to say, "Give labour some more representation." I think then we are bound to listen to them, but the Act is not being amended. It is for the State Government to do what they liked. My approaching the State Government to do this or that will be more discourteous than my telling my hon. friends opposite that I cannot accept their suggestions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill be passed. The motion was adopted.

THE INDIAN COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952

THE MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI C. D. DESHMUKH) Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to move :

That the Bill further to amend the Indian Companies Act, 1913, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

SHRI R A J A G O P A L NAIDU (Madras) : On a point of order. Sir, this was circulated as a supplementary list of business yesterday at about 5 p.m. and according to rule 121 of the Rules, of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, two days' notice is necessary. I will read the rule Sir. It says :

"On the day on which the motion for consideration is set down in the list of business which shall, unless the Chairman otherwise

directs, be not less than two days from the receipt of the notice, the member giving notice may move that the Bill be taken into consideration."

"Unless the Chairman otherwise directs". I do not think that the Chairman has directed in this particular case that two days' time need not be given to us. I request that some time should be given to us to consider the Bill that is being moved. I suggest that this can be taken up after item No. 5[^] has been disposed of, as item No. 6 or 7.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is under the direction of the Chairman that the papers have been circulated.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : I don't think the Chairman has directed that two days' notice need not be given.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): May I know whether the Chairman directed that, when the Bill was being circulated, two days' notice was unnecessary in this case or is it your pleasure just now, Sir, that we might proceed with it ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is under the direction of the Chairman that all papers are circulated.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Has the Chairman directed that the usual period of notice should be waived ? If he has not, then the House is entitled to 48 hours' notice. There is no reason why in this particular case more time should not be given. What is the reason for passing this Bill in such a hurry ?

SHRI C. D. DESHMUKH : I would suggest that I make my observations now. It is still 15 minutes to one and may be one or two other members also may make their observations. Then if you be good enough to relax the rules in regard to notice of amendments tomorrow, that would serve the purpose. Hon. Members can study the Bill in the meanwhile and maybe they might be assisted by such observations as might be made this morning.

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : That is all right.