

have become an inspector and drawing a pension of Rs. 400 or so. He came here only a few days back. During the last ten years after freedom, I have been communicating with the Home Ministry regarding him. His name is Professor Tarachand Gajra and two other political sufferers, Shri Thakurdas and Dr. Dayaram. They resigned their jobs in 1921 because Mahatma Gandhi wanted that people should leave the Government services. For the last ten years, I have been carrying on correspondence with the Home Ministry but nothing has been done. Rules are quoted. The political sufferers are in a very miserable plight and it is high time that we realised our responsibility towards them. What we Members of Parliament feel is indicated by our speeches and it is time that we did something substantial for them. That can only happen when the Congress Party unanimously told the Government that this matter must be taken up at the earliest possible moment and that every effort should be made to relieve the suffering of the political liberators of the country. They have done great honour to themselves and to the country for which they had suffered. I hope that we, or those of us who come back, will see that this will be the first act which our Government does by which we shall try to rehabilitate them and remove their grievances.

18.07 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

RULES COMMITTEE

SIXTH REPORT

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the Sixth Report of the Rules Committee.

RESOLUTION RE SCHOLARSHIPS FOR CHILDREN OF POLITICAL SUFFERERS—contd.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Distt.—Central): Sir, the time should

522 L. S. D.

be extended. We are so many Members who want to speak and participate. It is an important subject which concerns the whole of India.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I also want to make one request. Till now, there was not a single person who had opposed it. As far as this House is concerned, everybody has expressed himself in favour of it. So, the Minister may reply. Some time may be given for me to move my Resolution.

The Deputy Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): Opinions from more Members will also help the Government to formulate its policies.

Shri Raghunath Singh: We want to express our opinions and put forward some valuable suggestions. Therefore, we request that time should be extended at least by half-an-hour.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. How many hours had been taken?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: 2½ hours. Seven minutes were taken on that day. So, seven minutes should be left over to the other Resolution.

Mr. Speaker: If time is extended, the hon. Member will have to take his chance the next day.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: There is no chance. That is what I say. This is the last day on which the resolutions are to be discussed. On the 22nd, they cannot be discussed; that is why I say that this has been moved and discussed at least. I have no chance next time. I want a chance.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): It can be done unless of course they want to stifle the whole thing.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want to say that if the time is extended, the next resolution may be taken today. The next resolution is also important. I only want seven minutes. I have no objection if the House sits till 7-30 p.m. I only want seven minutes to which I am entitled. I would not insist on this but for the fact that this is the last session of this Parlia-

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

ment, perhaps, and I cannot move my resolution otherwise, and make my points on it.

Mr. Speaker: How long does the House want to sit?

Sardar A. S. Saigal: Up to 6-30.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Up to 7-30. Let them sit till 7-30. I have no objection.

Shrimati Shivrajvati Nehru (Lucknow Distt.—Central): Up to 6-30.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. Do the hon. Members want to carry on with this resolution till 6-30?

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Gopalan only wants to speak for a few minutes. So, I will close this debate at two minutes to 6-30 to enable Shri Gopalan to move his resolution. A few minutes here and there do not matter.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just want to place before this House one aspect. There may be difficulties for the Government to get at the exact import of the term "political sufferers". I should think that that aspect should not stand in the way of the Government granting whatever concessions that could possibly be given. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's resolution is of a very restricted scope, and it only wants to award scholarships to the children of political sufferers. I should think that he has been wise in restricting the scope of the resolution so that the Government may not find much difficulty in adopting it and then taking steps immediately for the implementation of the same.

When I just now looked through the subjects for which the various Ministries are responsible, I found that concessions to political sufferers come within the responsibility of the Home Ministry. It is because the question of scholarships is involved that perhaps the Education Ministry is represented and not the Home

Ministry. But I want to impress on this House that this is a subject which has to be tackled at the highest level possible and not to be ignored at all.

When we consider the scope of the term "political sufferers", I wish to bring within its ambit one class of political sufferers for whom concessions from the Central Government are not easily forthcoming. I mean the political sufferers of the erstwhile native States. We know that there were parallel political organisations in the native States. For the Congress also, there was a parallel organisation to carry on the struggle against autocratic rule. But those who suffered under the autocratic rule in the native States usually are not classed within the term of political sufferers when concessions from the Centre are extended. I just want to bring that aspect to the attention of the hon. Minister who is present here. If he is going to accept the resolution and take any steps, I should urge on the Government that the class of political sufferers whom I have mentioned should also be included in this term.

Mr. Speaker: I have found in the note made by the hon. Deputy-Speaker a number of names of Members who wish to speak. Those hon. Members who would like to speak may kindly rise in their seats. There are twelve Members. So, even at the rate of two minutes per head, we cannot conclude this debate at 6-30.

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move that the debate be continued for another one hour.

Mr. Speaker: Let us not force this to an issue. I suggest that this debate may be adjourned. Thus, we will have ample opportunity for all the hon. Members to speak next time. I can only say that this ought not to lapse. Full opportunities should be given to all Members and all sections. This is not confined only to the Education Ministry. This is more concerned with the Home Ministry.

The Home Ministry might certainly make a statement, taking all shades of view, and which will be binding. This will not lapse. This will be taken up at the next opportunity.

Shri Barman: I beg to move:
 "That the discussion be adjourned till the next Session."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:
 "That the discussion be adjourned till the next Session."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE NATIONALISATION OF TEA INDUSTRY

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore):
 I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that the predominant position of British Capital in the Tea Industry has proved detrimental to national interests and that the Tea Industry should be nationalised forthwith."

I am moving this resolution at a time when the Plantation Enquiry Commission has published its report. The findings of the Commission throw revealing light on the extent of the monopoly and control of the British capital in the tea industry, which is against the interests of our national economy. The report of the Commission places the British sector of the industry and trade in the dark. They have put the policy of the Government of India regarding the British capital to a crucial test.

For lack of time, I only want to point out the importance of the tea industry, as far as our economy is concerned. I will give some facts and figures from the report of the Commission. 46·2 per cent. of the world production of tea is in India. In respect of exports, 38·9 per cent. is from India. Out of our total exports worth Rs. 578·3 crores in 1954-55, tea alone accounted for Rs. 147·68 crores or 25·4 per cent. As

for employment, this industry employs 10 lakhs of people. If this industry is nationalised and expanded, certainly many lakhs of people can be employed in it. Not only that. It makes a substantial financial contribution to the Centre and to the State revenue.

I want to point out the condition of this industry today as it is left in the private sector, especially in British hands. Now the Britishers are more interested in developing this industry in East Africa. It is stated in the Commission's report that the Britishers are not replanting here, because they want to develop this industry in East Africa. According to the report, the industry has come to such a pass that if the 5,12,000 acres owned by non-Indian companies are not replanted and if 2,28,000 acres are not immediately replanted, the tea industry may not exist in 44 per cent. of the area in which it exists today. So, there will be not only no expansion of the industry, but even whatever is there will be destroyed. There is also another reason for the Britishers not replanting. If the production is less, then there will be more profit. So, in order to have more profit, they want to curtail production here.

The next point is that the continuance of the tea industry in private hands, especially in British hands, is against our social philosophy. Out of the total capital of Rs. 100·16 crores, the division between the non-Indian and Indian companies is as follows. The sterling companies and sterling proprietary companies account for Rs. 62·23 crores or 62·18 per cent. The non-Indian rupee companies and proprietary companies account for Rs. 16·37 crores, whereas the Indian rupee companies and proprietary concerns account only for Rs. 21·56 crores or 21 per cent. of the total amount. Out of the total investment of Rs. 100·16 crores, non-Indian holdings represent Rs. 72·32 crores and Indian holdings only Rs. 27·81 crores or about a quarter of the total investment.