



AITUC DIGITAL ARCHIVE - 2021

Folder Code: 2 File No. A1-256 S. No. _____

Digital File Code: _____

File Title: Proceedings of the 25th session of
AITUC

Year: 1957 / _____ / _____

Metadata:

Scanned:

Note: B

Name : Proceedings of 25th Session of AITUC

Address :

Subject :

From : 1957 To :

OFFICE FILE

NO. 405

Folder No-2
File No-X6

Diplomat™

PROCEEDINGS

OF

25th SESSION OF

A. I. T. U. C.

Ernakulam

1957

P r o c e e d i n g s

o f t h e

25TH SESSION OF

THE ALL-INDIA TRADE UNION CONGRESS

*

Ernakulam,
December 25 to 30, 1957

ALL-INDIA TRADE UNION CONGRESS
25th Session
Ernakulam
December 25 to 30, 1957

The Twentyfifth Session of the All-India Trade Union Congress began at 4 P.M. on December 25, 1957 in the Kerala Fine Arts Hall, Ernakulam.

The President of the AITUC, Com.V.Chakarai Chettiar, being unable to attend due to ill-health, Com.S.S.Mirajkar, Vice President, presided over the Session.

A message from the President was read on the occasion.

Com.M.M.Abdul Khader, Chairman, Reception Committee, in his welcome address, said that the trade union movement under the leadership of the AITUC has always been in the vanguard of the national liberation movement. It has not only taken a glorious path in the liberation of our country, but has always stood by the struggles of the working masses all over the world in the fight against colonialism and has stood with the people of Europe in the struggle against fascism.

The President of the Reception Committee said that within the country, the working class movement under the leadership of the AITUC has always stood in the forefront of the peace movement and he hoped, keeping with this tradition, this session will give a call for greater activity on the Five Principles of Peace.

In Kerala, the representatives of the toiling people have come into power. Efforts are being made, Com.Abdul Khader said, to dislodge this Government by unfair and undemocratic means and hence it is the prime objective of the trade union movement in India to see that this Government under the leadership of the working class is sustained in the State.

The President, Com.S.S.Mirajkar, then invited Com.E.M.S.Namboodiripad, Chief Minister of Kerala, to inaugurate the session.

Inaugurating the 25th Session, Com.E.M.S.Namboodiripad said:

Comrades,

I thank you sincerely for having given me this opportunity to associate myself as well as the Government of Kerala in this Session of the AITUC.

During the next five or six days, you will be deliberating on innumerable problems facing the trade union movement. I will just explain to you in brief what are the things the Government of Kerala has done during the last nine months, what we propose to do in future and what the problems we face are, and how we propose to overcome them with the full support and cooperation of the workers, peasants and other sections of the people.

The first and main thing we have done is that today there is a radical departure in the policy of the Government in relation to the struggle of the working people.

What had been happening so far was that whenever there had been a struggle or agitation of the workers or the peasants, these were sought to be settled through the intervention of the State machinery, particularly the police machinery.

Whenever there was a labour dispute, whenever the workers went on strike, the Government machinery that was set in motion was not the Conciliation Department of the Labour Ministry, but the police department, invoking sections 107, 144, etc. of the Cr. P.C. Thus the disputes were often accompanied by arrests, lathi-charges, firing, etc.

We are now trying to make a departure. I do not say that we have made a full departure from that policy. There are still shortcomings. But I want to tell you that we have made the first serious efforts to bring to the forefront of all sections of the people that such disputes are disputes to be peacefully settled by the conciliation machinery of the Government's Labour Ministry and not to be settled through police repression.

As a result of this policy, the working class in our State and the peasantry and other sections of the toiling people, and their organisations have gained in their bargaining capacity, and the possibility of their securing their legitimate demands through peaceful negotiations exists. Hundreds of industrial disputes which would otherwise have led to severe repression have been thus settled. I cannot say, all these settlements have been to the full satisfaction of the working class but I can claim that a big effort has been made to see that these disputes are settled as amicably as possible.

Together with this policy we have adopted in relation to such disputes - the policy of strengthening the positions of the working class, the peasantry and other sections of the toiling people, we have laid down that in the matter of industrial disputes, as far as possible, ~~the~~ it should be seen that the legitimate demands of the working class as has been laid down by the AITUC (most of which has the support of other trade union organisations as well) are secured to the utmost possible extent. Wage demands, bonus and other questions are sought to be settled on the basis of the general demands formulated by the trade union movement and in this, of course, the resolutions and policies of the AITUC have been the guiding line of our Government.

I do not want to go into detail as to how this has been brought about in industry after industry. I am sure, the delegates from Kerala would explain all this to you in the course of the discussions here. I want only to tell you that it has been, it is, and it will be effort of our Government to see that, to the utmost extent possible, the legitimate demands of the working people as laid down by the resolutions of the trade union movement, particularly the AITUC, are secured.

The third thing we are trying to do is that we have come to the conclusion that it is no more enough to settle individual disputes as they arise from time to time. We have come to the conclusion that a very serious effort should be made to solve these problems on an industry-wise and State-wise basis - problems ~~concerning~~ of wages, bonus, etc. (even bonus in those units which are running at a loss and those which are running at a profit). On all these questions and the basic question of relations between employers and employees, an effort has been made to see that a long-term agreement is arrived at.

I may tell you that we have succeeded in our efforts to bring the employers and the trade union representatives together to discuss and arrive at long-term agreements on issues such as wages and bonus as well as on a correct Grievance Procedure. It is being considered how workers' grievances should be attended to at the shop level, factory level and industry level.

With this Grievance Procedure, firstly, the worker can be assured that his grievances can be redressed. Secondly, the employers and the nation can be assured that stoppages can be minimised, if not eliminated. With this double purpose, a long-term agreement is being tried for.

This is of such a necessity since otherwise it is impossible for us to ~~at~~

us to advance the cause of industrialisation in our State. Why? Mainly because, for a State like ours, which is extremely thickly populated, where unemployment among the population is acute, it is of extreme importance that more and more industries are established, more and more employment opportunities are created, and that all existing units are maintained and further strengthened. This is as much important to the working class as the proper solution of questions of bonus and wages.

Under these circumstances, it is of tremendous importance to create a proper industrial atmosphere in this State. And particularly so, in a situation when the political opponents of our Government are attacking our labour policy according to which the working class is assured of its legitimate rights and interests.

Our political opponents are trying to popularise the idea that under this policy, there is no possibility of starting new industries. Their thesis is that the present Government's labour policy of helping the working class to secure its legitimate demands is a barrier to industrial expansion.

It is our firm conviction and I hope the AIFUC will agree with us that this is a totally fallacious argument.

Only by defending, maintaining and further strengthening the position of the working class, only by assuring the working class that any further increase in production will not be at their expense, not just to reap profits but will help the working people themselves to improve their living standards - such an assurance is a basic necessity for any plan of further industrialisation.

But if this is to become a reality, it is necessary that the trade union movement and we of the Government make our utmost endeavour to see that not only are individual disputes settled as and when they arise but a proper atmosphere is created for further industrial expansion - an atmosphere in which the working class is assured that their rights will be safeguarded and defended and the industrialist will be assured that they will be allowed to take a reasonable rate of profit.

With this idea we are trying to work out relatively long-term agreements. This we are trying to do in certain industries. And we are trying to bring the representatives of employees and employers at a tripartite conference. A tripartite conference was convened in November last at which a sub-committee was set up which is now trying to work out such a policy.

The fourth and last thing I want to tell you is that we feel that as a Government of the working people, it is one of our most important tasks to see that radical changes are brought about in the present administrative structure. Because we have inherited from the British Government, allied as it was with the feudal princes, a particular type of Government which is alien to the people, hostile to the people. A radical change in this system is a great necessity and this is a problem which we are attending to.

Our Government has set up a committee to examine the questions of administrative reforms. The Committee has already issued a questionnaire. But even the end of the work of this Committee will be only a beginning because this is an uphill task. We have no illusion that just by a report by the Committee, this Administrative machinery can be improved or reformed. It is a question of united struggle on the part of the people in which, of course, the trade union movement will have to play a vital part.

These are some of the basic questions we are trying to tackle. I hope in the discussions that would take place here, some of these problems will be posed, especially on administrative reforms and an industrial truce in which a proper atmosphere can be created for industrial expansion.

I hope that the results of your discussion will help us in the Government. With this hope, I have great pleasure in inaugurating this Session.

I thank you for giving me an opportunity to associate myself and the Government of Kerala with this session.

*

President, Com.Mirajkar, thanked Com.E.M.S.Namboodiripad, Chief Minister, for having delivered the inaugural address.

*

Com.S.S.Mirajkar then read the Presidential Address (See text)

*

After the Presidential Address, Com.S.A.Dango, General Secretary placed before the session the programme for the next five days. He said he will also introduce the fraternal delegates from the socialist and capitalist countries who have come to attend the session.

There was loud applause when Com.Dango stated that this was the first time that such foreign delegates came to attend the AITUC session. He remarked that there might as well be an applause for the Government of India for providing visas to the delegations and that this might indicate a change in the direction from the way the Government had been behaving so far. He hoped the change would be stable.

Com.Dango said that this session had fraternal delegates from socialist and capitalist countries and hence none could accuse the AITUC of being partial.

Of course, this session has got one more advantage, he said, and that was in a way unique. So long the AITUC had to hold its sessions without any minister gracing the occasion. For the first time in its history, a good minister of the working class opens the session and it is also very nice to find that "we meet in an environment where certain undesirable persons are not looking around." Com.Dango said the delegates can well imagine the occasion when about eight years ago, they had to meet with fraternal delegates from the police force protecting the session and protecting the country from their thinking! He added, here there is a situation where "there is no such fundamental contradiction between our presence and the Government of the State!"

Perhaps due to an underestimation on the expected participation of delegates in this session, some inconvenience had arisen to the Reception Committee. This underestimation he said was also shown in the shortage of delegate cards printed for the session. Com.Dango said, however, that this certainly showed that the AITUC is "not so strong" as the INTUC! And that will show how they stood in relation to the other friends too. The inconveniences therefore are inconveniences of growth, as the Prime Minister often remarks. On behalf of the Reception Committee, he said, he would apologise for the inconveniences caused but he felt things were not that bad.

Com.Dango then introduced the FRATERNAL DELEGATES - from Soviet Union, China, WFTU, Korea, France, Czechoslovakia, Vietnam.

Com. Dange then read the programme of the Session, for the day.

- 1) Messages received to be read before the session.
- 2) Greetings to the 25th Session by G. Casadoi, Secretary, World Federation of Trade Unions.
- 3) Announcements re. Credential Committee, etc.

Programme for 26th December:

Time - 9 to 12 a.m. and 8 to 6 p.m.

9 a.m. - General Secretary's Report

and after this, greetings from the leader of the fraternal delegation from the USSR.

There is no programme in the afternoon, to provide for translation of the report.

27th December

- greetings from the fraternal delegate from China.
- Discussion on the General Secretary's Report.
 - Greetings from French delegate.

28th December

- Greetings from Korean delegation
- Short conclusion on the discussions on the Report
 - resolutions.
- Greetings from Czechoslovak delegation, and Vietnam delegation
- Amendments to Constitution.

29th December

- Election of office-bearers and the General Council.

The President, S.S. Mirajkar, placed the programme for approval of the delegates and was unanimously approved.

*

Com. P. Dalachandira Menon read the messages received from:

- 1) All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, Moscow
- 2) All China Federation of Trade Unions, Peking
- 3) Yugoslav Trade Union Federation
- 4) Polish Trade Unions
- 5) F.D.G.B., Berlin
- 6) Shri V.V. Giri, Governor of Uttar Pradesh.

*

The following condolence resolutions moved from the Chair were adopted, all delegates standing in silence for two minutes:

- 1) On the death of Brother Giuseppe Di Vittorio
- 2) Comrade N.M. Joshi
- 3) Comrade S.P. Banerjee
- 4) Comrade Mrinal Kanti Bose
- 5) On Martyrs

The President then invited Comrade G. Casadei to greet the session on behalf of the UFTU.

COMRADE G. CASADEI read his message of greetings in French which was translated into English and other languages. (SEE TEXT)

*

Com. Dango then proposed the following names for the Resolutions Committee:

Com. Indrajit Gupta - Convener
Com. S. Y. Kollhatkar
Com. P. Ramamurti
Com. K. T. K. Tangamani
Com. Satish Lomba
Com. Raj Bahadur Gour
Com. P. Balachandra Menon
Com. Sailen Paul
Com. K. N. Joglekar - and four advisors:
- Com. K. T. Sule
Com. Jargolkar
Com. Vittal Rao
Com. T. C. N. Menon

The above proposed names were approved for the constitution of the Resolutions Committee.

*

The Session also approved the proposal made by Com. Dango to constitute the Credential Committee composed of the following comrades:

Com. H. C. Seldhar (Convener)
Com. S. Krishnamurthy
Com. Sudhir Mukhoti
Com. Chitnis
Com. S. S. Mirajkar

*

The President, Com. Mirajkar, then adjourned the session to meet again at 9.00 A.M. on 26th December 1957

SECOND DAY OF THE 25TH SESSION

December 28, 1957

Com. S.S. Mirajkar presided.

The proceedings began with a message of greetings delivered by Com. B.N. Ghosh, Secretary-General, National Federation of PSE Employees.

Greeting the session, B.N. Ghosh said, during the hard days the PSE Federation faced in July and August this year, it had the full support of the AITUC and hence the PSE Federation was indebted to the AITUC. He said this was not the first time that he stood before a session of the AITUC and referred to the days before the break in the trade union movement. He described in detail the period of heavy repression on the trade union movement from 1943 to 1951 but said that the AITUC and PSE trade unions have only emerged stronger.

The Secretary-General of the PSE Federation said there were reasons why it had to function independently, as is the case with other organisations of the Govt employees. He stated that there were people who had liking for particular trade union centres and in order to keep their solidarity, the Federation had been keeping themselves independent. But while functioning independently, he said, they were trying to follow the policy and programme of the AITUC. He listed instances, as in the Seminar on Workers Education, where the PSE Federation and the AITUC had identical viewpoints, and said, if there is anything good, he would not hesitate to support it.

B.N. Ghosh said the Government had once again thrown a challenge to the men of the public sector. He referred to the Government orders regarding non-recognised unions and particularly the Confederation of Central Government Employees. He emphatically denied the allegation made by Government spokesmen about the Confederation being a "political body" and said that the Confederation was composed of recognised trade unions of Government employees and hence no separate recognition is necessary. "We are determined to continue this Confederation, even if the Government does not like it," he added.

Since he, was one of the Vice Presidents and Com. Manna, another Vice President, being present this session, B.N. Ghosh said, the Confederation is also in a way represented at this session.

The Secretary-General of the PSE Federation strongly criticised the Government for denying the right of demonstration and agitation to its employees.

The interim relief, about which he was assured of "sympathetic consideration" by the Prime Minister, has been granted at only Rs. 5 and Com. Ghosh hoped the AITUC session would pass a resolution for the sanction of adequate interim relief.

It is only a temporary phase that his organisation was not affiliated to the TUC, he B.N. Ghosh said. He also referred to the experience he had with the TUI of Public and Allied Employees and said the TUI had sent a greetings to the last Federal Council meeting. He also spoke about the PTU, Vienna, where the Indian delegation which was wanted to move a resolution on Goa was not allowed to do so.

Com. Ghosh described the differences he had with Com. Dange in something which had arisen in the absence of adequate facts on each other's points of view. He concluded by saying "kindly take us as part and parcel of the TUC in India".

The President then invited Com. Dange to present the General Secretary's Report to the 25th Session.

COM. S. A. DANGE, General Secretary, before presenting the Report stated that he would like to clear one or two points.

He described the protest received about the delay in giving copies of the Draft Report as one which was thoroughly justified but he observed, the delay itself was justifiable considering the state of the organisational functioning. Com. Dange said the English practice of making available the relevant reports some two months before the session was worth emulating and he hoped "if all of us combine to make the organisation better, we shall be able to practise that method."

Referring to the problem of translating the reports into the different languages, he said amidst laughter, this could be possible only if the working class took possession of the Vigyan Bhawan by peaceful means! So in the absence of funds to pay hire the Vigyan Bhawan at 1000 rupees a day we and in the absence of taking over the hall peacefully, he jocularly remarked, the AITUC might as well evolve its own Vigyan Bhawan for the time being.

Com. Dange said it was certainly difficult to read and digest the report in a short time. He would put forward certain points and these points were already before the movement. "So I would request you to recall the experiences of the movement and in the light of that, let us discuss the report and come to conclusions."

"These points were discussed in the Working Committee and the General Council but that was not enough since it is the General Session which should approve all these policies.

"The report consists of 7 parts. The first part deals with the general problem of peace, socialism and national liberation. The second part is on our economy and the Plan - support to the Plan and criticism of the Plan and the tasks that follow. The third part deals with questions of wages and work and that our demands are in that respect. The fourth part deals with social security measures. The fifth is on trade union unity which is the main question in the struggle we have to carry forward. The sixth part deals with struggles and the lessons of struggles, while the 7th part deals nominally with the organisational question. We cannot go into details on organisation unless we have discussions. Then we have the conclusions which will outline for us the tasks.

Taking the first, the international and the national situation in general: The situation has changed very materially in the last two or three months. At the time of the Working Committee meeting, the situation was a different one. What is the main element of the change?

Not that the change is so radically different. For example, the question of peace and war. The common thread running for the last 10 years is that while there were small wars, peace has been advancing. We had before us however a question whether ultimately the capitalist group will win or the socialist camp will advance. And in this situation those who believed in socialism also had some difficulties, difficulties of thinking, difficulties of past mistakes, in the minds of some people.

Ultimately, a new weapon was invented - the H-Bomb. Is it bad or good, compared to the Atom Bomb? But there was a difference. And it was this difference that has changed the whole world situation.

You will recall that when the atom was split, it was a scientific achievement and tremendous power came into the hands of man. But the atom bomb which arose out of this discovery was dropped on the people of Japan and millions were killed.

Now we have the example of the other weapon. This is also a destructive weapon. But the H-Bomb instead launched a Sputnik, a new moon which we could see and hear.

Why should we take note of this? Not because it comes from the Soviet Union. We take note of it because the socialist science uses it not for war but for peace. Therefore we say a change has taken place.

The British newspapers said after the Sputnik was launched that the Arab States are now forever lost for the West. Those of us who were at Leipzig could notice this at the Fourth World Trade Union Congress where delegates from the Arab and African countries had come. A sudden shift had taken place. Now there is a larger weightage on the side of peace and socialism.

Something more has come out of it. At the United Nations, composed of 82 countries, a resolution was adopted, sponsored by Sweden, India, Yugoslavia and other countries unattached to any block. This resolution was based on the five principles of peaceful co-existence, which arose out of the first part of peace signal by India and China in 1954, the first of its kind in world history.

This is a very significant event, especially when the UN adopts a resolution on co-existence. The word "co-existence" was first used by Lenin and later this very word provoked hysteria in many quarters, including our country in the days of 1950-51. The correctness of this word was accepted first by two countries, then more countries joined in and now the UN has accepted it. This change has got to be taken note of.

What is it to us? We have to review our own past and our achievements.

We want socialism. Why? Because we don't like capital, because it oppresses us, keeps us in poverty. And for us, the way out is socialism. What is socialism? All have accepted it, - Communists, Socialists, Congressmen but each one is interpreting it as something like the provisional "paralrakma" - you can neither feel it, or catch it or describe it!

So, out of this we have to take something concrete. Because our workers judge socialism with wages, bonus, rationalisation, etc. They talk of the ideal of socialism but when it comes to gains of socialism, they pocket the gains.

From where did socialism come from? Socialism arose out of the working class of the capitalist countries - England, France and Germany, and later was by the working class of Soviet Union.

Why do we want socialism? There is unemployment and we experience a crisis of overproduction. The worker cannot use his own productive powers. Capitalism develops economy but it cannot arrange in such a way that what is given to the workers is not what they produce. Capitalism develops on the basis of private profit, appropriating the surplus the worker produces. Ultimately the question comes, is this correct? What is the answer - abolish profit, abolish capitalism and introduce socialism. This is how socialism arose as an idea. But ideas themselves are not enough. Lokamanya Tilak

once said, take one piece worth of bhung and you will get enough ideas. Therefore ideas must be translated into practice.

The working class took up the idea. There was severe repression. After the first world war, the idea became a practical proposition.

And with this idea of socialism also grew the idea of national liberation. Socialism and National Liberation were the two ideas in that period.

In 1917, the idea of socialism became a reality and that socialism was translated into practice. Some might say: was it really socialism? There are people who ask if we are going to have that kind of socialism.

What is the main characteristic of socialism? The INPUC says that their socialism is different from the AITUS's socialism. What is the difference?

We know that firstly, the capitalist ownership must vanish; secondly, standards should begin to rise, production should begin to grow, unemployment should start lessening. This is one test of socialism. This test of socialism, I want the INPUC to apply.

Another test - eviction of peasants from land. Apply that test also.

Apply these tests and you judge socialism. (Perhaps some people might say "no strike in future" and that is "socialism"!)

On this test, we find the socialism established after 1917 has satisfied this test. Of course, mistakes should be avoided.

Therefore, it is not just formal that we begin with the international situation: it is of necessity since our whole outlook is conditioned by what we mean by socialism.

The second thing is national liberation. At the Leipzig Congress we made a Report and that Report is available here.

The essence of the situation is that socialism has advanced and at the end of the Second World War, the national liberation movement could not be massacred, as they could for sometime after the first world war. Thus at the end of the second world war, colonialism had collapsed.

We are now politically free. Internationally we have got a situation where the socialist world is advancing and national liberation movement has advanced in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Small republics, like those of the Eilatius in Africa, are springing up and parading themselves before the world. And it was this parade of nations that took place at Bandung.

But mere political freedom does not go far unless you build your economy on a new foundation.

You know from history that the Marathas overthrew the Mughals. The Mughals and the Marathas were contending forces, and they were contending forces with only the sword and the horse on either side. But now it is not so. On one side we have a tiny gun and on the other, there is the atom bomb. So, today, for overcoming poverty, what is necessary is advance in ~~instrumentation~~ the instrument of production, i.e., iron and steel factories and so development of the instruments of production which means industrialization.

Our Jamshedpur comrades, however, do not take pride of their work in an iron and steel factory; they are more concerned with overtime, production bonus, John and Tata. The working class has to understand its ultimate objective and this must be given to the workers. You give understanding and he gives the practice, combine the understanding and the practice and then the country will be industrialised. The Government of India however want to industrialise without understanding and that is the difference between our Plan and their Plan. Our worker functions with a philosophy and understanding behind him.

The problem of the Plan is therefore not only a problem of strikes or demands but a problem of overcoming our under-development. This means overcoming the backwardness in agriculture and building new industries.

How does the Government of India proceed?

In the first years of freedom, there was complete anarchy - refugees, Kashmir problem, etc. We also helped in embarrassing them but the embarrassment caused was not much.

In 1951, they started with the First Plan. We certainly laughed at the Plan but there was something in the Plan.

No real planning is possible unless socialist forces are in power and unless major sectors of production are nationalised. Without this our Plan suffers. Here in our case, important sectors are in the hands of monopoly capital.

Has the First Plan achieved anything? Yes. A certain shortage of food production has been overcome, a sort of rehabilitation has taken place. 10 per cent was the increase in national income. This is a good thing but not such a good thing if it had grown in a proper way. But the First Plan went as the British had planned.

We say, we are glad there is a growth of 10% in national income, but where has it gone? The working class and the peasantry works but the landlord and the capitalist takes the gains.

The second chapter in our Report deals with this question.

Therein we point out why when the Second Plan came up, there was more awareness and more discussion. The first Plan was only to rehabilitate a war-shattered economy. There was no iron and steel works and it was not a plan to develop an under-developed country to industrialisation. Then came conscious planning. In 1955, when the First Plan was coming to its end, the situation became critical. The awareness came to the national bourgeoisie on the eve of the general elections and they also felt the direction of the Plan has to change and certain land reforms has to be taken up. And the Second Plan changed that direction.

I have listed here 5 features in which the Second Plan is totally different from the First Plan:

The first feature was that a large part of the investment has to be made in the State Sector. The major volume of new capital was to be state-owned.

The second feature was that now heavy engineering, machine-building plants, iron and steel works, coal-mining and oil exploration, which still remain in the hands of private and foreign monopoly capital were to be immediately undertaken in the state sector.

The third feature was that in all this development, sole reliance was not to be placed on the capitalist countries of the West in the matter of procuring capital goods and loans. Countries of the socialist camp, particularly the Soviet Union, were also to be approached for it.

The fourth feature was that land reforms like putting a ceiling on land and distribution of land was to be carried out.

The fifth feature was that as the basis for all this, the Parliament adopted socialism as the objective for the whole country.

You should go and see round the various States the different factories and report back to us how it is going up and find out who is responsible for the lags. We must study and we will see that the while the Bhilai steel plant is going up according to schedule, at Bourkela, only the tenements have been built so far. We must study on the aid from the socialist and capitalist countries and how it can be utilised. This is a matter of education and a matter of politics.

We must kick up a row if the plants fail to go up. The consciousness that if the Plan fails, the country loses, is not anywhere it. The capitalists and bureaucrats are conscious in their sabotage but we ~~may~~ support the Plan with a big "b-u-t". We must approach the Plan in an absolutely different way. The Plan must be made ours.

The five features are before you. You must have the desire to push it forward.

The national bourgeoisie is very clever. They see how the philosophy of socialism is taking hold of the workers. So they say they too are taking the road to socialism. You will say, it is a tactic to cheap the workers. No doubt, it is a tactic. However, socialism as an ideal can be put forward to the people now, as they do and we do. Twenty years ago, we would have been called sectarians if we did so.

We can defeat the manoeuvre of the bourgeoisie by making the ideal of socialism a reality and get their supporters as our allies - the middle classes, the ordinary Congressmen.

Therefore, in essence the Plan is a good thing. In essence, it must be accepted as a proper Plan. But this must be done with criticism.

Criticism comes from two sides - from the Right and the Left. Our criticism is from the Left. And both want to change the Plan. Therefore I found to my surprise in Parliament that when I attacked the Plan, Masani was also attacking the Plan. What is common between us - just the "Attack". If we follow such a tactic, this will not be helping the cause of socialism and progress.

So, what should be our direction of attack? The Right attacks because they want more private sector. We attack because we want more State Sector. Where State Sector halts, we must see that it is completed, by whatever methods. The Bhilai Plant and the Durgapur plant must be completed, whatever the overtime required. This objective must be fulfilled in time and if trade unions cannot do it, we need not talk of socialism. The power to build socialism is obtained by training in capitalist society.

We want State Sector. You will say it is State capitalism. But is it not better than capitalism, for the simple reason that the Parliament can take possession of it while it is not so in the case of private capital. In Parliament we can criticise the Industrial Finance Corporation but how can you criticise the Tatas.

Therefore, the trade unions must analyse what are their duties towards the State Sector and so criticism must be in concrete terms.

Then comes the question of foreign loans. Americans are not willing to lend to the ~~just~~ State sector but to the private sector.

The Finance Minister, T.T. Krishnamachari went to America to seek aid for the State sector but failed in his mission but the Birla delegation has got assurances of aid for the private sector.

In exports and imports, the Government says they have less money but during the last few years, private sector imports have increased more than that for the State Sector.

Mr. A.D. Shroff in his attack from the Right says: "both the planners and their supporters would have realized by now that the philosophy on which the plan was based - attainment of socialistic pattern of society - looked much a good horse in the stable but is proving an errant jade on the journey." Our reply to him is that the horse is good but the jockey is that of the monopoly capital, kick him out and the horse will run well.

Now we come to the tasks that are put down to implement the plan. First, change the tone of over-criticism of the Plan. Take to the worker the essence of the Plan, the five features of the Plan. This must be understood in every factory and every trade union and then they should evolve practical measures to fulfil the Plan. The delegates can give directions better from their experience.

For example, the theft of State property. Demand efficiency in the State Sector particularly.

Now we come to the question of the appropriation of gains of the increase in production.

The ~~income~~ appropriation is now done by the classes in power, i.e., the landlords and the bourgeoisie. That is of course the essence of capitalist development. Therefore, in order to fulfil the Plan, shall we not also agitate for our share in the net product of the Plan?

The share must be judged by the wages to the working classes, to the middle classes. But we find our share is not going up, while their share is.

So we try to increase our share and decrease their share. Otherwise the country cannot progress. Our increasing share has its beneficial results on the economy. Their share freezes the economy in a few hours and accelerates crisis. Therefore, the struggle for wages is an essential struggle. The Ministers say, don't struggle for wage rise, hold your struggle. We say: why not hold the profits.

In this connection, it is necessary that we make the elements of socialist economics understood by the trade unions. Otherwise, they would ~~never~~ not be able to counter the Government's argument of wage-price spiral. Inflation in the economy is not caused due to wage rises. Recently on the PEF question, I quoted the British TUC and AEL-CIO who both denounced the wage-price-spiral theory.

The 25 per cent wage increase demanded by AITUC was an average increase in the then-existing conditions. In coal, actually, the increase was 40 per cent. And in some cases workers may get a little less but the average should be 25%.

The way in which various forms of wage increases are given must conform to the different forms of economy. You cannot neglect this form. I will give you an example. In Jamshedpur, there was a concentration on profit-sharing and basic wages are low. You can never catch corruption in a bourgeois balance-sheet and only after adjustment in wages, and adjustment in DA should you go in for profit-sharing.

There are many peculiarities in our wage system where even elements of feudal rents come in.

In European countries, the main struggle is on basic wages. Therefore, you must think of the wage system as a system in a given economy and how it should be developed in the interest of the worker.

We say the prosperity is there for the last five years and hence there is a case for wage increase.

We say there is disturbance in food prices and so there is a case for change in D.A.

Because of inflation, we say, there is more profit, so we have a case to demand more bonus.

Therefore the tasks, as we have laid down in the Report, are:

1) To secure an adequate general rise in wages and D.A. to meet the rise in the cost of living and to improve the standard of living; to secure a guaranteed minimum wage. To merge the D.A. in basic wages. To revise the bonus formula.

2) To secure fulfilment of the conditions agreed to in the tripartite Indian Labour Conference before rationalisation and productivity measures are introduced, to resist them where they are not.

3) To secure the reduction and stabilisation of prices.

4) To agitate against compulsion to take D.A. or Bonus in National Loan or other certificates. To support them where workers agree voluntarily.

5) To work out and establish a national standardised wage system without loss to any section. To expedite the work of the Pay Commission and Wage Boards for all industries.

A few remarks have to be made here about the tasks.

For example, about the question of tripartite committee agreements, we have published two pamphlets on the subject already. The tripartite discussed the question of wage. In the first Plan, the tactics of the Government was to freeze wages in the name of the Plan. We have been able to defeat this tactic, and in some places we have advanced. And the tripartite came to the conclusion that we must work for the national minimum to go up. This is a great gain to the working class.

The second gain is on rationalisation. After the gains of the Kanpur general strike, they said no rationalisation without conditions of no retrenchment, no increase in workload, etc., and that too only ~~in~~ if it is in the interest of national economy. This condition has already been violated, for example at the Wanco Factory in Darjiling and jute mills. Therefore, this Congress must put on record that the agreements arrived at the tripartite conference are being violated by employers and if the employers violate and Government does not take any steps, we shall not be bound by the agreements.

Then, on the question of discipline. Voluntary discipline must be democratic discipline. There are two types of discipline. One is capitalist discipline of making the worker a prisoner in the factory with the Standing Orders, etc. and killing the workers self-respect and dignity. The essence of "insubordination" and "misconduct" in the Standing Orders must be resisted by the trade union movement.

Socialist discipline on the other hand, is based on the democratic rights of the worker and his right to criticise the management. We asked in the Standing Labour Committee: before you bring in the Code for

discipline, will you give recognition to the trade unions? will you ~~not~~ give us democratic rights?

Discipline is the essence of socialism and anarchy is the essence of capitalism.

Therefore discipline has got to be voluntary and with conditions on either side.

We are asked to ratify the code of discipline. The condition is that the code will not operate unless it is ratified by all the unions. We will ratify it only subject to conditions and we shall state in our resolution that if the conditions are not accepted, we shall not ratify the code.

The last thing in this chapter is on the National Savings Certificates. This is also a question of planning. They say, if we give bonus in cash, there will be inflation. But what guarantee do we have that if we give it to Government, the money shall not be given for speculation by the Mundras, etc.? Therefore, no compulsion should be there. Over and above the minimum needs, we will save and invest. The working class do want to save.

You know what has happened in the award of interim relief where the Govt paid the arrears not in cash but in savings certificates. The ICF and other Govt Employees should refuse to ~~take~~ take these certificates and demand cash. The rise in the cost of living cannot be paid in savings certificates. Will the Government of India supply rice and cloth with savings certificates?

Lastly, a system of national minimum wages has to be worked out through the Pay Commission and the Wage Board. There will be many problems on fixing the wage, as regional differentials, etc. For example, the tripartite agreed to 18 yards of cloth. This might be enough in as standard in the South but beyond Bhopal where they require two blankets and other woollen clothing, 18 yards should not be sufficient. Then there are differences in culture. Here in the South, even the rich sleep on the floor, but in the North, the poorest will have even a rickety cot. But there must be uniformity relating to the nature of work which must be uniform in the given industrial region.

Now the remaining two more questions can be skipped more quickly.

The next chapter is on social security. The main problem is sickness insurance. Some say let us scrap it. Some say no, let us improve it. The question is, do we take steps to carry out especially in Bengal, a total general strike against contributions to the ESI? That is before the Congress. The Working Committee came to the conclusion that we cannot take the road of total denial of contributions and demand scrapping the scheme but must struggle for fundamental improvements, such as treatment for the family, improving the administration, hospitals and long-term treatment of TB patients. Certain vested interests do not want hospitals to spring up quickly. This should be considered.

Then there are problems of Provident Fund and Maternity Benefit. In fact, women workers are being thrown out, especially in Bombay, and this problem of women workers being entitled to benefits is being used by owners to deny employment to them.

Coming to the next chapter, on questions of trade union unity, we have given more attention to the general problems. The conclusion that we can draw is that unity has advanced. Various trade union organisations, even the INTUC, are coming to a position of trade union unity in action. At present, the main form is action from below. At the top from time to time there is unity. The workers are prepared.

The AITUC and IIS are the biggest trade union centres co-operating in many fields. The IFTU also cooperates. These three are the main lovers of unity. Within the three, the major forces are those of AITUC and IIS, and without meaning any disrespect to the IIS, the major force is the AITUC. The AITUC is the strongest organisation - morally and politically - in the trade union field today.

In 1950, we were shattered and weak and in 1957, it is not the IFTUC or the IIS that is the major force, but the AITUC.

And in our phenomenal growth, it was the IFTU which has as a big brother has pulled us up in relation to our earlier tactics. And then we gained from strength to strength. Let us therefore see this aspect of international working class solidarity also.

Then the IIS leadership made a mistake. They were scared by the AITUC and started handing over their unions to the IFTU. Their leaders J.P. Narain and Asoka Mehta have gone out of the trade union field. They realized later that that was not the way.

This is the way unity is growing up.

Therefore, forget your trade union and political differences, criticise on fundamentals and in a friendly way. Let the leaders meet often. The AITUC has now 9 M.P.s, - a real calamity for the Government. They ask thousands of questions, and raise the problems of the workers before the Parliament. The MPs of the AITUC can meet other leaders in parliament.

But is immediate unity possible? The answer is no.

One important point is that although political unity is not essential to bring about trade union unity, political unity also helps. That was what happened in the struggle for Samyukta Maharashtra where the working class in all the industrial towns of Maharashtra & Gujarat were in the forefront of the struggle. This has brought the AITUC and IIS on common platform. And the IFTU which had a membership of 1,20,000 has now only a following of 26,000. In Rajkot, the trade unions had to preach class unity.

It is also necessary to take into account the problems of the Scheduled Castes. The conversion of the scheduled castes into Buddhism has to be properly understood as otherwise we will go wrong in our trade union work. Acceptance of Buddhism is a step forward. They shook off a religion which divides man and man and advance to a religion which is against this division. And they comprise 6 million people. If the other workers do not defend the scheduled castes, let us not talk of socialism.

Trade Unions in Tamilnad should go to the support of both the groups.

I will now come to the question of struggles.

The question is raised, since we shall have to support the Plan, should we go on strikes or not. Some people put this clever question. Let us come to general conclusion. What is the characteristic of the struggles in 1956? Struggles have grown from 3 million man days lost in 1951 to 5 million in 1955 and from then on to 7 million in 1956. Workers are up since prices are hitting them. But they also show sense in action. In 1956, the major forms of struggle was one-day (or less) protest strikes - guerrilla struggle followed by the working class, as in Banks and PCT. A tactic was practiced which

confirmed to the necessity of the situation. Therefore, if you ask me - strike or no strike - I would say, you decide your attitude and you will find your way.

Here there is no problem of banning struggles in the name of the Plan.

Coming to the characteristics of struggles, ~~strikes~~ it has to be noted that actions took place in unexpected industries, e.g., iron and steel and coal (even Jamshedpur). The Durgam struggle is before us. Those who complain about difficulty in collecting affiliation fees should realize that in Durgam, the Union collected 5 to 6 lakhs. In Bombay Rs.25,000 was collected.

I have noted 10 characteristics in the Report. (SEE REPORT)

So the slogans today should be what. In the Working Committee, we said:

- Organize and Unite
- Demonstrate and Protest
- Negotiate and Settle
- ~~Strike~~ If not, strike, peacefully and as a last resort.

On the question of negotiations to settle, an example of a strike when 23% per cent bonus was conceded on a demand for 26% may be noted. This happened in Kerala State. We must know how to retreat when necessary.

In this period, strike must be a last resort and when you strike strike unitedly and organized and always with the idea of settlement. Cease to take pride in 4-month old or long-drawn-out strikes. What is there to take pride in 4 months of suffering to the workers?

Lastly, I will read out to you, the 17 slogans I have put in the Report as our tasks:

READS

We are not asking for 6 or 7 hour day since the present national economy cannot stand it.

The proposal of ballot to determine the representative union was given by Sri V.V.Giri, an old friend. Even when he is Governor, he has not forgotten the AITUC and it is not impossible to take him back again in the TU movement. And wherever ballot was taken, the AITUC has lost.

As for the Preventive Detention Act, we are happy there is at least one State which says they do not want any such Acts. And they said they will not use police to break strikes. This has put the Congress Governments to shame. The other day, Pandit Pant promised that he will see that firing is not resorted to on workers' demonstrations.

Campaign against corruption and nepotism is important. When the Toloo scandal was exposed, how many unions held meetings to explain how the bourgeoisie loots the national economy? The Munira scandal should be made known to all workers.

The AITUC has become stronger and on the organizational plane, the Working Committee has certain proposals.

And lastly we say - FOR OUR COUNTRY AND OUR CLASS, UNITE AND WIN THE END OF POVERTY BELOW AND THE MENSHURE ABOVE, WHEREVER IT EXISTS!

(Lead applause)

The President then announced that the leader of the Soviet Delegation, Com. Gureev would now greet the Session.

COM. GUREEV then read his message of greetings.

On behalf of the AIFSTU, Com. Gureev, presented a statue of a mother and child to the 25th Session.

Com. Mirafkar, president, thanked the Soviet Trade Union delegation and Com. Gureev for the message and the present.

THE PRESIDENT THEN ADJOURNED THE SESSION
TO MEET AGAIN ON 27TH DECEMBER at 9.A.M.

THIRD DAY OF THE TWENTYFIFTH SESSION

December 27, 1957

The Session began at 9 A.M., with Com. Mirajkar presiding.

Com. K. B. Panikkar read an announcement about the meeting of trade groups.

Com. P. Ramamurti read messages received from:

- (1) Hungarian Trade Unions
- (2) Syrian Federation of Government Workers
- (3) Trade Unions of Jordan
- (4) Land Tenants Association, Trinidad
- (5) Miss F. Davies, Sydney, Australia
- (6) New Zealand Trade Unions
- (7) TUI of Public and Allied Employees
- (8) TUI of Metal and Engineering Workers
- (9) TUI of Transport, Port and Fishery Workers
- (10) Shri V. K. R. Menon, Director, ILO India Branch
- (11) All-India Kisan Sabha.

The President announced that the proceedings for the day shall begin with greetings from the Chinese delegation.

COM. LIU CHANG SHENG, leader of the delegation from All-China Federation of Trade Unions read his message of greetings and presented a scroll and films.

Com. Mirajkar, President, thanked the Chinese delegation for the message and presents.

The President then called upon the Session to take up discussion on the General Secretary's Report. Com. P. Balachandra Menon, General Secretary, Kerala State TUC, initiated the discussion.

COM. BALACHANDRA MENON (Kerala) said the Kerala delegation was happy to see that the 25th Session was held in Kerala where the leaders of the working class movement are in Government. It was but fitting, he added, that the land of Vayalar and Kayyur martyrs should have the honour to celebrate the silver jubilee of the AITUC.

Com. Menon said it was at the General Council meeting held in Calcutta that the AITUC took its general stand on the attitude to the Plan. The AITUC had then made it clear that the working class under the AITUC should have a positive attitude to the Plan. He fully agreed with Com. Dange's criticism of the First Plan and his observations on the Second Plan made in the Report and said the General Secretary's Report was a continuation of the policy laid down at Calcutta. The Kerala delegation considers it very helpful.

While agreeing with the formulations contained in the first portion of the Report on the international situation and the successes achieved by socialism, he said the crisis in the capitalist countries would have its repercussions in our country. Com. Menon was of the opinion that in spite of the progress made, ~~immense difficulties~~ crisis was there and the majority of the industries, e.g., match, textile, light engineering, cashew, etc., in Kerala were badly affected. Most of these industries are closing down or only partially working. He doubted under the circumstances how far a boom was there in the economy. A slight improvement was there in some industries like iron and steel, cement and coal but these were protected industries. He therefore cautioned that in framing our approach to the marginal industries, the TUs should be very careful.

Com. Menon said, in such marginal industries, the working class has got a dual role.

He described the dual role as firstly, preserving and advancing the rights of the workers, and, secondly, to see that these industries are properly organised. The Kerala Government and the TUC had taken steps regarding reorganisation of the coir industry. He criticised the Government of India for its inability to render technical and other help to the marginal industries.

Com. Menon suggested a guaranteed minimum annual wage in such industries - about 150 days work and a wage of Rs. 400 to 500 a year.

He then detailed the gains made by the Kerala workers following the formation of the new Government. The State-owned undertakings initiated the grant of wage increases, he said, and this covered even factories running on losses. The workers in transport, plywood, print teachers and village officials were those who made substantial gains. Steps are being taken to extend this to the private sector also and in a sub-committee of the Industrial Relations Board of the State, it has been accepted to give a State minimum of Rs. 1,12.0 a day.

A sum of Rs. 2½ crores was incurred by the State alone on account of the wage rises granted.

Com. Menon added that on bonus too, a satisfactory formula has been evolved, on the basis of the AIFUC standpoint. He was glad to announce that every employer in the State has now accepted the principle of bonus being paid as deferred wages and 0½% has been guaranteed as minimum bonus in each industry.

On the question of social security schemes, he said, they were only just attempting the health insurance scheme. He felt that the social security measures should be consolidated. The women workers of Kerala have also gained an increase in maternity benefit, from 8 annas to 12 annas, and certain other facilities.

More than all this, Com. Menon observed, it was on the question of recognition of trade unions and the evolution of a Negotiating Machinery that they have made striking progress. An agreement has been arrived at in the Industrial Relations Board comprising of employers and representatives of INTUC, IES, UTUC and AIFUC whereby the union which gets 60% majority in ballot gets the status of representative union or the negotiating agent. Thus the principle of ballot to ascertain representative status has been accepted by all.

It has also been provided, he said, in case no union gets 60% majority, all the unions would be given representation on the negotiating machinery commensurate with the percentage of votes secured by them. The reorganisation of Works Committees has also been taken up to make it functioning organisations.

In the State of Kerala, Com. Menon said, there was no compulsory adjudication. That has been what the AIFUC has been demanding. More emphasis has been given to the question of arbitration and arbitration boards.

On the question of trade union unity, they could not claim much but at least on top-level, they were able to reach an understanding regarding the Negotiating Machinery. The AIFUC unions had been working with others on wage struggles, etc. in different areas.

It should not be taken to mean that since the formation of the new ministry, the struggles of the workers were given up. There is no question of unconditional and complete surrender to the employers just because there is a Government of the workers, he said. They tried to negotiate and if it fails then they went for strike actions. But the Government had always actively intervened and the record of 2000 disputes settled in such a short period showed the important role the State Labour Ministry has played.

On workers participation in management, steps are being taken. For instance, in the State Transport, the managing council has a representative from the Union. Com. Menon said it was especially on this point that Com. Dange's suggestion about differentiating the State sector should be seriously considered. He felt the differentiated approach to the State sector should be stressed and especially so, when our Parliament and State Assemblies and the solidarity of the workers could effect a change for the better in that sector.

Com. Menon said on the question of minimum wages, although it would be difficult to evolve an all-India minimum at this stage, a State minimum could be tried for. And in certain industries which are crisis-ridden, he suggested an annual guaranteed wage and especially on this point, he sought guidance from the Session.

On the Kerala Government's attitude to non-AITUC trade unions, he said, there was absolutely no discrimination.

Com. Menon concluded by saying that under the inspiring leadership of the AITUC and the fraternal help of the working class the world over, the Indian working class will march forward with giant strides.

*

COM. SATISH LOOMBA, General Secretary, Punjab and Himachal TUC, spoke next on the General Secretary's Report.

Com. Satish Loomba said the Punjab delegation generally supports the views contained in the Report, which gave a general orientation to the trade union movement. For the first time, he said, a serious effort has been made for evolving a national line.

Coming to the chapter on the Plan which has become the most controversial, Com. Satish Loomba said Com. Dange's formulation that the previous support to the Plan was merely formal and that we should now support it basically, was correct.

He disagreed with the formulation in the Report ~~about monopolists' plan~~ about monopolists' plan and he felt the capitalist class, as a whole, and not only the monopolists were responsible.

The Plan should be viewed in the context of what was happening outside the country as well as inside. In the past, our support was conditional. The plan is formulated by the bourgeoisie but the new thing is that this plan has to be judged in the context of the age of the Sputnik, international influence of socialist ideas and movement, the advance of the working class movement inside the country, especially the victory of the AITUC in a number of working class centres in the general elections and the formation of the Kerala Government.

Therefore, the working class has to use this Plan in his context and apart from this, we are also vitally interested in the development of the country. There is an attack on the core of the Plan from the Right, from the foreign monopolists and Indian monopolists and it is our task to save the core of the Plan. And by doing this, we not only serve the interests of the country; our understanding has to be enriched that by doing this, we serve the interests of the working class. This is the correct orientation that has been placed in the Report. It gives correct stress to the needs of the working class and the needs of defence of the core of the Plan.

The delegation from Punjab felt that there was no contradiction in this twin approach of trying to safeguard the vital interests of the working class and trying to save the vital core of the Plan, which represented but two sides of the same picture. Therefore, ~~we~~
F

they felt, the line put forward was not a line of strike or no-strike. Com. Dange has correctly put forward the slogan: Organise and Unite, Demonstrate and Protest, Negotiate and Settle, If not Strike, peacefully and as a last resort.

Com. Satish Loomba said that there were certain points which should have been in the Report. The non-inclusion of these points tend to give some lopsidedness to the Report, he said. The first point missing was on internal resources for the Plan and taxation. At the last Working Committee meeting, it was formulated the prime mover in recent struggles was the question of taxation but there is no mention of this either in Com. Dange's speech or in his report. Therefore, in order to give a balanced view in of the entire picture and to give tasks in relation to the Plan and create necessary enthusiasm, it would be necessary that this important question of taxes and internal resources be dealt with in the Report.

The second point missing in the Report, Com. Satish Loomba said, was that no forecast on the way in which the economy was moving had been made. While a reference had been made to the State Sector, nothing had been said about the private sector. Therefore, the tasks in this respect were not clear. In certain industries in the private sector, there appeared a creeping crisis in many centres. Simultaneously, inflationary trends existed in the economy and this would lead to quite a spurt of struggles. Therefore, the prospect of struggle which was bound to come and which was necessary so that it might not take us by surprise and lead to interminable lengthening of struggles - that should have been presented here.

Thirdly, as Com. Dange made out in the Working Committee meeting, some sort of shift has occurred in the labour policy of the Government and which has had its repercussions on ~~some~~ certain sections of capitalists in India. The election results, election victory in Kerala, etc., and the contradiction between the big monopolists and the planners - this was seen in the 15th Indian Labour Conference and the State Labour Ministers' Conference. When these shifts are taking place, it is our task to intervene so that the Plan can be used for the benefit of the country and for defending the vital interests of the working class. This orientation is missing in the Report.

Coming to the tasks, Com. Satish Loomba said, one of the biggest bottle-necks today was the state of our organisation and ~~most~~ pointed attention has to be made to this aspect at this session, especially the task of training cadres for trade unions, and affiliations.

On the question of E.S.I., the Punjab delegation endorsed the line of demanding changes.

Com. Satish Loomba made pointed reference to the question of co-operatives. He said the report should be further enriched by including this aspect. In Punjab they had co-operatives engaged in the production of hosiery, leather, cycle parts and they were trying to run many other lines also. There are also big cooperatives in the sugar industry. But the co-operatives are facing difficulties due to the policy of the State Government influenced by private sector. Unless the AITUC take a line, it would be difficult for them to move forward. He felt, along with the State Sector, the co-operative sector is equally important.

#

COM. RAM ASREY, Secretary, UPTUC, speaking on the General Secretary's Report said there was general agreement on the same among the UP delegates and that it was a continuation of Indore and Calcutta decisions. The UP delegation hoped this line would help the movement forward.

Con. Ran Asroy said there were however shortcomings in the Report, as for instance, the absence of any organisational report. He welcomed the proposal about establishing the H.M. Joshi Memorial TU School for training cadres and said such schools should be organised in the States also.

Many conclusions of the Delhi Working Committee meeting had been left in the Report, he said, e.g., the question of taxation. The Report also did not deal with the criticism of the existing labour laws in the country and on how we have to press for changes.

Con. Asroy said there could be some misunderstanding about Con. Dange's speech where he referred to strikes. It has to be clarified if the new line corresponds to any new class relationship in the country.

The problems regarding the private sector ~~issues~~ have been inadequately dealt with. He queried how we should proceed when ~~there is~~ increasing production in the private sector leads to accumulation of stocks and the workers who produced more with enthusiasm face retrenchment for the same reason.

*

The President announced that the Rumanian Trade Union delegation has arrived and they were welcomed with prolonged applause.

*

CON. RAJAGOPALAN MAIR (Kerala) said the emphasis on the core of the Plan made in the Report would place regional planning in jeopardy. According to the Government of India, the "hard core" consisted of steel plants and then came the auxiliary development in relation to the hard core. Giving the example of Kerala, he said none of the development schemes of the State would come within the "hard core" or nearabout. He therefore stressed that we should call for fulfilment of the Plan as a whole and this could be done if the Government accepted the suggestions put forward by the working class movement. The neglect of regional planning priorities, he added, would lead to serious disruption and the trade union movement should fight this tendency.

Con. Rajagopalan Mair was of the opinion that in the absence of adequate explanations in the Report, it would be difficult to enthuse the workers for the Plan. He said the Report has also missed the most important prerequisite of planning, i.e., administrative reforms. The TU movement should campaign for such reforms, along with speedy reforms in land relations.

He disputed the claim made by Con. Balachandra Menon about TU unity achieved in the State. He contended that comparatively the IFTU was more helpful but not the UTUC or the IEE who consistently struggled to sabotage industrial development.

Emphatically stressing the need for efficiency in State Sector, he said the state of affairs in the Government-owned industries now suffering losses year after year has even become an argument against further nationalisation and against socialism.

Con. Rajagopalan Mair said that after sputnik, or as important, was the formation of the Kerala Government where the working class captured power thru parliamentary means. This is as much an international factor and should have been treated as such in the Report but he felt the Report has not dealt with this properly.

He gave details of the gains achieved by the working class under the new government, and said the worker has now a sense of freedom, and are acting in a responsible way. He said the example of the struggle in Rayons Factory referred to by Con. Dange, was exceptional.

Con. Rajagopalan Nair said the concessions secured by workers with the help of the Government were also creating new problems. For instance, he said, after the minimum wage of Rs. 1.14.0 had been fixed in the beedi industry, beedi factories are shifting to places outside the State.

The vested interests are plotting to overthrow the Government of Kerala and he said the working class in India as a whole should guard against this danger. The success or failure in Kerala is success or failure to the working class in the whole country and the TU movement should therefore take up campaigns for Kerala and educate the workers on what is being done in Kerala.

*

Con. S. A. Dange made a proposal for appointing a committee to consider amendments to the Constitution. He said the Sub-Committee appointed by the 24th Session along with Secretaries of State TUCs and the President and General Secretary should constitute this Committee.

The President placed the proposal for consideration of the Session and was unanimously approved.

*

The President then adjourned the Session to meet again at 3 P.M.

AFTERNOON SESSION - December 27, 1957, 3 P.M.

Con. Mirajkar in the Chair.

The discussion on the General Secretary's Report continued.

CON. BARIN CHAUDHARY (Assam) said the delegates from Assam generally support the points made in the Report. He said it is not enough that we support the good points of Government policy, but in States where we see the same policy implemented differently, we should press for implementing the good aspects.

He referred to the demand for Oil Refinery in Assam and said in all the towns of Assam, the workers unitedly fought for this demand.

Con. Barin Choudhary said that we should ensure that when Government takes over an industry, the workers' interests are protected. The experience in Assam, he added, was that when the State Government took over any undertaking, conditions of the workers worsened.

He sought the help of the AITUC in organisational work in the plantations of Assam. Here the question of housing was acute and even after sanction by Government, the construction cannot be taken up for want of cement, etc. The trade union movement should agitate to get priority supplies for workers' housing.

Previously in Assam, the INTUC was the strongest and we were weak. Now the AITUC is fast improving in strength. At the last session, we had only one affiliated union from Assam. This time we have brought 4 new unions, two of which came over to us from the INTUC. In the Assam coalmines, now the INTUC is non-existent. As for trade union unity with them, the INTUC would rather allow themselves to be liquidated rather than coming together with us. The Assam State TUC has now a membership of 55,000. Workers in INTUC unions are pressing us to form AITUC unions.

COM.M.S.KRISHNAN (Karnatak) said the delegation from Karnatak was also of the opinion that the approach made in the General Secretary's report is correct. They were happy to see that a change has come about from the line adopted by the Calcutta session.

He cited the example of Bharat Electronics where in the absence of a proper approach, the previous union had liquidated itself. Now the union there under the guidance of the AITUC has succeeded in winning new concessions on the basis of a correct approach.

Referring to the core of the Plan, he said, in the opinion of the Karnatak delegation, it is not necessary to make a differentiation between the "core" and the Plan.

Com.Krishnan queried if the emphasis on efficiency in the State sector would mean that we should not raise efficiency in the private sector? He felt the approach should not be as between private or public but as of the whole Plan itself.

Referring to problems of productivity, he said the problems of small scale industries should also be viewed in the same context.

He said it is not enough to state that we have to evolve a formula for bonus. There is the Kerala formula and we can use that to evolve an all-India formula.

On trade union unity, Com.Krishnan while agreeing with the main lines in the Report, spoke of their experience in Karnatak. On particular issues on which all sections of workers are united, the IITUC came forward. The IIS cooperated generally. Only if there is pressure from workers, would the IITUC come for some sort of unity. He pointed out that this should also be viewed as an organisational question.

Some lessons have been drawn in the report on the struggles, but he felt the attitude of the Government to their employees in the State Sector should also be noted. He said the Government was taking an extremely capricious attitude: refusing recognition, refusing to refer disputes in time as it happened in Hindustan Airframe for the last three years.

Com.Krishnan concluded saying that the organisational position should have been mentioned in the Report.

*

The President, at this stage, invited the fraternal delegate from the C.G.F.France, Com.Robert Hernie, to greet the session.

COM.HERNIE read his message of greetings.

The President thanked Com.Hernie for the message.

*

The discussion on the General Secretary's Report was resumed.

COM.S.Y.KOLHATKAR (Bombay) said a large majority of delegates from Bombay wholeheartedly supported the general line in the Report. He said that the correction which was overdue has been ~~made~~ clearly stated in the Report. While it is true that we have been saying so far that we support the Plan, there has also been simultaneously our criticism of the Plan almost negating our support.

Con. Kolhatkar said that the Government and employers characterize our struggles as anti-national, as Panit Holru declared at the time of the proposed P&T strike, ~~and~~ with the view of alienating the workers from the other sections of the people. Therefore, it has become all the more necessary that the positive aspects of our support to the Plan must be carried out and must be taken even to the most backward worker. It has become all the more necessary that our trade union tasks are fulfilled in the context of our support and our desire that the Plan must succeed. Because we must make the working class realize as early as possible that unless all our struggles are conducted in the context of the success of the Plan, we are likely to lose the sympathies of the other sections of the people. That is our experience.

Having note of that, the General Secretary has given urgent tasks, i.e., to defend the core of the Plan, because on this depends the independence of the country. Unless the working class realises this, it would not be able to discharge its role in the new situation. Therefore, the correction that was long overdue has come about.

He said, there is a minority section which believes that this is a bourgeois government, this a bourgeois plan, it cannot bring about any change and therefore we cannot co-operate or we cannot support the Plan.

Con. Kolhatkar then pointed out to certain laps in the report and said this should be taken into consideration at the time of finalising the report.

He said the Code of Discipline ~~proposed~~ proposed by Government and the Conduct Rules newly introduced to suppress Government employees' trade unions would show that the very Government which brings forward a code of discipline, denies even elementary rights to its own employees. Therefore, we should ~~insist on the Government to~~ press for an unequivocal declaration by Government on the question of recognition of trade unions and to remove the fetters on Government employees before coming forward with any Code for Discipline. At the time when the Code was announced, there was a meeting of AITUC, IIS and UTUC and Independent unions of Bombay and the TU representatives asked how we could agree to such a code, when the Government denies elementary trade union rights to its own employees.

Con. Kolhatkar said that the Bombay delegation found it somewhat difficult to agree with the ~~the~~ statement on page 24 that the real wages have increased during the last 7 years. Unless this statement is substantiated by facts, it is difficult to accept it. Because, we have been saying so far that real wages of the workers have been going down. In fact, so far as the Government employees are concerned, we know their wages have remained more or less constant, even the DA has not increased - only just now Rs.5/- was given. In the face of these facts, we must know on what basis this particular statement is made. Because before making this statement, the Report states that workers are getting more in money wages but less in the form of goods.

When the General Secretary made his Report, he made a special statement about the Scheduled Caste workers who ~~has~~ recently converted to Buddhism. On behalf of the Bombay delegation, I would request that that statement be included in the body of the Report, because for us it is a question vitally affecting working class unity. 60% of workers in Nagpur and 30 to 40% in Bombay belong to this section. The working class as a whole must fight against the injustice done to them.

Con. Kolhatkar sought clarification on the AITUC standpoint on workers' participation in management, whether after the Tripartite Agreements, there is any change in our attitude. He agreed with the conclusions in the Report on TU unity and gave experience of Bombay in Samyukta Maharashtra struggle, Goa, P&T, Santilal Shah, and the recent unity moves on the question of unemployment.

COM. ROBIN MUKERJEE (Bengal) said there were differences amongst the Bengal delegates. One section gave unqualified support to the General Secretary's Report while another section was totally opposed. But a majority felt that we should give general support to the 2nd Five Year Plan and general support to Com. Dange's position, but not uncritically.

Com. Robin Mukerjee said it was not true to say that the Report represented a continuation of the Calcutta General Council's standpoint on the Plan. So far as he could remember, there was no discussion on Com. Dange's letter which raised these questions.

He said the majority of Bengal delegates would not support a line of making our support conditional but at the same time, they do not want to accept the way in which Com. Dange has put it. The Indian working class is no doubt anxious about the Second Plan but Com. Dange in his effort to support the Plan, has unequivocally and almost unreasonably, has forgotten the major issues that are agitating the minds of the working class.

It appeared to him that Com. Dange felt that the Government is very mild always. The Government has so far changed its policy in regard to wage increases to the working class.

Com. Robin Mukerjee said that in the Report, Com. Dange should have also listed those struggles where the workers failed to get any benefit. Com. Dange referred only to coal struggles where concessions were won but not where the struggles were suppressed.

In the Engineering industries in West Bengal, no increase could be secured during the last three years. They have now got a tribunal. He said in the engineering industry, the workers fought innumerable struggles, have won many and lost many. But the workers felt they have at last secured a tribunal. It may be noted that even the British monopolists who control the engineering industry at last favoured a tribunal so that production might not be hampered.

Com. Robin Mukerjee queried why the slogan of the AITUC for Rs. 100 as minimum wage has not been referred to in the Report. Even Congress papers had acclaimed that slogan of the AITUC. The increasing exploitation of the working class has not been referred to in the Report and serious questions of retrenchment, etc. have also been missed.

He was afraid that Com. Dange wants to drag the delegates to another swing. He also felt there might be loopholes in Com. Dange's speech which might drag the movement to the Right deviation also. "Naturally therefore he pleaded for no strike."

Com. Robin Mukerjee disputed the point that they were bent upon strikes. He said it is their common experience with the workers that they have some sense and they do not go on strike everytime the TUC wants them to. But when they feel that conciliation machinery has not worked, even a tribunal has not been given, they resort to strike. He said Com. Dange's Report gave the impression, however, that the worker goes on strike without recourse to any conciliation, etc. If the major stress is given to this, he said, we will give up the struggle question altogether. In the last General Council session also, such type of resolution came.

He said Com. Dange in his speech and report made one or two remarks regarding our State. He wanted a thorough discussion on these remarks. The majority of comrades in Bengal wanted to thrash it out.

The assessment made in the report about the short and swift struggles in 1956, he said, might carry the impression that prolonged struggle should be avoided. He said they too are anxious to avoid prolonged struggles, but said Com. Dange has not taken note of the number of general strikes that took place, which forced the Government to give some concessions.

Finally, he said, the Bengal delegates do appreciate Com. Dange's speech and it would help them in the approach to the Second Plan. But at the same time, if the report is accepted in toto, he felt, the trade union movement would be derailed.

Com. Robin Mukerjee said that not only will there be a number of comrades who accept the Report, but there would be a good many men in Government also who will rejoice at this report because they will find that the AITUC is trying to abjure struggles, a policy altogether unknown in the history of the trade union movement.

So, the Report is not balanced and hence should be circulated to the Unions and next a General Council meeting should be called for discussing this Report thoroughly, he concluded.

*

COM. SANTOSH GHOSH (Bengal) said that he belonged to that section of Bengal delegates who agree with Com. Dange. The importance of the report is that it gives a clear line on the role of the working class in relation to the defence of independence and development of national economy. If we do not see this role of the workers, we cannot make programme.

Com. Ghosh said some people would say we support but... and this "but" is a very big "but". Let them think what will happen if the Plan is implemented. Will it help the workers or the capitalists?

He replied to Com. Robin Mukerjee who doubted about Com. Dange's line of struggle. He pointedly referred to what Com. Dange said about standing orders and the question of socialist discipline.

The line adopted by the General Council at Calcutta, he said, was about the dual role and the Report is therefore a continuation.

He said that even if political differences are there, trade union unity is possible.

Com. Santosh Ghosh said he cannot but mention the help given by the WFTU in formulating a correct policy in our movement. He therefore asked the delegates to consider the report in terms of the WFTU resolutions on the role of trade unions next in the colonial and dependent countries.

He pointed out certain inadequacies in the report and hoped Com. Dange would attend to it. The trade union unity questions are not properly dealt with. Although there are disharmonies in the IFTUC, the question of unity with them cannot be ruled out.

Com. Ghosh said the session should consider the problems of young workers, in the light of the proposed Congress of Young Workers about which Comrade Cassadai spoke in his message of greetings. He also called for all help to Indonesia.

CON.T.R.GANESAN (Tamilnad) said that the Tamilnad delegation is in general agreement with the approach on the various issues dealt with in the General Secretary's Report. The Report has given something new, positive and correct orientation towards the responsibilities of the working class in national reconstruction when there is such a mighty national upsurge. The call for a positive role and tasks of industrialisation, to defend the case of the Plan, is a new orientation.

In the Calcutta General Council, a clear orientation was not given. This is therefore new. The Tamil Nad delegation is sure that this positive attitude on TU tasks, on the role of the working class in national reconstruction, the Indian working class movement will march ahead.

Con.Ganesan, however, wanted to state it very strongly that copies of the Report were not available in time, so much so that 90 per cent of the Tamilnad delegates had to give their opinion on the basis of a second-hand report. This disadvantage should be overcome at the next session and he said no excuses will be tolerated. The new Working Committee should seriously consider the organisational lag at the top level and at the State level.

While agreeing with the 5 features of the Plan and the positive characteristics of socialism, he said it is not enough just to state them as such, but the trade union movement should work for removing the apathetic attitude among themselves and in the working class. For this, the tasks should be more concretised. Otherwise, he said, our philosophy too would be as vague as the Gita.

While it may be said that the acceptance of socialism as a goal by the ruling circles may be a tactic, are there any sections in the ruling circles which are really for socialism? He wanted clarification on this point.

Con.Ganesan said land reforms are as much important a heavy engineering in the public sector. While avoiding over-criticism, responsible criticism is necessary but in this respect, the main criticism of the Plan in the Report has to be elaborated and concretised. He also called for proper distribution of heavy industrial projects in various regions, in order that disruptive tendencies might not affect the TU movement.

He stressed the importance of abolishing the contract system in the private sector and said the fumbling of Government regarding the cottage industry and handloom should be severely criticised.

The Tamilnad delegation wanted adequate treatment of questions like Works Committees, Cooperatives and the obstacles in their development, democratisation of administrative machinery, the task of TUs in relation to democratic questions like taxation, etc. Con.Ganesan said a clarification is needed on what is the core of the Plan. He said he had seen a report of Con.Dange's speech in Parliament, where he reportedly advocated scrapping electricity projects.

He was not prepared to accept that real wages have gone up. The movement in the Plantations should be surveyed in the Report. He also sought clarifications on tackling the State Government employees' problem in an all-India way as well as on the approach to small, medium and big units of industry existing side by side, and also on industries which are in crisis.

Basing on the principles accepted in the 15th Indian Labour Conference, is it not time to concretise a minimum wage quantum, in so many rupees? he asked. Working class covered by the Minimum Wage Act should be asked to go into a movement to achieve that minimum.

On the question of social security, the IFTU had convened a special conference but the AITUC had not played its part effectively. On the BSL, he said, the Tamilnad TUC had been agitating for inclusion of families in the Scheme, but the Government is delaying the matter. His suggestion was that one-day protest action is necessary. The failure of the AITUC to give a proper lead has led to apathy and has disarmed the workers.

Com. Ganesan said he wanted a more concrete analysis of the Bank strike in Durgal about which reference has been made in the Report. He asked if "strike as a last resort" would mean a ban on strikes? A section of Tamilnad delegates were of the opinion that the Report has soft-pedalled the public sector. He added that we must try for unity of the working class in the course of the Second Plan itself. And coming to the tasks, he said, trade union unity should be not only against caste and religion but also language. Tasks on the Railways should be concretised and on slogan (11), and "unemployment".

Finally, he said the achievements of the Kerala Government should be effectively popularised and a slogan ought to have been given in the Report. A special resolution should be adopted about Kerala Government's achievements.

COM. K. L. MARASESHAN (Andhra Pradesh) said the Andhra delegation was also handicapped in not having enough copies of the Report and most of the time had to be taken in translation. The discussion among the delegation was therefore confined to the chapter on the Five Year Plan and our attitude.

The Andhra delegation generally welcomed the Report, he said, and they accept all the formations made by Com. Dingo in regard to the Second Five Year Plan. He said the Andhra TUCs support to the Plan had been positive but the work there was not planned in that manner. So the Report gave a new orientation to the movement.

As is pointed out by the 4th World Trade Union Congress, the dual task of supporting national development and fighting for the rights for the rights of the worker is not contradictory.

But there are problems, he said, when one seeks to implement the line. For instance, at the Vizag shipyard large sums were squandered due to the inefficiency of the French experts. The Union had given a memorandum to the authorities suggesting improvements but no action was taken by the Government. In several other cases also, to all the positive initiatives taken by the Union, the management has not cared to take any notice. However, it is necessary that a movement is built on this score and therefore the Report has laid stress on the same correctly.

Referring to another instance, Com. Marasishan said: Vizag receives machinery for supply to Hailal. Recently there was a theft to the tune of 4 Lakhs. The Union pointed out certain things connected with it but the reply received was that the Union should not raise such issues. He also stated that industrial relations in Government establishments were worsening, and hence in the report, mention should be made of this aspect, instead of generally saying about inefficiency and bureaucracy. It should be stated that the State Sector is not behaving as a good employer, they impose IFTU and when it comes to strikes, they shout that it is anti-national.

The Andhra delegation felt that we should change our tactics our attitude should be strengthening and creating consciousness that the Plan is for the development of the country. And it is possible that the conscious worker and his union can change the policies of the Government. He quoted instances of Nagargunasagar project and Machkund Project where workers have been forced to give strike or

Com. Narasimham expressed some doubts which had arisen among the Andhra delegates. Some said we are not putting equal emphasis on the demands of the workers as with the fulfillment of the Plan and hence we can strengthen the report by putting the demands aspect in a proper way.

Again, on the question of "core" given in the slogans on p. 35, do we take it that the Plan as such cannot be fulfilled? How do we define the "core" of the Plan? He felt, if we are confident of other things, why should we be defeatist in this respect.

Some comrades felt that there is no mention of taxation, policies followed in the State sector, support to monopolists, attitude to the democratic liberties, burdens on the people, etc., in the Report and hence this should be put there in a proper way in order to have a balanced view of things.

Com. Narasimham wanted detailing of the aims in relation to the private sector, and especially on the problems of small industries. He also laid stress on regional planning.

The role of foreign capital in our economy has not been adequately stressed in the Report. The Andhra delegation also felt that enough importance has not been given to the question of organisation also. Of course, the responsibility of the PTUCs to send reports is also there. Even then we should put stress on the new orientation in our style of work. We have been accustomed to a particular style of work. This should change.

Re. social security measures, the Andhra delegation agreed with the formulations in the Report. While working the ISI, the defects should be removed. In Andhra, the workers could not get medical aid before.

He felt the statement of rise in money wages and real wages has made rather hastily. In Andhra most of the small industries were closing. And even in a surplus state like Andhra, food prices are going up. In this situation how could it be claimed that real wages have increased?

On land reforms, he agreed with the conclusions in the report and said the worker should support and assist the struggles of the peasant. On the question of trade union unity, he said, the ITUC has no hold in Andhra but the Government is trying to impose the ITUC. He agreed that unity trend is growing but in the experience of Andhra, he felt the ITUC is being engaged to split the working class. The IIS is not following the same policy everywhere. In Hyderabad, one section of IIS always refused to work with us, while another section tries to work with us.

5

COM. B. D. JOSHI (Delhi) also protested against the delay in supplying copies of the Report. He said there is a strong minority of comrades in the delegation which does not agree with the Report. The delegation as a whole thinks that it is wrong to call this Government a government led by monopoly capital and then say that monopoly capital is sabotaging the Plan. This obvious contradiction is not explained in the Report.

The Delhi delegation however finds that the practical tasks laid down in the Report are correct and the delegation agrees with them. We have been fighting for a long time for the immediate economic demands of the workers. In fact, there has been little else in our activities and this to some extent gave some colour of economic to the struggle of the working class. Therefore it is necessary to raise the level of the consciousness of the workers and place before them the vital role of national reconstruction. To this extent the Report has put it positively.

Com.B.D.Joshi said the Report lacks a proper analysis of our economy. For example, it does not try to show us to what are the factors which are leading to the closures of factories today. What the position of foreign capital is and the relative position of ~~foreign~~ private and public sectors. Without a proper analysis of our economy, it is not possible to lay down our tasks.

The Delhi delegation agreed with the five features of the Second Plan. But the Report does not say anything about resources. To take only one instance, recently the Government increased excise duty. This had been done in the name of the Plan and this would eat into the workers' bonus and they are bound to resist it. So it is not correct to say that no contradiction exists. It does exist and comes sharply before us.

We must take note of the fact that the Government attitude to the trade unions is hostile, Com.Joshi said. It is no use blaming the bureaucracy alone, the Government itself is to blame. Our experience in Delhi is that under Pandit Nehru's own nose, the workers are arrested on trumped up charges and IOCs are facing trial.

He requested that the problems of small industries should be dealt with.

On ESI, Com.Joshi said, Delhi workers would enthusiastically participate in a one-day protest strike. Delhi workers are not prepared to accept national savings certificates. He asked for positive steps from Government on closure of factories and also referred to problems of Government employees. The Delhi delegation does not agree with the formulation that real wages have gone up.

COM.DANGE made an intervention before the conclusion of the session on the question of meetings of trade groups. He said the Working Committee had appointed several trade commissions and the composition of the commissions has been printed in ILL. Unfortunately the Commissions could not meet and prepare papers for the Session as was expected. Similarly a projected Rationalisation Conference could not also take place. Again, at the Working Committee meeting in Delhi, a proposal was made to submit a detailed memorandum to the Labour Minister on ESI. We have not got a proper study as yet on the question. So he proposed that since all the Commission members are now available, let us have some meeting of trade groups so that we may have some idea of the problems. Secondly, those who are affected by rationalisation can meet together and thirdly, the ESI group also should meet.

The PRESIDENT THEN ADJOURNED THE SESSION TO MEET AGAIN
AT 9 A.M. ON 23RD DECEMBER 1957

FOURTH DAY OF THE TWENTYFIFTH SESSION

December 23, 1957

The session began at 9 A.M. with Com.S.S.Mirajkar presiding.

The discussion on the General Secretary's Report continued.

COM.ABDUL MEMIN (Orissa) said they were also experiencing difficulty in giving a critical assessment of the Report since the copies were not available earlier. He agreed with other delegates that the Report gave a new orientation so far as trade union tactics are concerned. But he said so many things were omitted. However the Orissa delegation accepts the new approach.

So far as the State Sector is concerned, the Orissa delegation had certain problems in implementing the slogan of enthusing the workers to make the 2nd Plan a success. In Orissa the State sector is dominant, as for example, the Hirakud and Bourkula. But the Government did not like to give even a little hearing to our demands and suggestions to execute the project in time. On the other hand, when occasion arose and the workers united on the question of drinking water facilities and agitated, they had to face severe repression. Two workers were beaten to death.

Com.Abdul Memin did not therefore see any reason to believe that the Government would pay any heed to the suggestions made by the workers and therefore the Orissa delegation was a bit pessimistic.

He said while emphasis has been laid on the State Sector, nothing has been said about the private sector, except that monopolists are trying to sabotage the Plan. He felt that the State Sector cannot be separated from the private sector since both these sectors constitute the national economy.

On the question of resources, the Report refers only to foreign loans and that the capitalist States would help only the private sector. But the political strings attached to loans to the private sector are not discussed in the report. When foreign capitalists are financing the private sector, it should be controlled by the Central Government. Otherwise, the whole Five Year Plan will be jeopardised.

Re. foreign aid, Com.Dange said nothing beyond what is said by Pandit Mehru. Our attitude to foreign loan should therefore be specifically stated. There is also no mention regarding nationalisation and also on how to raise resources. On the other hand, Government seeks to impose taxes and about this also, no reference has been made in the Report.

Com.Abdul Memin also referred to the omission of national minimum wage, especially about the different types of industries - small, medium and large - in the General Secretary's Report and hence there is no directive on how we should formulate demands for minimum wages. On the implementation of labour legislation also, he could not find any reference in the Report.

He quoted the instance of Talcher mines where the former labour force of 2200 has now been reduced to 700. So many workers had been killed and no justice has been done. Even wages were not paid for 12 weeks. A sum of Rs.5½ lakhs is due to the workers. There are two other collieries in the area owned by Government. It was recommended that the Pay Commission Award should be implemented but most of the workers have been denied benefits under the Award. Under these circumstances, he asked, how could they work for the 2nd Plan.

He said the report makes no mention of the contradictory definitions of wages in the different Acts. All this should be thoroughly studied.

In Orissa, the AITUC had been able to establish control over two IWTUC unions. The IES does not come in for unity.

He also criticised the absence of an organisational report.

*

COM. RATAN ROY (Bihar) said that the Bihar delegation agreed with the General Secretary's Report. The Report while emphasising the role of the workers to ensure the success of the Plan does at the same time lay stress on winning the workers' demands.

He described the conditions existing in Jamshedpur where in spite of the much-vaunted claims of the Tatas, a worker gets only Rs. 63/- even after 4 bonuses. The cost of living went up by 100 points but this rise was not compensated.

Com. Ratan Roy said that even after increasing steel production from one million to two million tons, the TISCO says that no additional labour force is required but would instead absorb the "surplus" which now exists. On this score, what is the worker expected to do, in relation to the Tatas?

Now the position is that the Tata workers are prepared to come under the leadership of the AITUC. 25,000 signatures were collected by our union but the State and Central Government have so far resisted in giving us recognition. They had to negotiate with us on the Talco and Tinsplate strikes but they do not give recognition. So while demanding support for the Plan, these conditions should be borne in mind.

The Bihar delegation felt that the line in the report does not rule out strikes. On the other hand, if we go about with this line, the struggles and strikes would be successful. The Report gave additional moral strength to go about with the struggles.

Com. Ratan Roy suggested that the implementation of Labour legislation should be discussed in the Report, taking into consideration the Government labour policy also.

*

COM. S. A. DANGE then introduced the Labour Minister of Kerala, COM. T. V. THOMAS. Com. Dange said Mr. Thomas was with us as a delegate in the AITUC Session but the delegates should now see him as a Labour Minister of the AITUC.

Com. Dange then proposed three slogans expressing the hope that the Kerala Government should defend and fight the conspiracies to overthrow it:

LONG LIVE THE KERALA GOVERNMENT!
VICTORY TO THE KERALA GOVERNMENT!
VICTORY TO THE WORKERS AND PEOPLE OF KERALA!

Com. Dange then requested the Director of ILO, India Branch, Shri V. K. R. Menon who had responded to the invitation to attend the session, to greet the Session in the name of the International Labour Office.

SHRI V. K. R. MENON then read his message of greetings. (SEE TEXT)

The President, Com. S. S. Mirajkar, thanked Shri Menon for the message.

The leader of the KOREAN DELEGATION then read his message of greetings and presented a banner to the AITUC. (SEE TEXT)

The President thanked the Korean delegation for the message and presents.

Com.Dango then presented before the Session, the Deputy Speaker of the Kerala Assembly, Com.Ayichahal.

Standing

Com.Dango also introduced to the delegates, Com.Srinantan Nair, Member of the Presidency of the United Trade Union Congress who had come to greet the Session.

COM.KOUKOL, leader of the Czechoslovak Delegation then read his message of greetings and presented gifts to the AITUC
(SEE TEXT)

The President thanked the Czechoslovak delegation for the message and presents.

The President then said the discussion on General Secretary's Report shall now be resumed.

COM.KALYAN SINGH (Rajasthan) supported the views contained in the General Secretary's Report, and said it gave a new perspective. He said something should be said about the private sector in relation to profits. The capitalists should be asked to show their patriotism by taking less profits.

Com.Kalyan Singh said there should be some idea about how we visualise the minimum living standard. In regard to cottage industries, some efforts should be made to see that surplus workers are absorbed.

He said the Workmen's Compensation Act is very defective and our MPs should do something about it.

*

Com.Dango then introduced Com.K.P.Gopalan, Industries Minister, Kerala Government.

*

COM.GOVIND SRIVASTAVA (Madhya Pradesh) then spoke on the General Secretary's Report. He said the delay in getting copies of the Report has caused inconvenience. He remarked that on the activities of our trade union leaders, the report should have contained something, and also on the Beedi and Cigar Bill moved by A.K.Gopalan. The report could have also stated that the AITUC representatives in Government Committees fared.

While he accepted the general line of the Report, in the concrete situation of Madhya Pradesh, they are facing problems of recognition and the discrimination made by Government against the AITUC unions. The Government spokesman openly said no representation will be given to the AITUC, since we would create trouble.

Com.Govind Srivastava felt that the question of organising the unorganised workers has not been stressed concretely. He said some effort should be made to ensure uniformity in labour legislations and a TU Committee for bringing about uniformity should be formed and steps should be suggested for placing the same before Parliament. He also asked for more light on how to avoid unemployment in nationalisation schemes.

COM.P.D.GANDHI (Gujarat) said that the Gujarat delegation was in general agreement with the Report, although there is a minority which holds that support to the Plan will lead us to reformist positions. The majority feels that our support to the Plan should not be just formal but should be positive.

He gave an example of a strike in Gujarat which lasted for six months, only because of rivalry between two unions. Large-scale victimisation took place and ultimately, a functioning union was lost. Therefore, he said, this report would put our position in correct perspective.

In Gujarat, trade unions are organised by activists who come from other States. When there is a setback, the activists go back and they are therefore experiencing a shortage of TU cadres.

He doubted how in the face of corruption rampant in the public sector (Rs.5 to 10 to be paid to get sitting accommodation in the railways), the workers could be enthused. Also, he said, the textile mills in Maharashtra are going to close their night shifts on account of accumulation of stocks. In this situation, how do we proceed?

There is a new upsurge in Ahmedabad. A large section of workers is dissatisfied with the IFFUC.

A Trade Union Council has been formed in Jannagar which has affiliations from all unions.

COM.SUNDIR MUKHOTI (W.Bengal) said that he has to strike a different note in the discussions, with due respect to the opinions expressed earlier. He felt very strongly that the whole report was dominated by the approach to the Second Five Year Plan.

Com.Mukhoti said the Government's peace policy is to be appreciated but the report is somewhat disproportionate. This should not have been done. Regarding the Plan, it has been suggested that the assessment in the Report is a continuation of Calcutta Conference and General Council decisions. He said, however, only some discussions took place on Com.Dange's letter at the General Council meeting and it was agreed to postpone consideration and to circulate the same to the Unions. Although the letter was printed in TUI, it has not been actually circulated for eliciting comments. If that was done, then this discussion would have been unnecessary.

He was of the opinion that as for executing the Plan, we can only run behind them. The Plan has been framed by a bourgeois government, out to strengthen bourgeois interests in this country. It seeks to integrate the entire economy of the country to consolidate the position of Indian capital. So a plan which seeks to strengthen capitalism should not have the support of the working people.

Now the capitalists have also started speaking in terms of socialism because it suits them to do so and they get good protection under the present Government. In all States where capitalism developed, we find capitalists also want State enterprises for their own protection. Individual capitalists may have some differences, but the Plan is generally a capitalist plan. So if this plan is supported, we will be only strengthening capitalism.

Capitalism today is in crisis and I do not think, Indian capitalists could escape from that. The crisis in our country has become now or less a chronic affair. So in order to save themselves, they have framed a Plan and they try to secure our support.

The planners themselves declared that the first plan laid the basis of the 2nd Plan. We ourselves experience the acute economic crisis - loss of purchasing power, real wages are going down, sufferings of the people have increased. So from the working of the plan itself, we find how the people suffer. In a capitalist set-up, when a capitalist plan works, that means further modernisation of the means of production, that will mean more production but as they produce more, purchasing power will not be there to absorb the increased production and there will be crisis of overproduction.

Our internal market is limited and therefore, a foreign market is necessary. Do we have a foreign market? We do not have such markets and we cannot have such markets. With the competition from the advanced countries, we cannot hope with the success of the Plan to export goods and maintain our economy.

Taxation is a consequence of the Plan. Taxation is so high. Prices have gone up. For any success of the Plan, if we vote support to the Plan, we also vote for the enhancement of taxes. There is no way out. In the capitalist framework, if we want this Plan to succeed, it would mean more taxation. That such capitalist plans would ~~only create illusions and introduce~~ only create illusions and introduce Right deviation.

The objective of the AITUC is to establish socialism. So our responsibility to the working people is to give training to the working people in socialism and in this we can educate the working people only by exposing the Plan and capitalist crisis. If we therefore support the Plan, the working class will recede from its class awakening.

There is no rise in real wages. The rise in prices has led to reduction in purchasing power.

We had made a demand for Rs.100 as minimum wage. So far as I could see, that demand has totally disappeared from the Report. Then there was the question of 25 percent wage increase. That demand is also not there. There is now a talk of average rise of 25%. I do not know how it is. If we get 40 per cent in coal and 5 in another - is this way of calculation? If there has been such a great rise in prices, I think, 25 per cent has to be stressed in every industry and wherever wages are lower, we must demand more than 25 per cent. Adjustments are of course to be made. So far as we are concerned, at this platform of the AITUC, we must advocate an increase of 25 per cent in all industries.

In the AITUC constitution, there was a clause for 6-hour working day. In this present report that has been done away with and only in cases of specified industries, this has been demanded. We should say what should be the minimum working hours. We must not go back from the six-hour day in the Constitution.

The Code of Discipline which came from the Indian Labour Conference talks of sanctions against unions in case of indiscipline. What does it mean? What is the nature of the sanctions? I do not know. But this is an important matter.

Recently there has been trend, as is seen in the Central and State Government Reports, of having long-term agreements. What should be the AITUC's demand?

COM.DAS (W.Bengal) said he felt that the whole report lay on the approach towards the Second Plan. Why there is no 100/- wage demand? Why no 25% wage increase? Why no mention of taxes? Why workers have been criticised very severely for going on strike without notice? - All these have arisen not because of mistakes. It has arisen out of the approach that has been made to the Second Five Year Plan.

Our Government is a capitalist government and it is stated so in the report. In this period of general crisis of capitalism, can monopoly capitalist plan for liquidating capitalism? This is a contradiction. We feel this plan is made to entrench the capitalist rule in our country. It is the continuation of the First Plan. The first plan was to generate cheap power and the second plan is to use that energy so that capitalists might exploit the people more effectively.

Today in every capitalist country, there is mixed economy, there is State sector and private sector. Why is this so? The State has taken up those industries only which require huge capital and which are indispensable to industrialisation.

One good feature is that we are taking aid from the socialist camp. But socialist countries also take help from imperialists. Does that mean that they (socialist countries) have become imperialists? No. Same way India taking aid from Socialist camp does not mean that India is socialist. We must remember the human relation in the Plan, we must see the human content. The human content is that it is exploitation and exploiters.

They talk of socialism only to dupe our thinking and continue with mixed economy, since mixed economy is required by them. See the example of Nagarjunsagar. They are paying less wages.

We do want industrialisation. But we must remember that crisis is ahead and we are already in a crisis. Is it due to bad monsoon, drought? No. It is due to 10 years' policy of the Government to enrich the rich, to impoverish the people. We have to explain to the people that this crisis is caused by capitalism. The Five Year Plans and steel plants cannot be fulfilled unless power is in the hands of the working class.

COM.AJIT DEWAS (W.Bengal) said that real wages of the workers have not increased and it is natural in a society where few rich dominate. The number of unemployed has also risen. A plan which cannot enrich the income of the people and cannot solve unemployment cannot be called a people's plan. Secondly, he said the plan is made to attack the people. They want compulsory donations, impose heavy taxes and suppress all demands of workers. A government which has come with open support of industrialists cannot make a people's plan. The question does not arise whether we should support the Plan or not. The working class cannot give full support to the Second Five Year Plan.

COM.DANE said that in the discussions, all views and all States have been represented, of whatever political direction they may be. There are requests for more speeches but there is no time. The session has to take up the resolutions and the amendments to the constitution. He suggested that except for one or two speeches henceforth, all other speeches may be written down in the form of points so that it may be incorporated into the record.

THE PRESIDENT ANNOUNCED THE SESSION till 3 P.M.

AFTERNOON SESSION - 28th December 1957

Com. S. S. Mirajkar presided.

A message received from the SOBSI, Indonesia, was read: "The National Council of SOBSI convey warmest greetings from Indonesian workers. We regret that we are not able to attend your memorable Congress and wish greater successes in consolidating struggle and closer unity and for peace. Hoping support Indonesian workers' fight for abolition of Dutch aggression."

COM. CHANDRASEKHAR HIKERJEE from the United Iron & Steel Workers Union, Bumpur, conveyed greetings of the steel workers to the 25th Session. Although his union was not formally affiliated to the AIFUC, he said, they were following the line adopted by the AIFUC. Com. Dange is the President of their Union. He assured the delegates that the reasons preventing their affiliation would soon be eliminated and they would soon be joining the ranks of the AIFUC. He said therefore the policy and line now before the session for adoption are of special interest to them.

Steel industry is the kingpin in the Second Plan. Com. Dange's report has given a definite reorientation in the policy of the AIFUC and on behalf of the steel workers of Bumpur, he was glad to accept the Report.

The monopoly capitalists are out to sabotage the Five Year Plan. He emphasised this point by quoting what the Report said about Sir Biren Hikerjee (Director of Indian Iron & Steel) and his attack on the State Sector.

The steel kings are squeezing the workers in order to show that they can produce cheaper steel and thus beat down the State Sector. In spite of the expansion programme in the Bumpur steel mills, the management refused to recruit additional labour force and are trying to utilise the existing workers to meet the additional production also.

Com. Hikerjee described the heroic battles waged by the Bumpur workers against the steel barons and their IIFUC union. The workers have won many gains. Before the strike they got only 20 days wages as bonus but now they get 65 days bonus. During the strike 100s of workers were discharged. Now the Union has been successful in getting back 100 workers reinstated, with a compensation amounting to nearly 10 lakhs of rupees.

The minimum wage in Bumpur that was fixed eight years ago (Rs. 1 for males and 15 ps. for females) still operates. The DA which they get is only Rs. 25. The Union representing 10,000 workers was denied the right of recognition. These are the "ifs" and "buts".

But in spite of all this, he said, the workers by their positive attitude to the Plan can fight and change the "ifs" and "buts". On strikes, he said, only as a last resort should we go on strike and when we strike, we strike hard. If we do so, we shall show to all that we are striking not only for us but for the whole nation.

He requested Com. Dange to include a review of the conciliation machinery of the Government in the Report.

#

COM. HUOGEN DUY THI, leader of the Vietnam delegation, then read his message of greetings and presented gifts. The President thanked him for the message and gifts.

Then the session was addressed by the leader of the ROMANIAN DELEGATION who conveyed greetings to the 25th Session and presented gifts. The President thanked the Romanian delegation for the message and gifts.

The President then called upon the House to take up AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE AFTU.

Before the amendments were taken up, a message received from Shri M.V. Donda, Mayor of Bombay, was read.

COM. P. RAMAMURTI, Convenor, Sub-Committee set up by the Session to consider amendments to the Constitution, said that in the opinion of the Committee, only those amendments which are extremely necessary may be taken up now. He then proposed the amendments clause by clause.

(1) CLAUSE 2: f(see text)

This clause has ceased to have any meaning. This was drafted early in the 1920s and no longer holds valid. Now India is a free country. Therefore, this clause should be deleted.

Com. Meni Ghose put forward an amendment to the proposal. He wanted substitution of clause 2(f) by "To support and actively participate in the toilers' struggle for liberation from political and economic bondage." He said as is clear from his amendment, the working class of India is not free. The state in India is a capitalist State and the worker is still in economic and political bondage.

Since the Constitution Committee did not accept this amendment, it was put to vote. The amendment was rejected by the house.

The President then placed the original proposal made by Com. P. Ramamurti to vote and it was accepted by an overwhelming majority.

(2)

Com. P. Ramamurti then moved amendment to clause 6(a) of the Constitution:

(see text)

A delegate moved an amendment to the proposal that instead of the slab of affiliation fees, make the rate of 2 naye paise applicable to all unions. Another amendment moved was to reduce WFTU levy to Rs. 2/3 for those unions with a membership of less than 500.

Com. P. Ramamurti accepted the amendment to reduce WFTU levy to Rs. 2/3 for unions of less than 500 membership. But he did not accept the uniform rate of 2 naye paise for all unions. (This amendment was later withdrawn)

The President then put to vote the proposal made by Com. Ramamurti re. Clause 6(a) of the Constitution, as amended (Rs. 2/3 as WFTU levy upto 500 membership) and this was APPROVED.

The President then announced that the amendments can be taken up later on and now the General Secretary, Com. Dange, will reply to discussions on the Report.

CON. DAHE'S REPLY TO THE DISCUSSIONS
(23 December 1957)

Comrades,

We will now conclude the discussions on the Report. The speeches made here represented all States and all trends. The discussion was extremely helpful in the sense that it will fill up whatever is lacking in the Report and it will strengthen what is already there. So in that sense, majority of the criticism was extremely helpful. We got a number of facts and number of arguments which were not available otherwise and could not be made available for reasons of our organisational conditions before we met in this session.

The general tenor of the discussion was what? That there was general agreement with the main policies that are detailed in the Report. With all the defects, with all the shifts here and there that had been pointed out, yet the majority of the statements made here ~~were~~ from almost all the States, even including Bengal from ~~which~~ where some of my friends were critical and sometimes overcritical, even there there was a sort of general agreement with the line of the Report.

Now therefore I would take it that when we come to formulate general resolutions on the question, we will not have much of an argument left. But it is necessary that some of the arguments that have been raised have got to be answered or accepted. Some of the arguments are very pointed. For example, some criticism was raised on total opposition to the line. Therein, what do ^{we} ~~we~~ do? We cannot go into a discussion of the whole thing - role of the national bourgeoisie, role of monopoly capital, the way in which they want to develop the Plan and whether we are helping the development of capitalism and whether it is the role of the AITUC, whether or not ^{is} any under-developed country which has acquired freedom recently ^{whether} capitalism is a necessary stage or not,

or we can immediately go over to socialism? All these questions of a fundamental nature cannot be discussed here for the simple reason that, first, we do not have the time for it; secondly, we need not go into it, since we are not making any categorical statement that we are out to develop capitalism.

Therefore, the question of total opposition to the line will have to be left for an answer at a later stage. But I would certainly like to deal with it, if all the time necessary was at our disposal. You might say that time cannot be pleaded in case of fundamental things. But in our conditions when we are immediately more concerned with questions of wages, immediate struggles, etc., for the time being certain fundamental arguments may be left over. So I would confine myself to those points which cannot be avoided.

Coming to the first objection which at the very beginning I accept that not delivering the Report in time to the delegates certainly handicapped their discussions. There is no doubt about that. No doubt the organisation of the office has not been up to the mark. I do not want to go into reasons. But such a document of 86 pages cannot be discussed thoroughly if it is not handed over to the delegates early enough. I suggested earlier that we should evolve a system where reports are circulated quite in advance so that people can discuss it thoroughly.

Now, going over through some points which are of outstanding significance, there was certainly correct indignation and a question was raised: when you deal with the international situation you refer to Sputnik, but there is another Sputnik on the land and that is the formation of the Kerala Government. Why don't you mention that? The Kerala comrade who asked that question was much agitated about it. And he said such an outstanding factor as the victory through ballot box, we do not even discuss.

But we are not here assembled in a Congress of the Communist Party where questions can be put whether a Communist Party can come to power through the ballot box. Certainly it is a discussion for international comrades to carry out. Maybe the majority of comrades here are Communist Party members. But that certainly is not the problem for

discussion with us. Therefore, it was not that I was blind to the presence of the Kerala Government, not that I did not know it came to power through the ballot box. Otherwise, why do we hold our Congress at Bhopal? But we sometimes forget where we are and what we are dealing with and in what capacity and in what role. We mix up the role and mix up the front.

Reference to the Kerala Government came last in the Report where we said, here is a government which must be supported; here is a government which has given an example to others. And that all attempts that are made to overthrow this Government should be overcome by the working class, the peasantry and other sections of the people.

Therefore, on the platform of the AITUC, the Kerala Government and its coming to power through the ballot box will not be a subject for discussion in dealing with the international factors. So my friend will forgive me.

Coming to the second question, you will ask: not why this discussion of the Plan? The discussion of the Plan is necessary. Why at this stage? The first Plan was carried out without the AITUC supporting it or opposing it. The second Plan is also through one or two years. So why worry?

At the General Council meeting in Calcutta, we raised this subject. At that time, it could not be clarified. We are raising this here and purposely and positively so, and I would request you to consider what the situation is.

Why should we raise the problem of the Plan and then while raising the question of support, why put it in that fashion, i.e., to fulfil the core of the Plan, with the 5 features of the Plan and the State Sector? These questions have been asked.

If the Plan was being fulfilled smoothly, if the Plan was not being attacked by foreign monopoly capital and Indian reactionaries, I would not have raised the question. But the Plan today is under attack by them in order to see that its beneficial schemes should not be fulfilled, that its development which hits the foreign monopoly should be obstructed, that its development which helps national

economy should not be carried out. This is the desire of certain interests.

At such a stage, what should be the desire of the working class? For example, the foreign capital which opposed our freedom and now opposes our development - has it ceased to be our enemy? No. Foreign capital continues to oppose our further development, even though we have won freedom. It is stated so ~~very~~ ^{very} clearly in the Report to the NFTU Congress and what is stated there is stated here. I am stating it here because we are discussing here our own national situation.

Foreign monopolists refuse to give capital goods and even when they a little, they impose certain conditions which are so humiliating and which injure our national freedom. Therefore, anybody who wants the strengthening of our independence must see that the plans of foreign capital are defeated.

And this Plan poses the question: shall India succeed in industrialising herself or not? We must industrialise thoroughly and speedily. Therefore, the question of Plan is raised because it undertakes to do certain things and hence that Plan has got to go ahead. When it is going ahead, foreign capital attacks it. Do we want factories to grow? We want factories to be established. Foreign monopoly does not want it. Is it not therefore our duty to the working class to tell the foreign monopolists that their conspiracies are against our national economy, against our independence, are such that our industrialisation does not take place, the growth of our prosperity and higher standards of living will not take place and, therefore, we will see that their conspiracies are defeated?

This is the line of the whole people. Because, the question of independence and national freedom to be strengthened by national industrialisation is a question for all people. That is why even some Congressmen want to support it. Therefore, there is a contradiction amongst the bourgeoisie, no doubt. Because some sections are patriotic. National bourgeoisie as a whole ~~are~~ ^{are} patriotic.

We have to mobilise our support to the Plan - in support of what? and how will we mobilise?

First point to remember is that the plan is not the main question. It may be made by the bourgeoisie, not liked by us, it may or may not develop capitalism. By what direction it goes is not decided by the bourgeoisie. We are not going to allow the bourgeoisie to have its own way. If the working class is strong enough to prevent the utilisation of the Plan solely in favour of capitalism, then it will not develop into capitalism. But if we are weak enough, if we do not understand the direction and we cannot act in defence of the Plan, then what will succeed are some parts of the plan which will help the development of capitalism and nothing else.

They first tried to freeze wages, we hit them back and later on they changed that policy. Is this not a change which ~~was~~ came about because of our strength?

The Dutch-Shell Company wanted to raise the price of oil. We fought on this issue in Parliament and the Government was forced not only to deny any rise in prices but in fact argued for a price reduction. Here is also an example how people's action and people's voice can change the policy of the Government from appeasing foreign capital.

Therefore, the Plan has got to be raised in this way, because it is under fire from the monopoly capital and sometimes, I am surprised to find, it is under fire from some trade union leaders also. I heard a slogan that we must ~~fix~~ expose the Plan. Expose in what?

I raised the question not of a general support to the Plan. A criticism came, why only the core or the hard core of the Plan: why don't you support the whole plan as it is?

Why only the core? The core of the Plan is, as I put it, in the first place, the State Sector, heavy industry. The core is the way to progress. We comrades of the trade unions do not have enough time to study the Plan in detail. For instance, the Government wants to allocate money to bring in machines for rationalisation costing Rs. 30 to 40 crores. Shall we support all this? This is part of the Plan. We are not going to support it.

Panitt Nehru says food problem can be solved by National Extension Service and Community Projects. Do we believe that? We don't believe that. Food problem can be solved only by land reform. Supplement the land reform by supply of fertilisers, community development, etc. Unless basic land reforms are there, food problem will not be solved.

Therefore we say, we do not support everything. We don't support ~~anything~~ anything you do, but the hard core, viz., heavy industry, land reform, the State Sector. These must have the priority in the fulfilment of the Plan. Why priority? If we have all the capital and all the goods, then there is no question of talking in terms of the core. But when it is not so, shall we say what is necessary, or shall we not? The question is not whether to support the Government or not. Whether we like it or not, Millai and Roukela plants are a necessity for us. So fulfilment of the core does not mean by implication or otherwise, all support to the political policy of the Government.

There we want pruning, but not of the type demanded by the reactionaries.

They may want nylon stockings plant, we don't want that. Five crores is set apart for plastics. We don't want that, whether in private or State sector. For the private sector also, the money has to be provided by the State treasury.

We say, prune, change or revise the Plan. But what part? Then comes the controversy. Some would say: no steel plant, no machine tool plant. The Soviet Union is supplying a coalmining machinery plant. Some people would say, that is the need for that. So we must be careful and find out what is to be pruned and not to be pruned.

Prune out plastics, prune out rationalisation machinery. Prune out the racketeering parts of community development programmes which do not lead to any good.

A question was raised whether I wanted electricity schemes to be pruned. There are multi-purpose schemes, including the building

of damms, canal irrigation and development of hydro-electric power. For the development of hydro-electric power, turbines are required to be imported. The idea is to electrify all the villages. We say if there is a crisis and something has to be pruned, don't touch the steel plants, stop the turbines which are for electrification of villages. The villager will wait for electricity for another three years. Even most advanced countries today do not have the means to put electricity in every village. We have got now 40 million tons of coal. Why not use that? Lower down the price of diesel oil? This was how it was suggested by me in parliament but it was not unfortunately fully reported. I said, do have the irrigation but not village electrification which can wait for another three years. If diesel is made available cheap and diesel engines can be manufactured here, why should we go immediately for turbines? In planning, we must have a conception of our own resources. Certainly we will electrify. Lenin said Communism is soviet power with electrification. But he meant it differently. Here it has to be taken in the context of the present stage of development of our country.

So, in the first place, this was partly misreported, in part it was not properly understood. Therefore, don't think that I do not want electrification plans in Kerala or Andhra to go up.

What is necessary for the development of our country now? To protect its freedom and independence and to further it on to the road of development? This question is raised and the answer would be industrialisation. In what sphere - development of heavy industries. That is accepted. In what way? Particularly in the State Sector.

You should read the Report to the UFTU Congress wherein I said that:

(take the quotation)

Therefore I have emphasised the State Sector without losing sight of the fact that at the help of the State stands the national bourgeoisie and in the governmental services, functionaries have more pull. Therefore, even such a government, the State Sector would help us better than the private sector, which of course does not mean that we should neglect development of private sector.

Therefore, trade unions cannot go without a national policy on the question of national economy and industrialisation. After freedom, we must have industrialisation. Hence the resources of the Plan, the core of the Plan, had to be brought in the Report and it was brought.

^{we should} Therefore, ~~we~~ understand the thing in detail and in concrete form and not go into abstractions here, if you don't like certain theoretical things. I am not here to impose certain theoretical formulations. However, I do not want the trade unions to be blind on the direction of the development and the immediate tasks of industrialisation. Hence the plan has got to be raised in the trade union platform. It is not that it is a private affair of my own thinking or the domain of certain political parties. This does not conflict with any standpoint of any political party for the simple reason that it is the standpoint of the whole people. No political party is in conflict with the interests of the people as such.

So the tasks to follow would be what? Concentrate fire on the foreign monopoly capital and its plans of hampering national development. If you don't know the objective, you will fire in all sorts of directions. Therefore, the direction is against foreign monopoly capital, the capitalist countries which obstruct our development and hold it at ransom. We demand of the Government that foreign capital and its operations must be curbed and controlled. Wherever possible, foreign monopoly interests must be nationalised. If nationalisation might create difficulties, then curb their activities and this curbing must be a campaign which the trade unions must carry out. The whole economy is in the grip of the oil monopolies. Oil prices in India is higher than what it is in London. Even ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~oil~~ ~~market~~ ~~in~~ ~~India~~

said it was fantastic that we pay for oil at Mexican Gulf parity prices.

The railways want coal. Are the coalminers lazy? No. But the big foreign-owned concerns are sabotaging coal production. They want to dictate prices and we have to shout if they do it and tell them that we will take over the industry, if the Government would not curb them.

That is why we raised the question of the Plan, its scope and its fulfilment.

Therefore, I would say, concentrate fire on foreign monopoly capital. And, secondly, concentrate fire on their allies in the country. Are these allies?

At the Transport Federations' Conference, Com. Copalan made his presidential address. He said we need only one or two models of trucks and therefore can we afford the luxury of 7 to 10 models roaming about the country, wasting precious foreign exchange involved in the import of spares and other essential equipment for each individual model. Same way in cars also there are at least 10 makes. Why should there be so many automobile plants distributed in so many centres manufacturing so many models? The Soviet Union or China does not have this parade of models? Is it because they cannot afford it? But they don't do it.

Here in India there are capitalists like Tata who have entered into agreements with the foreign monopolists to manufacture cars and trucks in different varieties. And the different models which all of them put on the market consume a large amount of foreign exchange.

Therefore, it was right for the trade unions in transport to come forward with a national policy, on the question of the manufacture of cars and trucks.

I can give you hundreds of examples there we as a trade union, as a national organisation of the working class has to take charge of the economy of the country from one State to another until we take the whole country and hence the working class today must know what the Plan is.

These problems are becoming concrete and urgent and becoming day-to-day problems. Therefore, the problem of line is not raised for the pleasure of having a separate line, but since it is very vital.

I hope you will accept the main direction. I am not worried about this phrase or that phrase. Of course, certain phrases cannot be compromised but that is not the main thing. The main thing is: determine your attitude to the Plan.

Then we come to the second question. When we take a decision that we support the Plan, that it is necessary for freedom and national economy, - what about us?

Questions are raised: is the plan not being handled by capitalists and ministers who are dreaming of becoming capitalists, by a government which is bureaucratic, anti-working class and inhuman, which obstructs the development of the peasantry and workers? So what shall we do with regard to people's interests?

The first fallacy of this argument is that the Plan is not in their hands, ^{as} we think. We can change; we can influence; we can bring about good amendments.

In Parliament, we said, there is no need to keep 600 crores as reserve in London to back our currency, since no other country in the world ever does such a thing, and especially when the Government pleads they have no money to pay to the PEF employees. The Ministers laughed at us for this proposal but after two months, they themselves brought forward a bill reducing the reserves to 200 crores. Perhaps very soon they would bring it down to zero. Shri T.T. Krishnamachari said in the Plan debate that although they accepted certain criticisms of ours, they did so for their own reasons. We do not mind that and it is good if he accepts that.

It is not that the Plan is only in their hands. Because we have developed in strength. We are underestimating the strength of the working class, if we say the Plan is in "their" hands. Certainly, the Government in 1/15th India is in our hands. The fulfilment of the allocations here in Kerala is in the hands of its 14 million people. The 14 million can control the development of the Plan here.

The city of Bombay with its budget of 22 crores is in our hands. Our President San. Mirajkar is the Chairman of the Standing Committee and he is going back tomorrow to sign the budget of 22 crores. Do you still think we are not a force? In the whole of Maharashtra, every major municipality has been captured by the Saniti. The working class is the major force in the Saniti. Then there are several municipalities in other States and municipal budgets controlled by the workers. These questions are therefore becoming concrete. Therefore, we cannot play with the Plan.

We cannot neglect it. Even my Bengal friends are thinking, not incorrectly, that they would soon be in power. We in Maharashtra are also dreaming that we would assume the reins of Government after the bifurcation of the bilingual state. In all these conditions can we neglect the Plan? Therefore, we cannot be utopians and theoreticians in the abstract, as we had justification to be 10 years ago. Today you have to be realistic. The Plan is in their hands and partly in our hands also and we will see that it comes more and more into our hands.

Secondly, we have to defend our interests. Because it is in their hands mainly today, and because these people have not arisen from the democratic masses as we are, therefore, we have to be careful that the Plan is not used solely in the interests of the vested interests. That is why we say, defend the Plan, defend the working class - a two pillar policy.

That was the Working Committee's policy. You cannot have two exclusive policies: Either defend the Plan or defend the working class; or total struggle or no struggle. This sort of attitude of extremes would not help us in the evolution of correct tactics.

Some objection has been taken with what I said in the report that real wages have also increased. Some people dislike that statement. As a matter of tactic, some people do not want to say so. The total income of the working class has not made real advance but worker to worker, industry to industry, we have advanced. We said that this was achieved by defeating the Government policy of

wage freeze. If we simply say we defeated the policy of wage freeze - is there any increase? We have to say that we defeated the wage freeze policy. In the First Plan, the bourgeoisie wanted wage freeze. In the first year they lost 3 million man-days. And in 1956, the workers said they have waited long enough and came into action. The man-days lost rose to 5 million in 1955 and then on to 7 million in 1956. And at last in the Indian Labour Conference, the Government accepted that wage increases will be given.

This is a defeat for the monopolists who wanted the Plan only for themselves.

We have of course explained that the larger earnings were through larger production and larger productivity.

Where are we heading to? Is the direction correct or not? From 1930 to 1945, wages were continuously falling, both money and real wages. Money wage fall was restricted by D.A., but during the whole period, wages were falling and that was the direction. ~~throughout the period~~ In the First Plan, the direction was wage freeze. Our direction is no freeze; wages must go up and share in ~~particular~~ ~~national~~ prosperity. We succeeded in getting the increase. Now the direction is working class victory in getting more and more gains from the hands of the reactionaries. Therefore, the statement about rise in real wages does not mean that in no industry should we demand wage increases. However, even then you still have some objections, we may change that statement in order that the bourgeoisie does not use it, not to give room for interpretation that in case for wage increases does not exist.

I would say therefore that this is not a false statement or one which gives a false statement of our struggles. We give a clear direction of victories and the direction of the gains. It is to tell the working class that our policy of struggles for wages have got good results and with this we have got to go ahead.

The other questions which were raised are all minor. Only some objections were raised about certain slogans. For instance, some people asked: why don't you say definitely for a 25% wage increase.

Some comrades made very absurd points that we don't want any strikes. He has enough liberty to accuse me of pleasing the government. I could give an answer in the same terms. I could also answer that disruptive policies are there which please the government. So let us not go about with such type of phrases.

Why do we incorporate "average"? By simple experience. And experience which made me sit up with eyes open, especially in Kerala, then some comrades began to talk of 25 per cent and nothing less. And they said the AITUC has laid down 100/- as minimum and so Rs.100 and nothing less was the demand. As you will remember, some comrades raised here the problems of small-scale industries. When we formulated the national minimum of Rs.100/- we said that this minimum was for organised industries. Organised industry means textiles in Bombay and iron & steel. And in industry after industry, the AITUC centre had to sit with the comrades from coal, tea, cement, etc., who also talked of nothing less than Rs.100/-. It was a hard job to convince them. (Of course, on all these, there is no organisational report). That was my experience in Kerala also. Everywhere there was the question of how to proceed. Then it occurred to me that this rigidity was putting a ~~stiff~~ fetter on our movement. So, we shall have a direction and not concrete figures.

Somebody had cited the example of the toddi industry in Kerala, where faced with the increase in minimum wages, there was migration of capital. If there is too much increase in wages in Kerala, they will go to Tamilnad and when we catch them there, they will shift somewhere else and until and unless we are established in the Centre, this will remain.

The question is: why not raise Rs.100 as the slogan? I deliberately missed it. Of course, I have not to pay the 100/-. But we cannot then be responsible people. Trade union struggles are becoming responsible struggles. When we get power, people will say, we now talk of responsibility and so why blame the Congress? The trouble with them is that they never translate what they say into practice. IITUC may accept Rs.100 as minimum but they have no responsibility

to see through its implementation. When we demand 4 months bonus, they demand 5 months but sign for half a month. So in making formulation of demands in a radical way cannot win over the workers. Intellectuals may think so, but the worker is realistic. What is the use of being heroic about demands? And there are people who become rigid about it. In the PWT, they were arguing about 100, 120 or 150. I said keep it at 100. Somebody wanted 125; they said, why not at least say so. But when you raise the tempo of the movement, if you raise it too high and later settle less, the worker will desert you. The demand should be what we can expect.

Therefore I am modifying the earlier formulation. I say we must have a minimum wage, a national minimum and industrial minimum and differentials should be fixed up. Rigidity is obstructing a reasonable settlement, particularly in Kerala and in the Bombay municipality where we have the majority. In Bombay, soon after the Saniti won the majority, the workers mainly under the Socialist Party placed demands for wage increases. The Saniti had the problem of raising 2½ crores for this. Ultimately however they came around to realistic demands and was settled at around 30 lakhs.

Therefore, if you like, I have no objection of repeating the demand of Rs.100/- for the pleasure of being loyal to a certain resolution. But if you think rigidity should be overcome, argue the minimum in terms of certain needs as the Indian Labour Conference has itself accepted and vary it according to the regions. It has now been accepted that wages should be "need-based". Need is different from region to region and therefore you must have a certain room to manoeuvre, not as a tactic, but manoeuvre in relation to the given industry, condition of the movement, and so on.

This is my reply to the comrade who said, why don't you short the demand for Rs.100/-?

Wage Boards - what is our task? Seize hold of these Boards, conceded by the Indian Labour Conference but not appointed. Seize hold of the minimum. Seize hold of a rise in every industry.

A question was raised about long-term agreements. There is no reason why we should oppose long-term agreements as such but such agreements should contain conditions. We can have settlements on wages, bonus, etc. for two or three years. In the LNUC agreements the guarantee of stability of conditions is not given. That is why we opposed such agreements.

How many types of additions to wages you are demanding? The quantum you can argue about when you come to definite resolutions. But add up all the quanta and find out a realistic wage demand. Nobody demands that we should not have a national minimum or we need not have rise in wages. On the floor of parliament, it was the AITUC which said that the wage-price-spiral argument of bourgeois economics we do not accept. We quoted the British TUC which condemned such an argument. So in this chapter, there is no cause for complaint that the AITUC is not demanding wage increase. We shall support the Plan but we shall defend the interests of the workers. Production is increasing and profit is increasing and so wages also must increase.

So if anybody has any suspicion, I would like him to point out. To those who think so, let me say that they have not correctly understood the question or not properly followed. I would not accuse them of purposely misrepresenting.

Then we come to the question of closures. It is not yet an element of causing depression. These closures are a pressure tactic of the bourgeoisie to get concessions. Closures in textiles have got for them a half per cent reduction in excise. There are other types of closures when partners start quarrelling.

What should be the form of action? Ask the Government to take them over? They will say they don't want to take over old junk. Use provident fund contributions as capital? There cannot however be any overall solution to the problem. The Government should see that the wages and other dues to workers are immediately paid. In case of attachment on property, the Government should enact a law that the first charge should be the payment of arrears wages. Therefore, pressing the Government to meet the immediate needs of the workers

should be the immediate question. Then comes the question of reopening. We will have to evolve a concrete scheme in each particular case. This was done by the Defence Federation. When defence workers were threatened with retrenchment, they suggested alternative lines of production. As a result of the struggle of the workers and with this approach, all surplus defence workers were absorbed in other jobs. Therefore, this question requires study from plant to plant.

For example, in Rajasthan, one mill closed down. But the Government had given Rs. 60 lakhs to another capitalist to open another mill in the same Rajasthan. We asked the Ministers: why not use the new machinery in the old mill which has now closed down, where trained workers are already available? The Minister said that was an idea. These people just don't think. They do things in a bureaucratic way. Therefore, this question is not always that of the monopoly capitalist spoiling everything for the workers. The trade unions should therefore have a concrete task in order to protect the interests of the workers.

Social Security - Some comrades proposed that we should observe a one-day protest strike. I do not know what is actually happening. Especially I am worried about the way policies are discussed in the Bengal section. It is the most organised section and conscious section. May be I am dull and Bengal is considered most intelligent.

Once I proposed a handbill to Com. Nemon saying that don't sign agreeing to the ISI unless guarantees asked for are given. I was then told that it was sectarianism, etc. They signed. Then they said they are not getting the guarantees. What is the use of complaining now? How they complain that you are not allowing us to strike.

I know they are all very good workers. But there must be a certain line and certain understanding. There are some people who think that support to this scheme is fundamentally wrong. In Bombay also there was vehement opposition in the initial stages. Strong hefty workers came and said - "we never fall ill". They had to be told what social security is. This social security scheme is a new thing in capitalist society in India. This has to be explained to the workers.

The jute mill owners and the Government of West Bengal are interested in scrapping the scheme. I as a member of the Corporation got all the minutes and I know they try everything in order to sabotage the scheme. Therefore, we should not walk into that trap. But are there not difficulties? Yes, and on this we have put up our demands.

I would be all for a one-day strike, but, first complete the preliminaries. In Bombay, doctors got cheeky. 50 people went to see them and then everything was all right. In Kanpur and Delhi after workers demonstrated, the scheme started going better.

So you should give a verdict on this question whether you want this scheme or not. You will have to call a general strike, if you want to cut the contributions. Myself, the Working Committee, the General Council and the majority of States are of the opinion that the scheme is defective no doubt, but let it be extended to ~~the~~ all ~~existing~~ sections, to family members and implemented democratically, let specialist treatment be given, and let hospitals be built immediately.

The main slogan should be that immediately hospitals should be built in all major towns. In the Corporation, I told Minister Nanda that I would offer satyagraha on this question. I told him that wherever a big building is being constructed for big corporations, I would offer satyagraha on the demand that the hospitals for the workers should be built first. Until a hospital is built for us, no other building should go up. Bombay has Rs.50 lakhs for the hospital but for 5 years there is no hospital, on the plea of shortage of material. But the Starves has built its big office costing two crores, and steel, cement and everything was delivered to them by Government. Huge newspaper offices are being built by those who say they have no money to pay the working journalists. Therefore, organise satyagraha until a building for the hospital is completed. That is a slogan of action.

Therefore, my proposal would be, it would not be the time now to strike against the ESI Scheme because it has not gone that bad. In fact, it can be improved, if we approach correctly. But if you want to take a fundamental decision it is your choice. The Working Committee

thinks that is not the correct way. You can demand reduction in contributions and on other questions, you can carry on agitation.

Struggles - Some people have suggested that we are presenting here a line of no struggles. I do not know where you got it. Because everytime we do not shout about strikes and we say, strike as a last resort, some people have accused us as following a line of "no struggle". That is the first fallacy in this statement. The first fallacy is that in the mind of this commentator, struggle means strike, and if you propose strike as a last resort, you are for struggle as a last resort. In his dictionary struggle is strike. And therefore, this is a no struggle line.

I do not know how people who are in the trade union movement as veterans should interpret this slogan in such a way like and that I should be the person who proposes such a thing.

In the coal industry, we proposed to the Labour Minister that if a settlement is not arrived at and the tribunal's verdict implemented, the workers will go on a general strike. This was the official statement made by the AITUC. Ask the experience of the Bihar comrades? Ask the experience of Ranpur? (Bihar and Ranpur comrades concur with the statement). AITUC is not that gentleman who is against strikes and struggles. Therefore let us talk in a realistic way.

Even arguing a demand involves struggle: first with your head and then with the workers. Therefore, there is no "no struggle" or "no strike" line in this, and there is also no "yes strike" line in this.

I want to be frank about it. Some people pose the question: strike or no strike. It is a wrong formulation and a wrong question. The question is: you must organize, demonstrate, negotiate and try to settle and if not, strike. You cannot go about with strikes in the old way. You cannot allow a train and wagon to be derailed as was done at Kharagpur. I will protest against such things. You cannot allow violence and killing. That is not revolution. Even the blackleg is human and he can be won over by the thousands of striking workers. Therefore, you have to revise your values in the conduct of strike struggles.

You cannot go about in the old ways conditions in this country and the mind of the people of this country has to be taken note of. Seven years ago, 4 Europeans were put in the boiler and burnt. Who paid for it? The workers. Was it correct? No. This is not military and revolutionary struggle. If some people believe in armed struggle, let them do it - but not than the backbone.

Of course, you should defend yourself. If a blackleg attacks you, defend. Not by killing yourself. An injury done in defence of life is one thing and an injury done otherwise is different. In our country today values are changing. It is not a question of violence or non-violence. I do not think that in every situation we can avoid violence. But I believe in peaceful methods in the given conditions. Some people like the IFTU and the Government might say, it is a tactic. If 100 policemen came to beat me up, shall I not instinctively take hold of a lathi too and defend myself? And if we did that in Bombay, that was rightly done. They talk of indiscipline. Revolutionary indiscipline in defence of a cause is different. It is not violence. Indiscipline and discipline cannot be judged in abstract terms.

Therefore, it is not a question of struggle or no struggle, violence or non-violence. But in the given situation, as the Working Committee has formulated: Organise and Unite, Demonstrate and Protest, Negotiate and Settle, If not strike, peacefully and as a last resort. Strike as a last resort - not struggle. Our conception of struggle ought to be a homogenous whole.

Another point about struggles. I stated in the Report: "At the same time, we have to see that all this development taking place is not at the cost of the working people. Hence we have to follow a two pillar policy - to help in the development of the economy and to defend the interests of the working masses in that economy." None should think that we can defend the working class without struggles. We must have a two-pillar policy of helping the development of the economy and to defend the interests of the workers.

How do you defend the interests of the workers? We are not

equating ourselves with the mechanical policies of the IFTU or with the mechanical policies of certain gentlemen in the IIS, UTUC and sometimes in the AITUC who think that struggle means strike. This fact must be conveyed to the working class.

I do not think we have any other fundamental points of criticism to deal with now.

So, from this Session, we should go with all doubts clear. Certainly our discussion was rather inadequate. We should have discussed for four to five days and everybody must have got the opportunity to do so. Then the contribution from each industry and its experience would have been available and then we would have concrete tasks in relation to organisation also.

Organisation - An organisational report should have been there. Why is it not available? You know and I know; the secret is known to everybody. The trouble is, you did the right to criticise but did not take on the role to self-criticise also. Sometimes, a little bit of self-criticism would have been useful. How many of the PTUCs have sent reports after holding conferences? How many have sent reports on struggles and settlements? I had to send three telegrams on one occasion in order to know the meaning of one settlement in one centre. These are all on record. We do not have the means to send men to every centre. I have not got the energy to go about visiting every centre. I plead guilty that I was unable to attend all PTUC Conferences. However, if you want a bogus report, I can give you, quoting some membership and so on. But I wanted the main problems to be clinched here - problems on the Plan, wages, EIL, etc.

Because, we know that there is organisation downbelow. Even the desire to come to Eznakulam requires an organisation. Therefore, we have organisation and a higher membership but putting it down on paper is the problem. We have done so many things. All this must come on paper. I cannot produce reports from inner voice only. I could not get a single line from the Bengal TUC on the Bank strike.

I am yet to receive a report on the tea belt. I once personally handled

the tea belt so much so that it was called a "home department of Comrade Dange". Same has been the case with Burnpur. Why has this happened? Because there is some lag in organization. In West Bengal, there are veteran cadres. But a report on our difficulties can be made only on the basis of a report from them. So it is not a question of not telling you or my reluctance in giving a report. Please write at least once a year and then all that would get on nicely into an organisational report.

I had some proposals. We tried to set up some Commissions at the Working Committee meeting in Delhi. Comrades are busy and this did not work.

Now my proposal is this: After we have finished the session and after we have elected the new General Council, the Council members along with Provincial Secretaries and one or two from each State nominated or elected by the executives of the State TUCs, should meet in a conference, an extended meeting of the General Council, to take stock of the organisational position, to take stock of the trade position.

We have adopted the general slogans. These have to be applied to each state and each trade. For this there ought to be trade sessions. And hence, if it is possible, I propose that short sessions of trade groups should take place on 30th, to give us an idea of the problems.

If we are able to hold the extended General Council meeting in three months time, or say, in June, we shall have an assessment not only of organization but also undertake a correct and clear application of our decisions to each trade group.

Trade Federations are more and more getting organized and are developing a wonderful sense of organization. If a trade centre says no strike, any strike against such a decision fails. So, a good trade union and democratic discipline is developing in the trade federations as in the banks, ICF, coal, and so on.

But along with trade consciousness, there should be trade union consciousness. It happens in English trade unions that contradictions develop between trade and trade unions. Here we have no such difficulties. We have no craft unions. We are having united federations.

Therefore, in order to give concrete expression to all these things, I would propose an extended General Council meeting somewhere in the middle of June.

Somebody asked me in relation to efficiency in State sector, whether we are for inefficiency in the private sector. If you are inefficient in the private sector, you would be immediately sacked. However, in my formulation, I said we must have efficiency and particularly in the State Sector. Because gains of the State Sector belongs to the people and particularly because, the State Sector is curbing foreign monopoly in many cases.

Here now, we go with what objective? The Plan is under attack. Private sector is not under attack. Birla has come back with what he needed. Therefore, on the Plan and the economy, the Plan and the core, State Sector, heavy industry, objective of socialism - on all these we must put the trade unions in campaign and tell them that this is in danger and therefore we must defend them. Steel plants are on our soil and we must work it in the State Sector. Part of the Plan is in our hands. In Kerala State, it is in the hands of the working class. In many municipal towns, it is in our hands. In places where unions are strong, it is in our hands. We have the strength. So from this session, let us have a clear idea of not supporting everything, of the Plan in general. We want the Plan in a definite sector, we will strive for it and raise a hue and cry. The core of the Plan must be defended.

Secondly, the wages question. Wages must be properly asked for and properly fought for. Under any excuse, you do not give up the wage demand. Because prosperity is growing and we must have our share. The land is not in danger because of the workers' claims but because of the profiteering of the monopolists. With this you have the two pillars - defence of the Plan, defence of the people's interests, particularly, the defence of the interests of the working class. And this two-pillar policy has to be concretely understood and correctly applied. And the wages boards must be seized hold of.

From this session, therefore, on the question of the economy and the approach to national problems, we go with a clear idea. On the defence of workers' interests, we go with a clear idea. Nothing is vague. Nothing is obtained under capitalism without struggle. Nothing is obtained even under socialism without struggle: struggles may not be strike struggles.

We must have a harmoniously fitting idea of what is struggle. And no sectarian or reformist idea of struggle and the idea must be based on correct understanding. There is no "no struggle" line but the limitation of strike has to be understood. We are in power in many places. We are going to be in power in many more places. Therefore, we must understand the correct way of formulating our struggles. So if you have to apply restraint on certain things, don't think it is reformism but this restraint ~~must~~ should coincide with the given situation.

Lastly, organisation. The AITUC today is the strongest organisation in India. Who can deny that? The Government is changing its line towards us. That is not always due to the Government. Major part is due to us. The Government wants to discriminate, against us and in favour of the IFTU. But they have to take note of our strength too. The settlement in coal was brought about by our strength. And it is the same case with the settlements in Dair, jute, tea plantations. The trade union movement of the working class led by the Red Flag of the AITUC is a mighty force.

See that is happening in Indonesia, under the leadership of an organisation affiliated to the IFTU. Indonesia shows us the way. They support the Government. They take over the factories and then let the Government take charge of it. Something like that we may also have to do. If the oil monopolists get cheeky, we shall follow the Indonesians (applause).

But you must know when to do it. The Indonesians did not do it two years ago. There is a time for a certain tactic in a certain situation. You must know the correct tactic at a given time. There they have the SOBSI with 3 million members and a strong workers' party. The bourgeoisie is weak. The working class is stronger.

Take the example of Algeria. There the trade unions are the spearhead of struggle. The Egyptian trade unions stand behind Nasser on the question of Aswan dam. In Syria, Latin America, that is what is happening. In Bolivia they carried out a revolution and just after that all the trade unions rushed asking for wage increases. The revolutionary government said no, this is not the time. The workers agreed and waited and now they are pressing their claims.

So we must have a study of the relative forces.

The main point is that all over the world, the trade unions of our understanding along with the trade unions of the IFTU understanding are developing unity and this trade union unity is going forward. Trade union unity for defence of freedom of the country, to achieve national prosperity and defence of the workers' interests. If we also follow such a tactic, we shall achieve strength and forge ahead.

(Lark)

THE PRESIDENT THEN ADJOURNED THE SESSION to meet again at a night session at 10 P.M.

NIGHT SESSION - December 23, 1957

Com. Mirajkar in the Chair.

Amendments to the Constitution was taken up.

Com. P. Ramamurti moved the amendments.

- a) - An amendment stating that the year of the AITUC shall be from April 1 to March 31 was adopted. (see text)

To an amendment that unions should pay to the State TUCs, as fixed by the State TUC, moved by Com. P. Ramamurti, Com. Vittal Chaudhari moved an amendment that such levies and the affiliations fees should be sent by unions to the State TUCs. Com. Vittal Chaudhari later withdrew his amendment after explanation by Com. Ramamurti.

- b) - The original amendment moved by Com. P. Ramamurti on levy to be paid by unions to STATE TUCs was adopted. (see text)

Com. P. Ramamurti then moved amendment to Art. 9 (see text) that instead of 5, there shall be 7 Vice Presidents and that Asst. Secretaries should be designated "Secretaries" and their number increased from 4 to 5. Com. Raj Behadur wanted it to be specified as "not more than 7 Vice Presidents."

- c) - The amendment to Art. 9 (as amended) was approved.

The amendment on TRADE GROUPS was then taken up. Com. P. Ramamurti moving the amendment said that election to general council should be on the basis of total membership of each State. The State TUC would no better to give adequate representation to each trade. (See text of amendment). Com. Vittal Chaudhari and ~~was~~ a delegate from Bengal opposed the amendment. Com. Balachandra Menon spoke supporting the proposal. The amendments moved by Com. Vittal Chaudhari and the Bengal delegate was put to vote and declared lost.

- d) - Original amendment on Trade Groups moved by Com. P. R. was adopted by overwhelming majority.

Com. Ramamurti then moved amendment giving powers to the State TUCs (see text) to substitute members of General Council. ~~See~~

- e) - After discussion this amendment was put to vote and declared carried.

Clause 12 (b) - amendment moved by Com. P. R. that the number of working ~~was~~ committee members shall be raised from 20 to 35.

- f) - Put to vote and adopted.

Com. P. R. moved amendment stating that Secretaries resident in Delhi (?) ~~is~~ (see text) shall constitute a secretariat.

- g) - Put to vote and declared adopted.

Next amendment was for specifying that the General Sessions of the AITUC shall be held once in two years.

- h) - Amendment adopted.

Com. P. Ramamurti then moved for giving powers to the Secretariat to make consequential amendments, following the amendments adopted by the Session. This was agreed to.

*

COM. BALACHANDRA MENON then moved resolution stating that the Session adopts the general line of the General Secretaries Report. Sudhir Mukhoti objected to the resolution. Consideration was postponed till after translation of Com. Dange's speech (SESSION ADJOURNED)

FIFTH DAY OF THE TWENTYFIFTH SESSION

December 29, 1957

Com.S.S.Mirajkar in the Chair

As per the agenda, resolutions were taken up.

- 1) Com.Indrajit Gupta moved the resolution on fight against colonialism which was adopted.
- 2) Resolution on PEACE moved by Com.Indrajit Gupta was read and adopted.

*

The resolution on the General Secretary's Report moved by Com.Balachandra Menon was then taken up.

Com.Manindra Marayam Ghose moved an amendment to the resolution stating that ~~it~~ should be circulated to the various unions and should not be adopted at this session.

The President put the amendment to vote and it was declared lost.

The President then placed the resolution moved by Com.Balachandra Menon on the General Secretary's Report. The resolution was adopted by the session by an overwhelming majority.

*

Com.Dange then introduced the Education Minister of Kerala, Prof.Joseph Muxlasseri to the delegates.

*

The session then resumed consideration of the resolutions.

- 3) Resolution on ALGERIA, moved by Com.Indrajit Gupta was adopted.
- 4) Resolution on GOA moved from the Chair was adopted
- 5) Resolution on INDONESIA moved by Com.Indrajit Gupta was adopted.
- 6) Resolution on RELEASE OF POLITICAL PRISONERS moved by Com.Indrajit Gupta was adopted.

*

The President, Com.Mirajkar, said he wanted to take leave of the Congress and that he should be allowed to go, since he had to proceed to Bombay immediately. Com.Dange thanked Com.Mirajkar for his services in presiding over the session.

Com.Dange then proposed Com.Ramanurti to take the chair.

*

Com.P.Ramanurti in the Chair.

- 7) Resolution on Supreme Court moved by Com.T.C.N.Menon was adopted.
- 8) Resolution on T.U. RIGHTS moved by Com.K.N.Joglekar was ~~referred~~ then taken up. Com.George Chedayamuri moved an amendment for providing a negotiating machinery in which if any union fails to get 60% majority on ballot, all unions shall be represented according to the votes they secured. Com.Joglekar said that he would accept and incorporate the spirit of the amendment. Another amendment for inclu-

sion of Govt employees in the resolution was accepted. The resolution thus amended twice was adopted.

9) Com.Subbiah moved resolution on PONDICHERRY, which was adopted.

10) Resolution on SOCIAL SECURITY was moved by Com.Raj Bahadur Gour. The President, Com.P.Ramamurti, said that additional demands in the form of amendments will be accepted by the Resolutions Committee. A Bengal delegate moved amendment for specifying a three-months time limit for Government to remedy the situation. He said the present resolution has shifted from the Working Committee's position. Com.Dange replying to the point said if the West Bengal comrades felt that they could carry out an effective general strike on this issue, he had no objection. There was no question of debarring any decision of the Working Committee, he said. He only wanted that the issue of strike should not be for cancellation of the scheme.

Com.Dange objected to the amendment on the 3-month time limit and said the earlier time limit fixed by the Working Committee was not honoured by the ITUCs and he does not want such a disgrace to fall on the AITUC Session. The memoranda called for from ITUCs did not reach the Central Office in time and even Bengal could send it only in the 3rd week of October. He also said that the AITUC centre cannot organise the State TUCs for any action and such a reference should be deleted.

The resolution was then put to vote and was adopted unanimously.

*

Com.H.C.SENIAR then read the report of the Credentials Committee. (see text)

*

The session then took up the election of office-bearers.

For the office of the PRESIDENT, Com.P.Ramamurti proposed the name of Com.MIRAJKAR, which was seconded by Com.A.C.Nanda. The Session unanimously elected COM.S.S.MIRAJKAR as the President of the AITUC.

Com.Dange then proposed names for the seven Vice Presidents to be elected: HIMANTA KUMAR BOSE, RAMEN SEN, BALACHANDRA MENON, S.S.YOUSUF, P.RAMAMURTI, KEDAR DAS and one more name to be announced later. A.C.Nanda seconded. Com.S.V.Krishnan proposed Com.S.Krishnamurthy as one of the Vice Presidents. Com.Dange said it was embarrassing to oppose any name. He wanted Com.Parvathi Krishnan to be the 7th Vice President but on this some calculations were required. Com.S.V. Krishnan thereupon withdrew his proposal.

The 25th Session then elected Coms.Noranta Kumar Bose, Ramen Sen, Balachandra Menon, S.S.Yousuf, P.Ramamurti, Kedar Das as vice-presidents.

Com.Indrajit Gupta proposed the name of COM.S.A.DANGE for the post of the General Secretary. A.C.Nanda seconded. Com.Dange was unanimously elected as General Secretary.

Com.Dange then proposed the names of Com.K.T.K.TAREKIAHI, RAJ BAHADUR GOUR, INDRAJIT GUPTA, SAFEH LOONDA and K.G.SREEMATHA as Secretaries. Com.Balasubramanyam seconded. Com.Dange's proposal was accepted unanimously.

Com.T.B.Vittal Rao was elected treasurer, as proposed by Com.Dange and seconded by Com.Balasubramanyam.

The newly-elected office-bearers were then introduced to the delegates.

(ADJOURNED)

SIXTH DAY OF THE TWENTYFIFTH SESSION

December 30, 1957

Con. P. Ramamurti in the Chair.

- 11) Resolution on WAGES AND BONUS was moved from the Chair. Several amendments were moved, some of which were accepted. (See text of amendments). The resolution as amended was adopted.
- 12) Resolution on CODE OF DISCIPLINE moved by Con. Indrajit Gupta was adopted.
- 13) Resolution on FIVE YEAR PLAN was moved from the Chair. Con. Sailen Paul and Con. Sudhir Mishra objected to passing the resolution. On a vote, the resolution was adopted by overwhelming majority.

The President then suggested that in view of the shortage of time, the other resolutions along with the amendments moved by delegates be left for consideration by the Secretariat. The suggestion was agreed to.

ELECTION OF GENERAL COUNCIL - The names suggested from different States for election to the General Council was read out. They were duly elected. (See list)

Con. P. Ramamurti, President, then announced that after consultations with the Tamilnad delegation, Con. PARVATHI KRISHNAN was proposed to the post of the 7th Vice President. The proposal was accepted unanimously.

THEN THE SESSION ADJOURNED FOR A WHILE TO ENABLE THE NEWLY ELECTED GENERAL COUNCIL TO MEET AND ELECT THE WORKING COMMITTEE

The Session then resumed the proceedings, with Con. P. Ramamurti in the Chair. The Chairman read the names of Working Committee members elected by the General Council (see list). The following comrades were co-opted as members of the General Council: Cons. Arun Asaf Ali, K. B. Pandikar, Mahendra Sen and Ghauthmal.

A message of greetings received by cable from Albania was read.

Concluding the proceedings, General Secretary Con. S. A. Derge said:

We are now closing the session and you can now go back and review the session in terms of the discussion we had, the differences we had, and the experiences we had. Because ultimately at the end of the session, we are all unified, in spite of having some differences. Unity remains on the question of action, defending the interests of the workers, for those who do not agree with support to the Plan. Those who agree with the Plan go with the understanding of the two-pillar policy.

So we do ultimately part not with quarrels in our pockets, but agreement and unification in our heads. That should be the keynote of the reviews when we go to our States.

Second point ~~was~~ would be that this Conference was a grand parade of the national dignity and national greatness of the AITUC as an organisation. At the same time, it was a parade of the international prestige of the AITUC which was exhibited here for the first time when fraternal delegates from socialist and capitalist countries participated in our Session. I had a letter from Com. Lombardo Toledano, from the other end of the world. He wanted to participate and so did the African trade union leaders when we invited them at Leipzig. But they too are busy like us with problems of their newly liberated countries.

We should carry the idea to the working class, the idea of the grand unity that was shown here, on a national and international scale. Why then should we quarrel? We agree on many things and let us work together. Still why do we meet ~~at~~ here and the DTUC meets at Madurai and the IWS somewhere else. Therefore, we go with the appeal for unity.

Then we go with the criticism of the present conditions in the country, the way in which the Government of India and the monopolists are behaving. Criticise them and demand popular action.

We must tell the workers how we defeated the slogan of wage freeze and how we defeated rationalisation. We must apply our slogans to the conditions in each industry, in each area.

What is needed is a live organisation of the AITUC. Our membership is 9 lakhs. We challenge the Government to come and check up. We must train new cadres. We are soon going to plan sessions of trade union schools in each area. Government has asked us to nominate 5 people for preparing syllabus for workers education. We can take that syllabus as the basis. They want to produce cadres for their Government and the DTUC. We will produce cadres for our Kerala Government and the AITUC.

Our Working Committee does not represent a trade or a group. It represents a whole class. No Working Committee member should therefore think of his own State or his own party. The AITUC cannot be sunk in party discussions or lines. The AITUC must represent the interests of the people in politics and economy. The Working Committee members will have to give thought how to have a functioning centre. We are advancing. The Centre functions better when it is abused. But when criticising ultimately come to conclusions, don't leave anything to a future date, for eliciting public opinion. Here is the public opinion of the trade union movement and the working class. Let us therefore go back and report on what the gains are, how we are advancing and what are the future needs.

Lastly, - there have been hard work, hard abuses, hard replies, sometimes personal. I have been quite hard in replying. You will pardon me for all the harsh words.

In holding this session in Kerala, the Government and cadres of the trade union movement have all cooperated with us in making the Congress a success. For the first time, it is a grand thing to have a session in a State where the Government is with you and not against you. And we got cooperation from all citizens, even Christian people, who are supposed to be against us. We did not find any atmosphere of tension in this State and there was no atmosphere of hostility. We thank the Reception Committee, the Government of Kerala and the citizens of Ernakulam for their cooperation.

We thank the volunteers - a new type of volunteer is being born here.

We express our thanks to the owners of this hall for providing this for our session. We thank the Audio Equipment Co., for the nice loudspeaker arrangements.

I thank you all for the way in which we all of us together managed to conduct our affairs.

(Applause)

The Chairman, Gen. P. Ramasurti, then paid tribute to Gen. V. Chakravarti Chettiar, outgoing president of the AITUC. Because of his old age and ill health, he could not actively participate in our work but Gen. Chakravarti Chettiar has stood with us through thick and thin especially in the period 1948-51 when we faced terrific repression. Gen. Ramasurti then proposed that we convey our gratitude to Gen. Chakravarti Chettiar personally at Madras.

THE TWENTYFIFTH SESSION OF THE A.I.T.U.C. THEN CONCLUDED ITS DELIBERATIONS WITH THE SLOGAN -

AITUC ZINDGAD!

