

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप 377 के अन्तर्गत इस मामले को उठाना चाहते थे, वह अभी भी पेण्डिंग है और उस पर कोई निर्णय नहीं हुआ है। लेकिन इसी बीच में आप ने इस सदन में आ कर उस मामले को उठा दिया है, अब चूँकि उठा दिया है तो वह बात खत्म हो गई।

RE. BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): Sir under Rule 376 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, I would like to raise a point of order with regard to the business of the House. I may invite your kind attention to Bulletin Part II of June 25, according to which the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Energy follow immediately after the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting come after the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Energy. I find from tomorrow's tentative list of business that already the Demands for Grants for the Ministry of Energy have been listed for tomorrow. I dare say you will agree and hon. Members on both sides of the House will agree that this House has not been lacking in energy, and the energetic House would not mind if the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Energy are taken up after the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting which is far more important.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have received your letter and we have gone through the whole thing and we find that the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting also can be debated for a few hours after the Demands for Grants for the Ministry of Energy according to the present arrangements. It would not get guillotined; that is what we see from the present timings. We can

cut down the time we spent on the Ministry of Energy.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: The Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Home Affairs will take eight hours, and these will be taken up at 2.00 or 2.30 today.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We shall see that I&B Ministry is also taken up for a few hours, I do not think, it will be guillotined.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: If that is the case, we have no objection.

12.30 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR—contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up further discussion on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Labour. The Minister.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN- TARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am deeply grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in the debate on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Labour. I am sincerely beholden to them for the kind words that they have spoken about me and the good wishes that they have extended to me. I was particularly impressed by the fact that the debate was on an extremely constructive note and all the distinguished hon. Members who spoke and participated in the debate made constructive suggestions and examined the various aspects of the problems that the Ministry faces and the work that the Ministry is responsible for. I shall also approach my task of replying to the debate in a spirit of introspection rather than in a spirit of acrimony about the past or flamboyance about the future.

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

My attempt will be to look for a consensus rather than indulge in any attempt to provoke anyone who took part in the debate.

As far as the subject that we are discussing is concerned, it is very clear that this is one of the issues on which a national debate is highly necessary. There are many things in our country and many aspects of the life of our nation that call for a constructive national debate. It is true that for 30 years we have been independent, many things have been attempted, and many things have been achieved. A time comes in the history of a nation when it becomes necessary for us to sit back and attempt to analyse what we have achieved and to see whether we have arrived at where we wanted to reach. This is a national effort and it is not a partisan effort.

As far as our country is concerned, there were many things that we attempted to achieve, but, for various reasons, we have not reached where we wanted to reach and on this question, there can be no difference of opinion between the hon. Members opposite and the hon. Members on this side of the House. It may be because there was some ambiguity in our thinking and the defining of our objectives. It may be because unforeseen events impinged on the plans and programmes and the policies that we had formulated. It may be because there were some shortcomings and deficiencies in the implementation of policies for which the government which was in power should take responsibility. There may be difference of opinion between the hon. Members opposite and us in determining the extent to which the third factor should be given importance. But I am sure all of us will agree that these are the factors which we have to take into consideration.

I beg to submit to the House that of the major issues on which there is a need for a national debate in this

country, the question of industrial relations is one. As the hon. Members who participated in the debate pointed out, it is a major question that affects the entire fabric of the life of the nation. It is something in which everybody is interested. It is something in which everybody has a stake. Sir, there can be no such thing as an ossified model of industrial relations. Industrial relations have to be dynamic because they have to respond to the conditions of the society in which these relations exist. It is very clear that even if we recognize and assure ourselves of the three major points that were brought up in the course of the debate yesterday by my distinguished and hon. friends on the opposite side as well as this side—Mr. Ravi. Mr. Rajan. Mr. Chitta Basu and the others on this side whom I do not want to mention because their number is larger, namely, that industrial relations should recognize the right of workers to organize, themselves obviously, to protect their own interests through collective bargaining, to use the ultimate weapon of the strike, even if we grant all these things, as this Government does, still, there can be different pattern of industrial relationships. There is no uniformity in the patterns that we see in different countries of the world. There are a number of factors that determine, condition and colour industrial relations. Obviously, one is the form of ownership. Another factor is the techniques and relationships of production. A third factor is the nature of the state and the role that the state accepts for itself. A fourth factor is the instruments used by society to formulate public opinion. A fifth factor consists of the instruments that are used to forge and invoke sanctions and another relates to the relative roles of consensus, conciliation and confrontation, to the ethos in which the processes through which the reconciliation of sectional interests with the paramountcy of the collective interests of all sections takes place in a society. In all these respects, in each of these factors, tremendous

changes have taken place in our country. I do not want to take the time of the House to go into each of these factors. But I do want to tell the House, to beg of the House to remember that in almost all these factors tremendous changes have taken place in the last thirty years. Therefore, it is necessary for us to think afresh on the question of industrial relations, and not to think that because we had this system of industrial relations before independence and we maintained it for a few decades, we must cling to the system of industrial relations that we have been having in our country, even in the face of changes that have taken place.

In our country, as far as the question of ownership, for instance, is concerned we now have a very big public sector as the hon. members have remarked. It is obvious that there cannot be two codes of conduct, two pieces of labour legislation, one for the private sector and the other for public sector. There is a public sector, there is a private sector, there is a co-operative sector and there is the sector of the self-employed which we hope will increase in our country. Under such circumstances it has become very necessary for us to think afresh on the system of industrial relations and the machinery of industrial relations in our country. There must, therefore, be a national debate in which the trade unions participate, employers participate and all organs which contribute to the formulation of public opinion and the forging and invoking of sanctions participate. This debate should not only be on the structure, but also on the methods of conciliation, situations or problems that give rise to conflict or limitations and inhibitions that have to be kept in mind while resorting to struggle or dealing with conflict. I hope, therefore, that the debate in the House will be continued outside the House too and this debate will fructify in the formulation and the identification of a new consensus on the question of the industrial relations that we should have.

My hon. friend Shri Sathe who began the debate yesterday spoke of the responsibility for generating opportunities for employment. He pointed out that unemployment has been increasing in the country. He pointed out that unless there is a consistent, concerted plan to deal with the question of unemployment, not only in the urban areas but also in the rural areas where the vast majority of our population lives, we can have no successful employment policy. I entirely agree with him. In fact, when he was explaining to us the magnitude of the problem and when he said that increase in unemployment can be countered only if we generate opportunities for employment in the rural areas themselves through industrialisation in those areas, through the generation of resources in those areas, through organising and providing facilities for marketing, credit, etc., for one moment I wondered whether somebody from the other side of the House was speaking or somebody from this side was speaking. I say this not to criticise my hon. friend Shri Sathe but to point out that there is a large measure of agreement in this House on this question. Unless we address ourselves to the task of generating employment opportunities in the rural areas, we will not be able to tackle the problem of unemployment. That is why I say—the Janata Party and its Government will, if necessary, shift its emphasis from the urban areas to the rural areas to see that this problem of unemployment and poverty is buried deep in the course of ten years. That is why we have said that in the next ten years we will see that destitution ends, poverty ends and every able bodied adult in this country gains the right to employment. He pleaded for demarcation of areas so that the right kind of industrialisation can take place. Unfortunately in this debate one can not go deep into this question because it is dealt with by my distinguished friend the Minister for Industry. But even so I would like to point out this to my hon. friend Mr. Sathe and others that we in the Janata Party manifesto have referred to the question

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

of demarcation of areas for the production of certain wage goods and so on. I would like to add this that the question of generating employment is tied up with the question of appropriate technology. It is not that we have to cling to old forms and methods but we should encourage the adoption of a kind of technology which is consistent with our capital resources, our resources in skill and our need to match the investment-employment ratio to our needs. It is only then that we can go forward to the kind of industrial development which we want to have in the rural areas which will provide employment, improve the standards of living and create a new kind of life in our rural areas.

Mr. Sathe and other hon. Members who took part in the Debate referred to employment exchanges. They said that these are not functioning in a proper way. Well, perhaps, by a slip of the tongue, one of the hon. Members referred to employment exchanges as unemployment exchanges. There is no doubt that employment exchanges cover only a very small, an infinitesimal section of our population. There is no doubt that those who are unemployed or underemployed in the rural areas are not registered in the urban employment exchanges. It has also been pointed out that there are cases of corruption and malpractices. I would not deny that; it is possible; but what I wish to point out is this. The maintenance of these employment exchanges is largely the responsibility of the States. Even so we propose to look into the question because hon. Members have raised this question, and I will see that a survey is conducted into their operations to see where malpractices exist and how they can be removed.

I now wish to refer to the points raised regarding the organised and unorganised sectors. Many hon. Members referred to this question. It is true that only 10 per cent of our work-

ing population live in urban areas. There is a total workforce of 200 million approximately in this country; and only 20 million of these work in the organised sector and urban industries. 13 million work in the public sector including the Central Government, State Governments and local bodies and 7 million work in the private sector. Of these 20 million only 5 to 6 million belong to what may be described as the unionised sector of workers. It is an unfortunate fact that many of them are not unionised. We cannot ignore the fact that a large percentage of them are not unionised. This country has responsibility not only for workers in urban areas, not only for unionised workers, but also for others, whether they are in the rural areas or in the urban areas. In order to tackle this aspect of the problem a new emphasis is needed, a new direction is needed. A new orientation is needed to ensure that 90 per cent of the working population is not outside the field of attention of this Ministry.

We propose to correct this distortion which has been a legacy of the past, I do not want to say of any particular Government. But, unfortunately, it is a fact and it is a fact, that Members on the other side will bemoan as much as we bemoan. Therefore, we want to bring about a shift in the emphasis so that 90 per cent of our working population is not ignored by the Labour Ministry.

श्री उग्रसेन (देवरिया) : उनके सर्वे का कोई इन्तजाम मंत्री जी करेंगे जो यूनियनाइज्ड नहीं हैं ?

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: May I continue? Let him not interrupt me. My hon. friend has had his say. I enjoyed hearing him. Perhaps, he cannot enjoy hearing me.

Now I come to the next question. That is the necessity to balance the demands and the interests of the workers in different sections of the population. To an extent it can be said—it has often been said—I am not saying

in that in a derogatory sense—that workers who are in the organised sector of industry are a privileged section. I do not mean to say this in any derogatory sense because organisation is good for the worker. If the worker has no organisation he cannot fight exploitation, without organisation, one cannot fight exploitation in the rural area or in the urban area.

I hope my hon. friend, Shri Bosu is not walking out on this statement.

Sir, it is clear that an organisation is a great thing for labour. Even so, those who are in the organised sector and who have the benefits that accrue to them because of the solidarity and strength of unionisation must remember that the economy must be judiciously picketed, judiciously husbanded, to ensure that workers who are less fortunate, who have not been unionised and organised do not get further exposed to the kind of vulnerability that can arise from imbalances in the economy. I do not want to say more on this question. But, necessarily, this question has to be considered by the workers in the unionised sector.

Now, Sir, there was a suggestion which my hon. friends, Shri Ugra Sen and Shri Ram Dhari Shastri made that one way of dealing with this question of increasing opportunities for employment is to reduce the hours of work and to increase shifts and my hon. friend, Shri Ugra Sen, with his usual gusto, which I admire, went to the extent of saying—I am saying some thing good—that we should not give up this idea or ignore this idea because, capitalists may be against this idea. There is no danger; there is no fear that we will accept or reject any idea just because capitalists are in favour or against any idea. We shall examine this idea.

It is true that this idea, as my hon. friend Shri Ram Dhari Shastri said yesterday, has been suggested by the Royal Commission as well. We will examine this idea and if it is found

feasible, if it is found beneficial, then we will certainly adopt the idea. But, we will examine the idea.

Then, Sir, some references were made to the emergency. Now I shall not introduce any jarring note in what I am saying and, even if some things that I say may be unpleasant, I shall try to say them in as non-controversial a way as possible, because, it is not part of my purpose, to provoke anybody in this debate. The Ministry of Labour must set an example in conciliation and the quest for consensus. Therefore, I only say that, example is better than precept. (*Interruptions*). The hon. Member knows, and perhaps, he follows that in his life! Sir, as far as this question which was raised yesterday is concerned, namely the spate of strikes—after the emergency, that there was a spate of strikes, lock-outs and stoppages of work after the emergency—I would like to submit to the House that the emergency was an abnormal state of affairs. On this there can be no quarrel. We may all be sorry about what happened in different ways and in different degrees. We may be ashamed of what happened in different degrees. Some may have opposed; some may have wanted to oppose. The spirit was willing but the flesh was weak. I shall not criticise anyone on that score in this debate. But when opportunity arises I shall not be found wanting in the ability to criticise what should be criticised. But at the moment I shall steer away from such criticism. (*Interruptions*). Sir, as far as the emergency was concerned, as I said, it was an abnormal state of affairs. During the Emergency, it looked as though a long dark night of agony was setting over the country. The fundamental rights of the people of India came under attack. They disappeared in an eclipse. The rights of workers also came under attack. My hon. friend, Mr. Rajan, yesterday said that the first shots in the Emergency were fired against the workers. I think I am not misquoting him. I do

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

not want to remind hon. Members about the unpleasant things that happened. The attack on workers started with the Railway strike and the manner of attack, may I be permitted to say, was ruthless, if not barbarous. The attack on workers started with the days of the railway strike. There were attacks on the rights of workers in the Emergency, and many things happened. Many workers were retrenched, many workers were victimised. They were victimised for the sin of protesting against emergency, of standing for human rights, and standing for the rights of workers and the rights of trade unions for which millions of people have fought and suffered all over the country. They were arrested. They were retrenched, their services were terminated and the services of many people were terminated because some suspected or dreamt that they belonged to some organisation that somebody in authority frowned on (*Interruptions*) But, Sir, it is a fact that as soon as our party came to power, we took steps to see that the fundamental rights of trade unions and workers were restored, we took steps to see that those whose services were terminated during the emergency for political reasons were reinstated. (*Interruptions*) I do not understand why the hon. Member, Mr. Sathe, gets perturbed when there is any reference to the emergency. Now, as far as this is concerned, we have taken steps to see that those whose services were terminated for political reasons are reinstated.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Are you taking steps to reinstate all the people?

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I am coming to that. As far as the public sector and the Central Government services are concerned it is within our powers to issue instructions. We have also sent circulars to the State

Governments to see that this form of victimisation is corrected. Then, apart from the State Governments and the Central Government and the public undertakings, we have also the private sector over which the Government does not have complete control, does not have any control at all in a sense, but there one has to use the machinery that is available to one and the good offices that can be used by the Central and State Governments. This too is being done. The hon. Member raised certain questions about the employees... (*Interruptions*).

DR. HENRY AUSTIN: I want to draw your attention to the very painful situation obtaining in my constituency. 2000 workers of the HMT are on strike. Today is the 22nd day. I know the hon. Minister is taking interest; I should like to appeal to him that with his goodwill he should try to make a settlement someway. Two private sector companies, the Punalur paper mills and another Gionavala Binny Co., are also under lock out.. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: In answer to my distinguished friend Mr. Stephen, whose speech I missed in the debate....

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: We are not allowed to speak.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I know; I am sorry; I would have liked to listen to him. I may say that we are using our good offices to see that even in the private sector firms, victims are reinstated. With the coming into power of popular governments in various states this process may be accelerated and we hope we will be able to meet with the same measure of success that we have met with in the public sector undertakings and in the case of the central government employees.

Now, with regard to our attitude towards trade unions, soon after our government took charge we appreciated that it was necessary for us to have the fullest consultation with authentic trade unions before we formulated our policies. Therefore, we decided to revive the tripartite consultative machinery which unfortunately, for one reason or another had been put in cold storage for over six years. That again is a matter of regret as much to my hon. friends on that side as to Members on this side. All of us believe in the role and effectiveness of the tripartite machinery. India has made a significant contribution even in the ILO because of the fact that it has made effective use of the tripartite machinery. But unfortunately this machinery was put in cold storage. So we thought it was necessary for us to revive and resuscitate this machinery so that we may consult everyone and identify the maximum area of consensus before we embarked on any legislation in relation to labour. It was also necessary for us to do away with some of the apex bodies that had been set up during the emergency, because unfortunately certain criteria were used in the selection of the trade union representatives on these apex bodies, namely, restricting representation only to trade unions that accepted the emergency and the 20 point or the 25 point programme. Obviously those criteria are untenable and therefore the apex bodies had to be scrapped. I wish to assure the House that this does not mean that our government does not believe in bipartism or the utility of bipartite negotiations to which my hon. friend, Mr. Chitta Bosu referred. We do not want to throw out the baby with the bath water. We believe that bipartite negotiations and consultations have a role to play at various levels. Therefore the fact that the apex bodies have been scrapped and *made functus officio* does not mean that we are in any way under-rating the importance of bipartite negotiations.

SHRI K. A. RAJAN: The Kerala government has already scrapped it.

Shri Ravindra Varma: As far as our attitude to trade unions is concerned, I wish to avail of this opportunity to say a few words.

Sir, we believe in the solidarity of the working class. The strength of any working class movement lies in the unity of the working class. We want the movement to be strong. It should use its strength with a full sense of responsibility to the workers as well as responsibility to the community at large. We do not want to subscribe to the policy of 'divide and rule'. We will not seek any partisan ends or any political dividend by dividing the trade union movement. We do not want to adopt the policy of bolstering any particular Central Trade Union Organisation irrespective of the support it enjoys from the working class. Trade Unions should seek their strength from the workers, from the services they render to the workers and not from the support that they expect from the Government for any political reasons. We do not want to use Trade Unions to seek partisan ends. But we also expect that trade unions will not resort to direct action to serve the partisan interest of any political party whatsoever. Anything that promotes the fragmentation of the trade unions reduces the strength of the workers in dealing with their employers. It leads to acute and acrimonious inter-union rivalry, which often dilutes the sense of responsibility and results in competition and sometimes unreasonable demand.

Here I will have to refer to the multiplicity of the trade unions to which many hon. Members referred yesterday. For many years now, trade unions, workers, leaders of the working class as well as all other people concerned have been bemoaning the fact that the multiplicity of trade unions is adversely affecting the

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

strength of our trade union movement. I do not want to enter into a discussion on the reasons for the multiplicity of trade unions. But it must be admitted that this multiplicity has created enormous problems for the workers, for the employers and for the Governments as well. What is amusing about it and what is tragic about it is the fact that all the three sections say that multiplicity is bad and even so we have not been able to steer clear of the evils of multiplicity. There are many reasons for this. As I said, I shall not go into these reasons. However, one of the reasons certainly relates to the rules and practices governing the registration and recognition of the trade unions.

My hon. friend, Mr. Chitta Basu and some others including Mr. Rajan who made a very brief but eloquent speech, referred to the difficulties arising out of the present laws or practices relating to registration and recognition. This is a field in which we have to make close scrutiny and some method must be found to cut this Gordian knot. It has become a Gordian knot. How can we cut it?

There are two or three ways which are under discussion currently. Today according to the Trade Unions Act, as hon. Members are aware, any seven workers can register themselves as a union irrespective of the size of establishment, irrespective of the number of workers working in the establishment with the result that there is a direct incentive for multiplicity, whether it be on political basis or caste basis or whatever it may be. This is a matter which has been studied by the National Labour Commission and other Committees. There must be a solution to this. Can it not be that the solution lies in the way of prescribing a certain percentage of the workers of an establishment as an essential pre-requisite for registration. Now, if it is possible for us to have 10 per cent, 15 per cent or 20

per cent, we would be able to reduce the number. Even that will be an advance on what obtains today.

Secondly, I come to the question of recognition. As hon. members pointed out, it is crucial to the whole question of labour relations and industrial relations. What is the procedure for the recognition of a union? Here again unfortunately, there is no central law on this question. There is only a code of conduct, an understanding on the basis of which verification takes place and recognition is given. There is nothing which compels recognition. I wish to make this point clear because often times we hear complaints that the management does not recognise any union. If we had a central law which compelled the recognition of unions, this situation might not have arisen. There is no central law on this question, and it is a lacuna.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): There are State laws.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Yes, like the Bombay Industrial Disputes Act.

SHRI K. A. RAJAN (Trichur): It is a black law; we do not accept it.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: It is necessary to have a look at this question of recognition. One method suggested is verification of membership which is done when there is a dispute as to which union should be recognised. Another method suggested has been a secret ballot, to which more than one hon. member referred yesterday. There are some advantages in one system, and some advantages in the other system. I do not want to pronounce on this question because this is a matter which the committee that is being appointed according to the decision of the tripartite conference will look into. However, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a third proposal which that committee

will be considering and that is somewhat an innovation. That is precisely the reason why I want to state it in the House.

The proposal is that all the workers or employees of a particular industrial establishment should be regarded *ipso facto* as members of a union which will be recognised as the bargaining agent for collective bargaining in that establishment. Workers will have the option to opt out of membership, if they want. But otherwise, *ipso facto* it will be taken that every worker is a member, and this union will be the agent for collective bargaining. This will not in any way prevent or inhibit the rights of the workers to form other trade unions for activities which may not be confounded with economism. If I may use that word, like workers' education, quasi-political or political activity or any other activity. But the knotty question, the thorny question, before us is the identification of a bargaining agent. For that, there will be this union. If for any reason the number of persons who opt out is large enough, one can think of a collegiate agent for collective bargaining. These are some of the proposals that are being studied by the committee. I do not want to anticipate the decision of the committee. I only wanted to mention that these are the three or four proposals that are being studied by the committee which has been set up by the tripartite conference.

Sir, I will move to industrial relations. I see that I am racing against time at this moment. My distinguished colleague the Home Minister is already waiting in the wings and I shall be brief. About industrial relations, many hon. members pointed out to the lacunae in the Industrial Disputes Act. I wish I had the time to go into this question at length. I entirely agree with whatever was said from either side of the House on the question of the present procedures and laws being time-consuming, being such as encourage further litigation

and delays, etc., I agree with the criticism that has been levelled against the present situation as far as the Industrial Disputes Act is concerned.

My hon. friend, Mr Ravi, who made a very impassioned speech and referred to me as 'my erstwhile friend',— if that is a fact, I am very sorry. I still consider him as a friend. I do not think he meant what he is reported to have said.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: He meant erstwhile colleague.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: He meant, erstwhile guru.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I said 'My old friend'.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I must regret the steep fall from grace. Yesterday he pointed out to the lacunae in the Industrial Disputes Act and the conciliation processes that obtain today and said that there is nothing to compel the management to attend conciliation proceedings. He is right. This is one of the many shortcomings in the Industrial Disputes Act and we have, therefore, decided to set up a tripartite committee which will go into the question of the respective roles of the machinery in the Plants to settle disputes of the individual workers on the spot so that they may not become festering sores later on, the machinery for conciliation, the machinery for adjudication and the machinery for arbitration and the hierarchical system of tribunals to which also reference was made. The Committee appointed after the discussions in the Tripartite Conference will go into these questions, and it is on that basis that I said earlier that we hope to introduce a comprehensive Bill on industrial relations in the winter Session. Almost all the hon. Members who took part in the debate yesterday underlined the need for a comprehensive Bill which will bring together different pieces of legislation which exist today, streamline them,

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

remove shortcomings and lacunae and put forward simple, direct procedures which are not tilted in favour of the management, but tilted in favour of the workers, the exploited who need the support of the State. Our attempt, therefore, in this comprehensive legislation will be to bring forward such a measure and I do hope that it will be possible for us to bring forward this legislation in the winter Session.

Some reference was made to the public sector. My hon. friend, Mr. Ravi was quite dramatic, I think, in an effort to provoke me when he said that the Labour Minister today will find that an Under Secretary in the administrative ministry can veto his proposals. Whatever might have been his motive in putting the matter in that way, there is no doubt that the practice in the last few years has been that the Labour Ministry consults and gets the approval of the administrative Ministry before referring disputes for adjudication. This is a legacy of the past. We shall certainly examine this situation and I can assure the hon. Member that most of the Ministers directly concerned with administrative Ministries of this kind are people who have had long meritorious and distinguished record as trade union workers and leaders and, therefore, I have every hope that there will be no dual policy, as far as this Government is concerned,—in relation to the private sector and the public sector.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: We have to wait for 60 days before you decide whether it should be referred or not, and then place it in cold storage. Is it fair? Does it not go against Article 14 of the Constitution?

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: There is no question of cold storage. We are working in warm weather streaming sweat and the rain.

When I referred to this, I also wanted to say that such Acts as the Industrial Disputes Act, the Trade Unions Act, the Standing Orders, the Code of discipline evolved by the Indian Labour Conference as well as the points the hon. Members raised about definition of workmen, and industry, all these will be considered by this committee; and I hope the report and the legislation we bring forward will be satisfactory to the hon. Members opposite as well.

I will turn now to the question of workers' participation. This government is committed to the idea of workers participation. I know that for quite some time, there have been proposals about workers' participation; and as some hon. Members from the other side, said yesterday, some of these proposals were more for participation, in increasing production and productivity, rather than for participation in management. We do not propose to throw dust in anybody's eyes. When we talk of participation in management, we believe in it. We believe in a system in which workers will have their full share of participation in increasing productivity, and in receiving their share of the increased productivity, in management as well as in equity. Our manifesto has clearly stated that we believe in promoting the participation of workers in management as well as equity. Therefore we propose again to study this question very carefully, because we are not satisfied with make-believe schemes and half-way houses. This is not a simple question. I wish I had more time, because many devices have been used in the past, not in this country alone, but in other countries too with varying measures of success, but also exposing various dangers in this process. Therefore, one of the committees that the tripartite conference has set up, deals particularly with the question of workers' participation; and there are distinguished representatives of the trade union movement,

employers, public sector units and of the government working in this committee, which will report to us on workers' participation. On the basis of this evaluation and assessment, and definition of the kind of procedure that we should have for participation, from the plant level upto the Board level as hon. Members said yesterday, we hope to bring forward proposals for legislation.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What about allowing workers to run some of the sick units?

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I will come to it. I wish to say something about unorganized labour. It is very clear, as the hon. Members particularly from this side of the House said—when I refer to some Members I am not inviting them to stand up and shoot a question at me; otherwise I will have to continuously be looking at you, Sir, since there is no danger of your standing up and shooting a question at me—and it was pointed out with great emphasis—and I have already referred to this question—that we must devote attention to the unorganized labour in the rural areas. Unorganized labour, consists mainly of rural workers, agricultural workers, contract labour, "Dadari" labour—to which no reference was made probably because nobody from Orissa spoke yesterday—construction workers and others. This government has proceeded to ratify the ILO's convention on rural workers' organizations, because we believe that unless there are organizations of rural workers, it will not be possible for them to achieve the degree of improvement in their standards of living or social security that workers in the organized sector have achieved. It is, therefore, necessary to devote attention to the organization of rural workers.

Unfortunately, for lack of time, I shall not be dealing with the question of contract labour. But I want to assure hon. Members that though

I am not referring to it, I shall attend to every point that they have raised during the debate, and see that whatever remedial or corrective or supplementary action is necessary is taken, on this question. If I do not wax eloquent on this question it is not because of lack of feeling, but because of lack of time.

On the question of bonded labour, some remarks were made yesterday. It was pointed out that the numbers specified in the Report was unreal.

My distinguished friend and comrade, Shrimati Ahilya Rangnekar, also made some interesting observations on the Report, that it referred to the 20-Point Economic Programme and what not. I smiled when she made those observations because, in a sense, she was right. These things are referred to in the Report. But I must point out to her and the House that the Report is a report of the activities that took place. It is not a statement of intentions or a manifesto that we are placing before the House or on the Table of the House. So, these things were referred to in the Report.

As far as bonded labour is concerned, unfortunately, many States have replied that there is no bonded labour in their States, although it must be admitted that it is the absence of a proper survey and a proper effort to identify the disguised forms in which bonded labour exists that makes the States write back and say that "there is no bonded labour in our State." For instance, one State said that there were 37 workers who were bonded labourers out of whom 36 had been rehabilitated. But one of the hon. Members opposite, who came from that very State, pointed out to the continued existence of bonded labour in some disguised forms in his State. For want of time, I cannot go into this question again at length, but I only want to assure this House that we are in touch with the States to see that proper surveys are taken up to identify the disguised

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

forms of bonded labour and that efforts are made to liberate them and rehabilitate them and to ensure that they do not relapse into bondage.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: What is wrong that is mentioned in the Report for which you had to express regret? One of the lady Members mentioned about this programme and you expressed regret. I do not understand why you expressed regret.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I do not remember about what I expressed regret. I regret some things and I like some things. I do not know whether I have said anything about my regretting anything in regard to the hon. Member.

Now I come to the question of social security. I must be permitted to go fast for want of time. The hon. Members yesterday referred to social security schemes like ESIC, provident fund, gratuity, family pension etc. I will be excused, I hope, if I do not go into each of the arguments advanced and the questions put, for want of time. But I will consider every one of them. My hon. friend, Shri Ravi particularly referred to the question of exemption from the ESIC. This is a question that many hon. Members have raised. But one has to realise that in any social security scheme, or insurance scheme, there has to be a kind of pooling of risks and resources. That is how insurance works. Subject to that, of course, I will consider all the points that my hon. friends opposite as well as on this side of the House have raised.

Then there was a reference to the indebtedness of workers. It is a fact that some surveys have been conducted in this regard. They have revealed a high degree of indebtedness, particularly among the colliery and plantation workers. That does not mean that there is no indebtedness elsewhere. These are particularly vulnerable sections of labour. We

are at the moment considering this question, along with the Department of Banking, to see what kind of institutional arrangements can be made to provide consumer credit, consumption credit, to workers. We are also considering legislation to deal with this question to ensure that they do not become victims of usury.

Now I come to the question of safety in mines and the working conditions in mines. This is a very important question, and this Government has given top priority to this question. We convened a conference of all those who are connected with safety in mines, including the representatives of trade union organisations. I must tell the House that this was the first time that the representatives of trade union organisations were also invited to the conference on safety in mines. The Conference has examined this question, and we have revived the Committee of Review and have made it obligatory for this Committee to meet and review these measures and the implementation of these measures in the mines every three months.

Reference was made yesterday to the Chasnala tragedy. I have already placed on the Table of the House the Report of the enquiry into the accident in Chasnala as well as other mines. There is no doubt at all that the court of enquiry has found some officers guilty of negligence. As the hon. Members know, when such a report is submitted, there are three types of action that can be taken. One is in relation to breaches or infringements of the Mining Act for which the Labour Ministry is responsible; another is the action that the State Government take in regard to any culpability; and the third is the action taken by the administrative Ministry concerned. My hon. and distinguished colleague, Mr. Patnaik who is present here, referred to this question in the course of the debate on the Demands for Grants

of the Ministry of Steel and Mines. He said that on this question we propose to get in touch with the leaders of the opposition parties and to examine the reports that have been presented. As far as the Labour Ministry is concerned, we have given the utmost consideration to these reports which have been presented by people with judicial experience, and whatever action has to be taken will be taken, because we do not want the impression to go round that because of nationalisation we are not concerned with culpability as far as ignoring rules regarding safety are concerned. Safety first is essential because as far as the miners are concerned, they are exposed to great hazards, and if the Government and the Ministry of Labour cannot protect workers who are working so deep down in the mines against these hazards, the Government must be condemned. We, therefore, do not propose to invite such condemnation. We will see that the utmost attention is paid to the question of safety, and we shall ensure that rules regarding safety are strictly followed.

Some questions were raised about wage policy. Our Government has declared its intention to formulate a comprehensive National Policy on Wages, Incomes and Prices. A Wage Policy can be realistic and meaningful only when it is a part of an integrated policy on incomes and prices. A Wage Policy certainly has to take into consideration the need to ensure minimum wages to all workers including unorganised workers in the rural areas. It has to ensure that workers receive a legitimate share of the profits that accrue from production and increase in productivity. It has to rationalize wage differentials and reduce disparities in a phased manner, to protect the real wages of workers, to avoid providing incentives for the adoption of capital-intensive processes, to provide incentives for higher productivity and acquisition of skills, and to eliminate malpractices in the payment of wages. One cannot over-emphasize the necessity to

see that such a Wage Policy forms part of an overall policy on incomes and prices. One can carry conviction with the workers about the need for restraint in putting forth claims for higher wages only when similar discipline is apparent in the distribution of profits and dividends, in the salaries and perquisites, and seen and unseen incomes of those who are described as Executives or the Captains of Industry.

The question of National Wage Policy, as the House is aware, is receiving careful attention at the highest level. This is not a subject on which a policy statement can be made in a hurry because, as the House is aware, it deals with many aspects of wages, incomes and prices. A concerted policy in this regard is being formulated and when it is ready, it will certainly be placed before the House.

I shall refer to the sick mills in passing. My distinguished colleagues, the Minister of Commerce and the Minister of Industry also referred to this question. We are concerned with it primarily from the point of view of ensuring that workers do not get disemployed or retrenched. We shall, therefore, work in unison with the Ministry of Commerce and the Ministry of Industry to see that wherever possible, sick units are re-opened with the help of financial institutions and under the management of workers, if possible. This was a suggestion which some of the Members opposite also made yesterday.

Comrade Ahilya Rangnekar talked about discrimination against women. This Government does not believe in discriminating against anyone.

The hon. Member yesterday referred to a certain circular or order issued by the Madhya Pradesh Government about bidi workers. I shall certainly enquire into this question. I have not been able to do so after the House rose yesterday, but I shall certainly look into this question and if

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

there is any discriminatory order, I shall take the matter up with the Madhya Pradesh Government.

Then the question of police intervention in the strikes was raised by my distinguished and hon. friend, Mr. Ravi. I wish to say that unless a situation deteriorates into a law and order situation involving destruction of plant, machinery and life, we do not think there would be police intervention. This is the policy of our Government.

Then two other questions were raised. One was about bonus, and the other was about the CDS. Let me take up the CDS first. My distinguished and hon. friend, Mr. Chitta Basu, made a significant and highly scholarly contribution when he raised the point of wage freeze, price freeze, etc. and I was delighted to hear his observations on this question. On the question of the CDS, some suggestions were made in this House about interest rates as well as returning the instalment that falls due, in cash. These, as the hon. Members know and the House knows, are engaging the attention of the Government and, therefore, I am not in a position to say anything more on this question. It is primarily dealt with by my distinguished colleague, the Finance Minister.

On the question of bonus, many hon. Members said that I should make an announcement here and now. I wish I could have made an announcement. But then this is a matter in which there have been many zigs and zags of policy. I do not blame anyone, but the pendulum has oscillated to such distances that it needs considerable thought on all aspects of the question before a decision is taken. We are in the process of doing so, and I do believe that before the festival season—to which my friend, Mr. Ravi referred—it shall be the endeavour of the Government to see that a satisfactory decision is made known before the festival season

commences even in the southern most parts of this great sub-continent.

Mr. Ramamurthy from the other side, referred to the WIMCO, bidi industries and crackers. I shall certainly look into the question that he raised and I shall get in touch with the Tamil Nadu Government to see what can be done about it.

I think, I have covered most of the main questions that were raised yesterday. If I have not done, it is not because I want to ignore any point that was raised but because of lack of time.

Many cut motions have been moved. Some hon. Members told me that they have moved cut motions because that is the only way of drawing the attention of the Ministry to some shortcomings or grievances or some problems. Within the time at my disposal, I shall not be able to deal with each and every cut motion. But I say this that I have studied and I shall study every cut motion and take whatever corrective administrative action I can take in regard to the subject-matter of the cut motions.

I shall conclude by, once again, thanking all the hon. Members from all sides of the House who took part in the debate. It shall be the attempt of our Government to see that the work of this Ministry leads to full employment, to job security, to wage security and to social security for the workers and to a real new deal for the workers of the country. I beg of the House to pass the demands of the Ministry.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now I shall put cut motion No. 26 to the vote of the House. The question is:

“That the demand under the head Ministry of Labour be reduced to Re. 1.

[Failure to clear all dues of workers of the money deducted from them under the CDS. (26)].

The Lok Sabha divided :

AYES

Division No. 3] [13.52 hrs.

Ahmed Hussain, Shri
 Ahsan Jafri, Shri
 Alagesan, Shri O. V.
 Balakrishniah, Shri T.
 Banatwalla, Shri G. M.
 Basu, Shri Chitta
 Bhakta, Shri Manoranjan
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Shyamaprasanna
 Bhugarahan, Shri G.
 Chandrappan, Shri C. K.
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib
 Chavan, Shrimati P.
 Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
 Chettri, Shri K. B.
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Desai, Shri Hitendra
 Engti, Shri Biren
 Faleiro, Shri Eduardo
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun
 Gopal, Shri K.
 Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh
 Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
 *Hande, Shri V. G.
 Haren Bhumij, Shri
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
 Joarder, Shri Dinesh
 Kadam, Shri B. P.
 Kalyanasundaram, Shri M.
 Kamakshaiah, Shri D.
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Khan, Shri Ismail Hossain
 Kolur, Shri Rajshekhar
 Krishnan, Shrimati Parvathi
 Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
 Mahata, Shri C. R.
 Mallanna, Shri K.
 Meduri, Shri Nageswara Rao
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.

Murthy, Shri Kusuma Krishna
 Naidu, Shri P. Rajagopal
 Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
 Narayana, Shri K. S.
 Patel, Shri Dwarkadas
 Patnaik, Shri Sivaji
 Pradhani, Shri K.
 Rajan, Shri K. A.
 Ramamurthy, Shri K.
 Rao, Shri J. Rameshwar
 Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
 Rath, Shri Ramachandra
 Rathawa, Shri Amarsinh
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar
 Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara
 Roy, Shri A. K.
 Saha, Shri A. K.
 Seyid Muhammed, Dr V. A.
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
 Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan
 Stephen, Shri C. M.
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Tirkey, Shri Pius
 Tombi Singh, Shri N.
 Venkataraman, Shri R.

NOES

Arif Beg, Shri
 Bal, Shri Pradyumna
 Baldev Prakash, Dr.
 Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka Devi
 Bateshwar Hemram, Shri
 Birendra Prasad, Shri
 Borole, Shri Yashwant
 Brahm Perakash, Chaudhury
 Chandravati, Shrimati
 Chaturbhuj, Shri
 Chaturvedi, Shri Shambhu Nath
 Chaudhary, Shri Rudra Sen

Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh
 Chavda, Shri K. S.
 Choudhary, Shri Ishwar
 Dawn, Shri Raj Krishna
 Desai, Shri Morarji
 Dhillon, Shri Iqbal Singh
 Digvijoy Narain Singh, Shri
 Fazlur Rahman, Shri
 Ganga Singh, Shri
 Gattani, Shri R. D.
 Govindjiwala, Shri Parmanand
 Gowda, Shri S. Nanjesha
 Goyal, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Guha, Shri Samar
 Hazari, Shri Ram Sewak
 Hegde, Shri K. S.
 Hukam Ram, Shri
 Jain, Shri Kalyan
 Jasrotha, Shri Baldev Singh
 Jethmalani, Shri Ram
 Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu
 Kapoor, Shri L. L.
 Keasar, Shri Amrut
 Kaushik, Shri Purushottam
 Kesharwani, Shri N. P.
 Kishore Lal, Shri
 Kureel, Shri Jwala Prasad
 Kushwaha, Shri Ram Naresh
 Mahale, Shri Harishankar
 Mahi Lal, Shri
 Maiti, Miss Abha
 Malhotra, Shri Vijay Kumar
 Malik, Shri Mukhtiar Singh
 Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra
 Mangal Deo, Shri
 Mankar, Shri Laxman Rao
 Manohar Lal, Shri
 Meerza, Shri Kazim Ali
 Mishra, Shri Janeshwar
 Mondal, Dr. Bijoy

Munda, Shri Govinda
 Nathwani, Shri Narendra P.
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila
 Negi, Shri T. S.
 Parmar, Shri Natwarlal B.
 Oraon, Shri Lalu
 Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas
 Patel, Shri Dharmasinhbhai
 Patel, Km. Maniben Vallabhbbhai
 Patil, Shri Sonu Singh
 Patil, Shri U. S.
 Patnaik, Shri Biju
 Patwary, Shri H. L.
 Phirangi Prasad, Shri
 Pradhan, Shri Pabitra Mohan
 Raghavendra Singh, Shri
 Raghavji, Shri
 Rahi, Shri Ram Lal
 Raj Keshar Singh, Shri
 Rajda, Shri Ratansinh
 Rakesh, Shri R. N.
 Ram, Shri R. D.
 Ram Awadhesh Singh, Shri
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Gopal Singh, Choudhary
 Ram Murti, Shri
 Ram Sagar, Shri
 Ramapati Singh, Shri
 Ramjiwan Singh, Shri
 Rodrigues, Shri Rudolph
 *Roy, Dr. Saradish
 Saini, Shri Manohar Lal
 Sarsonia, Shri Shiv Narain
 Satapathy, Shri Devendra
 Satya, Deo Singh, Shri
 Shah, Shri Surath Bahadur
 Sharma, Shri Rajendra Kumar
 Shastri, Shri Bhanu Kumar

Shastri, Shri Ram Dhari
 Shastri, Shri Y. P.
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Sheo Sampat, Shri
 Sher Singh, Prof.
 Sheth, Shri Vinodbhai B.
 Shukla, Shri Madan Lal
 Singh, Dr. B. N.
 Somani, Shri S. S.
 Suman, Shri Ramji Lal
 Swamy, Dr. Subramaniam
 Tiwari, Shri Brij Bhushan
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri Ramanand
 Ugrasen, Shri
 Varma, Shri Ravindra
 Verma, Shri Chandradeo Prasad
 Verma, Shri Hargovind
 Verma, Shri Mritunjay Prasad
 Verma, Shri R. L. P.
 Yadav, Shri Jagdambi Prasad
 Yadav, Shri Narsingh
 Yadava, Shri Roop Nath Singh
 Yadvendra Dutt, Shri
 Yuvraj, Shri
 Zulfiquarulla, Shri

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As per the computer table, the result* of the Division is Ayes 63: Noes 117. In any case, the corrections will be made; there may be a few here and there. But, I think, the Noes have it, the Noes have it, the Noes have it. The Cut Motion is negatived.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up Cut Motions Nos. 92 and 93, moved by Shri N. Sreekantan Nair. Shall I put both of them together to the vote of the House?

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: Yes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I now put Cut Motions Nos. 92 and 93 together to the vote of the House.

Cut Motions Nos. 92 and 93 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up Cut Motion No. 105, moved by Shri Vayalar Ravi.

The question is:

“That the Demand under the Head ‘Ministry of Labour’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

[Failure to declare 8-1/3 per cent. bonus to all workers. (105).]

We shall follow the same procedure...

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: The usual procedure is to throw the doors open and allow those Members who want to come in and those who want to go out, to go out.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes. Let the lobbies be cleared. That is the meaning of clearing the lobbies.

The Lok Sabha divided:

*The following Members also recorded their votes;

AYES: Shri S. G. Murugaiyan, Shri Gev. M. Avari, Shri Darur Pullaiah, Shri K. Kunhambu, and Dr. Saradish Roy.

NOES: Sarvashri Charan Singh, R. P. Sarangi, R. K. Mhalgi, Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav, Dhanik Lal Mandal, Vinayak Prasad Yadav, Mahendra Narayan Sardar, V. G. Hande, Shiv Ram Rai, Bapusaheb Parulekar, Durga Chand, K. L. Mahala, Ram Prasad Deshmukh, Shrikrishna Singh, Dr. Ramji Singh, Shrimati Kamala Bahuguna, and Shrimati Rano M. Shaiza.

AYES

Division No. 4]

[14 hrs.

Ahmed Hussain, Shri
 Ahsan Jafri, Shri
 Alagesan, Shri O. V.
 Avari, Shri Gev M.
 Balakrishmiah, Shri T.
 Banatwalla, Shri G. M.
 Basappa, Shri Kondajji
 Basu, Shri Chitta
 Bhakta, Shri Manoranjan
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Shyamaprasanna
 Bhuvanarhan, Shri G.
 Chandrappan, Shri C. K.
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib
 Chavan, Shrimati P.
 Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
 Chettri, Shri K. B.
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Desai, Shri Hitendra
 Engti, Shri Biren
 Faleiro, Shri Eduardo
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun
 Gopal, Shri K.
 Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh
 Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Haren Bhumij, Shri
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
 Joarder, Shri Dinesh
 Kadam, Shri B. P.
 Kalyanasundaram, Shri M.
 Kamakshaiyah, Shri D.
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Khan, Shri Ismail Hossain
 Kolur, Shri Rajshekhar
 Krishnan, Shrimati Parvathi
 Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
 Mahata, Shri C. R.
 Mallanna, Shri K.

Meduri, Shri Nageswara Rao
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Murthy, Shri Kusuma Krishna
 Murugaiyan, Shri S. G.
 Naidu, Shri P. Rajagopal
 Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
 Narayana, Shri K. S.
 Patel, Shri Dwarkadas
 Patnaik, Shri Sivaji
 Pradhani, Shri K.
 Pullaiah, Shri Darur
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi
 Rajan, Shri K. A.
 Ramamurthy, Shri K.
 Rao, Shri J. Rameshwar
 Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
 Rath, Shri Ramachandra
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar
 Reddy, Shri K. Obul
 Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara
 Roy, Dr. Saradish
 Saha, Shri A. K.
 Sangma, Shri P. A.
 Seyid Muhammed, Dr. V. A.
 Stephen, Shri C. M.
 Sunna Sahib, Shri A.
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Tirkey, Shri Pius
 Tombi Singh, Shri N.
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.
 Visvanathan, Shri C. N.

NOES

Arif Beg, Shri
 Bahuguna, Shrimati Kamala
 Bal, Shri Pradyumna
 Baldev Prakash, Dr.
 Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka Devi
 Bateshwar Hemram, Shri

- Borole, Shri Yashwant
 Brahm Perkash, Chaudhury
 Chandra Shekhar, Shri
 Chandravati, Shrimati
 Charan Singh, Shri
 Chaturbhuj, Shri
 Chaturvedi, Shri Shambhu Nath
 Chaudhary, Shri Rudra Sen
 Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh
 Chavda, Shri K. S.
 Choudhary, Shri Ishwar
 Dawn, Shri Raj Krishna
 Desai, Shri Morarji
 Deshmukh, Shri Ram Prasad
 Dhillon, Shri Iqbal Singh
 Digvijoy Narain Singh, Shri
 Ganga Singh, Shri
 Gattani, Shri R. D.
 Gore, Shrimati Mrinal
 Govindjiwala, Shri Parmanand
 Gowda, Shri S. Nanjeshu
 Goyal, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Guha, Shri Samar
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Hande, Shri V. G.
 • Harikesh Bahadur, Shri
 Hazari, Shri Ram Sewak
 Hegde, Shri K. S.
 • Hukam Ram, Shri
 • Jasrotha, Shri Baldev Singh
 Jethmalani, Shri Ram
 Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu
 Kasar, Shri Amrut
 Kaushik, Shri Purushottam
 Kishore Lal, Shri
 Kureel, Shri Jwala Prasad
 Kushwaha, Shri Ram Naresh
 Lyngdoh, Shri Hopingstone
 Mahale, Shri K. L.
 Mahj Lal, Shri
 Maiti, Miss Abha
 Malhotra, Shri Vijay Kumar
 Malik, Shri Mukhtiar Singh
 Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra
 Mandal, Shri Dhanik Lal
 Mangal Deo, Shri
 Mankar, Shri Lakshman Rao
 Manohar Lal, Shri
 Meerza, Shri Kazim Ali
 Mehta, Shri Prasannabhai
 Mishra, Shri Janeshwar
 Mishra, Shri Shyammandan
 Mondal, Dr. Bijoy
 Munda, Shri Govinda
 Nathwani, Shri Narendra P.
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila
 Negi, Shri T. S.
 Oraon, Shri Lalu
 Parmar, Shri Natwarlal B.
 Parulekar, Shri Bapusaheb
 Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas
 Patel, Shri Dharmasinhbhai
 Patel, Km. Maniben Vallabhbhai
 Patil, Shri Sonu Singh
 Patil, Shri U. S.
 Patnaik, Shri Biju
 Patwary, Shri H. L.
 Phirangi Prasad, Shri
 Pradhan, Shri Pabitra Mohan
 Raghavji, Shri
 Rahi, Shri Ram Lal
 Raj Keshar Singh, Shri
 Rajda, Shri Ratansinh
 Rakesh, Shri R. N.
 Ram, Shri R. D.
 Ram Awadhesh Singh, Shri
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Murti, Shri
 Ramapati Singh, Shri
 Ramjiwan Singh, Shri
 Ranjit Singh, Shri
 • Rodrigues, Shri Rudolph

Saini, Shri Manohar Lal
 Samantashar, Shri Padmacharan
 Sarangi, Shri R. P.
 Sardar, Shri Mahendra Narayan
 Sarsonia, Shri Shiv Narain
 Satapathy, Shri Devendra
 Satya Deo Singh, Shri
 Shah, Shri Surath Bahadur
 Sharma, Shri Rajendra Kumar
 Shastri, Shri Bhanu Kumar
 Shastri, Shri Ram Dhari
 Shastri, Shri Y. P.
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Sheo Sampat, Shri
 Sher Singh, Prof.
 Sheth, Shri Vinodbhai B.
 Shrikrishna Singh, Shri
 Singh, Dr. B. N.
 Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan
 Somani, Shri S. S.
 Suman, Shri Ramji Lal
 Swamy, Dr. Subramaniam
 Tiwari, Shri Brij Bhusan
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tyagi, Shri Om Prakash
 Ugrasen, Shri
 Varma, Shri Ravindra
 Verma, Shri Chandradeo Prasad
 Verma, Shri Hargovind

Verma, Shri Mritunjay Prasad
 Verma, Shri R. L. P.
 Yadav, Shri Hukmdeo Narain
 Yadav, Shri Jagdambi Prasad
 Yadav, Shri Narsingh
 Yadav, Shri Sharad
 Yadav, Shri Vinayak Prasad
 Yadava, Shri Roop Nath Singh
 Yadvendra Dutt, Shri
 Yuvraj, Shri
 Zulfiquarulla, Shri

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The result of the division is:

Ayes: 69. Noes 128.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now I put Demands Nos. 68 and 69 to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1978, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 68 and 69 relating to the Ministry of Labour."

The motion was adopted.

*The following Members also recorded their votes:—

AYES: Shri Amarsinh Rathawa;

NOES: Sarvashri Birendra Prasad, Motibhai R. Chaudhary, Shiv Ram Rai, Ram Sagar, Ramanand Tiwary, Madan Lal Shukla, N. P. Kesharwani, Kalyan Jain, Harishankar Mahale, Dr. Ramji Singh and Choudhary Ram Gopal Singh.

Demands for Grants, 1977-78 in respect of the Ministry of Labour voted by Lok Sabha

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 30-3-1977		Amount of Demand for Grant Voted by the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
MINISTRY OF LABOUR					
68.	Ministry of Labour	28,33,000	—	56,67,000	..
69.	Labour and Employment	22,46,00,000	3,15,000	44,76,00,000	6,31,000

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: (Begusarai): May I bring it to the notice of the House that the latest convention is that during the Lunch Hour there would be no division and no question of quorum would be raised? Are we now departing from that convention?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have dispensed with the Lunch Hour.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: We decided to sit through the Lunch Hour and yet we developed the con-

vention that during the Lunch Hour there would be no division and no question of quorum would be raised.

14 hrs.

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 51 to 61 relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs for which eight hours have been allotted. *Demands for Grants, 1977-78 in respect of Ministry of Home Affairs submitted to the vote of Lok Sabha.*

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 30-3-1977		Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS					
51.	Ministry of Home Affairs	87,62,000	—	1,75,24,000	..
52.	Cabinet	64,73,000	—	1,24,45,000	..
53.	Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms	2,73,08,000	..	3,83,84,000	..
54.	Police	70,50,83,000	2,16,67,000	139,03,11,000	4,33,33,000
55.	Census	1,26,79,000	..	2,53,59,000	..