

Mr. DEPUTY—SPEAKER

(b) That a Minister shall not be eligible for election as a Member of the Committee and that if a Member after his election to the Committee is appointed a Minister, he shall cease to be a Member thereof from the date of such appointment ;

(2) That the functions of the Committee shall be :—

- (i) to consider the reports submitted by the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes under article 338(2) of the Constitution and to report to both the Houses as to the measures that should be taken by the Union Government in respect of matters within the purview of the Union Government including the Administrations of the Union territories ;
- (ii) to report to both the Houses on the action taken by the Union Government and the Administrations of the Union territories on the measures proposed by the Committee ;
- (iii) to examine the measures taken by the Union Government to secure due representation of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes in services and posts under its control (including appointments in the public sector undertakings, statutory and semi-Government Bodies and in the Union territories) having regard to the provisions of article 335 ;
- (iv) to report to both the Houses on the working of the welfare programmes for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes in the Union territories ;
- (v) to consider generally and to report to both the Houses on all matters concerning the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes which fall within the purview

of the Union Government including the Administrations of the Union territories ; and

- (vi) to examine such of the matters as may seem fit to the Committee or are specifically referred to it by the House or the Speaker ;

(3) That the members of the Committee shall hold office for a period of two years from the date of the first meeting of the Committee ;

(4) That in order to constitute a sitting of the Committee the quorum shall be ten ;

(5) That in all other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make ; and

(6) That this House do recommend to the Rajya Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Committee and communicate to this House the names of members elected from amongst the members of the Rajya Sabha to the Committee as mentioned above."

The motion was adopted.

14.44 hrs.

MOTION RE: CENTRAL GOVERNMENTS EMPLOYEES

MR. DEPUTY - SPEAKER: We shall now take up Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta's motion. We have already made some inroads into the private Members Bills time. Two hours have been allotted and I request the House to finish the discussion within those two hours. The mover will take up ten minutes and will need five minutes for reply: the Minister will take 15 minutes. Half an hour is gone. Other hon. Members may take five minutes each.

SHRI S. A. DANE, (Bombay Central South): Ten minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Then, we shall have to extend the time again. You have made the procedure topsy-turvy today.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बोलने से पहले मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे इस मोशन में गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से कौन जवाब देगा। क्या होम मिनिस्टर साहब देंगे? वह तो हाउस में नहीं हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The Prime Minister is here.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मेरा कहना यह है कि यह बड़ा गम्भीर मामला है, जो तीस लाख लोगों से सम्बन्धित है। अगर प्रधान मंत्री उत्तर दें, तो बहुत अच्छा है। लेकिन अगर उन्होंने जवाब नहीं देना है, तो मेरी प्रार्थना है कि गृह मंत्री या वित्त मंत्री को सदन में बुलाया जाये।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is coming.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप की आज्ञा से सदन के सामने अपना यह प्रस्ताव रखता हूँ :

“That this House expresses its concern at the refusal of the Government to refer the demands of the Central Government employees regarding need-based minimum wage and merger of dearness allowance with pay for arbitration and calls upon the Government to refer these demands for arbitration.”

सरकारी कर्मचारियों की तरफ से मुख्यतः चार मांगें रखी जा रही हैं: (1) उन को नीड-बेस्ड मिनिमम वेजिज मिलनी चाहिए; (2) वेजिज का पूरा न्यूट्रलाइजेशन होना चाहिए; (3) तन्खाह के साथ डी० ए० को मिला देना चाहिए; और (4) रिटायरमेंट की एज में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं करना चाहिए।

इन चार मांगों के लिए सरकारी कर्मचारी पिछले काफ़ी दिनों से आन्दोलन कर रहे हैं। इन मांगों को पूरा कराने

के दो ही तरीके हो सकते हैं। एक तरीका तो यह है कि वे आन्दोलन करें और दूसरा तरीका यह है कि वे बातचीत करें। इस सम्बन्ध में तीसरा कोई तरीका नहीं हो सकता है।

1960 में जब सरकारी कर्मचारियों ने हड़ताल की थी और इस सदन में वह आर्डिनेंस डिसकस हुआ था, तो प्रधान मंत्री, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, उस समय के गृह मंत्री और लेबर मिनिस्टर ने चिन्ता व्यक्त करते हुए यह कहा था कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों के लिए यह उचित नहीं होगा कि वे हड़ताल करें।

उसी समय एक यह विचार भी सामने आया कि कोई न कोई ऐसी मशीनरी बनाई जानी चाहिए, जो इंग्लैंड की व्हिटले कौंसिल के आधार पर बनाई जाए, और वह मशीनरी सरकारी कर्मचारियों की तकलीफों और ग्रीवासिज पर विचार करे और उन के सम्बन्ध में उचित हल निकाले।

उस समय पंडित पन्त भारत सरकार के होम मिनिस्टर थे। उन्होंने 22-8-60 को गवर्नमेंट सरवेंट्स की स्ट्राइक पर बयान देते हुए राज्य सभा में कहा था :

“But I must say this : that it is our desire to have some machinery for settling all matters between the Government servants and their officers or the Government by conciliation, negotiation and, if necessary, even by reference to arbitration. We hope that they live as a family which is pledged to serve the masses.”

उस समय के गृह मंत्री, पंडित पन्त, ने यह भावना व्यक्त की थी। इस का मतलब यह है कि उस समय सरकार ने एक खास ऐपरोच और एक विशेष दिशा दी कि किस तरह सरकारी कर्मचारियों की मांगों को पूरा करना चाहिए।

[श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त]

सरकार द्वारा यह भावना व्यक्त किये जाने के बाद एक जायंट कौंसिल स्कीम बनाई गई, जिस का इनागुरेशन 28 अक्टूबर, 1966 को हुआ। उस समय हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने मुबारकबाद का जो पत्र लिखा था, वह मैं आप की सेवा में पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। उस जायंट कौंसिल की स्कीम को बनाने में सरकार ने बहुत उत्सुकता दिखाई। सरकार ने एक ऐपरोच को जाहिर किया कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों की मांगों पर किस तरह विचार करना चाहिए और उन की समस्याओं को किस ढंग से सुलझाना चाहिए।

उस ऐपरोच के बेसिस पर उस समय के लेबर मिनिस्टर, श्री नन्दा, होम मिनिस्टर और स्वयं पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने उस बात को काफ़ी आगे बढ़ाया। छः साल के बाद जब उस का इनागुरेशन हुआ, तो प्रधान मंत्री ने अपने मैसेज में कहा :

“The Prime Minister said that the Government employees were members of the family of the Government. They had an important role to play in the economic and social development and serve the interests of the people. She hoped that the scheme would be worked in a spirit of co-operation, understanding and goodwill on the part of all concerned.” उसी अवसर पर श्री नन्दा ने कहा :

“Mr. Nanda said that the comitance of arbitration was the elimination of direct action or an agitational approach. An undertaking to abjure strikes was introduced in this scheme.”

यह जो स्कीम आई, उस के पीछे एक ही उद्देश्य था कि ऐसे किसी भी प्रकार के ऐजीटेशन, हड़ताल और आन्दोलन को एवायड किया जाये, जिसे

से वायलेंस हो या सरकारी काम में रुकावट हो। वह स्कीम बन गई, उस का इनागुरेशन हुआ और सरकार की ओर से यह भावना प्रकट की गई कि सरकारी कर्मचारी और गवर्नमेंट एक परिवार हैं ; चाहे मंत्री महोदय हों और चाहे सरकारी कर्मचारी, वे सब जनता की सेवा में जुटे हुए हैं।

लेकिन यह दुख की बात है कि बाद में सरकार ने अपने द्वारा व्यक्त की हुई भावना के खिलाफ़ काम किया। सरकारी कर्मचारियों ने अपनी चार मांगें सरकार के सामने रखीं। उन के बारे में जायंट कौंसिल में बातचीत चली। जब उन मांगों के बारे में डिसएग्रीमेंट हो गया, तो सरकारी कर्मचारियों ने यह मांग की कि यह मामला आर्बीट्रेशन के लिए जाना चाहिए। कम्पल्सरी आर्बीट्रेशन में जाना चाहिए। जब इस तरह की बात सरकार को उन्होंने कहीं और कहा कि डिसएग्रीमेंट हमारा हो गया है, सरकार की क्या नीति है यह बताया जानी चाहिए तो सरकार ने कहा कि हम आर्बीट्रेशन नहीं मानते। यह चीज आर्बीट्रेशन के लायक ही नहीं है। हां, हम बातचीत कर सकते हैं इस बारे में कि आर्बीट्रेशन होना चाहिए या नहीं होना चाहिए। यह एक अजीब बात है। मैं, वह जो कांस्टीट्यूशन है वह पढ़ना चाहता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि गृह मंत्री मेरी बात की ओर ध्यान दें। यह स्कीम है ज्वाइंट कंसल्टेटिव मशीनरी और कम्पल्सरी आर्बीट्रेशन का। सेक्शन 13 मैं आप की सेवा में पढ़ना चाहता हूँ :

“If there is no agreement between the two sides, the matter may be transmitted to a committee of the Council for further examination and report. But if a final disagreement is recorded and the matter is one for

which compulsory arbitration is provided, it shall be referred to arbitration if so desired by either side. In other cases, Government will take action according to its own judgment.

एक तरफ भी ऐसा अगर कहेगा तो भी कम्पल्सरी आर्बिट्रेशन में केस जाना चाहिए। अब आर्बिट्रेशन किस चीज में हो सकता है यह 16वीं दफा में बताया गया है :

“The compulsory arbitration shall be limited to pay and allowance, weekly hours of work and leave...”

तो इस का मतलब स्पष्ट है कि 13 वीं धारा और 16वीं धारा को पढ़ने के बाद डिसऐग्रीमेंट एक बार हो गया तो अगर एक पक्ष भी चाहे तो आप को कम्पल्सरी आर्बिट्रेशन में जाना पड़ेगा। इस के अलावा दूसरा कोई रास्ता नहीं है।

गृह-कार्य मंत्री श्री यशवन्त राव चव्हाण) : आप ने 13 को गलत तरीके से पढ़ा।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मैं फिर पढ़े देता हूँ :

“If there is no agreement between the two sides”—

There is no agreement between the two sides here—

“the matter may be transmitted to a committee of the council for further examination and report. But if a final disagreement is recorded”—it is recorded here—

“and the matter is one for which compulsory arbitration is provided, it shall be referred to arbitration if so desired by either side.”

और कम्पल्सरी आर्बिट्रेशन प्रोवाइड हुआ है किस किस चीज में, वह 16 वीं दफा में है :

25—8 LSD/68

“The compulsory arbitration shall be limited to pay and allowance, weekly hours of work and leave.”

अब मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ पे ऐंड एलावेंस के अन्दर जो यह इतने हमने कहे हैं वह आने हैं या नहीं ? पूरी तरह से आते हैं। मंत्री महोदय यह कहते हैं कि हम आर्बिट्रेशन नहीं मानते। हाँ, होना चाहिए या नहीं होना चाहिए इस पर बैठ कर बात कर सकते हैं। एक अजीब बात है। एक चीज तय कर दी। लगातार 6 साल से उस को गुड मेसेज देते हैं। पार्लियामेंट में ऐग्री कर लिया, पार्लियामेंट के सामने बयान देते हैं। एक आप ने यह कांस्टीट्यूशन बना लिया। अब जो चीज आप ने बना ली अगर वह किसी समय आप को सूट नहीं करती तो आप उस को रीओपेन क्यों करना चाहते हैं ? मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर इस तरीके से आगे रीओपेन करेंगे तो किसी भी चीज का आखिरी फैसला नहीं होगा। सरकार इस तरह से रीओपेन कर के इस ईश्यू को, एक बीच आफ ट्रस्ट कर रही है, गवर्नमेंट सर्वेंट्स को बीट्टे कर रही है। यह जो मशीनरी जे० सी० एम० की आप ने प्रोवाइड की है, एक तरह से इस बच्चे को पैदा होते ही आप गला घोट कर के हमेशा के लिए खत्म करना चाहते हैं। जिस मशीनरी को आप ने बनाया, जो नियम आप ने बनाए, अब उस नियम पर अगर सरकार ही नहीं चलती तो उस मशीनरी के रहने का कोई फायदा ही नहीं है। इस का मतलब है कि वह हमेशा के लिए दफना दी गई। इस तरह से अगर सरकार ही एग्रीमेंट का वायलेशन करेगी तो यह बड़े दुख और दर्द की बात है और इस तरीके से उस का नतीजा यह होगा कि आप ने बातचीत का दरवाजा बन्द कर दिया और सरकारी कर्मचारियों को मजबूर कर दिया कि

[श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त]

वह गलियों में जायें, वह सड़कों पर जायें, वह एजीटेशन करें, हड़ताल करें। और उन के सामने कोई दरवाजा आप ने छोड़ा नहीं। और कल को कोई एजीटेशन होता है, कल को कोई हड़ताल होती है, कोई वाइलेंस होता है, या कोई और भी तरीके अपनाए जाते हैं तो इस की जिम्मेदारी सारी सरकार के कंधों पर होगी। इस की जिम्मेदारी और किसी पर नहीं होगी। क्योंकि जब आप ने री-कंसोलिडेशन बन्द कर दिया, जब आप ने बातचीत के दरवाजे बन्द कर दिए, जो मशीनरी पैदा की थी, उसे खत्म कर दिया तो उस के बाद सरकारी कर्मचारियों के लिए कोई और बात बची नहीं।

इसलिए मुझे बड़ दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इतने योग्य मंत्री, चव्हाण साहब जैसे बैठ हैं और कितनी पेटेंटली इन-जस्टिस की बात की गई और अपने ही परिवार के लोगों के साथ जिन से आप गवर्नमेंट चलाना चाहते हैं, जिन से आप मांग काम लेना चाहते हैं, जिन को आप घर का आदमी कहते हैं, अगर एक घर का व्यक्ति डिससेटिस्काइड रहेगा, फूस्ट्रेटेड रहेगा, डिसअप्वाइंटड रहेगा तो कोई उस के अन्दर एफिशियेंसी नहीं आ सकती, ईमानदारी नहीं आ सकती, सरकार अच्छे प्रकार से नहीं चल सकती।

अब सवाल मांगों के बारे में रह गया। पहली मांग उस में यह है कि नीड-बैस्ड मिनिमम वेज होनी चाहिए। इंडियन लेबर कान्फरेंस के अन्दर इस को स्वीकार कर लिया गया था और इस के बारे में 9-8-60 को नन्दा जी जब लेबर मिनिस्टर थे तो उन्होंने भी इस लोक सभा में अपना बयान दिया था। मैं आप की आज्ञा से उस को पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। नन्दा जी कह रहे हैं :

"Perhaps it is not known that the need-based minimum wages was a unanimous recommendation, unanimous not only on the part of the workers' representatives—workers' representatives, of course, agreed to it—but all the employers also, the representatives of various sections of the employers also agreed to it. Then the States concerned, the Ministers, Secretaries, all agreed to it. Why did they agree? They agreed because it was a kind of a package deal. By agreeing to it they were getting rationalisation, discipline in industry and so on."

यह नन्दा जी जब लेबर मिनिस्टर थे तो कहा था। सब ने इस को एग्री कर लिया। आज अगर मोरार जी भाई कहते हैं कि हम इस को नहीं मानते, लेबर मिनिस्ट्री मानती होगी तो यह कोई मोरार जी की गवर्नमेंट है या नन्दा जी की गवर्नमेंट है या किसी एक पार्टी की गवर्नमेंट है? यह मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ। आखिर, यह एक ज्वाइंट रेस्पॉसिबिलिटी है। जब एक मिनिस्टर गवर्नमेंट के मेम्बर की हैसियत से कोई कमिटमेंट करता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार के ऊपर वह वाईडिंग है। आज आठ साल उस को बीत गए, लेकिन इन आठ सालों में आप ने क्या किया? सारे का सारा काम कोल्ड स्टोरेज में डाल रखा। कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई। एक पैसा उस में दिया नहीं गया और तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में और अब तो सवा तीन हो गई, करीब 35 हजार करोड़ रुपया खर्च हुआ। लगातार 20 साल से एक ही पार्टी की हुकूमत इस देश में रही। शायद दुनिया के किसी भी डेमोक्रेटिक देश में ऐसा नहीं रहा कि लगातार एक ही पार्टी की हुकूमत इतने दिनों तक रही हो और उस के बाद भी आज यह एजीटेशन करना पड़ रहा है कि नीड-बैस्ड मिनिमम वेज हम को मिले। यह सरकार उस को भी पूरा नहीं कर

पा रही है। यह बड़े दुःख की बात है। मेरा कहना है कि अगर सरकार पूरा नहीं दे सकती तो इस प्रिंसिपल को माने और कुछ टोकेन ही क्यों न हो, उस को देने की शुरुआत तो उन को करनी चाहिए।

दूसरे, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह बात ठीक है कि जो महंगाई बढ़ती है वह सरकारी कर्मचारियों को पैसा ज्यादा देने से बढ़ती है? वह तो उस के बारे में भी बढ़ सकती है। लेकिन क्या कभी इस चीज को आपने मालूम करने की कोशिश की कि कितनी इस पैसे के बढ़ाने से बढ़ी, कितनी इसमें नेचुरल इन्क्रीज हुई कितनी और कारणों से हुई? मैं सरकार से मांग करता हूँ कि आप काज-वाइज ब्रेक अप तैयार करिए कि कितनी वृद्धि नेचुरल स्केयर्सिटी से हुई, कितनी प्राफिटियरिंग से हुई... (व्यवधान)... मुझे दो मिनट और दीजिए। तीसरे डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग कितनी हुई है, इस के मालूम करने के लिये कोई न कोई सिस्टम इवाल्व कीजिये और जितनी भी डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग हुई है तथा उस के द्वारा जितनी कीमतें बढ़ती हैं वे सब सरकार पर डालनी चाहिए। इसी तरह से जो कीमतें प्राफिटियरिंग से बढ़ती हैं, वे ट्रेड-कामर्स और इण्डस्ट्री पर डालनी चाहियें। लेकिन अगर किसी और कारण से इन्क्रीज हुई है, तो उस के बारे में सोचा जा सकता है, गवर्नमेंट सर्वेन्ट्स भी सोच सकते हैं। लेकिन कितनी इन्क्रीज हुई है, इस को डिटरमिन करने के लिये कोई मशीनरी अवश्य बननी चाहिये। आज तक सरकार ने इस के लिये कोई मशीनरी नहीं बनाई है।

15.00 HRS.

दूसरे—सरकार यह कहती है कि देश में और भी बहुत सारे गरीब लोग हैं, जिनको खाना नहीं मिलता है। चूँकि

ये लोग एजीटेशन कर सकते हैं, इस लिये इन को ज्यादा मिले और उन को न मिले, यह कहाँ तक ठीक है। आप ठीक कहते हैं, लेकिन मैं एक काउन्टर-क्वेश्चन आपसे पूछता हूँ। मोनोपोली कमीशन की जो रिपोर्ट आपके सामने आई, जिसमें बताया गया था कि 75 परिवार ऐसे हैं, जिन्होंने सारे देश की इण्डस्ट्री के 45 प्रतिशत पर कब्जा कर रखा है—ऐसा डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन क्यों होता है? इस में किस का कुसूर है? यह डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन साइन्टिफिक तरीके से हो, ठीक तरीके से हो, इस के लिये सरकार ने कौन सी मशीनरी बना रखी है। अगर आप कोई साइन्टिफिक मशीनरी पैदा करते, जिससे ठीक डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन होता और उस के बाद महंगाई बढ़ती तो सरकारी कर्मचारी भी सोच सकते थे। इस बात की क्या गारन्टी है कि अगर सरकारी कर्मचारी भत्ता न लें तो जो पैसा बचेगा, वह गरीब लोगों पर खर्च होगा, क्या पता मिनिस्ट्रों पर खर्च हो जाये, डैम पर वेस्ट हो जाये—इस की क्या गारन्टी है? हर साल हमारा रीग्रल-वेज कम होता जा रहा है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चाहता हूँ कि उन का पूरा न्यूट्रलाइजेशन हो। सेकिण्ड पे-कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आई, लेकिन वह साइन्टिफिक नहीं थी। जब तक आप इस को फुली न्यूट्रलाइज नहीं करते, वेजेज के साथ एलाउन्स को मर्ज नहीं करते तब तक काम नहीं चलेगा। आप एलाउन्स को मर्ज क्यों नहीं करना चाहते हैं—इस लिये कि आपको पेन्शन ज्यादा देनी पड़ेगा, ग्रेचुइटी ज्यादा देनी पड़ेगी। मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि रिटायरमेंट की एज नहीं बदलनी चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव को रखता हूँ और माननीय मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि बिलेन्ड और

[श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त]

रियलिस्टिक व्यू लें। हमारे पास इतनी पुलिस है, मिलिट्री है, बन्दूकें हैं, उस की आड़ में गोलियों का डर दिखा कर लोगों की आत्माओं को नहीं दबा सकते। जब आप अंग्रेज से लड़ सके और अंग्रेज यहां से चले गये, तो आपकी पुलिस भी नहीं दबा सकेगी।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव को सदन के विचारार्थ पेश करता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That this House expresses its concern at the refusal of the Government to refer the demands of the Central Government employees regarding need-based minimum wage and merger of dearness allowance with pay for arbitration and calls upon the Government to refer these demands for arbitration."

There are two amendments. Are they being moved?

SHRI S. A. DANGE : I beg to move :

That in the motion,—

add at the end—

"failing which, the employees will be fully justified in resorting to a protest token strike throughout the country on the 19th September, 1968". (1)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I beg to move :

That in the motion,—

for "call's upon the Government to refer these demands for arbitration".

substitute —

"regrets and terms this as a breach of faith and violation of accepted principle of compulsory arbitration in accordance with the Constitution of the J.C.M. and therefore calls upon the Government to honour

its commitment and refer these demands for arbitration before the 19th September, 1968—the day on which 27 lakhs of Central Government employees are going on a day's token strike against this injustice." (2)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The motion and the amendments are before the House.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the hon. mover, when he was speaking, did express concern and sympathy with the cause of the employees and nobody can have another opinion of this issue. We—all have concern and sympathy and some understanding if not complete understanding; we do not claim to have that—about their problems. But the question is this. Why was the joint consultative machinery at all initiated? The very principle underlying the joint consultative committee and compulsory arbitration was to bring about harmonious relationship between the employer and the employees.

15.05 HRS

[SHRI GADILINGANA GOWD in the Chair]

In this case the employer is the Government and a part of the Government is their employees.

The purpose was to bring the employees and the employer together and not to divide them, not to go on dividing them further and further. The hon. Mover did express sympathy and concern about the cause of the employees to which I also give my support but, unfortunately, his underlying idea was a of making political capital out of it. I shall never be able to support. This is really not the problem. They do not realise that even the cracks which are visible today will demolish the house tomorrow and the day after. They do not realise that the cracks that they are creating today might give them immediate satisfaction or a few votes in the coming elections, but those very cracks

will go on widening and widening and a day will come when the entire structure will be demolished. I would only appeal to the hon. Members sitting to my right and on the Opposition Benches, let us not make politics out of every national issue. This is an economic problem of the country as such. These are the employees who form a class of the country's personnel. There are the industrial labour, the peasants, the landless labourers, the employees in the Government, in the public sector and in the private sector. There are the school teachers, college teachers and university teachers. Society is being divided into classes, which is quite understandable. They are a part of society. Therefore their problem cannot be dealt with in isolation; it cannot be done in isolation.

It is fact that hon. Members on this side and on that side have spoken in sympathy with the workers and have been able to achieve something for them. They have been given dearness allowance a number of times. So many pay commissions have been formed. But what has been the result of these? I live in Delhi. I know, the day the Government of India even takes a decision even before implementing the decision before the money gets into the hands of the people everybody raises the price. I know it. The vegetable vendor, the fruit vendor, the egg seller, the provision stores, the cloth shop, everybody in the retail trade, whatever may be the wholesale price anywhere, either in the factory or in the markets....
(*Interruption*)

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli): You can give it without telling others.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: Unnecessary interruptions do not credit to anybody. The hon. Member always takes a midday meal of interruptions, but I cannot satisfy him. I am sorry. He wakes up with that kind of satisfaction that he gets every day by making interruptions.

It is a fact that we are considering the problems of the workers. But what is the basis of our giving assistance to the workers? I appreciate the sentiments underlying the idea of this motion, but is it not a fact—hon. Members themselves have felt it—that whenever any such thing has happened, automatically prices rise and before that amount goes into the hands of the workers prices rise so much that they have to pay something more from their pocket than what they have got? You see the history of this wage increase.

Therefore the problem of prices, wages and incomes cannot be treated in isolation. The mistake that we are making today is of treating each problem in isolation and we are not treating the whole problem as a consolidated economic problem which requires answers at many places and like a vicious circle it has to be broken at many places.

The hon. Member's contention based on this report and the demand that this matter should be sent to arbitration is not also tenable, according to even the report. I would quote paragraph 13 which is to be read with paragraph 16. Paragraph 13 on page 3 says :—

"If there is no agreement between the two sides, the matter may be transmitted to a committee of the Council"—

Mark these words, to a committee of the Council—

"for further examination and report, but if a final disagreement is recorded and the matter is one for which compulsory arbitration is provided"

mind the words, and the matter is one for which compulsory arbitration is provided—

"it shall be referred to arbitration if so desired by either side."

The hon. members jump to conclusions without completing the paragraph. The last sentence of the paragraph is this :

"In other cases...."

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

That is, excepting those cases which should be sent to arbitration.

"In other cases, the Government will take action according to its own judgment."

Then paragraph 16 reads as follows:

"Compulsory arbitration shall be limited to :

- (i) pay and allowances.."
(*Interruptions*)

Please do not jump to conclusions. The hon. members jump to conclusions, at a wrong time and at a wrong place. This is a wrong time, if not a wrong place.

I was reading paragraph 16 :

"Compulsory arbitration shall be limited to :

- (i) pay and allowances ;
(ii) weekly hours of work ;
(iii) leave...."

Then, what is the enabling provision there? It is :

"of a class or grade of employees".

Why the hon. Member did not read this, I do not understand. It is the discretion of the two parties, either Government or representatives of employees, to refer matters to arbitration of a grade or class of employees. What I want to say here is that this is not a general proposition. This is limited in its perspective, in its scope, and limited also in its implementation. There will be limited cases which can be sent for arbitration, but those arbitration cases will be considered in respect of a class of employees or grade of employees, and it cannot be made a general proposition. The very idea....(*Interruptions*) You hear the speech made by the Opposition and then talk....You should be equally attentive....(*Interruptions*) Sir, unfortunately they are not attentive to the speeches of their own colleagues. The Mover of the motion has said this....

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : We are paying attention to your speech.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I am glad, you pay attention....

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : We like her more than hear her....
(*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : This is the kind of seriousness that they attach to the motion. They have gone away from the motion to the likes and dislikes of individuals.

The question is this. The hon. Member has made this contention that the very foundation of salaries and allowances of government employees should be based on need. This is not the contention which can be brought under this. I do appreciate that need is the criterion of every demand in this country. Need is the mother of everything. Naturally every poor person needs wages, living wages, salaries and allowances. Nobody has anything to say against the principle of that. But this contention which the hon. Member has made in connection with this class—paragraph 16 of the rules of Joint Consultative Machinery — is not tenable. The main demand of the hon. Member who has moved this motion does not come within the purview of this Joint Consultative Machinery and, therefore, at the present moment, there is no case for the entire salaries of government employees to be sent to arbitration on the basis of need-based salary.

SHRI NATH PAI : We heard you and liked you.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : I would like to quote this uplet, the couplet of Ghali .

गालिब का शेर मुलाहिजा फरमाइये :

"यह कहां की दोस्ती है कि बने हैं
दोस्त नासेह,
कोई चरासाज होता कोई गमगुसार
होता।"

श्री स०मो० बनर्जी : "हमीं से सीख के तज्ज जफ़ा हमीं पे जफ़ा, हमीं ने बार सिखाया, हमीं पर बार किया।"

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam) : We would like to be enlightened as to what has happened between these two Members here.

SHRI S. A. DANGE (Bombay Central South) : I should have been very happy if the problem of these 6 million employees would have been settled by couplets on either side. But the one couplet which they succeeded in writing is the joint consultative machinery agreement which has been broken by Government's policies. Speeches have been made here pointing out certain clauses. I am not going into the clauses. The joint consultative machinery was evolved out of a certain policy. Most probably some of the younger Congress Members may not remember it. There has been a struggle going on in this country between two lines of thought regarding the problem of the settlement of relations between capital and labour. We on behalf of the labour always demanded collective bargaining, sitting across the table and negotiating and coming to conclusions. The employers including the Government have all along resisted that policy ever since the employers in this country were born and also the Congress since it was born in this country until at last Mahatma Gandhi enunciated the principle in 1918 that if the textile millowners of Ahmedabad did not want to accept the principle of arbitration then he was going to lead a general strike. And a general strike was led by Mahatma Gandhi because the employers refused arbitration. Then those employers acceded to arbitration. Arbitration or failing that a strike—these became the fundamental standpoint of the INTUC after it was recognised by Government. Then, there was the question of the relation between the private employer and the worker and there also this was applied.

Then came the question of relations between the Government and their employees. It was claimed that Government should be treated as a special employer because it was an employer in the case of a State machinery and one could not afford the State employees holding up the State machine because their strike would mean a paralysis of the State machine and destruction of the Government perhaps. Therefore, the problem of strikes should be set aside and the relations between the employees and the Government should be governed by the principle of arbitration. This took three years of argument between the Government and the employees. Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha may not know the history of it. Government insisted that the employees should give up the right to strike and then they would discuss the question of the joint machinery. We on behalf of labour refused to give up the right to strike. We said that we were prepared to agree to things being settled by the joint consultative machinery and if it failed Government should agree to arbitration because in that case there would be no need to strike. After three years of haggling and negotiation they agreed to arbitration as a principle. And when the agreement was made and the machinery was settled, they now come round and say that they do not stand by the principle of arbitration at all.

AN HON. MEMBER : That is not it.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : No, that is so. Let me explain it. Government have said that they would arbitrate only in relation to grades or in relation to certain scales but they would not arbitrate on the principle of arbitration governing the relations between the employees and the employers. And, therefore, they said that the general question of wages as such should not be referred to arbitration. Why not? Then a new principle was enunciated by the Finance Minister. The Finance Minister is enemy No. 1 of the working

[Shri S. A. Dange]
 class in this country; not that others are friends, but I am saying that he is enemy No. 1 of the working classes. For it was this gentleman who first torpedoed the need-based minimum convention, when the convention was arrived at after great argument. 1957 was a year of some landmarks. Then certain conventions were enunciated. In 1955, the Second Five Year Plan with a reorientation of policy was enunciated by the Congress Government with emphasis on heavy industry. That required a re-enunciation of relations between the trade unions and employers. As a result, Tripartite conferences took place in 1957 and two-three conventions were enunciated. One was concerning a need-based minimum wage. Need-based minimum is no fiction of Ghalib—Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha may note. It is defined in wages.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : It is also not politics.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : This is not all. 72 square yards of cloth also form an element of need-based minimum according to that committee, and cloth is not politics, unless it becomes politics through Birlas and Tatas.

SHRI NAMBIAR : Whem it is silk, it becomes politics.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Also synthetic cloth and terylene which Shri Dange is wearing.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : The need-based minimum was accepted, as was pointed out by Shri K. L. Gupta, by all sides including Government. As soon as the Second Pay Commission was appointed, it made a reference to Shri Morarji Desai, asking 'whether this convention is applicable to you or not. He said, 'Government is not bound to pay any attention to these convention'. This was the reply, a stab in the back of all the conventions we wanted to develop in this country, about relations between the worker and the employer. He said 'I am not bound by it'. If you are

not bound by it, all right, we shall not be bound by it. Let us talk it across. That is a different matter. But do not say that 'we are sticking to the convention and the working class is not'. We agreed to the relations between employer and employee being governed by arbitration. The Government of India is running away from that principle and that commitment, sticking only to certain interpretations, certain clauses.

Then came the second convention on wage boards. We said, let an all-India wage board be appointed for every industry so that anarchy in wages is eliminated. The second Pay Commission had to cut down the 3,000 categories of wages and grades in government service and reduce them to a certain rational minimum, and even that minimum is irrational even now. So you can imagine how much anarchy there was in the wages. We proposed: for God's sake, bring each industry under an all-India wage board, study the wage rates, study the grades, introduce some order, because we, as employees, as workers, in a capitalist system want not anarchy in wages, but certain constitutional relations between the wage rate of the worker and the claims of the employer upon the workers. We desire a certain order to be established.

This convention was the convention on wage boards. Ten wage boards were appointed. One or two reported and their reports were brought into effect. Now this year the Government of India has revised its policy. The Government of India, yielding to greater and greater pressure of the monopolists, is now violating every convention that was established in 1957, to the detriment of the workers. Is that our politics? Have we created that politics? Who violated unanimous conclusions of the wage board on the electricity industry? Who violated the wage board recommendations about journalists? Who violated the wage board recommendations on the coal industry? Who

violated the wage board recommendations in other industries? One after another, every wage board recommendation is violated, revised and changed to the detriment of the workers. Why? Are Government not revising their policy? They are giving up first joint consultation and arbitration as a principle which they tried to impose on us. Years ago I had to fight two general strikes in the city of Bombay in order to defeat the imposition of compulsory arbitration by law on the textile workers of Bombay. We were denounced as creators of disorder. Now who is denying arbitration, we or they? They are denying arbitration, not we. Who is denying wage boards? They, not we.

Therefore, if we call for a general strike, why should we be blamed? It was accepted as a principle by Shri Nanda, by the Government of India, that if an employer rejected an offer of arbitration, the worker was entitled to go on strike. Is that not a standing convention? Shri Joshi and everybody else very well know. Today, we as Government employees, are entitled to go on a strike when the Government has rejected arbitration and therefore our strike is legitimate and legal. Therefore, you have no right to victimise because one of the fundamental principles of the law of trade unionism is that when a strike is legal and legitimate and just, the employee cannot be victimised and thrown out of service. Whether the strike fails or succeeds or an agreement is reached or not, the employees have a right to be reinstated. These are the fundamental principles that have been enunciated in this country, whether the Government stands by them or not.

They say that the budget cannot be submitted to discussion and arbitrary will of arbitration. This is not a normal budget; nor are we normal employees dealing only with administrative machinery. One can understand similar argument about purely administrative machinery. But eighty per cent of the Central Government

employees are industrial workers. Take the railway workers. You have a monopoly there. You say that the budget cannot be made the subject of arbitration. They are fitters, turners, engine drivers, etc. How can you treat them as a Government Secretary or a typist running the administrative machinery? The defence services, P & T., Communication, C.P. W.D.—all these are value creating domains of the public economy which cannot be subject to the arbitrary law of administrative machinery which, if it fails, will bring disaster to the country as you say. These are economic sectors of public employment subject to the economic laws of the country whose budgets cannot be treated on a par with the other state budget and which cannot be brought under third party discussion or arbitration.

But your other budget also is subject to arbitration. Why did you decide to give Rs. 100 crores subsidy in the name of exports incentives? Where did those funds go? Who dictates that part of budget dispersal? They are part of the budget as dictated to you by people in commerce or the demand of the Development Council. When the heavy guns of commerce say that the Government budget must change, Government bows down and the Finance Minister translates their desires into action in the budget and spends extravagant amounts according to their dictates. But when we come to the question of full neutralisation of DA, what does he say? We do not make the prices. Mrs. Tarakeshwari Sinha's theories on economics are of the days of Adam Smith. There were different conditions in those days. Now a days, the prices are fixed by monopolists. Inflation in the money mechanism is employed by modern monopoly capitalism in order to prevent prices falling at any cost. Since the last world war, nowhere have prices fallen. Whenever there is a downward trend, the inflationary mechanism is set in motion by banks so that the prices are pegged up at a particular high level. What about the price theory? We are

[Shri S. A. Dange]

not responsible for prices. If you give higher wages, then prices rise. Is that the position? No. They, the price makers, know first that the wages are coming. They already set a rise in the price. It is because there are two or three firms controlling production in a given line that they can dictate the prices. For a certain injection, two firms have a monopoly in this country. For a unit which costs them two paise to produce, they are charging 20. Have you checked them? We are not shaping the prices of things. If there is full neutralisation of the rise in the cost of living in the shape of dearness allowance, it comes to about Rs. 160 crores. Can they not find Rs. 160 crores? The need based minimum wage has already been worked out by the cement wage board. That can be taken as a standard and the salaries can be revised. The anarchy of the wages can be reduced. You can have a proper machinery. But the Government of India is out for a battle against the working class. But the working class is more united this time than before. Not only the industrial workers are united. Indeed the intellectual worker, the middle-class white collared worker is well organised. The banks can act with one will and hold it. Even the Birlas and the Tatas cannot break that spirit. For one hour, even if that gentleman comes with a cheque, it will not pass. We have developed that power. And we are glad we have developed that. You are very sorry we had developed that. But you will not be able to break it. The LIC has developed its power. All this Phalanx, the working class army, is now getting into one mind. Only one lacuna is there. We are still divided into several trade union sectors and of that you can take advantage; I know. The INTUC walked out of your Joint Council along with everybody else when arbitration was rejected. And afterwards you played tricks with the INTUC, and now they have backed out of the railway strike. It does not matter. We will still talk with them and see what can

be done.

Therefore, my submission is that it is a good picture. They should be glad that the worker is so organised, and they and we can negotiate and take the economy forward. Even in a capitalist economy, the capitalist requires collective bargaining and organised relations, of wages and service conditions between the employer and the employee. But if it does not take place, the sheer anarchy of behaviour will overtake this country and no amount of law and order will restore that economy to its previous level.

श्री शशिभूषण (खारगोन) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो प्रश्न हमारे सामने है उस को बहुत कुछ जिस ढंग से बिगाड़ा गया है, उस का मैं कुछ आप के सामने एक रूप रखना चाहता हूँ। बहुत क्रान्ति की दात कही जाती है। बहुत अन्तर बढ़ गया है इस की बात कही जाती है। लेकिन भोले-भाले कर्मचारियों को भड़का कर जब उन्हें स्ट्राइक के रास्ते पर ला दिया जाता है, उस के बाद उन्हें बीच में छोड़ दिया जाता है। मैं आप को एक मिसाल देता हूँ। पुलिस की स्ट्राइक यहां पर हुई। जिन लोगों ने स्ट्राइक कराई एक बहाना बनाकर उन के नेता अस्पताल में दाखिल हो गए और आज जब पुलिस के कर्मचारी मेरे घर पर आते हैं, फटे हाल, गरीब, रात को उन को सोने की जगह नहीं है, उन के लिए जब हम इन के पास प्रार्थना करने जाते हैं तो यह कहते हैं कि स्ट्राइक क्यों की थी? जिन नेताओं ने स्ट्राइक कराई थी वह उन से हाथ उठा लिए। सारे पुलिस के कर्मचारी जो हड़ताल किए थे, वह गुनहगार नहीं हैं। उन को भड़काया गया और अब उन को बीच रास्ते में छोड़ दिया गया। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग अधूरी क्रान्ति करना चाहते हैं, सस्ती राजनीतिक चापलूसी करना चाहते हैं इन आन्दोलनों से उन्हें उन कमजोरों के साथ खिलवाड़

नहीं करना चाहिए और उन को बीच में नहीं छोड़ देना चाहिए। मैं आप से एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। जो आज सरकारी कर्मचारियों की डिमांड है दस साल बाद उस से बहुत अधिक हो जायगी, दस साल पहले बहुत कम थी। यह डिमांड बढ़ती घटती रहेगी। लेकिन यह प्रश्न मनोवैज्ञानिक ज्यादा है....(व्यवधान)....यह जो सेक्रेटरीट का इतना बड़ा गोरखधन्दा है इस में तनख्वाहों का फर्क तो 100 और 30 का है, 100 और 3000 का लेकिन ग्रेड्स अगर देखें जायें तो 2 हजार हैं। इतने जो लोग परेशान हैं वह अपनी तरक्की के लिए नहीं परेशान हैं जितने इस बात के लिए परेशान हैं....

एक माननीय सदस्य : 2 हजार कहां हैं ?

श्री नाथ पाई : 574 हैं।

श्री शशिमूषण : मैं आप को और बता दूंगा। तो जो ग्रेड्स हैं उन का नतीजा यह होता है कि कुछ बेचारे टेम्पोररी हैं, कुछ परमानेंट हैं, बीस बीस साल पुराने टेम्पोररी बैठे हुए हैं, कुछ फौरन आ कर फौरन परमानेंट हो जाते हैं। कुछ गृह मंत्रालय के अन्दर नये विभाग आए हैं और वह सरकारी संस्थान बाहर थे, लिहाजा उन लोगों को पूरा अधिकार नहीं दिया जाता है, हजारों किस्म की शिकायतें कर्मचारी आ कर करते हैं कि किस प्रकार उन को जो उन से पीछे थे, आगे कर दिया गया और बहुतों का भविष्य इस से बिगड़ जाता है। जो गृह मंत्रालय के इन्चार्ज बैठे हुए हैं, उन के भविष्य तो बहुत सुधरे हुए हैं, आई. सी. एस. लोगों के और आई. ए. एस. ने भी अपना इन्तजाम कर लिया। लेकिन जो ग्राम कर्मचारी हैं, कोई भी दरखवास्त दे तो बना बनाया ड्राफ्ट मौजूद होता है, वह आप के सामने

रख दिया जाता है और वह इतना जल्दी आता है कि सेक्रेटरी महोदय दो मिनट के अन्दर देख कर उस ड्राफ्ट को अप्रूव कर देंगे। साइक्लोस्टाइल रख रहते हैं। कोई कोशिश नहीं करता कि फाइलों में नीचे जाय। जा भी कैसे सकता है जब तनख्वाहों का अन्तर तो सिर्फ इतना है एक और 30 का, और यह गोरखधन्दा इतना अधिक बना रखा है तो कर्मचारी परेशान हैं। बहुत कम परेशान हैं इस बात के लिए कि उन की तनख्वाह कम या ज्यादा की जाय। परेशान इसलिए हैं और यह एक मनोवैज्ञानिक बात है। मैं समझता हूँ, उन के साथ अगर थोड़ा सा उन को विश्वास में ले कर यह सब उन की दिक्कतें दूर की जायें तो कर्मचारी काफी नज़दीक आयेंगे आप के और वह इधर उधर बहकेंगे नहीं। एक बात यह जरूर मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक ऐसी जगह जरूर होनी चाहिए जहां बैठ कर सरकारी कर्मचारी और अधिकारी अपनी बातों का फैसला करें। मैं नहीं कहता और मैं कभी नहीं समझता इस बात को कि हमारी सरकार ऐसा मौका न दे कि लोग आ कर एक जगह बैठ कर अपना फैसला कर सकें क्योंकि हम इस पर विश्वास करते हैं कि जिनके मामले हैं उन के साथ बैठ कर तय करें और यह एक प्रजातंत्र का अधिकार है। यह देना चाहिए हर एक कर्मचारी को, यह मेरी एक प्रार्थना है।

मैं आप के सामने एक मिसाल देना चाहता हूँ। यहाँ दिल्ली ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में कुछ कर्मचारी जो पांच-पांच साल से काम कर रहे थे, अब उन से कहा जा रहा है कि दोबारा इम्तहान दो, टाईपिंग का इम्तहान दो, भाषा का इम्तहान दो। जो क्लर्क थे उन को टाइपिस्ट बनाया

[श्री शक्ति भूषण]

जा रहा है और जो टाइपिस्ट ये उन को क्लर्क बनाया जा रहा है। उनका टाइपिंग का इम्तहान लिया जाता है और उस में नौकरी से काफी लोग निकाल दिए गए। नई भर्ती शुरू कर दी गई। अगर उन के साथ थोड़ा बैठ कर बातचीत कर ली जाती तो मैं नहीं समझता कि दिल्ली ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का कोई नुकसान होता। आखिर वह तो वहां काम कर रहे थे। दूसरे आदमी उन की जगह रखे गए। तो यह जो बात कही जा रही है कि बैठ कर अधिकारी और कर्मचारी आपस में फैसले करें, वह बहुत आवश्यक है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों को भी राजनैतिक लोग मुस्तलिफ यूनियन्स में बांटने हैं। उन की यूनियन को बांटते हैं, बिरादरी के नाम पर, धर्म के नाम पर, प्रांतीयता के नाम पर। तो मैं जो यह राजनैतिक संस्थाएं हैं उन के कारकुनों से कहना चाहता हूं कि इन की अगर यूनियन एक रहे तो यह झगड़े बहुत ही कम होंगे। लेकिन कोई हिन्दू के नाम पर, कोई मद्रास के नाम पर, कोई किसी नाम पर बांटता है। यह बात गलत है। आल इंडिया रेडियो में और दूसरी जगह बहुत सी यूनियन्स बनी हैं, दो - दो तीन - तीन यूनियन्स बन गई हैं। मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूं कि वह सही तौर पर उन से हमदर्दी रखना चाहते हैं तो उन को डिवाइड न करें और उन्हें काम करने दें, इतनी ही मेरी दरखास्त है।

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the motion brought forward by my hon friend, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, requesting the Government or calling upon the Government to refer the demands of the Central Government employees to arbitration. This is a very simple proposition, a clear request to the Government to honour

the commitments made by them and the machinery evolved by the Government in consultation with the representatives of the employees. It is a clear case. If the Government feels that what they are doing is just they should not have any cause to be afraid of referring the entire matter to arbitration. It is a clear case as enunciated in the machinery and no amount of argument or sidetracking the issue will take away the rights and conventions conferred upon the employees.

The hon. lady Member, the fair lady who is not here now, raised certain questions. She requested the House not to make politics out of the issue. I think it is a very unfair suggestion on the part of the fair lady. She said it is a national problem, it is an economic problem. We also accept that. Suppose the Government solves the problem, it does not become a problem in the hands of others. That is why there is need for them to take time by the forelock and solve this question.

Her other argument was—I do not know how she stooped to that level of raising that point—that any rise in the salary or dearness allowance will push the prices further. She has been an economist, I am told, and she has also been in the Ministry. Now she is on the side of Ministry. I can invite the attention of the hon. Lady Member to the reports of the Pay Commissions. The Gajendra-gadkar Commission went into this specific question of dearness allowance. The First Pay Commission and the Second Pay Commission invariably went into this argument and contended that argument. For the benefit of the House I would like to quote para 3.5 from the Gajendra-gadkar Commission's report :

"It was argued before the First Pay Commission that an increase in salaries and wages was likely to lead to an increase in prices and thus would start the vicious spiral of rising prices and rising wages. This argument was rejected by the Commission in the context of the

lowest paid employees. It observed that the argument cannot be allowed to support a claim to keep a large section of people below the minimum level of subsistence. If even a small measure of improvement in their position will itself tend to increase the effects of inflation the State must find other ways of counter-acting these effects."

Therefore, the Commission has already dealt with this age-old question. The employees demand a rise in their pay scales and a rise in their dearness allowance because the prices are rising. This is only an effect and not a cause for a pay rise.

The next point is about merger of dearness allowance with pay. Nowhere in the world there is such an item called dearness allowance being perpetuated over decades. For more than two decades we have been perpetuating this item of dearness allowance. This also was mentioned in the Gajendragadkar Commission's report. This is what it says :

"In fact, the Commission observed that it was not aware of any other country except possibly Pakistan in which dearness allowance had become a normal supplement to salaries and wages both under Government and outside employment."

Because dearness allowance by its very nomenclature has been designed to meet a short term phenomenon, when prices have already risen to the highest level it is high time that Government should come forward to merge the dearness allowance with pay.

Thirdly, this is the year when we are going to celebrate the centenary of Mahatma Gandhi. Mahatma Gandhi was the one person who said that we are fighting for *swaraj* to lift the down-trodden, to make the *daridranarayana* get some comfort. The Ministers on the other side, who are claiming day in and day out that they want to implement all that Gandhiji

has said, they have been flouting most of his sayings. What is the position of the *daridranarayana* today? Under the regime of Indira Gandhi they have been made *maha daridranarayana*. That is the only alteration that has taken place in their position.

Then, Mahatma Gandhi said that no Minister or official should draw more than Rs. 500 a month. Now they have increased their salaries to Rs. 1,500 or even Rs. 2,500. When we take into account the perquisites, the total comes to Rs. 10,000. The argument given is that Mahatmaji said this in 1937, now the purchasing power of the rupee has come down and today's Rs. 2,500 is only equal to Rs. 500 of 1937. Then, why not apply the same argument in the case of Class IV and other poorly-paid government employees? Why not you try to increase their salaries and improve their position ?

Here in this House many Members of Parliament, whenever they sit in a committee, they want increased daily allowance. They want many other perquisites also. Why not apply the same logic in the case of the government employees also? When you want to increase your pay packets, why not extend the same benefits to the poor government employees who are under a heavy burden?

The government is moving in a vicious circle. When they come to us they say that if they increase the salary of their employees, it will affect the prices and the prices will rise. But the basic cause for demanding increased allowance or salary is inflation. The unbridled inflation that is prevailing in this country has affected its economy. The rise in prices and the inflation have given windfall profits to big business and industrialists. But the poorer sections and the fixed income groups have been hit hard. Therefore, it is high time that we make a revision of their wages and merge the dearness allowance with pay.

[Shri Sezhiyan]

So, I wholeheartedly support the motion moved by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : चेयरमैन महोदय, इस मंहगाई के दौर में अगर हम महसूस करें तो वाकई आदमी सोच नहीं सकता कि सफेद लिबास में ये भाई, जोकि गवर्नमेंट के मुलाजिमान हैं—चाहे वे सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट के हों या स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स के हों—किस तरह से अपना गुजारा करते होंगे। इसमें कोई पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है बल्कि यह सवाल एक इंसानी हमदर्दी का है। एक भ्रनपड़ मजदूर जोकि देहात में काम करता है, किसी फैक्टरी में काम करता है उसी तरह से एक पढ़ा लिखा मजदूर है जोकि गवर्नमेंट का मुलाजिम है, जो इंजीनियर हैं वह भी मजदूर हैं, वकील हैं वे भी मजदूर हैं और जो पार्लमेंट के मेम्बर हैं वह भी जनता के मजदूर हैं।

एक बात जो मैं महसूस करता हूं और जिसमें बड़ा वजन भी है, वह यह है कि दिल्ली जैसे शहर में दो सौ या तीन सौ रुपए की तनख्वाह लेकर, जहांपर कि इतनी मंहगाई है, मकानों का इतना ऊंचा किराया है, हमारे देश में आबादी का उत्पादन भी कितने ही देशों से ज्यादा है, उसके बच्चे भी हैं, दो-चार बच्चे और बच्चियां स्कूल में भी जाते हैं, उसे सुबह-शाम को कुछ सब्जी भी खरीदनी है, एकाध प्याला दूध भी बच्चे को चाहिए सेहत बनाने के लिए या फिर कम से कम चाय ही हो और फिर कुछ उधर के भाई सूखी रोटी भी खा लेते हैं लेकिन अगर पंजाब का कोई हुआ तो उसे चुपड़ने के लिए थोड़ा सा धी भी चाहिए, यह सब काम दो सौ रुपए में कैसे चलेगा जबकि उसका 5—7 आदमियों का परिवार हो? इसलिए इसमें किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है। मेरे भाई अपने केस को खुद अपने हाथ

से बिगाड़ते हैं। ये अगर घुड़सवार हैं तो उनके मुकाबले में हमारा टट्टू भी पांच सवारों में हो, यह इनका हाल है। दूसरे भाई कहते हैं कि हम भी पीछे क्यों रहें। कम्युनिस्ट भाई कहते हैं कि हमारा तो घरबी घोड़ा है, हम सबसे आगे जायेंगे। सोशलिस्ट पार्टी वाले कहते हैं कि हमारे में तो लोहिया जी की रूह काम करती है, हम तो गड़बड़ करने के लिए खड़े ही हुए हैं, किसी तरह से हमको लीडरशिप चाहिए। और इसमें मारा जाता है बेचारा गरीब सरकारी मजदूर, या इम्प्लॉय या दूसरे भाई। सवाल अकेले सरकारी या मरकजी एम्प्लॉयीज का नहीं है, सारे देश में चाहे लोकल बाडीज हों, चाहे स्टेट्स के एम्प्लॉयीज हों चाहे यहां के एम्प्लॉयीज हों, चाहे गांव के मजदूर हों, चाहे जरई मजदूर हो, चाहे म्यूनिसिपल कमेटी के भंगी हों, सभी के सामने यह समस्या है जो तन्ख्वाह लेते हैं। लोकल बाडीज, कारपो-रेशन, फर्म्स, कम्पनीज सब जगह लोगों की जान मुंह पर आई हुई है कि कैसे उन की दिक्कतों का इलाज होगा। उस का इलाज मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से पूछना चाहूंगा। यह नहीं है कि वह कुछ करना नहीं चाहते हैं। उन के अन्दर तड़प भी है, लेकिन उन के बस की बात नहीं है। पहले इस मंहगाई का सत्यानाश करो, पहले इस का इलाज करो। लेकिन यह उन के बस के बाहर की बात है। कुछ न कुछ कसर रह ही जायेगी। एक साल नहीं, दो साल नहीं, सालहा साल कोशिश की गई, फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर ने भी मदद करनी चाहिए हम लोग खामख्वाह उन पर इल्जाम लगाते हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि चोर को नहीं, पहले चोर की मां को पकड़ो। चोर की मां मंहगाई है। उस का इलाज कैसे हो? इस मंहगाई से पहले छुटकारा मिले, दूध भी सस्ता हो, चाय भी सस्ती मिले, रोटी भी सस्ती

मिले, पढ़ाई भी सस्ती मिले, दवादारू सस्ती मिले, चीनी सस्ती मिले, कपड़ा सस्ता मिले। मैं तो यहां तक कहने के लिये तैयार हूं कि सरकार ने अपने मुलाजिमों की आदत बिगाड़ दी है। वह उन को तन्ख्वाह बढ़ाती चली जा रही है, यह गलत बात है। जो महंगाई का स्पाइरल है उस के रोकना चाहिये। आज उन के लिये फेअर प्राइस शाप्स खुली हुई हैं लेकिन तब भी उन को चीजें हैं मंहगी मिलती हैं। आप तो उन के लिये इलाज यह कीजिये कि उनको अमेनिटीज आफ लाइफ दीजिये। कोई आम तबके के लोग नहीं हैं। (व्यवधान) मेरी बात सामने बैठे हुए लोगों को अच्छी नहीं लगती क्योंकि यह उन को सूट नहीं करती है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह आपको डिरेल करना चाहते हैं।

श्री रणधीर सिंह : डिरेल उधर के साथी होते हैं, रणधीर सिंह नहीं होता।

असली बात यह है कि मेरी 100 फीसदी हमदर्दी उन लाखों इन्सानों के साथ है। इस में कोई शक नहीं है, लेकिन उन के पूरे फोर्स का इंजैक्शन लगाओ। यह क्या है कि एक साल 2 रु० बढ़ा दिये, दूसरे साल 5 रु० बढ़ा दिये, तीसरे साल 10 रु० बढ़ा दिये। इस से नहीं चलेगा। गवर्नमेंट कोशिश करती है, लेकिन वह बेचारी भी क्या करे? एम्प्लायीज की झोली फटी हुई है और वह जो कुछ भी देती है वह नीचे से निकल जाता है। आज लोग उस को बुरा कहते हैं, उन को गवर्नमेंट की हालत का पता ही नहीं है। यह जो यहां पर पांच सवार हैं उन में से जन संघ वाले चाहते हैं कि लीडरी में वह सब से आगे जायें, कम्युनिस्ट समझते हैं कि वह तो पैदा ही इस काम के लिये हुए

हैं। लेकिन यह जो एक्स्प्लायटेड तबका है गरीबों का उन्हें नजात दिलाने का यह तरीका है कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब कोई कमेटी कायम करें जो सारी हालत को देख कि उन को किस बात की तकलीफ है, उन के रेम्यूनरेशन किस कैटेगरी के हिसाब से हों।

आज मैं आप की माफ़त यह भी पूछना चाहूंगा कि आज उन 60 रु० पाने वालों के लिये आप ने क्या किया जो बीस हजार फीट की बुलन्दी पर बैठे हुए हैं और आधा घंटा भी आराम से सांस भी नहीं ले सकते। जो वहां पर बैठे हुए पाकिस्तान और चीन का मुकाबला करते हैं, वह भी तो किसी माई के लाल हैं। आज यहां पर लोग लाल झंडा लिये पार्लियामेंट हाउस के सामने खड़े रहते हैं, लेकिन फौज के सिपाहियों की तन्ख्वाह के बारे में कोई नहीं सोचता, चाहे वह हवाई फौज हो, चाहे धरती की फौज हो चाहे बहरी फौज हो। आज उस खेत मजदूर के लिये, उस आदमी के लिये जो सिर्फ एक वक्त की खिचड़ी के ऊपर काम करता है, एक वक्त की रोटी पर काम करता है, उस के लिये भी सोचना होगा। आज जो हरिजन गरीब टट्टी का टोकरा सिर पर उठाता है, उस गरीब की रोटी की तरफ हमारी सरकार को देखना होगा।

सामने बैठे हुए लोग तो अपनी लीडरी चमकाने के लिये हर दूसरे तीसरे दिन लाल झंडा ले कर और चार आदमी पीछे ले कर पार्लियामेंट हाउस के सामने फोटो खिंचवाने के लिये आ जाते हैं। उनकी लीडरी जरूर चमक जाती है लेकिन 95 फीसदी आदमी जो मर रहे हैं, सड़ रहे हैं, उनका कोई पुरसां हाल नहीं है। यह यहां बातें करने चले आते हैं। यहां पन्ना लाल बारूपाल बैठे हुए हैं। वह पन्ना लाल बारूपाल अपनी

[श्री रणधीर सिंह]

बिरादरी की बात करते हैं, गरीब देहात के रहने वालों की बात करते हैं। जो मुट्ठी भर एक्स्प्लायटर्स हैं उन की बात वह नहीं कहते। मैं आप की माफ़त उन से भी कहना चाहता हूँ और होम मिनिस्टर से भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेरी 100 फीसदी हमदर्दी इन भाइयों के साथ है और उन का कोई न कोई इलाज होना ही चाहिये।

आज इन लोगों का ही सवाल नहीं है, पंजाब में, यू० पी० में, हरियाणा में, राजस्थान में, हर जगह पर एम्प्लायोज़ का मूवमेंट है। चुनावों उनका इलाज किया जाये। इन लोगों की गरीबी का भी इलाज किया जाये और जो दूसरी स्टेट्स के लोग हैं उन की गरीबी का भी इलाज किया जाये। मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि साथ में उन शेरों नाहर, हिन्दुस्तान के बच्चों का, हमारे मुहाफिज़ सन्तरियों का भी वह खयाल करें। आज 120, 130, 140 रु० यहाँ का एक चपरासी लेता है एक फाइल को यहाँ से वहाँ ले जाने के लिये, लेकिन जो 60 रु० पर दो-दो साल कुनबे का मुँह नहीं देखता वह भी तो किसी का लाल है, किसी का भाई है। यह चीज़ भी इस मौके पर बिल्कुल रिलेवंट है।

परसों हम पार्लियामेंट के बीस मेम्बर होम मिनिस्टर साहब से मिलना चाहते थे, लेकिन मिल नहीं सके, दिल्ली पुलिस के बारे में। उन के बारे में एक दख्खान्त भी दी हुई है। यह बात ठीक है कि इन आदमियों की वजह से डिसिप्लिन टूटी है, लेकिन चव्वाण साहब की शक्तियत जहाँ बाहर से एक मजबूत आदमी की है, जो कि होनी चाहिये, वहाँ उन का दिल निहायत नरमी और मेहरबानी का है। वह उन की बातों को सुनें। एक

साल, दो साल तक उन लोगों को बड़ा रगड़ा लग चुका है, वह भुखों मर रहे हैं। उन को तन्खाह नहीं मिली है। मैं निहायत इज्जत के साथ, निहायत प्यार के साथ, निहायत अदब के साथ और निहायत अकीदत के साथ मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ... (व्यवधान) क्या शाउट करते हो, एक्स्प्लायटर? कोई हमदर्दी नहीं है इन साहब को गरीब पुलिस के साथ। होम मिनिस्टर साहब एलान करें कि उन के केसेज को बन्द किया जायेगा, उन के मामलों को वापस लिया जायेगा और उन गरीब आदमियों के साथ हमदर्दी दिखलाई जायेगी।

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : After a series of increases, mentioned by Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha, to the Central Government employees during the past 20 years, these employees have raised certain basic demands and they have also decided to go on a one-day strike on the 19th September to see that their demands are conceded. Now, some of the major demands are : need-based minimum wage must be fixed for the lowest categories and on the basis of that proportionate grades must be fixed; secondly, hundred per cent neutralisation of the cost of living index must be calculated and must be granted to them; the dearness allowance must be merged with the basic salary; and all that. Similar other important demands have been raised. Are they justified in raising such basic and fundamental demands at this juncture? My opinion is that they should have raised these demands even earlier; long ago they should have raised these demands and decided on a determined strike so that they could have got these things from the Government. I am saying this on a particular fact that I have in my possession.

So much was said about so many increases during the past 20 years. Even after so many increases through the Pay Commission Gajendragadkar

Commission and all sorts of Commissions, what is their present position as compared to 1947? The hon. members who talked so much did not consider this simple fact.

If we take 1947, the year of Independence, as the base year and take 100 as the cost of living index in that year, the lowest-paid government employee was getting Rs. 55 as total emoluments; if we take the Independence year, 1947, as the base year and 100 as the cost of living index, the cash that he was getting at that time was Rs. 55. In the first quarter of 1968, the cost of living index was 370, i.e., on the basis of 100 in 1947. This means that he must get a cash equivalent to Rs. 162 to enable him to purchase the same amount of materials which he got for Rs. 55 in 1947. Is he getting Rs. 162? Notwithstanding all the allowances granted by these Commissions, as against Rs. 162, in the first quarter of this year, he was getting only Rs. 129. Rs. 129 means that they were getting only 80 per cent of the real wages which they got in 1947 which means—I hope Shrimathi Tarkeshwari Sinha will look into this fact also—that notwithstanding the series of increases, today in 1968 they have been brought to a position where a wage-cut of 20 per cent has been enforced on their earnings. My hon. friends were talking so much and shouting so much about the Himalayas....

(Interruptions)

16 HRS.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I was speaking about the jawans.

SHRI UMANATH : During the time of the Defence Ministry's demands, where was my hon. friend? We spoke about the jawans. Jawans are not his monopoly.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: What does he think of himself? I cannot be cowed down by him. (Interruptions)

27—8LSD/68

SHRI UMANATH : I want to tell this hon. Member who talked so much about the jawans and also this House that today if the Central Government employees are fighting, they are fighting not for a higher standard of living but they are fighting for the restoration of the wage-cut. That is the real essence of the matter. It is a fight for the restoration of the wage-cut and not for a higher standard of living.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Now, he will not shout.

SHRI UMANATH: The national income of this country, as calculated by this Government during the past 20 years has gone up by 20 per cent according to official statistics, but the Central Government employees have suffered a wage-cut of 20 per cent. I would like you to compare these figures with another figure. The minimum electricity charges sanctioned by the Government of India to a Minister at the Centre is Rs. 200. If they give 100 per cent neutralisation it will mean only Rs. 162. This Government is refusing to pay 100 per cent neutralisation and refusing to enable the Central Government employees to meet their total family needs even to the extent of 81 per cent of the electricity charges allowed to the Ministers. This is the shameful position that this Government is taking. Now, I come to the other question.

AN HON. MEMBER : The Finance Minister and the Home Minister are both going away from the House.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : I am present here taking down notes.

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu) : As the hon. Member got so angry they both have gone away.

SHRI UMANATH : Every time the Central Government employees raise their demands, two or three arguments are generally raised. One argument is that the income of the rural population in the villages is so low and the differential between the income of the rural population and that of the Central Government employees is so vast and that should not be allowed. This argument has been used by my hon. friend who was talking so much about the jawans and so on.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : Yes, of course, I talked about the jawans. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI UMANATH : When the Central Government employees make a demand, they raise the question of differential between the income of the lowest-paid rural population and that of the Central Government employees. Shri Sanjeevaiah when he was Minister here said that the lowest salary must be Re. 1 per day for the rural population. All right. The Avadi session of the Congress laid down that the differential between the lowest and the highest income in this country should not be more than 1:30. Now, let us take the salaries of the Ministers. When they decided about their salaries, did they base them on the Avadi decision that the differential should be 1 : 30? Today, the relationship between the income of the lowest-paid rural population and that of a Cabinet Minister is not 1:30 or 1:40 but 1:100. This is the thing they have done. I want to ask this Government : when the poor Central Government employees raise their demands, the question of fixation of a minimum, then Government cite this as their objection, but when the Ministers fixed their salaries, in the ratio of 1 to 100, where was this argument? Did it enter their heads? Where did it go? It went into the skies, into the air. This is the nonsensical argument they are putting forth.

The other day the Finance Minister in reply to a question said that

100 per cent neutralisation would amount to Rs. 102 crores. I would add another Rs. 100 crores because the State Government employees are also involved. So far as 100 per cent neutralisation is concerned, it will come to about Rs. 200 crores. Now, Shri Morarji Desai says : Rs. 200 crores! It means putting a burden on the taxpayer. When Central and State Government employees' basic demand is raised, the argument is put forward that it would involve increasing the burden of the taxpayer! I would like to say this. The cement industry demanded a higher rate for cement; the colliery owners asked for higher prices for coal; sugar factory owners asked for higher price for sugar. If these demands are conceded, will it not tax the taxpayer of this country? Will it not hit his pocket? If the price of cement is increased, if the price of sugar is raised and if the price of coal is enhanced, all this will hit the taxpayer. But when these people asked for increases, the same Morarji-Desai and Chavan did not tell them : 'No, no this is going to further tax the taxpayer'. They readily obliged them. That is the point.

I ask this question : When you raised the question of the taxpayer being burdened when the employees' demand for a minimum wage for their entire family needs, and when you did not raise the same argument to prevent the colliery owners, the sugar magnates and the textile magnates from putting up their prices, why do you bring in this question here in the case of the employees alone? My submission is that for this Government, so far as the country's and people's wealth is concerned and our people's labour is concerned, it is not meant for enriching the people themselves; it is meant to enrich Tatas and Birlas. That is why they are not raising this argument against them but are doing so against the employees.

Finally, now they are going on strike. All the four wage settlement machineries have failed and now they have come to a decision to strike.

First there was the tripartite. The second was the Pay Commission machinery. Third was the wage board and fourth, JCM in which arbitration everything, is included. All the four have gone out. The tripartite machinery is smashed by Government themselves. They are the first to defy its decision. As regards the Pay Commission, we have seen. Notwithstanding the Pay Commission, there was a wage cut of 20 per cent. So the Pay Commission ultimately turned out to become an instrument through which a wage cut is enforced and not a wage increase given. So that has also failed.

Then the wage board. We have seen how it has worked in the case of the newspaper employees. After four years of the wage board decision, they have gone on strike for forty days now and it is continuing. We could have gone on strike four years back. Why should we have waited? Then the JCM has also failed.

Hence this decision to go on strike by government employees. The bank employees are also going on strike, the LIC employees are now prepared for strike. The all India employees of State governments are to strike. If at all there is going to be any lesson in this situation, it is not that the Central Government employees only must go on a determined strike, but that the LIC Banks' and State Government employees, all should go on strike unitedly to get a minimum standard of living by fighting this Government.

श्री एस. एम. जोशी (पूना) : सभापति जी, सदन के सामने जो सवाल है, वह बहुत ही गम्भीर है। श्रमजी तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा ने एक अच्छे वकील की तरह बाल की खाल निकाल कर यह साबित करने की कोशिश की कि जो मजदूर आर्बिट्रेशन चाहते हैं, उन को आर्बिट्रेशन मांगने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है।

सभापति जी, यह जो जे० सी० एम० बनी, जिसके रूल्ज अभी सदन में पढ़ाये गये, यह मशीनरी कैसे बनी, इस की तह में जब हम जायेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि आज जो हमारी मांग है उसी मांग को लेकर यह जे० सी० एम० बनी। 1960 में जब केन्द्रीय मजदूरों की हड़ताल हुई थी, उस समय भी मैं उस के लिये जिम्मेदार था। अभी यह बताया गया है कि हम लोग लीडरी का शौक रखते हैं और अपना उल्टू सीधा करने की कोशिश करते हैं और लोगों को हड़ताल में ले जाते हैं। लेकिन, सभापति जी, मैं उन आदमियों में हूँ जो हमेशा कम्प्रोमाइज की कोशिश करते हैं। मगर कम्प्रोमाइज की भी कोई हद होती है, जिसके आगे कोई कम्प्रोमाइज नहीं हो सकता है—उस के आगे तो फिर सरण्डर रह जाता है। आप यह देखिये कि 1960 में जो स्ट्राइक हुई वह किस मांग को लेकर हुई तथा उस का विरोध भी हुआ, वह किस लिये हुआ? स्ट्राइक की मांग थी कि हम को डीयरनेस एलाउन्स मिलना चाहिये, जब वह नहीं दिया गया और इन्कार कर दिया गया, तब मजदूरों को मजबूरन स्ट्राइक करनी पड़ी।

अभी जैसा हमारे मित्र डाॅ. साहब ने पूछा कि आखिर यह मामला क्या है—यह लड़ाई क्यों हुई और जे० सी० एम० क्यों बनी? अभी जब आप एग्जिमेन्ट का प्रश्न बता रहे थे, व्याख्या कर रहे थे तो बताया गया है कि अगर क्लास आफ वर्कज हम बतायेंगे तो हमारा आर्बिट्रेशन मांगने का अधिकार हो जाता है। हम आर्बिट्रेशन नहीं चाहते हैं। वैसे अगर मजदूरों की मांग है, तो हम समझते हैं कि बातचीत होनी चाहिये, बातचीत से हल नहीं होता है तो फिर अपनी जो शक्ति है, उस शक्ति के जरिये

[श्री एस० एम० जोशी]

कलैक्टिव वारगेनिंग करते हैं और उस के बाद आखरी कदम होता है—स्ट्राइक। हमारे जो सरकार के कर्मचारी हैं, शासन के कर्मचारी हैं—क्या उन को स्ट्राइक पर जाना चाहिये—यह सवाल उठता है, क्योंकि स्ट्राइक होने से सारी मशीनरी ठप्प हो जाती है, इस लिये देश के हित में है कि हम लोग स्ट्राइक न करें। लेकिन अगर स्ट्राइक नहीं करना चाहेंगे तो हमारी मांगें कैसे पूरी होंगी। इस लिये जैसा डांगे साहब ने बताया—कोई रास्ता बूझ निकालने के लिये जे. सी. एम. बना ताकि जिन मामलों में हमारा मतभेद रहेगा, यदि वे मजदूरों के मामले हैं तो आर्बिट्रेटर के पास जायेंगे और ये दोनों मामले, जिनके खिलाफ कहा जाता है—वे मजदूरों के ही मामले हैं।

एक मामला नीड-वेस्ड-वेजेज वाला मामला है, वह वेज-क्लास एम्प्लाइज के लिये है, जिनको चौथे दर्जे के एम्प्लाइज कहा जाता है, उन के लिये आता है और जो स्ट्राइक हुई, उस के बाद स्ट्राइक को फाइट करने के लिये जो मशीनरी बनी, वह भी ऐसे ही मामले को लेकर बनी, डीयरनेस एलाउन्स को लेकर बनी। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि गवर्नमेंट क्या कर रही है? एक तरफ प्राइवेट सैक्टर की बात है और दूसरी तरफ यह बात हो रही है। इस लिये मैं कहूंगा कि यह काफ़ी गम्भीर मामला है। अगर आपको आर्बिट्रेशन नहीं देना है तो कोई दूसरा जरिया निकालो। अगर जरिया नहीं है तो यह कैसे हो सकता है कि कुछ भी न किया जाय। ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। हम मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधि बन कर यहां बैठे हैं, हम आपसे कहते हैं कि यह कोई सैन्ट्रियेट के सरकारी कर्मचारियों का ही मामला नहीं है, यह मामला रेल्वे के मजदूरों का है, यह

मामला डिफेन्स के कर्मचारियों का है, पी. ड० ल० डी के लोगों का मामला है, पोस्ट एण्ड टेलीग्राफ के लोगों का मामला है तथा उन संस्थानों के लोगों का मामला है जिसमें सम्पत्ति पैदा होती है, धन पैदा होता है—ऐसे मजदूरों का मामला है। सिर्फ इस लिये कि वे संस्थान हुकूमत के हाथ में चले गये हैं, इस लिये उन का कोई अधिकार नहीं रहा—यह नहीं हो सकता। टाटा के मजदूरों को स्ट्राइक का अधिकार है तो फिर आज हमारी फैक्ट्रीज में जो लोग काम करते हैं—जैसे डिफेन्स प्रोडक्शन है, एम्प्लूयीशन फैक्ट्रीज हैं, उन मजदूरों को अगर स्ट्राइक का अधिकार नहीं है, तो फिर उन के लिये दूसरे जरिये होने चाहियें।

इन सब समस्याओं को हल करने के लिये हम को जे० सी० एम० का जरिया बताया गया। लेकिन आज चव्हाण साहब कह रहे हैं कि तुम उस में पोलिटिक्स लाते हो। मैं चव्हाण साहब से पूछना चाहता हूं कि यह पोलिटिक्स कहां है। अगर जे० सी० एम० में झगड़ा हो गया, तो वह किसी एक पार्टी का झगड़ा नहीं है, उस में इन्टक के लोग भी थे, हमारे लोग भी थे, सब लोग थे। अगर उस में किसी बात को लेकर मतभेद हुआ, तो उसे पोलिटिक्स कैसे कह सकते हैं। जब हम ब्रिटिश के खिलाफ लड़ते थे, तो हमारे देश में एक छोटी सी जमायत ऐसी भी होती थी, जो हम लोगों को कहा करती थी कि तुम को अपनी फोटो समाचार-पत्रों में देखनी है, इस लिये तुम आजादी के लिये लड़ रहे हो। इस लिये, सभापति जी, मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूं कि पोलिटिक्स हमारा सिर्फ प्रोफेशन ही नहीं है, बल्कि एक मिशन है जिसको लेकर हम ने अब तक काम चलाया है।

इस लिये आज सवाल जरिये का सवाल है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह आग्रह करूंगा—वह यहां पर बैठे नहीं हैं, शायद सलाह—मशविरा करने गये हैं—कि सलाह—मशविरा कर के अगर इस में कोई रास्ता निकल सकता है तो अवश्य निकालें। चव्हाण साहब कहते हैं—कि बातचीत करने के लिये आओ। किस लिये? यह मामला आर्बिट्रेशन है या नहीं है। यह तो बाल की खाल निकालने की बात हुई—हम इस के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि यह मामला तय हो, कैसे तय हो, यानी नीड-बेस्ड-वेजेज के लिये क्या करना चाहिये, इस बात की कोई चर्चा है, तो हम जाने के लिये तैयार हैं, लेकिन उस मशीनरी में वह फिट बैठता है या नहीं बैठता है—इस के लिये हम नहीं जायेंगे। वह आर्बिट्रेशन मशीनरी इस लिये बनी कि स्ट्राइक न हो और हमारी मांगें पूरी हो जायें—लेकिन सरकार उस को करना नहीं चाहती है।

अब क्या करना चाहिये—मुझे तो कोई रास्ता दिखाई नहीं देता है। जो एक्शन कमेटी बनी है, मैं उस का चेयरमैन हूँ और मैं पूरी जिम्मेदारी के साथ कहता हूँ—भले ही ये लोग हमें गोलियां खिलायेंगे, हम गोलियां खने के लिये तैयार हैं। रोटी नहीं मिलती है तो गोलियां भी खा लेनी चाहियें। आप कुछ भी कहें, मजदूरों के सामने कोई रास्ता नहीं रह गया है, अब अन्याय का विरोध हमें करना होगा। हम गांधी जी के बताये हुए रास्ते पर चलने वाले हैं, थोड़ा सबक हम ने उन से सीखा है, सब कुछ तो नहीं सीखा है। मैं स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश के मजदूरों को अगर न्याय नहीं मिलता है, तो देश की सेवा अच्छी तरह से नहीं हो सकती, वे अच्छी तरह से काम नहीं

कर सकते, अपनी कार्यक्षमता को नहीं बढ़ा सकते और इस सब की नैतिक जिम्मेदारी सरकार की है।

मैं शासन से कहना चाहता हूँ—अब यह सिर्फ रुपये-पैसे का सवाल नहीं रहा है। आप लोग एग्जीमेन्ट की बात करते हैं, उस एग्जीमेन्ट को हम कुबूल करते हैं, हम उस पर कुछ दिन चले हैं, लेकिन जब उस एग्जीमेन्ट पर अमल की बात आती है तब आप यह कहते हैं कि यह एग्जीमेन्ट के विरुद्ध है या नहीं है—इस पर विचार करो—यह चीज नहीं चलेगी। पंजाब में कुछ दिन हुए रोडवेज के लिये एग्जीमेन्ट हुआ था, जब एग्जीमेन्ट को तोड़ा, तो उस के खिलाफ लोगों ने हड़ताल की। उन को काम से हटा दिया गया। हम जानते हैं कि इसी तरह से यहां भी हम लोगों को सताया जायगा हम यह भी जानते हैं कि जब हम लोग स्ट्राइक करेंगे तो उस को दबाने के लिये इनके पास पूरी मशीनरी है, जो मशीनरी ब्रिटिश लोगों के पास थी, वही मशीनरी इन के पास भी है, हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि हम अपने मजदूरों को खतरों में डालें। लेकिन जब हम यह फैसला करते हैं कि हम स्ट्राइक करें, तो सोच सामझकर कर रहे हैं, इस की जिम्मेदारी अपनी समझकर कर रहे हैं।

मेरा कहना सिर्फ इतना ही है कि हमारे सामने नैतिकता का सवाल है। आप के साथ हम एग्जीमेन्ट करते हैं और अपनी स्ट्राइक की बात को छोड़ते हैं तो यह कैसी नैतिकता रही? यह भी एक अजीब बात है कि दूसरे देशों के साथ जो हमारे एग्जीमेन्ट्स होते हैं उन को हम मानते हैं लेकिन यहां आपस में किये गये एग्जीमेन्ट को आप तोड़ देते हैं। उदाहरण के लिए मैं आप को बतलाऊं कि कच्चे सम्बन्धी एवार्ड हम ने माना

[श्री एस० एम० जोशी]

क्योंकि उस के एवाइड को मानने के लिए दोनों पार्टीज का एग्रीमेंट था लेकिन मजदूरों के साथ किये गये अपने एग्रीमेंट को यह लोग तोड़ रहे हैं। यहां भी सरकार को अपने एग्रीमेंट को अनुर करना चाहिए था।

मेरे सामने यह बात है कि मजदूरों को जब मैं स्ट्राइक पर ले जाऊंगा तो उन के ऊपर जो आफत आयेगी, जो मुसीबत का पहाड़ टूटेगा उसे मैं सोच नहीं सकता हूं। लेकिन इस के साथ ही हम लोगों को यह भी देखना है कि क्या हम डरपोक बन कर जुल्म और नाइसाफी के आगे सिर झुका देंगे? यह नहीं हो सकता है और अपनी जायज मांगों को मनवाने के लिए और न्याय हासिल करने के लिए अगर हमें खतरे के रास्ते में जाना पड़ता है तो हमें जाना चाहिए। वह एक हमारे ऊपर फर्ज आता है और हमें उस कर्तव्य को अंजाम देना है। लेकिन जहां मैं मजदूरों के अधिकार के लिए लड़ता हूं और उन को कहता हूं कि वह अपने जायज हक्क को प्राप्त करें वहां मैं यह भी उन से कहता हूं कि जब वह लोग अपने काम पर ड्यूटी पर जाते हैं तो उन को मन लगा कर मेहनत के साथ अपनी ड्यूटी करनी चाहिए क्योंकि उन्हें याद रखना है कि टेक्सपेयर्स से वह जो रुपया बतौर उजरत के पाते हैं उस की ऐवज में उन्हें पूरा-पूरा काम भी करना चाहिए। इसी के साथ जब कर्मचारी विवश होकर हड़ताल पर जाते हैं तब भी वह देश का ही काम कर रहे हैं और अगर वह 19 सितम्बर को एक दिन की हड़ताल पर जा रहे हैं तो ऐसा वह साधारण होकर ही कर रहे हैं और इस के सिवाय उन के पास कोई दूसरा चारा नहीं रह गया है। अगर हमारे मजदूर एक दिन की हड़ताल पर

19 सितम्बर को जायेंगे तो उस की जिम्मेदारी हम लोगों पर नहीं है बल्कि खुद उन के ऊपर है जिन्होंने कि यह एग्रीमेंट तोड़ा है। वह लोग ही इस के लिए जिम्मेदार रहेंगे। मैं इतना कह कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूं।

श्री अ० सि० सहगल (बिलासपुर) :
सभापति महोदय, श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त ने सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट इम्प्लॉईज के लिए जो मोशन मूव किया है मैं उस के बारे में अपने विचार रखना चाहता हूं। वह मोशन इस तारीके पर है :

“This House expresses its concern at the refusal of the Government to refer the demand of the Central Government employees regarding need-based minimum wage and merger of DA....” etc.

मैं इस बात से सहमत होते हुए कि हमें अपने केन्द्रीय सरकारी कर्मचारियों की मदद करनी चाहिए, हमें यह देखना है कि हमारे रिसोर्सज उन को किस हद तक मदद कर सकने की स्थिति में हैं। मदद करने का एक रास्ता होता है और उस के लिए मैं उन से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह मिल कर एक साथ बैठ जायें और मुद्दों पर ठंडे दिल से तबादला ख्याल करके किसी कोमन एग्रीमेंट पर पहुंच जायें।

मेरे भाई ने फरमाया कि वह 19 सितम्बर को हड़ताल करने जा रहे हैं मैं उन से निवेदन करूंगा कि यह जो वह स्ट्राइक करने जा रहे हैं उस के लिए वह यह देखें कि आखिर पब्लिक एक्सचेंजर के प्रति भी उन की एक जिम्मेदारी है और वह इस बात को जरा मन में सोचें कि उन की इस स्ट्राइक से पब्लिक एक्सचेंजर का कितने रुपये का नुकसान होगा मैं यह नहीं कहता कि उन को बड़ा हुआ मंहगाई

भत्ता न मिले या उन का वेतन न बढ़ाया जाय लेकिन हमें अपनी लिमिटेशन का भी ख्याल रखना है। उस के साथ आप डिफेंस आर्गनाइजेशन को भी देखिये। अगर आप वेतन और मंहगाई भत्ता आदि यहां पर बढ़ा सकते हैं तो आप को डिफेंस आर्गनाइजेशन में भी बढ़ाना पड़ेगा। उस के जितने भी कर्मचारी आप के हिन्दुस्तान भर में हैं और वह हर एक सूबे में हैं वहां पर भी उन की वेजेंज को और दूसरी चीजों को माननीय सदस्य के मोशन के अनुरूप बढ़ाना पड़ेगा। इसीलिए मैंने कहा है कि आप उस के लिए अपने पब्लिक एक्सचेंजर को देख लीजिये मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि आप लोग उन के लिए बैठ करके एक ठंडे दिमाग के साथ इन सारी चीजों को देखें। गरम दिमाग से काम करने से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। आखिर में वह सब हमारे भाई हैं और वह देश का काम करते हैं इस से मैं इंकार नहीं करता लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि वह इस बात को भी देखें कि वह जो आप के एम्प्लॉईज हैं वह दफ्तरों में कितनी दफे बाहर जा-जा कर चाय पीते हैं और यह कि दफ्तर में वह कितना ऐक्चुएली काम करते हैं? आप के पास में आफिसर्स हैं और उन से पता लगाया जा सकता है कि हर एक आदमी को कितना वर्क करने के लिए दिया जाता है और यह कि वह इतना वर्क कर रहे हैं? अगर ऐसा कोई डांचा नहीं रक्खा गया है, वर्क लोड हर एक आदमी के लिए फिक्स नहीं किया गया है तो मैं कहूंगा कि यह सम्बन्धित डिपार्टमेंट्स की शक्ति है। यह तय किया जाय कि कितना काम हर एक सरकारी कर्मचारी से लिया जाय और उतना काम उन से बराबर लिया जाय। यदि वह अपना पूरा कोटे वाला काम नहीं करते हैं तो आप को आगे आना चाहिए और कहना चाहिए कि

इस आदमी ने अपना पूरा काम नहीं किया है इसलिए उस प्रपोरशन में उस की तनखाह काटी जानी चाहिए।

जब सरकारी कर्मचारियों की बेजेज और मंहगाई भत्ता बढ़ाने का सवाल उठता है तो फौज के जो आदमी हैं उन को भी आप देख लीजिये। वह बड़े मुश्किल हालत में आप के बौरडर ऐरियाज की हिफाजत कर रहे हैं। वह किस तरह से वहां पर हैं, उन के बच्चों की क्या हालत है, उन के बच्चों की पढ़ाई की क्या हालत है इन सारी चीजों को मद्देनजर रख कर ही आप इस काम को करें। अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो मैं आप के साथ इस में रहूंगा और रहूंगा ही नहीं बल्कि लीड भी करूंगा लेकिन जैसा मैंने कहा सारी चीजों को ठंडे दिमाग से आप सोचिये। आप अपने पब्लिक एक्सचेंजर को देखिये कि कितना रुपया आप कहां से लेने वाले हैं? जल्दबाजी में काम करने से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। लेकिन इतना मैं कहने पर मजबूर हूं कि आज के हालात में गवर्नमेंट के पास इतना पैसा नहीं हो सकता है कि वह आप की सारी मांगों को मान ले। इतना कहने के बाद मैं अपना ब्याख्यान समाप्त करता हूं।

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, from the ordeal through which the two million employees of the Central Government went in 1960 I suppose three lessons, three inferences, three conclusions were drawn. Some were victory, some were losses to us. On the side of credit I would put these three. One was that we after a struggle of nearly two decades succeeded in persuading the Government of India to accept the principle of arbitration even when the Government is the employer. Nobody had been persuaded by the logic of the Government of India that arbitration is a good thing to accept when the dispute is between

[Shri Nath Pai]

a private capitalist and the workers. But somehow what is good in a dispute where the private capitalist is concerned was not supposed to be good enough where the Government of India was the employer. Shri Jaiprakash Narayan has been strenuously trying to persuade the Government of India to accept this principle. But out of the sacrifice of the Government employee in their struggle of 1960 came this one single victory, that is the acceptance of the principle of arbitration.

There were two lessons since Shri Chavan was not the then Home Minister I want to recall them. One was that the strike exposed the hollowness of the claim of the Congress Party that it is trying to create a socialist pattern of society I would like Shri Chavan to know that socialism is something that does not come through legislation. It has to be built from the bottom, from the foundation, slowly and gradually and if our claim that we are dedicated to this cause is a serious one if we are sincere about what we claim what we want to do, then the question comes who are going to be the carpenters, the masons and the builders of the new edifice of this socialism? If you are serious about what you want to do, who are going to be your colleagues your comrades in arms, who are going to drag the chariot of socialism towards its goal. Certainly it is not your ICS officers to day. I have great regard for some of them. But we see what their loyalty is towards socialism. They are running public enterprises. The day they resign or they retire from that post they are joining one private company after another. This is not the kind of colleague whom I would like to have in my task of building socialism. Basically, if the goal of the nation to gradually progress towards a welfare society and then to a socialist society is to be achieved, then we must see who are the colleagues. I have no doubt Shri Bhagat by your side is a good colleague. But your ultimate colleagues will be the two-and-a-half million employees

who are running the machinery of the Government of India. If they become partners, if they become colleagues, if they get committed to this goal, then only there is some hope for this country in reaching its destination. Everything is done to thwart their wishes, to defeat them, to demoralise them. Still we want to claim that we want to march towards this goal.

The third advantage is something which came to us that I would like my fellow colleagues to bear in mind. There was a third lesson from the strike of 1960. It was this, that no leader of the Central Government employees should forget that when Parliament is not in session they should consider three times before giving a call for a strike. The government was tremendously benefited by the fact that the strike was during a time when Parliament was in recess. They could use all the modern apparatus of suppression. 45,000 government employees were suspended, 21,000 were arrested and all the other apparatus were turned full-scale against the employees. So, we will have to take into consideration this fact also that once a strike takes place, we the leaders suffer only partially. During the last strike 2 million employees suffered 12,000 of whom were without a job for a long time. That has also to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Chairman, somebody now said that politics is the cause of the strike. May I read a candid admission on the part of the then Prime Minister of India. I think it was Shrimati Taraeshwari Sinha who, while intervening in the debate, said that she has a little understanding of these things. I must confess that a little understanding is a very dangerous thing. May I now read to her letter? This is not politics. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in a confidential letter, a copy of which Shri Chavan must have received in his then capacity as the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, said this to his colleagues :

"We have thus far not evolved any adequate machinery for the

rapid settlement of disputes of this type. The Government's way of dealing with such matters is a leisurely way and it takes months and even years before we come to grips with the problems. A problem which perhaps could have been solved with greater ease becomes more difficult. Frustration takes place and passions are aroused and these lead to a conflict which ultimately does no good 'to anyone'.

I would like to tell my hon. friends in the Congress Party that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru wrote this after the 1960 strike. Whatever he might have said on the floor of the House, to his colleagues he was admitting that it was his government's policy which was the main cause of the government servant's strike of 1960. Then I would like to read the speech of another distinguished member of the Congress Party, Shri G. L. Nanda. What is the dispute about? Shri G. L. Nanda, participating in the same debate says that there was a unanimous recommendation of the labour conference. What was the unanimous recommendation about? Were the government employees asking for the moon? They were asking for something to which the government was a party. Shri G. L. Nanda defended it, as was very eloquently cited by the mover of the Resolution than I could have possibly done. Here he says :

"While accepting that the minimum wage was a need-based wage which should ensure the minimum human needs of the industrial workers, the following norms were accepted as a guide for all wage-fixing authorities including minimum wage committees."

And then he says :

"I do not know how the government made a mistake about the calculation as to the burden the tax-payer will have to carry in case the government wishes to implement this recommendation."

He spells out what is the minimum wage. I do not know whether Shri

Chavan's advisers have placed before him the relevant papers but I think it is worth going into. Anyhow, I shall not take the time of the House on this point.

Now, what is this quarrel about? I was submitting earlier that it took three long years of persuasion with the Government of India and ten years of struggle before the principle of compulsory arbitration was accepted. Here I would like to read what my other colleagues have read.

16.34 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Sir, you were a witness to this debate and you were evincing keen interest in the emergence and evolution of the struggle of the working class in this country. The preamble to the agreement between the government employees and the Government of India has this to say :

"The Government of India have decided to establish a machinery for joint consultation and arbitration of unresolved disputes."

I would like Shri Chavan to bear in mind that this is the key-stone of the arch of negotiations between the government and its employees, its pillar, its base, its foundation. If in the preamble it is stated what is the objective of this machinery, where does the quarrel come? Now, about clause 13 and clause 16, I think you were right that they are to be read together. But what is the very purpose of this machinery? How was it born? How was it conceived? May I recall another incident? Perhaps, he might not have the file with him. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in a letter to me dated the 17th of January written from Bangalore had this to say :

"I agree with you that some kind of a consultative machinery will have to be evolved."

Perhaps you knew this thing.

[Shri Nath Pai]

This had been accepted by Government in 1960 but this was created only two years back. Have we given it a fair trial? At the first real opportunity of the test for the Government, the Government backs out of its commitment. I want Shri Chavan to ponder calmly and coolly over the implications of the Government trying to back out of its own solemn commitment.

There may be difficulties. As Shri Joshi has rightly pointed out we shall sit down to consider your difficulties and find out some other method. He made a constructive suggestion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the Deputy Whip of the Congress cannot go on continuously disturbing the proceedings. This shuffling across must stop. I will not speak till it stops. This is distracting the House continuously. I have great regard for him; he is a personal friend of mine; but this is the Lok Sabha going on. What is this continuous shuffling along? I do not mean any personal disrespect to him.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You conclude now.

SHRI NATH PAI : We are talking something; we want to advance something. It is a very serious matter. We are confronted with the prospect of a strike. We know the penalties our Government employees have to pay. We are not taking this decision lightheartedly. With a heavy heart we reach this conclusion if we fail in persuading Shri Chavan and his colleague. We still hope that he might rise to the occasion and find a way out. Nobody is wanting that the doors be closed. We do not want the doors to remain closed.

As Shri Joshi pointed out on what basis? We are not demanding something new. This is what you promised. This was the understanding. The then Home Minister his worthy predecessor Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri one day called some of us before the

recognition of the Government employees which was withdrawn as a result of the strike by way of punishment was granted and during the negotiations he once suggested to us, "I am prepared to accept the principle of arbitration; will you not now give up your right to strike?" We reported this to you. We said, "Shastriji, do you feel sure that always this country will be having Home Ministers of your commitment to democracy? A time may come when very arrogant type"—I do not mean you, please—"worse people can one day be Home Ministers." He is dedicated to democracy... (*Interruption*). Please do not try to distort and mislead. There is enough misunderstanding as it is and I do not want to add to it.

We told him, "The right to strike, not responsibility but when every other avenue has been closed, is one of the pillars of democracy; if we surrender it, we do not take away the right of the working class only but we take away one of the major weapons and shield of democracy in India."

I want to make a plea. Now is not the time to go into detailed arguments. The Government is on the horns of a dilemma. If you accept the principle that the merger of dearness allowance is an arbitrable thing, do you not by implication accept that basic need-based wage is also arbitrable, because the two are so connected with each other that you cannot separate the one from the other? I want to submit to the Home Minister, if you accept the principle that dearness allowance merger question is arbitrable, what does it lead to? It leads to the basic question of what should be the minimum wage.

There is a huge responsibility on the Government of India. We are today seeing that the whole structure which we have been building gradually for a fair deal to labour in this country as one step towards the socialistic goal is crumbling down. You are concerned with the strike,

You were good enough to inform us that he is taking an enlightened interest in the settlement of this dispute. But I am afraid, if the Government of India does not realise its responsibility as the pace-setter of social justice, it is no use trying to tell the capitalists what they should do. It is in the interest of the Government of India to create better living and working conditions by giving better salary and other benefits to the working class. Will it have the authority to talk to the private capitalists that this is the kind of India they want to build if the Government of India does not see its way to this kind of honest working and fair deal to its employees? I am afraid, this will remain a dream only in words.

Finally, it is not yet too late. I completely endorse Shri S. M. Joshi's constructive approach to this. I miss Shri S. M. Banerjee, but even Comrade Dange has said, let us not take a false prestige idea. Time is still not lost. If all our appeals, all our pleasure turned down by the Government saying that there is nothing to discuss, the responsibility for what happens will be the Government's. This is not a threat; this is not a warning, still it is a plea with the Government of India that nothing is yet lost. Take a constructive approach and see how you can meet this legitimate demand of the Government employees which you have accepted and which your earlier colleague has said to the House is a legitimate thing on the part of the employees.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We have already exhausted two hours, the time allotted for this debate. Mr. Sequiera and Mr. Banerjee have to speak. What I suggest is that they should be very brief and finish in a few minutes....

SHRI NAMBIAR : I want only two minutes....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No, no. Then I will call the Home Minister..

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : I would like to intervene. They may continue later. We have some other work. We thought that the time was two hours....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The time-table has been topsy-turried....

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I do not mind their continuing later. But I would like to intervene now. There is no question of any reply as such....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Before he speaks, I would like to....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No, no. We have changed the time-table. We cannot blame him.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara) : May I know when we will be taking up the Private Members' business?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : After this.

SHRI NATH PAI : There is a very important Resolution.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI : I want to know the time approximately. I must have an idea.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : About half an hour more. How long the Home Minister will take?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I will take 15 minutes. I will make the briefest possible speech. I do not propose to reply to every point that has been raised here; that is not necessary.

Really speaking, the problem, in substance, is a very important one, no doubt, but is a very small one in content. The difference is very small. I am glad, the hon. members have promised to be constructive in this matter. I hope, they will be constructive. Being constructive does not mean making merely constructive speeches. The question is whether

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

they are prepared to accept a constructive attitude or whether they have made it a point that whatever they have said must be conceded or whether they propose to be constructive....(Interruptions). I am putting my case. It is no use going to the entire background of the problem as some hon. friends have done. Some hon. friends gave a talk about socialism. Mr. Dange gave us a very interesting discourse on political economy....

AN HON. MEMBER : On arbitration.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Also on political economy. It was a very interesting discourse. It is a pleasure to listen to him when he explains from his own point of view the economic problems.

We also humbly claim to believe in socialism. Socialism does not grow out of demands. Socialism grows out of the growth of economy and social values which guide distribution of national income. This is, really speaking, the basic approach of socialism.

With this background, let us come to the problem. There are only two demands on which, at the present moment, argument is going on—one is about merger of dearness allowance and the other is the need-based minimum wage.

SHRI S. M. JOSHI : Full neutralisation also.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : There are five demands.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am talking, really speaking of the two demands on which the entire controversy is going on

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Take also those which you have rejected.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : At the present moment, these are the two demands.

SHRI S. M. JOSHI : Full neutralisation is also very important.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : It may be important. I will give you a little bit of the history of this problem. As I had some occasion to make a statement on the floor of the House also....(Interruptions) both the groups discussed the matter and recorded their disagreement. On behalf of Government it was explained to them that—it appears, it was a very carefully worded explanation that was given — both these demands are non-arbitrable....

AN HON. MEMBER : Seems ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I said, appears... (Interruptions). If we want to enter into a legalistic argument, I am prepared to argue the matter, but I do not want to do it because that is not the mood of the House. I know that.

If you look to the spirit of these rules, this constitution, the scheme for joint consultative machinery and compulsory arbitration, there is no doubt that compulsory arbitration is accepted, but accepted in a very limited way.

Let us not forget that it is not compulsory arbitration in an unconditional manner. Arbitration, if it has to be, really speaking, made applicable, must mean something definite. Now here is a problem which is being expected to be referred to arbitration in its entirety, in its totality: the question of need-based minimum wage. If at all we are talking in terms of socialism, are we merely going to consider this matter in isolation, in relation to a particular section? My hon. friend, Shri Randhir Singh, was right—I entirely share his spirit—when he asked : when we talk about a need-based minimum, is it only for a particular class of people in India? What are we suggesting? It is only those who are very well organised and who can compel strikes

or create obstructions in the working of normal civil life of the country or Government, that have got the right to this ?

SHRI NATH PAI : Give to all.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : If it is to be considered for the entire society, the approach has to be different.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : The convention embraces only the industrial workers.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : When it suits him, he talks in terms of philosophy; when it suits him on other occasions, he starts talking in terms on conventions in a particular matter. It is an important matter. I do concede that need-based minimum wage is a concept which it ultimately must assert itself in the country. I have no doubt about it. But there also, you will have to prepare the country for it; merely preparing Government and merely creating a demand for that is not enough. You will have to create objective conditions in the country for that.

Therefore, the demand for a need-based minimum wage is a national issue, the economic, social, political and administrative implications of which will have to be thoroughly examined, worked out and then applied. That is a matter for planning as such.

About this question of the demands as such, we have invited those people—I have explained this point already for talks. We think, it appears to us, that these demands are non-arbitrable. But even then, we are prepared to discuss with you the arbitrability or non-arbitrability of this issue. We have said that. But that has been refused. Is it a constructive attitude? May I ask Shri Nath Pai?

SHRI NAMBIAR : Arbitrability is not to be discussed.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : A thing which even the Imperial Government did not refuse, here the representatives

of government employees refused to their own Government! Then they claim they are having a constructive attitude. Is it so?

SHRI NAMBIAR : Arbitrability is not to be discussed. That is clear.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Not clear. We are not considering the question of general arbitrability; we are considering here the question of arbitrability of a particular demand.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Which is arbitrable.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : He has made up his mind.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : If I say he is not Mr. Chavan, will he believe it?

SHRI S. M. JOSHI : If it is not arbitrable according to him—let us assume for argument's sake—what is his method to solve the problem ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : That is why I say, come and discuss. Let us see what are the arguments.

SHRI NATH PAI : What is the method ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : It may be that I may succeed in persuading them and still further convincing them that I am right and they are wrong (*Interruption*) It is also a method. Can we say it is not? Why are they afraid to sit together?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Why is he afraid of arbitration?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Why are they afraid of being convinced about this matter ?

They have said 'No'. Well and good. But the representatives of INTUC came and discussed.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Loyal dog.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Wise people who are, really speaking, loyal to the nation.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : If Mr. Chavan is not loyal to the workers, they will not be loyal to him (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : They have to be loyal to the country, not to you.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am glad that Shri Madhok and Shri Banerjee are thinking and speaking with one voice. I am glad to see Madhokji and Shri Banerjee speak with one voice ; it is a good thing.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Do you not think that loyalty to the country comes first ? No question of anybody agreeing or not agreeing.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I do not say that they should be loyal to me or to this Government. But loyalty to the nation is the most paramount thing.

I shall sum up our present attitude. We are prepared to discuss both these questions with them. We have told them that in the case of merger of dearness allowance, it is a specific problem and we are prepared to discuss this matter with them. When we are discussing any matter, to think of arbitration is premature. Still, in case our negotiations fail, I do not rule out arbitration about the merger of dearness allowance. What more reasonableness can you expect of the Government ? But as far as the need based minimum wage is concerned, we are not in a position to accept this demand nor are we prepared to accept the arbitrariness of that problem. I do not want anybody to be in any doubt about it. I do not know whether we have reached a stage in this country to accept this and leave it to some arbitrator to decide what is the need based minimum wage. The general concept of national minimum wage or whatever it is under examination by the Labour Commission at the present moment.

श्री रवि राय (पुरि) : तो इसको श्री नेशनल लेबर कमीशन के पास भेज दीजिए ।

श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण : पहले का काम तो पूरा होने दो ।

To cut a long story short we have got full sympathy for the Government employees. Somebody mentioned—and I accept that we are a family. We want to see them happy. But at the same time, sometimes the head of the family has to be a little firm in certain matters. Otherwise, the family is ruined. So, our position is that we are prepared to discuss this question of the merger of the dearness allowance. In case nothing comes out of this discussion, we shall leave it for arbitration. In the case of the need based minimum wage, there is no question of any arbitration.

SHRI NATH PAI : You did not answer the point of neutralisation of the cost of living. We have understood your mind—not that we agree. This point was raised by all of us. What is the constructive attitude of the Government ? That is not a tall claim, you will agree, that we get in 1968 what we were getting in 1947. The Reserve Bank Review pointed out last year—and we cited it for the benefit of the Finance Minister—that the real income of the industrial worker and the Government employee in the year 1967 was less by one percent than in 1947. Are we wrong that Government's policy should be to neutralise the increase in living costs ? What is the Government's attitude.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : If I am asked a question and an answer is to be given like this, it does not help. I should like to sit with my advisers and sit with his advisers also and discuss this matter.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I have moved a substitute motion which reads as follows :

That in the motion,—

for "calls upon the Government to refer these demands for arbitration"

substitute—

“regrets and terms this as a breach of faith and violation of accepted principle of compulsory arbitration in accordance with the Constitution of the J.C.M. and therefore calls upon the Government to honour its commitment and refer these demands for arbitration before the 19th September, 1968 — the day on which 27 lakhs of Central Government employees are going on a day's token strike against this injustice”

Sir, I expected some convincing answer from the hon. Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan, but he had no argument. What did he say? He said that the employees' leaders did not want to discuss it or they refused to discuss it with the Cabinet Sub-Committee. If you read the resolution of the JCM, which was very ably read by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, you will find that this matter, whether it is salary or allowance, leave or hours of work, is arbitrable. Now, the question is whether the employees' representatives should discuss it for years together. It was discussed for two years in the JCM, and when the demand was finally rejected by the cabinet Sub-Committee, the Chairman from the Government side on the JCM, and when the rejection of the demand was recorded in writing, then it should have been referred to arbitration. But it has not been referred to arbitration. Then the two issues that is, the minimum wage and the merger of dearness allowance, which were rejected by the Cabinet Sub-Committee, by the Chairman of the JCM, were rejected and therefore, they should have referred it to arbitration. But it was certainly said that the employees' representatives should go and meet the Cabinet Sub-Committee consisting of the Deputy Prime Minister, the Home Minister and the Labour Minister. What was to be discussed there? Whether arbitration should be resorted to or not, whether this question is

arbitrable or not: that was to be decided, and they wanted to refer this question of arbitration to an arbitrator? This is ridiculous. They could have clearly told the employees that they were not in a position to agree to it. I would have understood that, but by a jugglery of words they have cheated 27 lakhs of Government employees of their legitimate demand for arbitration.

I was one of those who discussed this problem with the then Home Minister, Shri Nanda and the Home Secretary, whether we should abjure the right to strike. The All-India Defence Employees' Federation, under the leadership of Shri S. M. Joshi and others, did not accept the JCM because we knew that in the JCM, the moment the employees go there, they are going to be cheated by this Government. We knew that, and our apprehensions were correct. Now, what remains? He wants us to discuss what? Whether this question is arbitrable or not. I can say here and now, as the representative of the joint council of action, that we are not going to discuss this issue unless the Government decides here and now that these matters will be referred to arbitration.

Why is he so afraid of referring this matter to arbitration? Because the Government has a weak case: the Government have done injustice after injustice to the Central Government employees, and today, you know once it is referred to arbitration, naturally they will be given a need-based minimum wage and they will have full merger of the dearness allowance, because this Government, after 20 years of Congress misrule, have failed to peg the prices, reduce the prices, hold the price-line. And today, the whole of Government employees have a right case and they demand more.

I am really sorry that after hearing Shri Chavan's speech, the Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister did not make any statement which I expected from him. If Mr. Chavan's reply is final, and if the Prime Minister does not think it proper even to talk on this subject, what will happen? Whenever

we go to her in delegation on deputation, she smiles; that smile has got effect on us only for two or three hours. Not more than that. One should find out what is beyond that laughter, what is beyond that smile. There should be something more than that smile.

So, I am saying here and now' Mr. Chavan may be the Minister; they may all behave like Ministers, and they may try to crush us, the Central Government employees who number 27 lakhs. But the Central Government employees, under the banner of the joint council of action, despite fissiparous tendencies, fissiparous attempts of the INTUC who are the stooges of this Government and who may do whatever they like, will strike; the strike is going to take place on the 19th. All the Central Government employees, 27 lakhs of them, will be on strike, despite tear-gas, despite lathi charge despite the Preventive Detention Act and other measures. If he wants to have a discussion, we will not discuss this issue, whether it is arbitrable or not. We are prepared to discuss at a national level. Let the Prime Minister call a meeting of all the representatives and we are prepared to discuss. But not the question of arbitrability. We do not want to involve ourselves in this ticklish question whether it is arbitrable or not.

17 HRS

Mrs. Tarakeshwari Sinha said, this pertains to a particular grade. Minimum wage always applies to those who are getting the minimum, not to those who get the maximum. The allowance of the MPs is going to be increased shamelessly from Rs. 31 to Rs. 51. The allowances of Secretaries and Joint Secretaries have been increased by Rs. 250. Ministers can spend Rs. 40,000 on electricity, etc. But they do not want to give a minimum wage to Government employees. They have suffered so much and they will not suffer more. It is being said that there is politics in this. The only politics in this is that the Government has cheated 27 lakh employees and they will definitely go on strike on the 19th September.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA (Marmagao): Sir, without subscribing to some of the economic theories that have been put forth by some hon. colleagues from the opposition and calling the INTUC any names, I rise to support the motion of Mr. Gupta. This is a country with a large disparity of incomes. In these circumstances, it is the duty of this Government to be in the vanguard of any movement for a need-based minimum wage. Instead, we find that it is hiding behind commas, full stops and provisos of a Scheme. You are aware that in this country we have accepted the tripartites system, in labour matters. In this system, it is this very same Government which is the conciliator, and in many cases, arbitrator, in those disputes. If it treats its own employees in this way, what face has it got to act as a conciliator or arbitrator? We have at present the newspaper strike. If they are not able to put their own house in order and they are threatened with a strike by 27 lakh workers, how are they going to talk to the newspaper people? What face have they got to say anything?

This Government, under the able stewardship of the hon. Home Minister is very proficient in the acquisition of powers after powers. It is equally efficient in the misuse, or overuse, if you wish to be kind, of some of these powers in directions to its advantage. But when it comes to owning up its responsibilities, its proficiency and efficiency dips down to almost zero. Mr. Chavan has spoken about this being a national issue. If it is so, it has added importance, and it must be faced by this Government at the earliest possible moment. He also spoke of loyalty. May I ask him, is an employee to be loyal to the Government while the Government has no responsibility towards the employee at all? Is it loyalty from one side without responsibility from the other? I submit that the Government should stand up to its responsibilities and find a way which is acceptable to both sides to settle this question. Government should set its house in order and be an

example for all employers in this country, including those of agricultural labourers, as Mr. Randhir Singh wants, and all of us want as well.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I will be very brief, but I cannot but remind the House of the Directive Principles of State Policy which provide that this State would secure a social order for the promotion of the welfare of the people. It also provide for a clear directive to Government to ensure a living wage for its workers. There was a certain temper, a certain outlook, a certain point of view which pervaded this country when this Constitution was inaugurated. Today we find a section of our population, perhaps one of the most national minded and one of the most patriotic sections, subject to near starving conditions. I do not know the position in the whole country but I know about New Delhi.

17-06 HRS.

[SHRIMATI TARAKESHWARI SINHA *in the Chair*]

Madam, I happen to be here most of the time. There is a policy for which I cannot use any other word but a policy of repression. In this context, whether you refer to article 16 of the JCM or to the larger purposes of the National Commission of Labour, we cannot forget that in the Government today, as we saw in Shri Chavan today, there is a certain tendency to continue in a certain obstinate way and suppressing at the same time, an outlook which we thought would go out and in its place an outlook of reasonableness would come. Could anything be more reasonable than going to the Arbitration Board and asking the Arbitration Board to look into the financial aspect? We on this side of the House also realise that financial solvency is necessary in this country. But we must remind the Government, and it is our duty to remind them, that it must be a model employer. Otherwise what will happen is that in this country

economic policies will be inevitably produced which lead to extravagance and which in the name of effecting savings will really cut at the point where it hurts the most.

It is said here that all these are issues of a general nature. It is asked, are these issues arbitrable, are these not of a general nature? I would say, anyone looking at this matter with a cool disposition, as was suggested to us, would come to the conclusion that these are fairly specific issues. As far as my knowledge goes, in this city at least, the class IV employees above all are the people who have found that they have been deprived of any benefit under any sort of national wage policy. They have been oppressed and depressed. Today it is a wonder that there is any hope in their lives.

Whether they are high-sounding phrases which we have borrowed from abroad or not, we talk of Whitley Councils. But we forget that Britain, however exploiting it was outside, within the British Isles secured a certain standard of justice. That led many of us in India, including Gurudev Tagore, to hope that a progressive India and a progressive Britain could one day forget their differences.

What we find here is that a strike is impending on the 19th September, a strike which I can assure you will be successful as far as Delhi and New Delhi are concerned. I dare say it would be successful in the whole country because there is a feeling on the part of the people that these issues are after all issues which this Government can tackle if they have a will. Where there is a will there is a way. They are claiming that they can manage the affairs of 500 million people. This refers to a relatively small section of the population.

What is it that we are asking of them regarding the need-based minimum wage? If one looks at it one will find that perhaps it will add up to the present Rs. 135 plus another Rs. 65. However the Employees have demanded Rs. 30 only to start with the realisation of their demand of the Need-Based Minimum wage. Give this

employees Demands (M)

employees Demands (M)

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

Rs. 30 immediately. Give something to start with. Let there be a momentum. This, I submit, can only be done if you accept this principle of arbitration. I can go to various sources of information. I can refer you to the Nutrition Advisory Committee. It has provided certain norms. Find out what you are giving to your own employees. Then you expect from them a certain efficiency. You can look at the 15th Labour Conference. Find out whether or not a sum of Rs. 125 was mentioned. What does that Rs. 125 mean today? Finally, I would say that if you look at the general concept of productivity, of economic advance, we were given some statistics the other day in our parliamentary papers. What is the increase in national income? What does this mean? Though we cannot convert them to a specific situation, we find among the Treasury Benches a tendency to run away from challenges. There was a time when the Ministers themselves were bold enough to face a resolution. People brought up in a revolutionary context, who have shouted *Bande Mataram*, to day we find that whenever there is the slightest difference of opinion, the conclusion drawn is procrastination, the conclusion drawn is "let us leave these matters" or "let the sleeping dogs lie"; these are the mottos. I submit that in this case when it is conceded that wages are exceptionally low, when it is conceded that this subject of minimum wage has been raised in the world councils—may I remind you that from 1927 onwards it was discussed in the International Labour Organisation—what we have to find out is, what is the immediate utility of this rather obstructive attitude? We know that repression cannot succeed. I dare say the Soviets have undertaken repression in Czechoslovakia, and this matter will come before the House. People can be led astray. But wisdom lies in anticipating a situation. Let not the 19th find us in a situation where we have to present a spectacle to the world that we stop working in our offices and that we cause a lot of discomfort to those who find it necessary to transact public

business. As Gandhiji used to say, there is a limit to human patience. It was Gandhiji who taught us that there is virtue in divine discontent. So, let us not blame anyone. Rather, let us find out how we can use modern technology, modern methods of arranging our sorts of affairs, I refer to the speech of Shri Saigal. I like an approach of that nature. Let us think of better norms of working in our offices.

But I submit to the Home Minister that he is instilling fear and fear never leads to success. It is a certain creative outlook that is needed, a certain purposive outlook and that is what a discussion of this type should lead us to. The Government employees do not want to go on strike, but you are compelling them to go on strike. This is the attitude which is reflected more by the bureaucratic administration rather than the Directive Principles of State Policy. That is the difficulty. Because, bureaucracy has, as Max Weber pointed out, its own functions. Therefore, the purpose of political judgment, political analysis and synthesis of different outlooks which we create in this great forum of the Indian people is to present opportunities for fresh thinking and concrete resolution of something which we must adopt in our own society as well as in international society. May I, therefore, commend through you, Sir, to the Home Minister the need to take a fresh look at the subject and to realise that power does not consist of oppression, the modern concept of power is to communicate new ideas, new concepts and win allegiance to a new scheme of things which is unfolding itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : Madam, I want only two minutes which was half promised to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All right.

SHRI NAMBIAR : Madam Chairman, I was very much perturbed to hear the speech of the hon. Home Minister where he said that the question of arbitrariness is not at all there and that on

[Shri Nambiar]

his side he had decided that this is not going to be referred to the arbitrator. But, between that opinion of his and the strike that is going to take place on the 19th September there is a very big gulf. That gulf, if it is not bridged, it will not end by a one-day strike on the 19th of September. That one-day strike on the 19th is a token one to bring home the point.

Arbitration on the need-based minimum wage, merger of dearness allowance with salary, compulsory retirement at the age of 50 or after 25 years of service, computerisation and consequent retrenchment, if these questions are not discussed and understanding reached before the 19th September there will be a token strike on the 19th September, to be followed by an indefinite strike by all the government employees on a date which is yet to be decided, which will lead to a very serious situation.

Let us not think that it is a one-day strike on the 19th September; alone, whether it happens or not, it does not end with that. It is a very serious thing. Anyhow, the Government of India will have to consider the issue in all its seriousness and will have to tackle it. They cannot get away with it. The Central Government employees are well organised and strengthened. They are very strong because of the reasonableness of their demand. Therefore the Government cannot escape it and this House cannot ignore it. If a remedy is to be found, he must have a second thought before it is too late. That is my appeal to him and I think he will be wise enough to respond to the appeal and the desire of the Members of this House.

श्री कबंरलाल गुप्त : सभापति महोदय, मैं सदन का हार्दिक आभारी हूँ कि मेरे इस प्रस्ताव को सब तरफ़ से समर्थन मिला है। इस सदन की केवल एक माननीय सदस्या, श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा ने इस को पोलिटिकल गेम कहा है। मैंने तो बहुत नेकनीयती से इस प्रस्ताव को इस सदन के सामने रखा

था। माननीय सदस्या ने मेरे प्रस्ताव को पोलिटिकल गेम कहा है, लेकिन मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि उन्होंने मेरे बारे में कहा तो सही। मैं भी आप की आज्ञा से एक शेर पड़ता हूँ :

वह गुस्से से देखें, मगर देखते तो हैं, मैं खार हूँ, हूँ तो किसी की निगाह में।

अभी होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि मिनिमम वेज का मामला किसी भी हालत में आरबिट्रेशन में नहीं भेजा जायेगा। मैं आप के जरिये से उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह मांग तीस लाख सरकारी कर्मचारों कर रहे हैं; अगर यह आरबिट्रेशन को नहीं भेजी जायेगी तो इस प्रश्न को सुलझाने का और कौन सा तरीका है, इस समस्या की और कौन सी सालूशन है। इस सवाल का जवाब उन्होंने नहीं दिया है। सरकार ने जे० सी० एम० की जो स्कीम बनाई है, अगर उस में आरबिट्रेशन की व्यवस्था नहीं भी है, तो अगर सरकार का केस मजबूत है, तो फिर वह आरबिट्रेशन से क्यों भागना चाहती है? जब इस सदन में कहा गया कि कच्छ के प्रश्न को आरबिट्रेशन में न भेजा जाये, तो सरकार की तरफ़ से कहा गया था कि हमारा केस मजबूत है, हम आरबिट्रेशन से क्यों भागें। उसी तरह अगर इस मामले में भी सरकार का केस मजबूत है, तो उसे आरबिट्रेशन से क्यों भागना चाहिए?

लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि सरकार का केस कमजोर है और इसी कमजोरी की वजह से वह आरबिट्रेशन की बात को नहीं मानना चाहती है। उसे मालूम है कि अगर यह प्रश्न आरबिट्रेशन में जायेगा, तो उस का वरडिक्ट सरकार के खिलाफ़ होगा।

[श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त]

अच्छा होता कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब साफ़ तौर पर कहते कि हमारे देश की इकानोमिक कन्डीशन ठीक नहीं है ; हम आज सब सरकारी कर्मचारियों को पूरी मिनिमम वेज नहीं दे सकते हैं, आहिस्ता आहिस्ता देंगे। अगर मंत्री महोदय यह आश्वासन दें, तो सदन उस को मान सकता है। लेकिन यह कहना बिल्कुल ग़लत है कि सरकार इस मामले को आरबिट्रेशन में नहीं भेजेगी।

अगर आरबिट्रेशन का वरडिक्ट सरकार के खिलाफ़ जाता है, तो उस के बारे में भी जे० सी० एम० स्कीम में प्राविचन है। उस की धारा 21 में कहा गया है कि अगर आरबिट्रेशन की तरफ़ से कोई फ़ैसला दे दिया जाये और सरकार समझे कि वह नैशनल या पब्लिक इन्ड्रस्ट में उस को इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं कर सकती है, तो उस समय सरकार क्या करे ; उस की व्यवस्था इस प्रकार है :

“Subject to the overriding authority of Parliament recommendations of the Board of Arbitration will be binding on both sides. If for reasons, to be recorded in writing, the Central Government is of the opinion that all or any of the recommendations of the Board of Arbitration should, on grounds affecting national economy, social justice, be modified, the Central Government shall, as soon as may be, lay before each House of Parliament the report of the Board containing such recommendations together with the modification proposed and the reasons therefor and thereupon Parliament will make such modifications in the recommendations as it may deem fit. Modifications may extend to the rejection of recommendations.”

इस का मतलब यह है कि अगर यह सबाल सीधे तरिके से आता है, आर्बिट्रेशन को भेजते हैं और आर्बिट्रेशन

जो फ़ैसला देता है, अगर उस में कोई जैनुइन डिफ़िकल्टी है तो वह सदन के सामने आनी चाहिये, लिख कर आनी चाहिए, उस के क्या कारण हैं, कहां तक इम्प्लीमेंट कर सकते हैं, कितना इम्प्लीमेंट कर सकते हैं—यह सब बताना चाहिये। लेकिन मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इन्होंने 30 लाख कर्मचारियों को एजीटेशन की तरफ़ धकेल दिया है। इस लिये मैं आपसे अनुरोध करता हूं कि इस पर दोबारा विचार किया जाय।

दूसरी बात—इन्होंने यह कही है कि जो लोग एजीटेशन कर सकते हैं, जो लोग हड़ताल कर सकते हैं, उन को ही फायदा क्यों हो, बाकी लोगों को फायदा क्यों न हो। मेरा इस के बारे में यह सुझाव है कि देश में जितने भी इकानामिक इन्डरेस्ट्स हैं, उन की एक राउण्ड-टेबिल कान्फ़ेन्स करनी चाहिये और वहां पर यह बात तय की जाय कि देश की नैशनल इन्कम पालिसी क्या हो, नैशनल प्रोडक्टिव पालिसी क्या हो, नैशनल प्राइस पालिसी क्या हो—इन का कोई साइन्टिफ़िक तरीका बनाया जाय और उस के बाद तय किया जाय कि हम इस तरह से इन्क्वलि डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन या फयर डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन करेंगे। इस समय तो आपने इस तरह की कोई व्यवस्था ही नहीं बना रखी है—एक स्लोगन लगाया हुआ है, आप मांगते हैं तो दूसरे लोग भी मांगते हैं, इस से मंहगाई बढ़ेगी—यह केवल स्लोगन मात्र है। आज से 25-30 साल पहले सब लोग ज्यादा यह पसन्द करते थे कि सरकारी नौकरी में जाय, लेकिन आज उल्टा हो गया है। आज सरकारी नौकरियों में तनख्वाह ज्यादा नहीं मिलती है। आज मिनिमम वेज बैंक के अन्दर 205 रु. माहवार है, टैक्सटाइल में 195 रु. माहवार है, इन्जीनियरिंग में 180 रु.

माहवार है और सरकार में केवल 135 रु. माहवार मिलता है—यानी सरकार में निमिनम वेजज सब से कम है।

मैं और अधिक न कहते हुए सदन से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि यह किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, हम इस पर बैलैन्ड तरीके से सोचें, पार्टी लाइन को छोड़ कर सोचें। वह देश की हमारी अपनी मशीनरी है, हमारा परिवार है, इस दृष्टि से सोचें। अगर इस दृष्टि से सोचें—तो यदि हमारी मशीनरी बिस्सैटिस—फाइड रहेगी तो देश में कमी एफिशियेन्सी नहीं आ सकती। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने भाइयों से भी प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वे मेरे इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करें और सरकार से यह कहें कि वह इस को आर्बिट्रेशन के लिये भेज दें। अगर कोई दिक्कत आती है तो वह दिक्कत सदन के सामने आये।

MR. CHAIRMAN : There are two amendments to the Motion.

Is Mr. Dange pressing his amendment ?

Division No. 227]

SHRI S. A. DANGE : Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I now put Mr. Dange's amendment to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived

MR. CHAIRMAN :: Is Mr. Banerjee pressing his amendment ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Yes. Only voice vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I now put Mr. Banerjee's amendment to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived

MR. CHAIRMAN : I now put the main Motion, the Motion of Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That this House expresses its concern at the refusal of the Government to refer the demands of the Central Government employees regarding need-based minimum wage and merger of dearness allowance with pay for arbitration and calls upon the Government to refer these demands for arbitration."

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER
in the Chair] The
Lok Sabha divided :

AYES

[17.25 HRS.]

Amat, Shri D.

Ayarwal, Shri Ram Singh

Badrudduia, Shyi

Banarje , Shree S. M.

Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy

Bharti, Shri Maharaj Singh

Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri

Chavan, Shri D. R.

Chauhan, Shri Bharat Singh

Dance, Shri S. A.

Dar, Shri Avdul Ghani

Deo, Shri P. K.

Dwiv dy, Shri Surendranath

Esthose, Shri P. P.

Gopalan, Shri P.

Gowd, Shri Gadilingana

Gowder, Shri Nanja

Guha, Shri Samar

Gupta, Shri Indrajit

Gupta, Shri Kanwarlal

Jha, Shri Shiva Bhandra

Joshi, Shri Jagannath Rao

Joshi, Shri S. M.

Kalita, Shri Dhireswar

Khan, Shri Ghyayoor Ali

Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali

Kikar Sing, Shri

Kundu, Shri S.
 Madhukar, Shri K. M.
 Majhi, Shri M.
 Mangalathumadam, Shri
 Meena, Shri Meetha Lal
 Meghachandra, Shri M.
 Menon, Shri Vishwanatha
 Misra, Shri Shrinibas
 Modak B. K.
 Mohammad Ismail, Shri
 Mohan Swarup, Shri
 Molahu Prasad, Shri
 Muhummad Ismail, Shri M.
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Nair, Shri Vasudevan
 Nambiar, Shri
 Nath Pai, Shri
 Nayanar, Shri E. K.
 Nihal Singh, Shri
 Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
 Patil, Shri N. R.
 *Pramanik, Shri J. N.
 Rai, Shri Jharkhande
 Ramani, Shri K.
 Ranga, Shri

Agadi, Shri S. A.
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Aga, Shri Ahmad
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.
 Azad, Shri Bhagwatjha
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata
 Barupal, Shri P. L.
 Basumatari, Shri
 Baswant, Shri
 Besra, Shri S.C.
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhagavati, Shri
 Bhandare, Shri R. D.
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Birua, Shri Kolai
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal

Ranjit Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Ray, Shri Rabi
 Reddy, Shri Eswara
 Reddy, Shri M. N.
 Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman
 Sambandhan, Shri S. K.
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
 Sen, Shri Deven
 Sequeira, Shri Erasmo De
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Sharma, Shri Narain Swarup
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
 Shastri, Shri Ramavtar
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shastri, Shri Shri Shiv Kumar
 Singh, Shri J. B.
 Somani, Shri N. K.
 Sondhi Shri M. L.
 Subbavelu, Shri
 Suraj-Bhan, Shri
 Thakur, Shri Gunanand
 Umanath, Shri
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
 Viswambharan, Shri P.
 Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti

NOES

Buta Singh, Shri
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.
 Choudhary, Shri Valmiki
 Dass, Shri C.
 Desai, Shri Morarji
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
 Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G. C.
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageswar

Gajaraj Singh Rao, Shri
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indra
 Ganpat Sehai, Shri
 Gavit, Shri Tukuram
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalakanti
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Heerji Bhai, Shri
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri Tulasidas
 Jadhav, Shri V. N.
 Jagajiwani Ram, Shri
 Jumir, Shri S. C.
 Kamble, Shri
 Karan Singh, Shri DR.
 Kature, Shri A. S.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kotaki, Shri Liladhar
 Bushok Bakula, Shri
 Laskar, Shri N. R.
 Mahadeva Prasad, DR.
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
 Mandal, DR. P.
 Marandi, Shri
 Master Shri Bhoela Nath
 Masuria Din, Shri
 Metha Shri Asoka
 Metha, Shri P. M.
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mohammad Yusuf, Shri
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.
 Naidu, Shri Chengalraya
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Pandey Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath

Pant, Shri K. C
 Paokai Haokip, Shri
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Patrap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathi, Shri
 Patel, Shri Manubhai
 Patel, Shri N. N.
 Petil, Shri C. A.
 Patil, Shri S. D.
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Poonacha, Shri C. M.
 Pradhani, Shri K.
 Prasad, Shri Y. A.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi
 Radhabai, Shrimati B.
 Raju, Shri D. B.
 Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, DR.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad, Shri
 Rana, Shri M. B.
 Randhir Singh, Shri
 Rane, Shri
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Rao, Shri J. Ramapathi
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Sambasivam, Shri
 Sankata Prasad, DR.
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara
 Sarma, Shri A. T.
 Sayyad Ali, Shri
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri
 Sharma, Shri M. R.
 Shashi Ranjan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri B. N.

Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Sheth, Shri T. M.
Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
Shukla, Shri S. N.
Siddayya, Shri
Siddeshwar Prasad, Shri
Singh, Shri D. N.
Sinha, Shri Mudrika
Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
Sonar, DR. A. G.
Suder Lal, Shri
Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Sursingh, Shri
Swaran Singh, Shri
Tamaskar, Shri

Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
Tiwari, Shri D. N.
Tula Ram, Shri
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Verma, Shri Prem Chand
Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That this House do agree with the Thirty-sixth and Thirty-seventh Reports of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st and 28th August 1968, respectively".

The motion was adopted

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The result* of the Division is : Ayes :78; Noes : 140.

The motion was negatived.

17.29 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: MOVEMENT IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA—Contd

17.28 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEM- BERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

THIRTY-SIXTH AND THIRTY-SEVENTH REPORTS

SHRI BHALJIBHAI PARMAR
(Dohad) : I beg to move :

"That this House do agree with the Thirty-sixth and Thirty-seventh Reports of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st and 28th August 1968, respectively".

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Surendranath Dwivedy on the 14th August 1968 :

"This House hails the brave people of Czechoslovakia in their bid to liberalise and democratic, the political life of their country, reiterates its faith in the policy of non-involvement and non-interference in the internal affairs of any country and appeals to all freedom loving countries to extend their support and sympathy to the movement in Czechoslovakia",

along with amendment moved.

*The following Members also recorded their votes :

AYES : Sarvashri Gulam Mohammad Bakshi, K. P. Singh Deo and Dr. Ranensen

NOES : Sarvashtri J. N. Pramanik, G. Venkataswamy and A. S. Saigal.