

Acc. No. 25555
Dated 11.3.2015
LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

4825

LOK SABHA
Tuesday, 10th April, 1956

*The Lok Sabha met at Half Past Ten
of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

11-30 A.M.

***DEMANDS FOR GRANTS**

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion of the Demands for Grants Nos. 70, 71, 72, 73, 74 and 136 relating to the Ministry of Labour. As the House is aware, 5 hours have been allotted for the Demands of this Ministry.

There are a number of cut motions to these various Demands. Hon. Members may hand over the numbers of the selected cut motions which they propose to move at the Table, within 15 minutes. I shall treat them as moved, if the members in whose names those cut motions stand are present in the House and the motions are otherwise in order.

The time-limit for speeches will, as usual, be 15 minutes for the members including movers of cut motions, and 20 minutes if necessary, for Leaders of Groups.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Many hon. Members are absent.

Mr. Speaker: If within 15 minutes they are present all right; otherwise their presence won't be noticed.

Does the hon. Labour Minister want to say anything?

The Minister of Labour (Shri Khandubhai Desai): No, Sir.

4826

**DEMAND No. 70—MINISTRY OF
LABOUR**

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,49,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Ministry of Labour'."

**DEMAND No. 71—CHIEF INSPECTOR
OF MINES**

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,37,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Chief Inspector of Mines'."

**DEMAND No. 72—MISCELLANEOUS DE-
PARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER
THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR**

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,52,79,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour'."

**DEMAND No. 73—EMPLOYMENT EX-
CHANGES AND RESETTLEMENT**

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,94,51,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges

* Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Mr. Speaker]

which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of the 'Employment Exchanges and Resettlement'."

DEMAND No. 74—CIVIL DEFENCE

Mr. Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,03,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Civil Defence'."

DEMAND No. 136—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

Mr. Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,42,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Capital Outlay' of the Ministry of Labour'."

Shri Tushar Chatterjea (Serampore) :

Sir, while I cannot say that the Labour Ministry has not done any good to labour, yet the point is that whatever little good the Ministry has done for labour has been clouded by the failure of the Government to tackle the main problems that labour today is faced with. The report of the Government itself says that the number of working days lost has increased in contrast with the previous year. That itself shows that it is not to the credit of the Government and that the work of the Labour Ministry has not been done well. Why has labour dispute increased? It is mainly because the Government has failed to tackle the main problems of the labour, that is, problems relating to wages, retrenchment and such other basic things.

Let me first of all take the question of wages. Eight years have already passed since Independence, but the question of a living wage is still left out of consideration by the Government. Whenever we raise this question, Government shows a completely indifferent attitude towards it. Not only that; there is the question of a fair wage. The Fair Wages Committee's report is there. Only some months back, the Gajendragadkar Commission, in its award, commented very

severely about the wage policy of the Government and suggested that at least the Fair Wages Committee's report should be implemented. But that point also is not being favoured by the Government.

What is the actual wage position? Even in respect of real wages, the workers in every industry have not even come up to the pre-war level. We could have understood that Government is serious about the wage position, if at least the minimum thing that Government could do under the circumstances has been done. But even the minimum thing has not been done—I mean proper adjustment of wages in every industry for all employees, adjustment according to the last Pay Commission recommendations. Even that minimum thing has not been done.

As we read the reports of the Government, as we read their policy statement, we find that they mean to say that wages cannot be increased overnight and that wages must be linked with production. That means that if production increases, then and then only wage increase can be made. But even this policy of the Government has not been implemented. We know that production has increased by more than 40 per cent. Has wage increase been made to that extent or even anywhere near about that? Nothing of the sort. This production increase is not a general production increase as such; along with increase in production, if the condition of the industry is surveyed, we find that there is also profit increase and there is also increase of productivity per worker. So, this production increase cannot be attributed mainly to capital or to any other reason. It has been accompanied by profit increase and also by increase of productivity per worker. Even then, wage increase has not taken place. I studied the conditions of some industries, of course, in West Bengal; I studied the cases of the Indian Iron and Steel Company, Jessops Factory, Burn and Company, Dunlop Company, etc. In all these factories not only production has increased, but profit also has increased tremendously and productivity per worker has also increased to a great extent. But in none of these factories a wage increase has even been recommended by the Government. Therefore, the main question is that the Government has no policy of guaranteeing a proper wage to the workers. It is because there is no

Government policy about wages, because of the absence of any Government policy, tribunals that have been appointed to deal with wage questions; Tribunals go their own way, employers too go their own way. In the recent jute tribunal, a wage increase of Rs. 3 was sanctioned no doubt; but under what conditions? Even the last jute tribunal in its calculation suggested that Rs. 70 should be granted to the worker as wage at the lowest level but because there is no standard laid down by the Government, because there is no guiding principle laid down by the Government, the tribunal was unable to give that award. The present jute tribunal has fixed the wage much below Rs. 70; it has fixed it at about Rs. 67 or so. What is the position of the employers? Because there is no Government policy about wage fixation, only the other day we found that in Terai the tea planters, instead of raising the wages, have cut down three annas in the wage of the workers. Not only the I.N.T.U.C. supporters but all sections of labour are aggrieved and are demanding the restoration of the wage cut. It is because of the absence of any real wage policy of the Government that all these disputes arise, and in spite of some good things here and there, the labour problem is not solved. Last year there was the great bank employees' dispute. The bank employees are still aggrieved. Even their existing pay is cut to a great extent because of the absence of a Government policy about wages.

So I feel that if Government want to take any practical steps towards guaranteeing a proper wage to workers, at least they can do two things. Firstly, some substantial wage increase in conformity with the production increase must be made. At least 25 to 30 per cent. increase in wages should be uniformly decided upon. Secondly, a national minimum wage should be decided upon so as to lay down the first step towards achievement of a living wage.

In this connection, I raise the question of bonus also. It is true that bonus is being given either through bipartite agreements or through collective bargaining or through tribunals. In most of the cases labour has realised some bonus no doubt, but there is no Government policy as such for providing bonus. There is no statutory provision for validating the claim for bonus. Because of the absence of the statutory provision for bonus—at least I know it in the case of the jute industry—the

bonus claim has been completely turned down. A tribunal was set up, but the bonus issue has been taken out of the terms of reference of the tribunal. Even Shri B. C. Roy, the Chief Minister, had to admit that in the case of the jute industry the bonus claim was justified. In most of the Jute factories, he said factory owners are in a position to pay bonus; but, because the jute boss is very strong, perhaps, they influenced the Government; perhaps, something happened behind the scene and the bonus issue was left out of the terms of reference. I do not raise the question of the quantum of bonus, etc. now. They may be decided upon later. But, at least, some statutory provision must be there so that the bonus claim may not be left out of consideration.

Then comes the most vital question of retrenchment. Most of the labour disputes are due to retrenchment. Government says that the unemployment figure is rising; the Finance Minister in his long speech admitted that. We do not say that the unemployment problem can be solved overnight and that all the unemployed should be absorbed in a day or two. But, we expect the Government at least to make a move towards the direction of the solution of the unemployment problem. The minimum that we expect from the Government is some step to stop retrenchment. Otherwise the talk of solution of unemployment problem is all moonshine. Has Government moved towards any practical solution of the retrenchment problem? We do not think that they have. Retrenchment is increasing in every industry—in jute, textile, engineering, ordnance factories, Defence Department—and also in Government concerns and the DVC. It is the cry of the day and everywhere strike ballots are being taken by workers. Unrest is growing and the Government is faced with a crisis. When labour unrest is there, Government accuse the labour leaders, but they do not see their way to tackle this retrenchment problem. Even in its own concern, Government has done nothing to solve the problem. In the ordnance factories, we hear that a large number of trained people are facing retrenchment. On the one hand we see this. On the other hand, under the auspices of the labour Ministry, a large number of training centres have been opened, in which people will be trained. Now, it is really a contradictory position. In one concern, thousands of people, trained people, are facing retrenchment; even after training,

[Shri Tushar Chatterjea]

they have no security of service, etc. On the other hand, training centres are being opened and new recruits are being taken for training.

In the DVC, 3,000 or more men are being threatened with retrenchment. In its own departments, Government cannot care to inquire whether that resolution which the prospective surplus and the prospective recruitment could be combined, so that, suddenly, retrenchment problem would not come upon the workers. Long back—I believe one year back—retrenchment in the DVC was anticipated. At that time, it was said that some co-ordinated method would be formulated in consultation with all the Ministries, so that, suddenly, this retrenchment did not come upon the workers. One year back, I heard the Planning Minister assuring a questioner that this would be done and that his officers would be instructed to survey the position in other projects and to make a list of prospective recruitment so that, before actually retrenchment took place, things could be adjusted. The issue was posed one long year back. But during this one whole year, the Ministry did not do anything and Government has not paid any heed to this matter and did not take it seriously. Suddenly, now, 3,000 to 4,000 workers in the DVC are seriously threatened with retrenchment. Even then, Government sits tight and it does not pay any attention to the cry. When there are terrible movements, then only does Government sit up. When one or two suicide cases occur, only then, it does something. It was assured that 2,000 workers would be absorbed in the Durgapur Coke Oven Plant and 500 in Bihar Government plants. But in spite of that assurance, I heard, day before yesterday, that, while making no plan for the absorption of the retrenched personnel, notices are being given for retrenchment. There is no plan for reinstatement or absorption. The workers are faced with this problem.

As for private concerns Government will say that it has provided for retrenchment compensation, compensation for lay-off, retrenchment, etc. in the Industrial Disputes Act. But, whoever has some knowledge about jute and other industries, knows that that token retrenchment compensation is no compensation at all. It is no safeguard for the workers. In spite of that provision, indirect retrenchment is going on everywhere.

There was, about a year ago, a resolution about rationalisation of jute and textiles. We were opposed to that but the House adopted a modified resolution in which some conditions were laid down for rationalisation. In jute industry, these are not being followed; indirect retrenchments are going on and surplus labour is not being absorbed in other works. Right and left, dismissals are going on. Yet, the Government has not cared to inquire whether that resolution is being implemented by the jute boss or not. If that is the attitude of the Government, retrenchment problems cannot be solved.

I will now come to some labour laws which Government claims to be very important. The Minimum Wages Act is, it is true, a very important thing for the labour. But it is on paper only. For all practical purposes, the majority of the workers falling under this Act are not getting minimum wages. For instance, the *bidi* workers in my district—there are 6,000—should get a minimum wage of Rs. 2-2-0; that is the fixed minimum. 4,500 workers get only Rs. 1-12-0 to Rs. 2-0-6, though the fixed rate is Rs. 2-2-0. The fixed rate is only in paper; really they get much less.

Again, there are cases where the existing minimum rate was Rs. 2-8-0 in 1946. In 1952, it was Rs. 2-5-0. After the application of the Minimum Wages Act, some employers found it easy to lower it down to Rs. 2-2-0. Thus, the Act has not always worked to the advantage of the workers; it was disadvantageous. The majority of the agricultural labour has not yet been benefited by this Act.

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Member must have an idea of the time. He must conclude now.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : Yes, Sir. The Employees State Insurance Act is a very good thing; but it has created more problems than advantages. The Sub-committee appointed by that Corporation has reported, that medical arrangement is very inadequate.

They are so inadequate that the workers are not satisfied. The workers are paying for medical facilities, but they are not actually getting any facility at all.

Again, in some places, at least in the jute area in West Bengal, the workers as a whole are not satisfied with the application of this Act. Why? Because, till

now they were getting medical facilities free of cost and under this Act they have to pay for it. Therefore, it is not of any economic advantage to them; on the other hand, it is an economic disadvantage to them. The Government will say that for every worker who is getting less than one rupee per day no employee's contribution is required. We should understand—the Government also should understand—that today there is practically no worker who gets less than one rupee per day. Most of the workers—99 per cent. of the workers—who fall under the Employees' State Insurance Scheme, get more than one rupee per day. Therefore, this argument that there is no employee's contribution is meaningless. It is only on paper that this provision is there. It is meaningless for all practical purposes. I would, therefore, suggest that the limit of 'no employee's contribution' should be raised from Re. 1 per day to at least Rs. 75 per month.

I do not want to touch on all the points and I will just conclude by referring to two important points. The first one is about the welfare measures for labour. Lots have been said about welfare measures for mica workers, coal mine workers, plantation workers etc. Only the other day I went to Manbhium District to see the condition of the shellac workers. To my amazement I found that the shellac workers, in the course of the melting work, get their hands and feet deformed with the result that they are unable to do any other work. There is no protective measure for them. There is no relief measure provided for them. If after 10 or 12 years work every melter's condition is that he is unable to do any other work, then he is rendered almost an invalid. But, neither is there any protective measure to protect their hands and feet from being deformed, nor is there any relief measure provided by the Government for the deformed and disabled workers. The Bihar Labour Enquiry Committee, who went into the matter, made certain recommendations. But, I understand, all those recommendations are in paper only and no action has yet been taken.

Then I want to point out that, good labour laws are no doubt good for the workers, but the Government should see that proper enforcement of those laws is made. Secondly, there should be a guarantee that the employers will follow those labour laws. What is the position

if an employer violates any provision of the Tribunal Award? Is there any provision in law by which that employer can be pulled up? There is only a provision to fine the employer up to Rs. 1,000. Therefore, if an employer by violating the Tribunal Award evades payment of a lakh of rupees, he will always be ready to pay Rs. 1,000 as fine. By paying this fine he will be saving Rs. 1 lakh because he will not be paying the increased wages to the workers.

Then there is another thing. In my constituency there is the B.P. Railway. An industrial dispute was going on for a long time since 1949. The Tribunal Award was repeatedly violated by the employer. Reference was made to the Ministry repeatedly and the Ministry assured intervention. But, whenever the Ministry tried to intervene, the Ministry found that nothing could be done. The employer did not implement the Award and did not pay the increased wage to the workers. That thing went on from 1949 to 1955. The Ministry is helpless. The Government is helpless in the matter. It cannot enforce the Award. It cannot pull up the employer. It cannot inflict any punishment on the employer. Therefore, what I say is that for all labour laws—the Coal Mines' Act, the Plantation Labour Act, the Tribunal Award and others—there should be some such arrangement by which the employers are really made to follow them. If they do not follow them proper punishment should be inflicted on them. That arrangement should be there, otherwise the labour will lose faith on labour laws and the labour will lose faith in the work of Tribunals, etc.

Therefore, if the Government is really serious about meeting the demands of the labour and ameliorating the conditions of labour, labour laws should be framed in such a way that the basic problems are solved and those labour laws too should be enforced in such a way that the employers have got to obey them. There should be no scope for the employers to evade them. If the Government moves in this way then only we can understand that the Government wants to do something for labour and not otherwise.

Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang): Mr. Speaker, my friend who just spoke has drawn attention of the Government and the Labour Minister to certain developments in our economy and has said that the labour policy is not going right. But

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

most of the points which he has raised are connected with the national economy.

National economy at the present time is a hard fact. Therefore, we cannot walk out of the condition of national economy. In the circumstances, the difficulty which we are facing today will continue for a very long time indeed.

To take a balanced view of what the Labour Ministry has done or not done is the main question before us. I would rather think that there are certain highlights in the functioning of this Ministry which must not be lost sight of. For instance, the extension of the Provident Fund Act to nearly 15 lakh workers, and the extension of the Employees' State Insurance Act to one million workers nearly, and the progressive policy of going on extending them to other sectors of organised labour is really a highlight. It is a very great social security measure.

My friend said that the people are opposing the Employees' State Insurance Act. It is quite true because the benefits there are less than those given in some industries. But the whole point is that we are bound to go step by step towards the national insurance. Then only all the labourers in the country can be covered. If in going towards that goal, certain sectors which are getting higher advantages oppose it, then I think it is a short-sighted policy. So far as the extension of privileges under the Employees' State Insurance Act are concerned, I think the matter is under consideration. Already a move has been made and the Actuary's report is there in that respect. I think the benefits will be extended to the families also. As soon as the benefits are extended to the families, I am sure a great deal of opposition to this Act would be withdrawn and the labour will welcome it.

There have been certain other developments in this Ministry which are of remarkable importance. One remarkable thing is that a great deal of steps have been taken for the purpose of educating management. Indian management is one of the most backward in the world. It does not understand what should be the position of labour in the industry. Therefore, we had been asking for an education scheme for educating Indian management. Luckily, certain steps have been taken. The Central Labour Institute has been set up, a Production

Centre has been set up and training within industry has also been arranged. These three have been provided. The programme is that there will be museums set up in different parts of the country where labour concentration exists, so that the people will be able to go to such museums and understand how labour is to be kept, what is the relation between the productivity of labour and his health, efficiency, work, living conditions, wages etc. In this way there may be a balanced view of things. I think this is a very good step. If we had gone in for a type of economy which is of the dictatorial type—everything to be done by the Government—then it was possible to expect everything from the Government. But, since our economy is of a democratic type in which the private employer will continue to remain, it is very necessary that educative measures so far as employers are concerned be undertaken and extended. From this point of view, I welcome these measures.

12 NOON

Then, with regard to the social welfare schemes, Government has taken certain detailed and definite steps in different industries and has gone forward. But in this matter I may suggest that the progress registered has not been enough. Much has to be done. In some industries labour welfare funds were created, but those funds have not been able to produce as much as they could have produced. I draw the attention of the Ministry pointedly to this fact so that further efforts might be made and so that the funds which are collected might be expended properly, and that progressively the principle of labour welfare fund might be extended to other industries. Recently, there was a discussion on this question in the Standing Labour Committee in which the employers did not seem to take to it kindly. I would say from the experience of other countries that there is a direct relation between productivity and labour conditions both in the factory as well as at home. If this major fact is admitted and accepted, I have no doubt that the employers in India will also come forward and try to change the conditions of living and working so that higher productivity might be registered.

There is a theory—that India labour is backward and its productivity is less. I had a chance to read the I.L.O. figures and so far as these figures are concerned, I find that man for man, Indian labour

is not backward. The reason why foreign labour is forward is because they have the added advantage of superior machines. So far as men are concerned, Indian labour is on a par with others. Therefore, if Indian labour is put on a par with regard to the conditions of living and working, I have no doubt that the production achieved by Indian labour would be equal to or correspond to that amount of productivity achieved in other countries. From all these points of view, I would invite the attention of all the employers of the country to these facts and ask them to think deeply so that they might change their 18th century notions about conditions of work of labourers and give better working conditions to the working classes so that labour could show better productivity.

It is worth-while noting that last year certain steps were taken towards bipartite agreements. I am particularly referring to the bonus agreements in respect of plantation, textile and iron and steel industries. In India, the experience of bipartite agreements has been meagre. Employers prefer tribunals rather than bipartite agreements. But I welcome this trend in the trade union relations of our country. If this trend goes ahead and we are capable of concluding further agreements with regard to other conditions, namely, wages, etc., it would be a great thing. From that point of view, I hope the present trend will show fruitful results. But these are things which are not worked by chance. They are carried through by a process of education so that the employers will come to accept firstly, trade unions, and secondly, the necessity of bipartite agreements.

I agree that in the last year there has been a tendency towards growing unemployment. From the figures which you find from the employment registers and from the notices served for retrenchment in the Government departments like Defence, Damodar Valley Corporation, Food, etc., it is seen that there has been a growing tendency which is borne out by rationalisation of jute industry and also in the textile industry. With regard to rationalisation, I have no doubt that the agreement which was arrived at was very sane. First, there must be an agreement on the question of rationalisation between workers and managements. Secondly, that agreement should include sharing of gains and fatigue. Thirdly, there should not be unemployment. We went so far as to say that

there should be only such rationalisation, for the time being which would increase production. But rationalisation of the modern type which reduces the number of workers should not be undertaken. At least for the next two years this should be completely stopped.

So far as the jute industry is concerned, about which my friend was also speaking, it has been practically accepted now that it has to be modernised because otherwise it could not stand competition. But so far as other industries are concerned, it has not been accepted and it has to wait till the lack of competitive capacity of those industries in relation to foreign competition is established. Therefore, so far as rationalisation in other industries is concerned, I think that rationalisation which produces unemployment should not be adhered to. Only that rationalisation which increases productivity should be undertaken.

An important point which was made was with regard to wages. It was said that last year very disconcerting trends were seen. The number of man-days lost had increased. One of the most important reasons for this was the question of wages and bonus. On the question of bonus, it has been one of sheer chagrin. I think the employers and workers have come to some agreements which have been mentioned, but the general question of bonus still hangs fire. I have no doubt that unless and until this problem is solved adequately, the situation would continue to be clouded.

Luckily, I find that it has been suggested in the Second Five-Year Plan that there will be an Expert Committee set up by the Planning Commission to solve the bonus question. The sooner it is done the better. I think that so far as the tribunals are concerned they have completely failed on this issue. Therefore, an Expert Committee should be set up and it should try to solve the question and find out an amicable way in which the workers and employers could work. I think in that case a great deal of trouble which is plaguing our relations will be removed.

So far as the question of wages is concerned, it is really a very serious matter. I was just looking through certain figures. Certain papers were circulated by Government in which we have been told that since 1946 up to 1954

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

the wages have increased by 50 per cent. and that productivity has increased in a corresponding degree, and that therefore the workers are not badly off. But I think it is rather unfair to compare conditions since 1946, because we start from 1939. In 1939, the figure is 100. In 1946, it is only 74 or so. The index of wages was then 74 or 76. It was far less than 100. Therefore, we come to a wrong figure, it seems that the workers have gained a great deal. Actually, it should be calculated from the pre-war level of 1939, so that we could get the correct estimate about the increase in wages. As I said, I was looking into the figures. It is interesting to find that since 1950, the index of productivity rose from 78.8 to 113; that is, by 34.2 points. In the same period, the real earnings rose from an index of 371 to just 371—that is, it is zero. There is practically no rise at all with regard to the index of wages. Therefore, what happened to the productivity increase of 34.2 points? Obviously it did not come to labour. It must have gone to the managements. The index of purchasing power, due to the price fall in commodities and not through a wage increase, rose from 90.1 to 102.7; that is, by 12.6 points. That shows that wages did not increase. Because the commodity prices were reduced, the purchasing power had increased. Obviously, a rise in productivity entitles the worker to have an increase in wages, apart from the fall in prices. If there is a fall in prices, it should be an additional gain to labour. Therefore it should not be deducted from what he is entitled to. I therefore think that labour has a right to demand justice.

In the first Plan it was laid down that there will be so much of deficit financing and other things and that therefore labour should not demand more. It was said that labour should be satisfied with the minimum wages and that as and when productivity increases the matter would be considered. Now, the first Plan is over. Productivity has increased. Now is the time for labour to demand of the employers to make concessions.

I hope the employers would make concessions. They have not yet done. When we see the figures of profits and salaries, what do we find? We find that the percentage of salaries out of the net income of industries declined from 42 per cent. to 33 per cent. between 1950 and 1954, whereas the percentage of profits which includes dividends,

rents and taxes increased from 58 per cent. to 67 per cent. This is added proof that the workers are really entitled to have higher wages than what they are paid today. Then, it is found that in these years, the total net income of factories was Rs. 210 crores whereas the profits, that is, dividends increased by Rs. 193 crores. That means, practically the whole of the increase in income went towards dividends which includes all those items which I have already mentioned. It did not go to labour. From all these points of view, I hold that labour has not got what it should get on the basis of profit. After these figures have been divulged, labour is asking for it. I hope it will be given. I beg to point out that it is necessary also, because, it is found that there is an increase in the wholesale price index of 9.9 per cent. The increase in food articles is 19.4 per cent. Therefore, the workers want this increase. I hope that it will be considered in the light of these remarks.

I also think that on the threshold of the Second Plan it is time for us to consider whether we should not give the workers a flat rise in their wages. A flat rise of 25 per cent. and an agreement between labour and industry that they will keep pace for the next three years would go a long way in ensuring continued higher production in the different industries. I am going to point out two other factors which have reduced the cost structure. One is the enforcement of the Company law. The Company law has reduced the overhead costs to some extent by abolishing the managing agency system or by trying to lead the economy towards its abolition. Secondly, there is reduction of the remuneration of the managing directors. There would be a saving under that category. There is the other question, namely, the reduction in the gap between the highest and the lowest, which is a recommendation of the Taxation Inquiry Commission. I understand that the Finance Minister is going to take steps for that reduction. I have no doubt that some step will also be taken by the employers directly by themselves in the light of the nation's policy, so that there may be some reduction on that account also. If all these are added up, I have no doubt that there will be a considerable reduction. If we add up this reduction of 34.2 per cent. due to productivity, 10 points due to Company law reforms, 5 points due to the lowering of the gap and 5 points on account of a proper accounting system which is obligatory

under the Company law reforms, the total savings would be about 57·2 points from which we are only asking 25 per cent. I think this is a very fair proposal and is worth considering.

The next question is with regard to the position of industrial legislation. The law which obtains in our country has been accepted by and large by all sections of labour in this country, namely, not to go on strike until other avenues are exhausted. It is a great luck for the country that this has been accepted by all sections. But the point is that the law itself is so dilatory that a great deal of belief in the efficacy of this system is ebbing away. I will cite the example of the Bank Awards. Something should be done so that the legal machinery may be made quick. Secondly, the executive machinery also should be expanded so that it may be quick. Both these steps have to be taken together. One step would not be sufficient. The sooner it is done, the better. Last year, there was one amendment of the Industrial Disputes Act by which individual disputes could be taken up by either tribunals or judges other than those before whom the matter was pending. That was a step in the right direction. There is the question of abolition of the appellate tribunal pending. I think it should go. Unless it goes,

Shri B. S. Murthy : (Eluru) : Lock stock and barrel.

Shri K. P. Tripathi : the whole machinery will not be able to discharge the responsibility for which it was created. The Industrial Disputes Amendment Bill had also been introduced and it is pending. I think it will be quickly passed in this session. The sooner it is passed the better. This structural arrangement must discharge the duty for which it was created. It has not discharged it so far. So, quickly it should be made to discharge its duty. There is a feeling in some quarters in the country, in Parliament also, that there is too much of legislation, particularly labour legislation. Obviously, this feeling is wrong. Actually we are behind time. All legislation on labour is out of date. The Payment of Wages Act, the Workmen's Compensation Act, all these are completely out of date. They have to be amended. It is most unfortunate that we are not finding the time. Other Ministries are also thinking that labour legislation is taking too much of time. It is not so. If time were granted and these legislations were passed quickly, a great deal

of controversy between labour and capital and the uncertainty which is the cause of the fight would not be there and the position would be much better. I think the general prejudice in Parliament and in some Ministries with regard to labour legislation should not be there. I think it should be withdrawn. Then, it would be possible for us to advance quickly and reduce the causes of conflict.

I find that there is a great lack of enforcement machinery. I find that there is a suggestion that there should be a Standing labour tribunal for the purpose of enforcement. If it is done, it would be very fair. The sooner it is done, I think it will be good. There were several disastrous accidents, last year in the collieries, particularly. The Government was quick enough to set up Enquiry commissions. They have submitted reports. The causes have been found out. One of the points that has arisen is lack of supervision. I think Government is coming forward to employ a large number of inspectors. If that is done, I think the Inspectorate would be brought up to date and such disasters would be prevented.

One major cause of conflict in the public sector has been lack of negotiating machinery. So far as management at the top level is concerned, there have been labour directors associated in it. But, at the factory level, there is no negotiating machinery. It is creating a great deal of misunderstanding. In a democratic society, since we have accepted the idea of labour participation in management, this is bound to crop up in each factory in some form or other. Therefore, I think it is high time that some sort of negotiating machinery were accepted by the public sector. So far as participation of labour in management is concerned, this matter should be expedited. I may draw the attention of the House to the experiment in Germany. The experiment has so well succeeded that it is called the German Miracle, because productivity has so much increased. Despite complete destruction of German industry, the production has now crossed the 1939 level. The reason for this is labour participation in management, firstly in the directorship and secondly through the council of management. There are other instances like France where labour participates in the management. Labour participation in management is a great cause of reducing the conflict. I think

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

employers in the country also are getting habituated to the idea of labour being a partner rather than being a down-trodden animal only. The quicker measures are taken in this direction the better for us.

Then I would draw the attention of the Ministry to the situation obtaining in the ILO. For the last two years the ILO has become the hot bed of cold war. There was a time when it used to discuss only labour problems, but now most unfortunately the situation is such that it has become a platform where all sorts of politics are brought to bear upon the question whether certain countries should be ousted from the ILO. We have been trying in our own way to project the idea of co-existence in the ILO and we have had some success, but the situation remains tense even today, and I do not know what will happen in the different sessions of the ILO which are going to take place hereafter. But I have no doubt I can make this comment that because of the importing of the cold war into the ILO labour work has suffered to a great extent and attention has been diverted to non-labour matters, particularly political matters. But I congratulate our Ministry for maintaining the balance. They have also tried to play fair by the terms of India's foreign policy in the labour sphere also.

So far as a comprehensive social security scheme is concerned, I think this matter should be given fair consideration. We from the INTUC submitted a memorandum in which we suggested that the contributions for gratuity, provident fund and State insurance should be merged into one so that pension could be provided alongwith other benefits. From our actuarial calculations we have shown that it is really possible. It is pending with the Planning Commission now I understand. I hope the Labour Ministry will take steps so that it might be considered in the right way. If we can give higher benefits by amalgamating all these three things, then I think all the objections which are there in a latent state in labour in this country will disappear, and it will be heralded as one of the best pieces of labour legislation in the country.

With regard to housing, I have to suggest one most important thing to the Labour Ministry on this occasion. I have felt that because housing is with the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply, it is not making any progress whatsoever. So far as housing in the public sector

is concerned, it may be a matter for the Works, Housing and Supply Ministry, but so far as housing in the private sector is concerned, it should be the responsibility of the Labour Ministry, because it is the Labour Ministry which has direct contact with the management in the private sector. It is the Labour Ministry which has got influence. It is they who can exert influence and make them build. In the private sector it is not a question of building, it is a question of allocating funds, of making the private sector accept the loans and grants. Obviously, the only Ministry that can do this is the Labour Ministry. I do not know why it is still under the other Ministry. I would therefore request Government to consider the suggestion as to whether, so far as the private sector is concerned, the question of building houses might be transferred to the Labour Ministry. Of course, if after consideration it is found that even in the private sector certain funds are going to be diverted so that the Government itself may undertake building operations, those cases or those funds might be diverted to the WHS Ministry or this Ministry itself might be given adequate staff so that it might undertake building. But I have no doubt that until and unless the Labour Ministry shoulders this responsibility, no progress will be registered in this sphere.

So far as the implementation of the Plantation Labour Act, the Mines Act and other welfare Acts are concerned, I would draw the attention of Government to the progress which is required to be made, which might have been but which has not been made, particularly in the Plantation Act which was passed in 1951. A very small portion of it has been implemented and the rest still remains, and I have no doubt that if it is left to the employers alone there is no chance of their doing it even in a measurable time. Initially when there was an agreement between the employers and employees, they had said that they would build about eight per cent. of the houses every year, but since then no progress has been registered. Every year they say there is a crisis. Either a prospective, actual or past-crisis is there and no progress is made and it becomes an excuse. Therefore, I have no doubt that unless the Labour Ministry takes this matter up and tries to do it in the right way and makes them to agree to a programme, or sets up some other agency which might undertake building, this will not be possible or will not be done.

With regard to certain basic questions like sick leave, privilege leave, casual leave, holidays with pay etc., these are matters which are more a question of social and national policy rather than matters which are the look out only of the industrialists or of the workers. I live in society, I am forced to observe certain holidays, certain festivals. Obviously, it is the social policy which should determine what should be the number of holidays given to me, the amount of sick leave, privilege leave, casual leave and all that. I quite agree that Government is justified in having consultations at the Standing Labour Committee level for the purpose, but in the ultimate analysis it should be by central legislation so that it might be assured to labour all over the country. In this connection I draw the attention of the Ministry to the statement made by our Prime Minister some time back that in a planned society the causes of conflict between labour and management should be gradually removed, so that the cause itself might disappear. If the cause is there there will be constant tug-of-war between labour and management, the management trying to reduce half a day or a quarter day and we trying to get half a day or a quarter day more. Obviously that is not healthy sign. It is on the basis of central legislation alone that all industries will be treated equally and there will be no unfair difference between one section of the industry and another, so that no section will be prejudiced. This is a far better way of dealing with it than the other way.

In regard to silicosis, Government has brought forward a report which says that there is a great deal of this disease prevalent. Steps should be taken to prevent that, but unfortunately no adequate steps have been taken and the situation remains where it was. I think if the Government takes steps in this direction, the illness will be reduced and conditions of work will be improved. It may be that some extra expenditure may be involved. It will pay ten ten-fold because the worker will have higher efficiency and less illness and therefore it will result in increased production both for the workers and the country.

Mr. Speaker : Shri Vidyalkar. Thereafter I will call Shri Somani, then Shrimati Subadhra Joshi, then Shri P. C. Bose, then Shri Ramachandra Reddi, then Shri B. S. Murthy, Shri Ramnanda Das, Shri Rajaram Shastri and Shrimati Anusuyabai Borkar. Others later on.

Shri B. S. Murthy : Is it in that order?

Mr. Speaker : It is in this order. I request all other hon. Members also, whose names I have not read out, to be here, because I propose to call them also.

श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार (जालंधर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी मुझ से पहले असम के एक माननीय सदस्य ने जो बातें कहीं हैं, मैं उनका समर्थन करता हूँ।

जहां तक मंत्रिमंडलके कार्य का ताल्लुक है, मैं यह मानता हूँ कि मंत्रिमंडल ने काफी उत्साह के साथ मालिकों और मजदूरों के बीच अच्छे संबंध स्थापित करने का प्रयत्न किया है इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि इस समय मंत्रिमंडल के प्रयत्न केवल इसी हद तक जारी नहीं हैं कि कानून बनाये जायें और उनको इस्तेमाल में लाया जाए बल्कि वह मारल प्रेशर (नैतिक दबाव) एगजर्ट करके और समझ बूझ के तरीकों से एम्पलायर्स नियोजक की मैनटेलिटी में उनकी मनोवृत्ति में, काफी परिवर्तन लाने में भी सफल हुआ है। लेकिन हमें अपनी आवश्यकताओं को देखते हुए और दूसरा पांच साला प्लान (योजना) जो हम आरम्भ करने वाले हैं, उसकी आवश्यकताओं को देखते हुए अभी बहुत दूर तक जाना है, और इस प्लानको सफल बनाने के लिए हमें मालिकों और मजदूरों में अच्छे सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने हैं। और मजदूरों में चाहे वे औद्योगिक क्षेत्र के हों चाहे खेती के क्षेत्र के हों, काफी उत्साह पैदा हो और विश्वास और भरोसा पैदा हो जिससे कि देश के अन्दर जो काम है उसको आगे बढ़ाया जा सके। हम इस समय अपने देश को आर्थिक दृष्टी से आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। उसके लिये यह बुनियादी चीज है कि मजदूरों में काफी उत्साह हो और उनमें काफी भरोसा हो। दूसरी तरह यह भी आवश्यक है कि सरकारें काफी जिम्मेदारी के साथ काम करें और वे मजदूरों को इस तरह से संगठित होने में मदद दें कि मजदूर देश की उन्नति के कार्य में अपना पूरा सहयोग दे सकें। अगर इस समय हम लोग इस कार्य में भाग नहीं लेते और मजदूरों में उत्साह पैदा नहीं करते, या मजदूरों में फ्रस्ट्रेशन (निरुत्साह) रहता है या हम उनमें फ्रस्ट्रेशन पैदा करते हैं तो उसका यह लाजिमी नतीजा होगा कि हमारी तमाम योजनायें टक जायेंगी और हम अपने कार्य को आगे नहीं बढ़ा सकेंगे। इस समय मजदूरों में काफी असंतोष है। कुछ तो उनमें असंतोष स्वाभाविक है पर कुछ उसको

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार
 बढ़ाने का भी प्रयत्न किया जाता है। हमारे देश में कुछ ऐसे एलीमेंट्स (तत्व) हैं जो इस बात को आवश्यक समझते हैं कि मजदूरों को आगे बढ़ाने का यही तरीका है कि उनको संगठित करके ज्यादा से ज्यादा न्यूसैस वैल्यू (अनुभवात्मिक आदत) पैदा की जाये और उनके अन्दर यह भावना पैदा की जाये कि तुम जितनी मुसीबत पैदा कर सकोगे उतनेही सफल होओगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि ट्रेड यूनियन्स (कार्मिक संघ) का यह रास्ता गलत है हमको न्यूसैस वैल्यू पैदा करके मजदूरों के अधिकार नहीं लेना है बल्कि उनको जिम्मेदारी का अहसास कराके और उनमें संगठन और जिम्मेदारी और समझदारी पैदा करके हमें उनके अधिकार बढ़ाने हैं। इसके अलावा, जहाँ एक तरफ जहाँ इस तरह से न्यूसैस क्रियेट (पैदा) किया जाता है वह दूसरी तरफ न्यूसैस इनवाइट (आमंत्रित) किया जाता है। कुछ एम्प्लायर्स ऐसे हैं कि जब तक मजदूर ऐसे हालात पैदा न कर दें कि काम रुक जाये, वे टस से मस नहीं होते। और मैं कहूँगा कि यह चीज सिर्फ प्राइवेट सेक्टर (गैर सरकारी भाग) में नहीं है बल्कि पबलिक सेक्टर (सरकारी भाग) में भी है। अगर मजदूर बहुत हल्ला और शोर मचाने को तैयार हो जाते हैं तो हम उनके सामने झुक जाते हैं लेकिन जब तक वह उसूल की बातें करते हैं हम झुकने को तैयार नहीं होते। इससे मजदूरों में यह भावना पैदा होती है कि अगर हम हल्ला मचायेंगे तो हमारी बात मानी जायेगी वरना नहीं मानी जायेगी। हमें इन दोनों बातों को ही रोकना चाहिये। यदि हम देश के कार्य को आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो हमें इन बातों का इलाज करना ही होगा। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि जहाँ ट्रेड यूनियनों के कार्यकर्ताओं का यह फर्ज है कि वे जिम्मेदारी से काम लें, वहाँ एम्प्लायर्स को भी, चाहे प्राइवेट सेक्टर के हों या पबलिक सेक्टर के, मजदूरों की वाजिब शिकायतों पर ध्यान देना चाहिए और उनको दूर करना चाहिए। जो अवस्था आजकल है उसपर मुझे दुःख होता है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि इस परिस्थिति का सारा जिम्मा हमारे लेबर मिनिस्टर (श्रम मंत्री) साहब पर ही है, लेकिन मैं यह समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट को तो एक माडल (आदर्श) एम्प्लायर बनना चाहिये और उसे अपने व्यवहार में कुछ स्टैंडर्ड (स्तर) कायम करने चाहिये, कुछ मेयार कायम करना चाहिये जो कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर के लिये मार्ग प्रदर्शित करे। इस समय वह चीज नहीं हो रही है मजदूरों के बारे में कुछ बुरा आदि बातों

तो तो हमें पबलिक सेक्टर में मानना ही चाहिये। मैं यह समझ सकता हूँ कि हमारे कानून मजदूरों के लिए बने हुए हैं उन पर प्राइवेट सेक्टर में पूरी तरह अमल न हो, लेकिन अगर उन कानूनों का पबलिक सेक्टर में पालन न किया जाये तो यह हमारे लिए शोभा की बात नहीं है मिसालके तौर पर हमारा इंडस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट्स ऐक्ट (औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम) है और वर्क्स कमेटीज (कार्य समिति) का संगठन है। हम चाहते हैं कि हम मजदूरों को मैनेजमेंट (प्रबन्ध) के साथ मिलकर काम करने का मौका दे कर मजदूरों और एम्प्लायर्स को साथ लेकर चल सकें हैं। लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि चाहे पबलिक सेक्टर में हो चाहे प्राइवेट सेक्टर में हो, वर्क्स कमेटीज का संगठन जैसा होना चाहिये वैसा नहीं है और उनसे कोई लाभ नहीं होता। मजदूरों के नुमायन्दे उन संगठनों में पूरी तरह से नहीं आ पाते या अपनी बात नहीं कह पाते। प्राइवेट सेक्टर में तो मैं यह शिकायत कुछ हद तक समझ सकता हूँ लेकिन पबलिक सेक्टर में कुछ महकमें ऐसे हैं कि जहाँ कानूनों का पालन नहीं किया जाता और वहाँ नीचे वालों के साथ अच्छा सलूक नहीं किया जाता। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे श्रम मंत्री जी इन चीजों पर ध्यान दें। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमको अपने स्टैंडर्ड को कायम रखने में जितनी कामयाबी पबलिक सेक्टर में होगी, उसी हद तक इन स्टैंडर्ड्स को प्राइवेट सेक्टर में भी कायम रखा जायेगा।

जहाँ तक पबलिक सेक्टर का सवाल है मुझे खास तौर पर से मीक्पोरिटी आफ सरविस (सेवा सुरक्षा) के बारे में कहना है। मैं ने डिफेंस (प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय) की डिमांड्स (मांग) पर बहस के दौरान में भी कहा था कि मैं अनुभव करता हूँ कि पबलिक सेक्टर में तो रिट्रैचमेंट (छूटनी) के लिये कोई जगह ही नहीं होनी चाहिये। जब हमारी इकानमी (अर्थ व्यवस्था) एक्सपेंड (बढ़ि) हो रही है और हम लोग ज्यादा से ज्यादा एम्प्लायमेंट (रोजगार) की बात करते हैं तो फिर रिट्रैचमेंट की तो कोई गुंजाइस ही नहीं होनी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस विषय में प्राइवेट सेक्टर में कुछ दिक्कत हो सकती है। लेकिन पबलिक सेक्टर में तो हमको कहीं भी छूटनी करनी ही नहीं चाहिये और हमें यह कोशिश करनी चाहिये जो वर्कर (काम करने वाले) ज्यादा हों उनको दूसरी जगह एबजाव (काम में लगाना) कर लिया जाये। डिफेंस की बहस के समय हमारे इस सदन के

बहुत से सदस्यों ने इस ओर ध्यान दिलाया था लेकिन मुझे अफसोस होता है कि अभी तक इस नीति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है और अभी तक हमारे पास समाचार आते हैं कि छंटनी हो रही है। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में पब्लिक सेक्टर का ध्यान खास तौर से दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

जहाँ तक वेजेस (मजूरी) का सवाल है, मेरे मित्र श्री त्रिपाठी जी ने अभी तक उसके बारे में बतलाया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहाँ पब्लिक सेक्टर के लिये, प्राइवेट सेक्टर के लिए और गवर्नमेंट की जो सर्विसेज (सेवायें) हैं उन सब के लिये एक वेज कमीशन (आयोग) मुक़र्रर करना चाहिये और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में हमारे श्रम मंत्री जी शीघ्र ही तमाम मिनिस्ट्रीज (मंत्रालय) को इस बात के लिए सहमत कर सकेंगे।

हमने पंचसाला योजना के सिलसिले में यह निश्चय किया था कि हम बहुत नये कानून नहीं बनायेंगे लेकिन जो पुराने कानून हैं उन पर अमल दरांमद करेंगे। यह सही है कि उन पर अमल दरांमद कराना बहुत कुछ स्टेट्स (राज्य) के जिम्मे हैं। स्टेट्स में इस ओर कहीं थोड़ा बहुत ध्यान दिया जाता है और कहीं इस ओर बिल्कुल ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार को स्टेट गवर्नमेंटों का ध्यान दिलाना चाहिए कि जो नीति यहाँ निर्धारित की जाती है उसके अनुसार काम करें और जो कानून बने हुए हैं उनको लेटर (अक्षरक्षः) और स्पिरिट (बर्ताव) में पूरी तरह पालन करें। अगर हमारे किसी कानून में कोई कमी है तो उस कानून में तबदीली करके उस कमी को दूर किया जाये। अगर ज्यादा स्टाफ (कर्मचारी) की जरूरत है तो स्टाफ रखा जाये। कभी कभी यह शिकायत मुनने को मिलती है कि लेबर स्टाफ के पास काफी पावर्स नहीं हैं। इससे दिक्कत होती है। इस कमी को दूर करना चाहिये। आज यह हो रहा है कि ट्राइबुनल्स (न्यायाधिकरण) के फैसले होते हैं और वे पड़े रहते हैं, पर उन पर कोई अमल नहीं होता हमारे ही प्रांत में ऐसे बहुत से केसेज हैं कि जिन में फैसलों पर अमल दरांमद नहीं हुआ है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें इस ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये और कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि जो फैसले हों उन पर अमल हो। अगर ऐसा नहीं होगा तो मजदूरों का कानून पर से विश्वास उठ जायेगा। आज होता यह है कि जब वे कानून को तोड़ते हैं तो उनकी मुसीबत

हो जाती है, पर जब कानून उनके हक में होता है तो उस पर अमल दरांमद नहीं होता। यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है।

हमारी बहुत सी ऐसी इंडस्ट्रीज (उद्योग) हैं जहाँ पर कि न्यूनतम वेजेज की कोई मियाद नहीं है और यह जरूरी है कि हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा इंडस्ट्रीज में मिनिमम वेजेज (न्यूनतम मजूरी) मुक़र्रर करें। एग्रीकल्चर (कृषि) के अन्दर मैं जानता हूँ कि मिनिमम वेजेज को मुक़र्रर करने में और उसका पालन करने में कठिनाइयाँ हैं लेकिन हमें उसके लिए कोई न कोई रास्ता अवश्य निकालना चाहिए।

श्रम के सम्बन्ध में जब हम विचार करते हैं तो यह अक्सर देखने में आया है कि इंडस्ट्रियल लेबरर्स (औद्योगिक श्रमिक) हमारे सामने आ जाते हैं और जो खेतिहर मजदूर हैं और जो एग्रीकल्चर लेबर हैं वह ज्यादातर एग्नोर (अवहेलना) हो जाता है और उस की उपेक्षा हो जाती है। मेरा तो सुझाव है कि इस के लिये श्रम मंत्रालय एक अलग छोटा सा विभाग इस के लिए मुक़र्रर करे जो विशेष करके देहाती मजदूरों के हितों की ओर ध्यान दें और उनके सम्बन्ध में वह विचार करें। आज के दिन हमारे देहाती मजदूर लोग बहुत उपेक्षित हैं और हम देखते हैं कि हमारा ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट (कामिक संघ आन्दोलन) भी उन लोगों में बहुत नहीं गया है और दूसरी तरफ़ श्रम मंत्रालय का ध्यान उन खेतिहार मजदूरों की दशा सुधारने की ओर कुछ विशेष नहीं जाता है और उसके लिए न ही कोई विशेष मशीनरी है जो खास तौर पर उनके लिए ध्यान दे सके। मैं चाहता हूँ कि श्रम मंत्रालय का ध्यान विशेष रूप से इस ओर जाय।

रेशनेलाइजेशन (वैज्ञानिक) के सम्बन्ध में यहाँ पर काफी बहस ही चुकी है और गवर्नमेंट की नीति उस सम्बन्ध में काफी साफ़ है लेकिन मैं अनुभव करता हूँ कि बावजूब गवर्नमेंट की नीति के छोटे छोटे कारखानों में रेशनेलाइजेशन चलता रहता है और मजदूर बेकार किये जाते हैं और वह रेशनेलाइजेशन न सिर्फ़ प्राइवेट सेक्टर में बल्कि पब्लिक सेक्टर में भी चलता है और उसकी वजह से मजदूर लोग आये दिन बेकार होते जा रहे हैं। मैं कम से कम अपने प्रान्त की बात कह सकता हूँ कि इस रेशनेलाइजेशन की बदौलत काफी संख्या में मजदूर

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार]

काम से हटाये जा रहे हैं। यह भी देखने में आया है कि कारखाने वालों ने किस तरह गवर्नमेंट ने जो एक्साइज ड्यूटी (उत्पादन शुल्क) लगाई और उस के बारे में जो एक लिमिट (सीमा) रखी तो बड़े बड़े कारखानेदारों ने उसके लिए यह तरीक़ीब की कि अपने बड़े कारखाने के बीच में चार इंच या आठ इंच की एक दीवार खींच दी और उस कारखाने को दो कारखानों में तबदील कर दिया और यह फ़ेगमेंटेशन आफ़ फैक्टरीज़ (कारखानों का विभक्तीकरण) बहुत हो रहा है और यह कह करके कि अब तो हमने पुरानी फैक्टरी को बंद कर दिया और नई फैक्टरी चालू की है, पुरानी फैक्टरी के मजदूरों को निकाल दिया और दस दिन के बाद एक की जगह दो फैक्टरीज़ चला करके उनके अन्दर फिर मजदूरों को नये सिरे से भर्ती कर लिया और पुरानी सर्विस उनकी वेग (व्यर्थ) कर दी और पुराने उनके अधिकार ख़तम कर दिया। मेरा कहना है कि इस तरीक़े से मजदूरों का विश्वास हम पर से उठ जायगा। हमें मजदूरों के हितों की हिफ़ाज़त करनी है क्योंकि आख़िर मजदूरों के पास कोई ऐसे बहुत बड़े बड़े वकील या सलाहकार लोग तो हैं नहीं जैसे कि बड़े बड़े मिलमालिकों और कारखानेदारों को सुलभ है और यह देखा जाते हैं कि जो श्रम सम्बन्धी कानून पास किया जाता है तो मिलमालिकों के उन वकीलों और कानूनी सलाहकारों की ओर से उस कानून में सुराख़ तलाश करने की कोशिश की जाती है और उन कानूनों को तोड़ने के रास्ते तलाश किये जाते हैं कि किस तरह से इनको बेकार किया जाय। होता यह है कि एक तरफ़ श्रम मंत्रालय कानून बनाये, गवर्नमेंट कानून बनाये या यह सदन कानून बनाये, और दूसरी तरफ़ उनको तोड़ने के लिए रोज़ नित नई तरीक़ीबें निकाली जाती हैं और इस तरह एक हाईड और सीक (आँख़ मिचौली) का खेल शुरू हो जाता है। इसलिए यह बहुत ज़रूरी हो जाता है कि मजदूरों के वास्ते जो कि एक कमज़ोर पार्टी है, उनकी हिफ़ाज़त करने के लिए हमें कोई न कोई रास्ता निकालना चाहिए।

मैं यह कहना चाहता था कि जो हमारा कानून है उसके अन्दर अगर रिट्रैचमेंट बेनीफ़िट (छूटनी का लाभ) देना हो या हमें और दूसरी तरह के बेनीफ़िट्स देने हों, तो हमारे यह कारखानेदार उनसे बचने के लिये कोई न कोई रास्ता निकाल लेते हैं और फ़गमेंटेशन करके छोटे छोटे कारखाने

बना कर वह अपने को उस कानून से बचा ले जाते हैं जब कि जैनबिन (प्रामाणिक) तौर पर वास्तविक तौर पर वे कारखाने अलग अलग नहीं हैं और एक बनावटी तौर पर अपने को कानून से बचाने के लिए इस तरह का फ़गमेंटेशन कर लेते हैं और मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसको रोकने का कोई न कोई उपाय सरकार को अवश्य करना चाहिए।

मैं अन्त में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ हम मजदूरों के हित के लिए कानून बना रहे हैं वहाँ इस बात के लिए भी कोई व्यवस्था उनमें ऐसी रखनी चाहिए ताकि मजदूरों को मिलों के मैनेजमेंट में शामिल किया जा सके। मैं यह अनुभव करता हूँ कि शायद प्राइवेट सेक्टर में ऐसा होना बहुत जल्दी सम्भव हो या न हो मैं नहीं कह सकता कि किस हद तक संभव हो सकेगा, लेकिन पब्लिक सेक्टर के अन्दर अगर हम इस बात के ऊपर यकीन रखते हैं और इस उसूल को मानते हैं तो पब्लिक सेक्टर के अन्दर हमें तुरन्त इसका परीक्षण आरम्भ कर दना चाहिए। पब्लिक सेक्टर के अन्दर कुछ स्थान ऐसे निकालने चाहिये और उन स्थानों पर हमें परीक्षण की तौर पर अगर हमें परीक्षण की सफलता में यकीन हो तो मैं समझता हूँ जल्दी से जल्दी इस को कामयाब बनाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। मगर जसा कि अभी मुझ से पहले श्री के० पी० त्रिपाठी ने कहा कि दूसरे देशों के अनुभव से हम यह जानते हैं कि मजदूरों को मैनेजमेंट के अन्दर शामिल करके काफी प्रोडक्शन में तरक्की होती है और काफी उद्योगों की और देश की तरक्की होती है। हमें उस तरीक़ीके पब्लिक सेक्टर में फौरन इस्तेमाल में लाना चाहिए। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आशा करता हूँ कि कुछ सुझाव जो मैं ने यहां पर पेश किये ह, उन पर विचार किया जायेगा।

Shri G. D. Somanl (Nagaur-Pali): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at a time when our industrial production is steadily increasing and we are on the threshold of a gigantic expansion of industrial production, both in the public and private sectors, the role that our Labour Ministry has to play in our national economy cannot be over-emphasised. It is quite obvious that the responsibility of the Labour Ministry is very great in ensuring healthy and sound labour relations and seeing that our industrial production in all fields continues uninterrupted without any sort of trouble, strife or disputes. It is, therefore, in the context of this heavy responsibility

of the Labour Ministry—and of course, of the employers and workers—that I would like to make a few observations on the broad features of our labour policy.

My hon. friend, Shri K. P. Tripathi, was just now referring to the 18th century attitude of the employers. I can only say that he has been less than fair and just to himself and to the Labour Ministry as well, because obviously it is not the employers who shape their own policy but it is the policy of the Labour Ministry which guides the relations between employers and workers, and as such, it is as much a charge against the Labour Ministry or the labour leaders as against employers. (*Interruption*). So far as the actual facts are concerned, I think if any impartial analysis is made of the improvements in wages and other amenities, it will be found what a remarkable progress has been made from the pre-war period as regards the industries in the private sector. I, however, do not want to go into details, but would like, on the other hand, to refer to the growth of certain healthy relations, which have been the feature of certain agreements arrived at in the country during the year about which we are discussing the Labour Ministry's Demands for Grants.

I would, in this connection, like to refer to the bonus agreements that resulted in the important textile industry in Ahmedabad and Bombay due to bi-partite negotiations, and as one who was directly concerned with the negotiations in Bombay, I would like to pay a tribute to the perseverance and to the helpful attitude of our labour leaders which ultimately resulted in the conclusion of the final agreement. Those of us who are aware of these bonus disputes during the last several years know how year in and year out, both sides were engaged in litigation, and hardly had the industrial court given its judgment on the dispute of a particular year, when the dispute over the subsequent period was taken to the court. That way this process of arguments and counter-arguments continued almost ceaselessly. Therefore, this has come as a great relief and, for a period of five years, this question of bonus has been decided in a manner which has been recognised as satisfactory and fair to both sides by all impartial observers. What I wanted to make out is that if responsible leaders on both

sides try to generate the same spirit of harmony and goodwill to promote such bipartite agreements, I think, we will be doing more service to the cause that we have at heart than by indulging in fruitless controversies and charges against each other. Therefore, if I have referred to this bonus agreement, it is in that spirit. Now, that a certain background has been created in certain important fields of our industrial relations, it is highly desirable that this goodwill and harmony should be continued and strengthened by actions and speeches on both sides so as to ensure that this goodwill and harmony will lead to a permanent basis of bipartite negotiations whereby we will not have to take recourse to industrial courts and to all sorts of outside interference.

In this connection, I would also like to mention that we have more or less agreed in principle to institute a joint negotiation machinery in Bombay so that it will be the duty of both sides in future to settle all disputes that may arise by mutual negotiations and to avoid as far as possible reference to industrial courts. I am, therefore, very much hopeful that given the necessary spirit of compromise and goodwill—when we are now entering a new chapter in the history of industrial relations in our country and are on the threshold of an industrial evolution under the Second Five Year Plan—this spirit of harmony and goodwill will produce very substantial results.

While referring to this agreement one cannot but express sorrow and disappointment at what happened in the same year in Kanpur where we had a prolonged strike on this issue of rationalisation. So far as this rationalisation is concerned, I would like to make it very clear that almost all responsible employers' organisations have accepted the principle that no rationalisation which involves any substantial retrenchment should be allowed and that this rationalisation should only be allowed in cases where any substantial retrenchment can be avoided. It is, therefore, on this principle of rationalisation without any retrenchment that one has to express some disappointment at the very slow progress that is being made. In spite of the acceptance of this principle, there are cases in which the labour leaders have not been responsive or co-operative in implementing schemes of rationalisation on these lines.

[Shri G. D. Somani]

Certain facts have got to be recognised. We are living in a modern world where technological improvements are taking place rapidly and unless our industries are rationalised and allowed to work on a rationalised basis, it will be more and more difficult for our various industries to function smoothly and efficiently and we might not also be able to hold our markets in international competitive fields. It is, therefore, of vital importance from the point of view of development of our national economy that every encouragement should be given to this, subject to the overall restriction of avoiding retrenchment, to enable the various industrial units to modernise to be able to function in a manner whereby they would be able to produce the best quality goods at the lowest possible price. It is in this connection that I would like to appeal to the hon. Minister to exercise the good offices of the Labour Ministry in encouraging these schemes of modernisation in certain of our important industries in a manner which, will, on the one hand, bring no distress to the workers and, on the other, enable our industries to function in future with that efficiency which alone will enable them to deliver the goods both for internal consumption and for outside export. This is a matter which, I think, given goodwill on both sides, can be solved very satisfactorily and it is in that spirit of mutual co-operation that I want this important question of rationalisation to be dealt with so as to ensure that our industrial progress is not, in any way, retarded.

I wish to say something about the question of housing, to which my hon. friend Shri Tripathi also referred. Although this question is not of the Ministry of Labour, I think, the Ministry should take a little more interest and pains than what they have been doing. I am aware that Government do have a scheme of giving subsidy or loans for the construction of these houses. But, there are certain genuine difficulties due to which it has not been possible for the employers to take advantage of the scheme and the good offices of the Ministry should be available to the employers to take advantage of the scheme. There are certain procedural difficulties; there are certain rigidities and restrictions due to which the amount of subsidy or loan is not available for a long time—even for years together and there is also the point that amount of subsidy or loan is

much less than what is allotted to the State Government for the same purpose of housing the industrial workers.

In this connection, I may also draw the attention of the hon. Minister to what the Bombay Mill Owners' Association has done. This is not part of the agreement that we have had regarding bonus. But we have agreed to contribute about Rs. 50 lakhs for the housing of the industrial workers in Bombay. But, here again, we find the procedural difficulties in evolving a suitable scheme which will give the best possible results within the shortest possible period I would appeal to the hon. Minister to evolve a sort of scheme which will enable the employers to take advantage of the grants given by Government for the purpose of housing industrial workers.

The last point that I would like to deal with is about the question of workers' participation in management. This question has created a lot of controversy recently, both in the House as well as outside, and the matter has been discussed time and again. I am glad to find that more or less an agreement has been reached whereby it will be possible for the workers' representatives to take more active part in the management of industrial concerns. I need not go into the details of the arrangement that has been arrived at....

Shri Nambiar : (Mayuram) : It is not an arrangement. We do not know what arrangement arrived at is.

Shri G. D. Somani : It is there in the Draft Outline of the Second Five Year Plan and, if the hon. Member would go into the details of the Draft Outline, he will find there the way in which it is proposed to ensure the participation of workers in the management.

My point was only this. The attitude of the Communist Party has been different at different stages. We had, at one stage, found them very forcefully supporting the demand for workers' representatives on the boards of directors; later on, they changed their attitude, and, we find at present, the Communist Party is opposed to any appointment of workers' representatives on the boards of companies.

1 P.M.

Shri Nambiar : We are opposed to nominations; we are agreeable to election.

Shri G. D. Somani: My point in drawing attention to this matter is that they have not followed a consistent attitude. In any case some sort of a mutually acceptable formula has been evolved and I do look forward to the progressive participation of the workers' representatives in a manner which while on the one hand will not cause any undue interference or obstruction in the day to day management of the concerns, will, on the other hand, create a sense of responsibility in the workers' representatives, to feel that they too are fully associated with the broad outlines or with the broad features of the working of the industrial units with which they are associated. We are, fortunately now in a period when, by the good offices of the Ministry of Labour, it has been possible by a process of mutual consultations and negotiations, to evolve a future pattern on many of the controversial points, a pattern of relation which carries a very great measure of agreement among all sections. It is therefore a very good augury for the Second Five Year Plan that we are entering the Plan period with such an amount of agreement and goodwill on both sides. I would appeal to the Ministry of Labour to make all possible efforts to strengthen this tie of goodwill, to promote this system of tripartite negotiations and to see that both the employers and the workers function in such a way which will enable industrial units to function most efficiently.

After all, whatever may be said about the increase in wages and provision of various amenities, it is the capacity of the industry to pay, that will have to be taken into consideration in doing whatever we want to increase the emoluments of labour. If you go too fast and make things difficult for the industry concerned, naturally it will have its repercussions and ultimately the interest of the workers themselves will be adversely affected. We have to co-ordinate the various aspects which have a bearing on industrial production. It is no use simply taking a one-sided view of the picture. The question of increasing productivity is really of very vital importance and I do not agree about the figures which my hon. friend gave about increase in productivity.

So far as the textile industry is concerned, I can say that in regard to the cost of production per unit, we are far higher here than anywhere in the world. It is true—and I do concede—that our workers are not in any way inferior, or

less in their capacity; but the effect of the present conditions of the machinery has got to be faced and unless our labour friends co-operate in the matter of modernisation of the various industries, this question of further increasing the emoluments of workers will not be solved. So, the real solution to increasing the amenities of workers lies in giving all possible assistance to modernisation.

Another aspect of the problem could not be ignored and that is the question of disparity between the earnings of the workers in the industries and the earnings of workers in agriculture and other sectors of our economy. The disparity is so great that our labour friends will be well advised to concentrate their attention on increasing the standard of workers in all these occupations like agriculture and other sectors. So long as the present disparity continues, it does not on the face of it reveal any necessity for doing very much for the industrial workers, as for workers in other sectors. This question of glaring disparity that at present exists between the industrial workers and the agricultural workers looks more urgent than the question of increase in the wages of industrial workers alone.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: Do you suggest any reduction in wages then?

श्री टंडन (जिला इलाहाबाद—पश्चिम): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कुछ थोड़े से शब्द इस श्रम विभाग के कार्य के सम्बन्धमें निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। मैं श्रम प्रश्नों के सम्बन्ध में कोई भ्रान्दोलक नहीं रहा हूँ। मैं इन प्रश्नों को देश की दृष्टि से ही देखता हूँ न श्रमिक संघटनों की दृष्टि से और न मालिकों की दृष्टि से जो श्रमिकों से काम लिया करते हैं। जैसे जैसे हमारी समाजवादी व्यवस्था बढ़ेगी वैसे वैसे इस श्रम-विभाग का काम अधिक दायित्वपूर्ण होता चला जायेगा क्योंकि समाजवादी रूप देने में यह आवश्यक है कि हम दिन-पर-दिन श्रमिकों का अधिक ध्यान रखें। श्रमिकों की ही देश से बहुतायत है। जैसे जैसे हम श्रमिक बढ़ायेंगे वैसे वैसे समाजवादी व्यवस्था समीप आती जावेगी अर्थात् जैसे जैसे हम बेकारी हटायेंगे, हर एक को काम दिलायेंगे वैसे वैसे हम में से बहुत अधिक लोग श्रमिक होते चले जायेंगे। बही सामाजिक व्यवस्था उचित है।

श्री अन्तिम वक्ता ने जो बातें कहीं हैं, उनके सम्बन्ध में अधिक तो मैं नहीं कहना चाहता परन्तु उनसे मैं केवल एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। वह स्वयं सहाय पुरुष हैं। परन्तु मेरे ऊपर कुछ असर हुआ है और कुछ मेरा यह अनुभव है

[श्री टंडन]

कि श्रमिकों से काम लेने वाले प्रायः उतने सहृदय नहीं रहे हैं। मैंने एक बार इस भवन में भी अपना एक अनुभव आपके सामने रखा था। मैं बम्बई में एक मिल देखने के लिये गया तो मैंने क्या पाया कि श्रमिकों को धोखा दिया जा रहा है। श्रमिकों ने जो काम किया, जो सूत काता, उसको जब तराजू में तोला जाता था तो हर बार कम तोला जाता था। यह बहुत पुरानी बात है। परन्तु मेरे हृदय को इसमें बहुत भारी धक्का लगा। यह कह सकता हूँ कि इस जीवन में मेरे ऊपर एक शंका चढ़ गयी है कि ऐसा धोका भी मिल मालिक करते हैं। मैंने सुना था कि उस मिल के मुख्य मालिक एक धर्मात्मा पुरुष हैं। मैं उनका नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। परन्तु ऐसी मिल में मजदूरों और मजदूरनियों को धोखा देना और उनके काते हुवे सूत में जितना उमका पाउड्रेज है या आउमंज है उसमें हर बार जब वे उसे लाकर तोल कराते हैं, कमी करते जाना क्या यह ठीक है! इससे मुझे बड़ा धक्का लगा था। मुझे जमींदारों का अनुभव है कि किस प्रकार का व्यवहार वे काश्तकारों के साथ करते थे। यह बात मुझे अपनी छोटी उम्र में देखने को मिली जब मैं अपने एक रिश्तेदार के यहां गया हुआ था। मैंने देखा कि एक गरीब आदमी धूप में खड़ा है। मैं नहीं समझ पाया कि इस आदमी को क्यों धूप में खड़ा किया गया था। मैंने उनसे पूछा तो वे हंसने लगे। फिर पीछे मुझे पता लगा कि वह बेचारा एक गरीब काश्तकार था जो अपना लगान नहीं दे सका था और इसलिये उसे यह सजा दी जा रही थी। ये दो बातें मेरे सामने आयीं जिन्होंने मेरी राजनीतिक भावना को बदल दिया। वह जमींदारी का नक्शा था कि किस तरह से जमींदार काश्तकारों से व्यवहार करते हैं। वे जमींदार मेरे करीब के रिश्तेदार थे इस घटना ने मेरे हृदय पर बड़ा असर डाला। बाद में मैंने इस विषय का अध्ययन किया और मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुंचा कि जब तक यह जमींदारी प्रथा है किसानों का भला नहीं हो सकता और सन् १९३० में मैंने यह आन्दोलन चलाया कि जमींदारी प्रथा समाप्त होनी चाहिये। कांग्रेस से हट कर मैंने इस आन्दोलन को उठाया कि जमींदारी प्रथा समाप्त हो। फिर वह कांग्रेस का अंग बन गया। लेकिन उस में मेरा हाथ तो बराबर था ही।

इसी प्रकार जो मैंने मिल में धोखाघड़ी देखी थी उससे भी मेरे हृदय पर यह भावना रह गयी कि कारखानों के मालिक किस प्रकार का व्यवहार

गरीब श्रमिकों के साथ करते हैं। मैं वैयक्तिक रूप से किसी के लिये नहीं कहता। मैं जानता हूँ कि बहुत से जमींदार बड़े सज्जन थे। उन्होंने बड़े बड़े कामों में सहायता की थी और सचमुच वे काश्तकारों के साथ अच्छा व्यवहार करते थे। मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि बहुत से मिल मालिक भी बहुत सज्जन हैं। परन्तु मैंने देखा कि जमींदारी एक क्रम है। उस क्रम में दो चार जमींदारों के अच्छे होने से किसान बच नहीं पाता था। उस क्रम में उसकी बड़ी मुसीबत थी। आज जो क्रम है उसके अनुसार श्रमिक काम करते हैं और बहुत से लोग उनको नीकर रखते हैं। इस पर कुछ विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें इस क्रम को बदलना होगा।

मैं यह नहीं कहता कि सरकार ही सब कामों की मालिक होती चली जाये। सरकार जैसे जैसे मालिक होती है, जैसे जैसे नेशनलाइजेशन (राष्ट्रीयकरण) बढ़ता है, मुझको उसमें भी बड़े गहरे दोष दिखायी देते हैं। नेशनलाइजेशन को बढ़ाने के मानी हैं ब्यूरोक्रैट्स (नीकरशाही) को बढ़ाना। जितना ज्यादा सरकार का अधिकार बढ़ता है उतनेही ज्यादा वे लोग बढ़ते हैं जो जनता से बरताव करने में सरकारी क्रम से काम लेते हैं, और उस सरकारी क्रम के बारे में हम जानते हैं कि ऊपर के स्तर को छोड़कर नीचे का स्तर कितना उतरा हुआ है और कितना उसमें भ्रष्टाचार है। मैं इसका अनुभव करता हूँ कि जैसे जैसे सरकारी क्रम बढ़ता है वैसे ही वैसे भ्रष्टाचार भी बढ़ता है। इसी तरह से और प्रश्न भी आ जाते हैं। दूसरी ओर मिल मालिकों का जो क्रम है उसका मैंने एक उदाहरण दिया है। वहां भी वैयक्तिक लाभ का अधिक ध्यान है और मजदूरों के मुख दुख की ओर बहुत कम ध्यान है। मेरा तो आज यह निवेदन है कि हमारे जो श्रमिकों को मजदूरी पर रखने वाले लोग हैं वे दिन पर दिन एक बात की ओर ध्यान करें। मैं यहां केवल उनके हृदय से एक आकर्षक अपील नहीं कर रहा हूँ किन्तु मैं उनके मस्तिष्क की ओर भी जाना चाहता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे लोग सोचें कि आज संसार और हमारा देश भी बदल रहा है। यह पुराना ढंग था कि कुछ थोड़े से बड़े बड़े जमींदारों और पैसे वालों के हाथ में समाज की बागडोर थी और बाकी तीचे के लोग थे जिनको दबा दबा कर उनसे काम लिया जाता था।

जब मैं किसानों के लिये काम करता था तो किसी जमींदार की यह बात मेरे कान तक पहुंचायी गयी कि घोड़े की ओर घास की यारी

my hon. friends have already gone through them very exhaustively.

But I want to make one observation in regard to these legislations and other measures, and that is that all legislations and schemes should be implemented as quickly as possible. Otherwise, they really lose their grace, and labour feels very bitter about it. There are cases, for example, in the mining industry where schemes for housing and water supply have been passed by the Government but no tangible results have come forth so far, and even after many years the same overcrowding and the same difficulty in regard to water supply still continue. I would, therefore, urge on the Minister to look into these and other cases which are hanging fire for years and remedy the defects due to which implementation is being delayed.

I am glad that the Labour Ministry has taken up the question of abolition of rickshaw-pulling. There is, of course, a difference of opinion as regards this question, but I think it has been decided long ago that this occupation is really derogatory to self-respect and should be abolished as soon as possible. The practice of a man driving on the shoulder of another either for money or for whatever may be the consideration, is really very undesirable. But the fact, of course, has to be borne in mind that a very large number of people—not lakhs but probably a million—earn their livelihood by this occupation and also support their dependants. I, therefore, think that the Labour Ministry has very wisely decided to abolish this occupation by gradual phases, so that those who will be out of employment on account of the abolition of this occupation may gradually be absorbed in some other occupation.

Recently we were hearing a lot about retrenchment in the river valley projects. The river valley projects temporarily appointed a large number of people, but as soon as they have finished that work, they are retrenching them. But these workers, it must be borne in mind, although temporarily appointed, have worked not for two or three but for six, seven or eight years, and probably some of them have become burdened with families. It is, therefore, highly necessary that their case should be considered very favourably. I think that between the Planning Ministry and the Labour Ministry, a co-ordination committee should be formed to transfer the retrenched workers, immediately after retrenchment,

to some other work which may be started by the Planning Ministry. This must be so co-ordinated that there may be no bitterness and unpleasantness left in the workers and they may find a job immediately after retrenchment.

Now, I would like to point out to the Ministry some industrial evils existing in the industries. I do not say that nothing has been done to eradicate these evils, but those who work in the labour movement and those who have got some experience of the industrial field know very well that these evils are really the drags pulling the labourers down and hampering their progress towards civilisation. Drinking is one of them. This, of course, is a very big issue, a national question. It has been considered by the Prohibition Inquiry Committee and it is being considered by the Government as well. Then comes gambling. Probably it flows from drinking. After that, we find that the diseases they suffer from are generally of a type which we may call not industrial diseases but industrial social diseases. They suffer very much from venereal diseases. I think this matter should be inquired into by a committee including some medical men, so that the cause may be found out. There was a local inquiry somewhere some years ago and it was said that the real cause was 'sex disparity', which meant that the labourers did not have the opportunity to bring their families to their working areas and did not get living accommodation, sufficient wages and other amenities. Therefore, many of these young people live alone. They earn some money and naturally go to the 'devils', the drinking shops, the gambling dens and other places to contract all these diseases. As a result, many of them also suffer from such diseases as TB—probably in the slums of industrial areas, there are more TB patients than in other places. Consequently, they suffer and after a certain age, become inefficient; many of them become invalid. So my suggestion to the Government on this point is that they should institute a thorough inquiry into all these industrial evils in all industries in India, textile, mining, iron and steel and others.

Another suggestion I have to make—and this point has not been touched by any hon. Member—is this. I have noticed that in the industrial area these people, the workers, are paid cash weekly and they are exploited by shopkeepers and other suppliers, in weight—they give them less in weight—in price—they are

[Shri P. C. Bose]

charged higher—and in quality—they are supplied adulterated stuff. These things can be seen anywhere, in the tea gardens, in the mining areas and in any other industrial area. All sorts of adulterated food are supplied to them. Therefore, I personally feel that they should be encouraged and helped to form co-operative stores. Co-operative stores, if properly conducted, will help them to get goods of quality in proper quantity—that is, in good weight—and at a cheaper rate also, because there will be no profit motive.

If these two things—the co-operative stores system and eradication of these industrial evils—are taken care of and looked into and remedied, I think the labourers will automatically go ahead and progress in every respect. In fact, they will feel that their wages also have increased. With these words, I support the Demands for Grants of the Labour Ministry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The following are the selected cut motions relating to various Demands under the Ministry of Labour which have been indicated by the Members to be moved:

Demand No.	No. of Cut Motions.
70	193 to 204, 508, 509, 511 to 520, 1110 to 1115, 1140 to 1142, 1156 to 1161.
71	930, 931, 1116, 1117.
72	1118.
73	1143.

Suppression of A.I.T.U.C. Union in Tripura

Shri Biren Dutt (Tripura West): I beg to move:

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

Need to implement decision of payment of bonus to tea labour of Tripura

Shri Biren Dutt: I beg to move:

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

Need to grant housing loans to Tea gardens in Tripura for construction of houses for workers

Shri Biren Dutt: I beg to move:

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

Need to provide aid to Agartala municipality, Tripura for constructions of shaded stands for rickshaw pullers in Agartala

Shri Biren Dutt: I beg to move:

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

Need to provide housing loans to Bidi Factory owners in Tripura to construct housing accommodation for workers

Shri Biren Dutt: I beg to move:

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

Need to provide grants-in-aid to the Tea gardens in Tripura for building welfare centres

Shri Biren Dutt: I beg to move:

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

Need to provide Agartala Municipality with grants for constructing houses for Harijans

Shri Biren Dutt: I beg to move:

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

Need to provide funds for improving the conditions of the State-owned Electricity Supply Company of Agartala, Tripura

Shri Biren Dutt: I beg to move:

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

Need to establish a Conciliation Board in Tripura

Shri Biren Dutt: I beg to move:

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

Need to empower Labour Department to summon the employer in cases of non-payment of wages

Shri Biren Dutt: I beg to move:

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

Need to start regular registration of the unemployed in Tripura

Shri Biren Dutta : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need to revise the wage scale of Bidi workers in Tripura

Shri Biren Dutt : I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Necessity to fix a national minimum wage for all employees

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under 'the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Necessity of early implementation of the Minimum Wages Act for all agricultural labour in the country.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Necessity of early legislation for validation of bonus claims of employees of various industries.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Necessity of proper legislation for checking retrenchment

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Necessity of proper legislation for compulsory provision for housing facilities for industrial workers.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

3— 40 Lok Sabha

Need for proper application of Factories Act to Bidi Industry

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for proper welfare measures for labour in Shellac industry

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for introducing protective measures against occupational disease in Shellac industry.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for better arrangement for medical facilities for employees under Employees State Insurance Act.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for enquiry into the rationalisation problem of the jute industry

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for encouragement of Trade Unionism .

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Labour policy of the Government

Shri Tushar Chatterjea : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Recognition of Trade Unions by employers

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for granting of full trade union rights to Government employees

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for fixing of minimum wage of Rs. 100 for industrial workers

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need for granting of bonus to workers

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Lack of housing for workers

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Employees State Insurance Scheme

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Working of the Plantation Labour Act, 1951

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure of the employer conciliation machinery

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to provide employment in the Ministry to the Backward Classes on the basis of population.

Shri V. Boovaraghasamy (Perambalur): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Status and pay scales of laboratory helpers in the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Service conditions of the rice mill workers in the district of Midnapur

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Service conditions of saw-mill workers at Kolaghat in the district of Midnapur

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Over-time allowance to workers

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Trade Union rights in State Undertakings

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

नहीं हुआ करती अर्थात् घोड़े तो ये जमींदार और घास था किसान । आज मुझे कुछ ऐसा लगता है कि हमारे मिलमालिक भी अपने को उसी ढंग का घोड़ा बनाये हुए हैं और ये श्रमिक घास बने हुए हैं ।

श्री फीरोज गांधी (जिला प्रतापगढ़—पश्चिम व जिला रायबरेली—पूर्व) : आधुनिक घोड़े हैं ।

श्री टंडन : मेरे हृदय में तो कोई हंसी की बात नहीं है और न है व्यंग की बात । मेरा तो यह निवेदन है कि अब समाज की स्थिति को देखकर हमारे भाइयों को अपना क्रम बदलना चाहिये । हमारे बहुत से बुद्धिमान भाई हैं जिनमें से प्रमाणस्वरूप एक तो हमारे सामने बैठे हैं जिन्होंने अभी अन्तिम भाषण दिया है । उनमें हृदय है । परन्तु ऐसा लगता है कि जो क्रम चला आता है उसके हम सभी दास बन जाते हैं । कोई से अपने को इसका अपवाद नहीं मानता । जो हमारा पुराना ढंग चला आता है उसमें हम सभी दोषी बन जाते हैं ।

हम देखते हैं कि गांव का एक गरीब परिवार १५ या २० रुपये महीने में अपनी गुजर करता है । आप सोचें कि किस प्रकार एक कुटुम्ब १५ या २० रुपये में रह सकता है । आपके पास श्रक रखे हुए हैं कि कितने कुटुम्बों की आमदनी १५ या २० रुपये है । लेकिन क्या हम और आप १५, २० रुपये में गुजर करने वाले हैं? हमको तो पचास, सौ और दो सौ रुपये भी कम दिखायी पड़ते हैं । और हमारे भाई मिल मालिकों को तो लाखों रुपये भी कम दिखाई पड़ते हैं । एक तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस प्रश्न पर विचार करने में हम भविष्य की ओर भी देखें, कुछ अपने को भी बनावें, अपना उदाहरण ठीक करें । यदि हमको कम पैसा भी मिले तो हम संतोष करें । हमारे यहां तो इस विषय में धर्म की भावना सब के सामने बहुत स्पष्ट रखी गयी है । आप सोचें कि यह जो हमारा वैभव है यह तो बहुत ठहराऊ नहीं है । तो क्यों न हम अपने जीवन में ही इस वैभव को थोड़ा अलग करके, अपने ठाट बाट को कम करके जीवन में ही इससे बहुत कुछ अलहदगी करें । यदि हमारे मिल मालिक यह आदत डाल लें तो मेरा विश्वास है कि श्रमिकों के साथ उनका बरताव दूसरा ही होगा । श्रमिक उनके साथी हो जायेंगे, उनके भाई हो जायेंगे । क्या यह वैभव कभी एक कुटुम्ब में रहा है ? बहुत से लोग सोचते हैं कि हम

अपने बच्चों के लिये लाखों करोड़ों रुपया छोड़ जायें । मुझे इससे बड़ी मूर्खता दिखायी नहीं देती । कुछ कमाना तो आदमी को अच्छा लगता है लेकिन जो यह मोचते हैं कि हमें अपने बच्चों के लिये भी बहुत धन छोड़ जाना चाहिये वह में समझता हूं कि बुद्धिमानी की बात नहीं है । लड़के कैसे निकलेंगे? लायक होंगे या नालायक? शायद आपका पैसा ही इनको नालायक बना देगा । पैसे में लोगों को भोगविलास की और खींचने की प्रवृत्ति रहती है और स्पष्ट है कि जहां वह भोग विलास की ओर गया, वह नालायक बना । अपने मरने के बाद पैसा छोड़ कर जाना अपनी संतति के साथ बहुत मित्रता नहीं है । इस लिये हमारे जो बड़े बड़े धनिक लोग हैं उनको अपने जीवन में ही उसको बांट देना उचित है । क्या ही आनन्द आये अगर अपने जीवन में वे उसको बांटें और ऐसे मंगलित ढंग से बांटें कि श्रमिकों की वह चीज हो जाय । मिल एक धनिक व्यक्ति की चीज न होकर उन हजारों श्रमिकों की बन जाय जो उसमें काम करते हैं । इसी तरह जो धन उस धनी व्यक्ति के पास पड़ा है अगर वह उन हजारों श्रमिकों में बांट जाय तो आप देखेंगे कि आपके समाज का रूप ही बदल जायगा ।

यह जो हमारे भाई ने कहा कि कोई योजना ऐसी बनी है जिसमें मिल मालिक और श्रमिक मिल करके उद्योग श्रमों को चलायेंगे उनकी वह बात मुझे बहुत अच्छी लगी और मैं उनकी उस योजना का स्वागत करता हूं । मैं तो यह भी कहने वाला था कि मिल मालिकों को छोड़ कर गवर्नमेंट स्वयं इस विषय में यत्न करे और श्रमिकों को आधार बना कर कुछ काम शुरू करे जिस पर श्रमिकों का अधिकार हो और जो केवल श्रमिकों की वस्तु हो । मैं नहीं जानता कि गवर्नमेंट (सरकार) ने ऐसा प्रयोग कहीं पर किया है या नहीं लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट को ऐसा प्रयोग अवश्य करना चाहिये ।

श्री फीरोज गांधी : शूगर इंडस्ट्री (चीनी-उद्योग) में २० कोआपरेटिव मिलें बनी हैं ।

श्री टंडन : मैं उनका स्वागत करूंगा मगर वह अभी महज कागज पर ही होंगी । जो समाजवादी क्रम हम चाहते हैं उसमें मुख्य बात यह है कि हम अधिक से अधिक धन हर एक पुरुष को पहुंचा सकें जिसको मैं पैसे की तट उपयोगिता (माजिनल यूटिलिटी) कहता हूं जब वह हमारे देश में बढ़ेगी तब अधिक सुख होगा । अर्थ शास्त्र

[श्री टंडन]

के एक विद्यार्थी के नाते मैं कह रहा हूँ कि जिस देश में पैसे को तट उपयोगिता अधिक होती है, वही देश सुखी होता है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि हमारे भाई श्री सोमानी के पास १०० रुपये की तट उपयोगिता क्या है? बहुत कम है और २/४ रुपये की तो उनके लिये कुछ है ही नहीं लेकिन उतने ही रुपये की एक गरीब देहाती आदमी के लिये बहुत अधिक उपयोगिता है। जब हम इस प्रकार से अपनी समृद्धि का बंटवारा करें कि अधिक से अधिक उसकी माजिनल यूटीलिटी हो तो मेरा निवेदन है कि हमारा समाज बहुत सुखी होगा। हम अपने देश की सामाजिक व्यवस्था इसी माजिनल यूटीलिटी के आधार पर करना चाहते हैं और हम जो धनिक लोग हैं, उनके हृदयों को इस बात के लिये तैयार करना चाहते हैं कि वे उसी और बढ़ने का प्रयत्न करें, अर्थात् अपने पैसे की अपने पास ही न रक्खें बल्कि उन लोगों की दें जहाँ कि उसकी सचमुच माजिनल यूटीलिटी (उपयोगिता) बढ़ सके।

यह जो हमारे भाई ने माल पैदा करने के सम्बन्ध में मूल्य की चर्चा की और बताया कि कितने मूल्य पर माल पैदा होता है, उसके बारे में मेरा निवेदन है कि वह वास्तव में बहुत विचारनीय बात नहीं है। मैं जानता हूँ कि आपकी निगाह में दूसरे देशों के साथ प्रतियोगिता है, परन्तु वह वास्तव में बहुत बड़ी बात नहीं है। मैं तो अपने देश के सुख की ओर जा रहा हूँ। मूल्य उतनी महत्वपूर्ण वस्तु नहीं है जितना गरीबों को सहारा देने और गरीबों की जीविका चलाने का प्रश्न महत्वपूर्ण है और आज यही मुख्य प्रश्न हमारे सामने है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, और आगे कहने से पहले मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि कितने मिनट आप मुझे बोलने के लिये और देंगे?

Mr. Speaker: As long as he wants.

श्री टंडन: मैं बहुत ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा, थोड़ा ही लूंगा। मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि जब हम कोई प्रश्न उठाएँ तो यह देखें कि हम इसमें मुख कहां तक बढ़ा सकते हैं। किसी चीज का मूल्य क्या हो, मंहगी पड़े या सस्ती पड़े, इसको हमें विशेष नहीं देखना है। गांधी जी ने कितनी ही बार हम लोगों को यह बात समझाई कि मूल्य किसी चीज का रुपये पैसे में क्या है, यह कोई महत्व की बात नहीं है। आप जानतें होंगे कि

एक वस्तु जो कि हमारे देश में बहुत सस्ती मिलती है, वही वस्तु दूसरे देश में मंहगी मिलती है। उदाहरणार्थ, रूस में एक जोड़ी जूता ७०, ८० रुपये का मिलता है, इसी तरह खीरा जिसको कि यहां आम लोग खाते हैं और जो मुझे बहुत प्रिय है और जो यहां पर केवल दो या तीन पैसे में मिल जाता है वही खीरा रूस में छे आने और सात आने में मिलता है लेकिन इस पर भी रूस हमारे देश की अपेक्षा अधिक सुखी और समृद्धिशाली है। हमारे सामने न तो मूल्य का प्रश्न होना चाहिये और न ही मंहगे, सस्ते का प्रश्न। हमें तो यह देखना चाहिये कि गरीबों को हम किस रीति से सहायता पहुंचाते हैं। हर एक काम में हमारा दृष्टिकोण यह हो कि अधिक से अधिक लोग काम में लगे और गरीबी घटे।

इतना निवेदन करने के बाद अब मैं श्रम विभाग की जो रिपोर्ट है, उसकी एक मद की ओर तुरन्त आ जाता हूँ। जैसा पहले मैंने कहा मैं यह समझता हूँ कि हमारे श्रम विभाग का महत्व दिन प्रतिदिन बढ़ेगा। बहुत से प्रश्न हैं जिनकी तरफ आपका ध्यान भी नहीं है, उन प्रश्नों को आपको लेना पड़ेगा। आज आपका श्रम विभाग अधिकतर इंडस्ट्रियल लेबर (औद्योगिक श्रमिकों) की ओर ध्यान दे रहा है। अभी हमारे भाई श्री विद्यालंकार ने खेतिहर मजदूरों को दशा सुधारना की ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाया था और बतलाया था कि आज उनकी कैसी खराब हालत हो रही है, मैं उनसे पूरी तरह सहमत हूँ। हमारी सरकार का ध्यान देहाती श्रमिकों की ओर नहीं गया है। उनकी बड़ी दयनीय दशा है। आपने उनकी दशा सुधारने के लिये क्या किया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो लाखों और करोड़ों आदमी देहातों में बेकार बैठे हुए हैं उनको मजदूरी और काम दिलाने के लिये आप क्या कर रहे हैं। बेकारी के सम्बन्ध में रिपोर्ट में दिये हुए एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज के अक्तुबर सन् १९५५ के अंकों को मैंने देखा। करीब ७ लाख ब्याक्ति नौकरियों के लिये प्रार्थी थे। इनके अलावा कितने ही लाखों और करोड़ों व्यक्ति देहातों में बेकार बैठे हुए हैं और कितने ही अर्धबेकारी की अवस्था में हैं और श्रम विभाग उन बेकारों और अर्धबेकारों की संख्या पता लगाने में असमर्थ है, उनकी संख्या हमको कही नहीं मिलती है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हमारे देश में बेकारी बहुत अधिक है। जितना अधिक हम बेकारी को दूर कर सकें उतना ही अधिक हम अपने देश और समाज की सुखी बनायेंगे। इस कार्य में आपका और आपके विभाग

का दायित्व बहुत अधिक है। जहाँ भी हम सोचते हैं कि हम नये काम आरम्भ करें वहाँ श्रम विभाग का लगाव हो जाता है। जहाँ कहीं कुछ काम हो रहा है और जहाँ कुछ लोगों ने कोई काम उठाया है, उन से आपका यह लगाव रहता है कि उन में कितने श्रमिक लगे हुए हैं और उन कामों से कितने लोगों को जीविका मिल रही है। आपने बेकारों की संख्या, करीब ७ लाख के एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज में दी है, मगर वह पर्याप्त नहीं है। आप को तो यह सोचना है कि यह जो बेकारों की जनसंख्या पड़ी है उन को कैसे आप जीविका देंगे, कैसे आप उन को ऐसा श्रमदान देंगे कि वह सब लोग काम में लग जायें।

इधर यह प्रश्न तो है ही। इतने कम समय में उस योजना की तस्वीर तो मैं नहीं खींच सकता जो मेरे मस्तिष्क में है कि किस प्रकार से उन को श्रम दिया जाय, परन्तु आप की रिपोर्ट में एक बात खटकी। मैं ने उस में देखा कि रिक्रशा की चर्चा है और जो रिक्रशा वाले आज हैं उन के खिलाफ आपने एक जिहाद उठाया है। मैं घबरा गया। जब शुरू शुरू में अंग्रेज यहाँ आये थे तो उन्होंने रेल गाड़ी यहाँ चलाई और इस तरह से उन्होंने लाखों आदमियों की रोजी छीनी थी, लाखों आदमियों की रोजी छीन कर रेलगाड़ियां चलीं। हां, यह अवश्य है कि अब तो वह आधुनिक क्रम है। मुझ को वह कथा याद है कि जैसे जैसे मिलें यहाँ खड़ी हुई, कितने जुलाहों की रोजी छीनी गई। उन की रोजी छीन कर मिलें यहाँ खड़ी हुई। एक समय था जब हमारे यहाँ हाथ से काम करने वाले बहुत लोग थे। मैं ने रेल के आरंभ की चर्चा की, उस समय भी आना जाना होता था। लाखों आदमी लगे थे इस काम में। दिल्ली से कलकत्ते तक घोड़ा गाड़ियां दौड़ती थीं। लाखों आदमी गाड़ियां बनाने में लगे हुए थे, घोड़ों की देख रेख में लाखों आदमी लगे हुए थे। बहुत से गरीब लोग चिट्ठियां ले कर सीढ़ते थे, डाक इधर उधर जाया करती थी। सरकारने इन सब चीजों के लिये दूसरे रास्ते बनाये आज आप कहेंगे कि गरीबों को बहुत दूर तक दौड़ना पड़ता था। यह हमारी करुणा के विरुद्ध था। लेकिन उस का नतीजा क्या हुआ। आप उस आदमी के मित्र बने जो कि मेहनत करता है, लेकिन आप ने क्या किया? अगर आप उस का काम ले लें और उस की जगह पर मिर्कनिकल (यांत्रिक) क्रम पर काम करने लगे तो मैं कहता हूँ कि आप ने अपने हृदय की करुणा को उस की मित्रता में नहीं लगाया। देखने में तो

वह बात करुणा से प्रेरित मालूम होती है परन्तु मैं इस विभाग से निवेदन करता हूँ कि यह गहरें विचार की बात है। हर चीज में जहाँ मनुष्यों का परिश्रम लगता है अगर उस में आप ऐसी तरकीब लगा दें जिस में वह काम जल्दी और आसानी से हो जाय तो आदमी बेरोजगार हो जायेंगे। बचपन में मैं देखता था कि जब पानी का नल नहीं लगा था, उस समय लाखों आदमी कुएं से पानी खींचने में लगे हुए थे। यह एक रोजगार था और लाखों करोड़ों आदमियों के घरों में पानी कुओं से खींच कर आता था। यह सोच कर कि जो पानी खींचता है उस को मेहनत पड़ती है, अंग्रेजों ने नल लगवा दिये। उस समय इस से विरुद्ध बलवे भी हुए। बहुत आदमी बेरोजगार हो गये। हमें सोचना पड़ेगा कि जब हम कोई सामाजिक व्यवस्था करते हैं तो हम किसी भी मनुष्य से उस का काम छीन लें या न छीनें। यह आवश्यक है कि ऐसे प्रश्न को हम विस्तृत दृष्टि से देखें। क्या आप के विभाग ने सोचा कि आप किसको कौन सा काम करने देंगे और किस को कौन सा नहीं करने देंगे? मैं स्वयम् सोचा करता हूँ कि जो गंदा काम है उस को हम बन्द करें। परन्तु क्या कभी आप ने इस दृष्टि से इस प्रश्न को देखा कि कौन सा गंदा काम है और कौन सा ऐसा काम है जो हमें रोकना नहीं चाहिये। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि सब से गंदा काम जो आप और हम मनुष्य मे ले रहे हैं वह मलमूत्र उठवाना है। हम मलमूत्र की सफाई के लिये लाखों आदमियों को लगाये हुए हैं। यह गंदा से गंदा काम है और यह भी सही है कि बहुत से आदमी इस में लगे हुए हैं। मैं तो समझाया करता हूँ भंगियों को, कि बन्द करो यह काम। आप को समाज की व्यवस्था ऐसे क्रम के अनुसार बनानी होगी कि यह काम मनुष्यों द्वारा न हो। मैं ने आज इस प्रश्न को इस लिये लिया कि आप का ध्यान खींचू कि अगर आप देखते हैं कि कौन काम हम लें और कौन न लें तो आप की दूसरी ओर जाना पड़ेगा।

आपने रिक्रशा खींचने के काम को समझा है कि यह इतना बुरा काम है कि इस को रोकना चाहिये। मनुष्य को मनुष्य पर सवारी न करनी चाहिये। एक मनुष्य गाड़ी पर बैठता है और दूसरा खींचता है इस को आप ने बुरा समझा है। यह आपेक्षिक दृष्टि का सवाल है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि इस काम में लाखों आदमी लगे हुए हैं। मैं अपने सूबे की बात जानता हूँ। हमारे सूबे में इस काम में लगभग ३ लाख आदमी लगे हुए होंगे। कितने

[श्री टंडन]

ही आदमी रिक्शा के बनाने में लगे हुए हैं, मिस्त्री लगे हुए हैं। जो आप ने रिक्शा के लिये लिखा कि लाइसेन्स बन्द किया जाय उस का अर्थ देखिये।

Mr. Speaker: I have already given half an hour to the hon. Member. I have to distribute the five hours. I cannot ask the hon. Member.....

श्री टंडन I shall just bring my remarks to a close and finish in two minutes.

जब आपने इस रिक्शा की व्यवस्था को हाथ में लिया तो मुझे थोड़ा ताज्जुब हुआ अगर आप यह देखते हैं कि कौन सा गन्दा काम है, तो दूसरे काम को उठाना था, रिक्शा इतना गन्दा काम नहीं है, और अगर आप यह समझते हैं कि रिक्शा खिंचने वाले के ऊपर कोई बड़ा जुल्म होता है तो यह सही नहीं है। मैं जानता हूँ कि एट्रेस पास कालेज के विद्यार्थी कुछ जगहों पर रात को रिक्शा चला कर अपना गुजारा चलाते हैं। मैं इलाहाबाद को जानता हूँ। वहाँ कितने ही विद्यार्थी हैं जिनको कालेज में पढ़ने के लिये सुविधायें नहीं हैं। वे रात को रिक्शा चलाते हैं और उससे अपनी पढ़ाई और गुजारा चलाते हैं। यह कोई ऐसी बड़ी बात नहीं है। अरे पालकी में तो भूषण कवि को बिठला कर हमारे एक बड़े प्रसिद्ध राजा ने हाथ लगाया था और अपने कंधे पर पालकी को रखवा था। अगर एक एक आदमी को चार चार और पांच पांच आदमी ले जाते रहे हैं तो यह कोई बड़ी भारी बुरी बात नहीं है। आज जो हमारा बाइसिकल का रिक्शा है अगर उस पर एक या दो आदमी हों तो हर्ज नहीं है। हाँ, इस प्रकार से न चलावें कि तीन तीन और चार चार आदमी उस पर बैठायें। मेरे विचार से अगर बाइसिकल रिक्शा पर एक आदमी बैठे और साथ में कोई वच्चा बैठ जाता है तो उसके खींचने में कोई बड़ी कठिनाई नहीं है।

यह जो उद्योग है जिस में देश के लाखों आदमी लगे हुए हैं, अगर हम इस उद्योग को बन्द करते हैं तो उनको बेकार करते हैं। जब उस दिन स्वास्थ्य विवाद में मैंने इसकी चर्चा की थी तो हमारी मंत्रिणी जी ने कहा था कि हाँ, हम ने यह लिख दिया है कि उनके रोजगार का इन्तजाम किया जाय तभी रिक्शा बन्द किया जाय। मैं आप से पुष्टता हूँ कि आप के पास रोजगार कहां है।

आप कहते हैं कि सात लाख आदमी आपके यहां भर्ती के लिये बैठे हैं, तो वह सोचिये कि इतने अधिक आदमियों को बेकार करने से क्या लाभ होगा। जो आप के पास बेरोजगार लोग बैठे हुए हैं पहले उनको तो काम दीजिये। सबसे पहले आपका कर्तव्य उन के प्रति है। गरीब सब जगह हैं। उनके प्रति जिस तरह से आप करुणा दिखाते रहे हैं, कि हम धीरे धीरे उन के रोजगार छीन लें, अपने गरीब भाइयों को रोजगार से वंचित कर दें यह उचित नहीं है। मेरा तो यह निवेदन है कि अगर आप देश में मोटर कार का आना बन्द कर देते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता। मैं तो इस बात का पक्षपाती हूँ कि हमारे देश में मोटर कार का आना बन्द हो जाय और हम एक एक आदमी को किसी न किसी तरह के काम में लगा लें, एक एक को रोजगार दें दें, तब हम मिकैनिक्ल डिवाइसेज (मंत्रों) की बात सोचें। सरकार की ओर से जो यह लिखा गया है कि रिक्शा बन्द कर दिया जाय, गरीबों का रोजगार हम छीनें, इस के सम्बन्ध में तो मुझे वही अंग्रेजी की कहावत याद आती है कि भगवान हमें हमारे मित्रों से बचाये। आपका विभाग उनका मित्र बन कर आ रहा है लेकिन वास्तव में वह उनका रास्ता बन्द कर रहा है उससे उन के रोजगार की हानि हो रही है। आप इस प्रश्न को विस्तृत दृष्टिकोण से देखिये कि कौन से ऐसे रोजगार हैं जिनको बन्द करना है परन्तु साथ ही साथ आप का यह कर्तव्य है कि आप दिन पर दिन सबको रोजगार देने के रास्ते बनावें, रोजगार मिलने के जो मार्ग हैं उनको बन्द न करें।

Shri Kamath: On a point of order, Sir. Some days ago, you gave a wise ruling that Select Committees of the House or any other Committee of the House should not meet between 10 A.M. and 1 P.M. I understand that my colleagues here.....

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow such interruptions here. I am very sorry. We are in the midst of the debate. What is the hurry for such points? I have repeatedly told the hon. Member that he ought not to interrupt the proceedings of the House in such a manner. If he finds it very necessary, he may write to me early. What is the meaning of interrupting the debate like this?

Shri Kamath: I wanted to raise a point of order that a Committee.....

Mr. Speaker : A point of order can be raised only with respect to a matter which is before the House.

Shri Kamath : I was referring to your ruling. It has not been followed. There is contempt, by the Committee, of the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Speaker : He may bring his point later, or he could have written to me. We are thirsting for time here. He should co-operate with me.

Shri Kamath : We want the Committees also to co-operate with you. The Committees are not co-operating with you.

Mr. Speaker : Obviously he wants to point out that some Committee is sitting now.

Shri Kamath : Yes; that is what I wanted to say but you interrupted me.

Mr. Speaker : I shall take note of it, and I shall find out. I am much obliged to him.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (कर्नाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बोलने का मौका देने से पहले हमारे एक आनरबल मेम्बर (माननिय सदस्य) ने हमारे लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब को बहुत कम्प्लिमेंट्स (समादर) पे किए हैं। मुझे यह अर्ज करना है कि जिस तरह से उन्होंने कम्प्लिमेंट्स पेश किये हैं उससे तो मेरे दिल में एक शक सा पैदा हो गया है कि क्या जो पालिसी (नीति) हमारे लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनाई है, वह सचमुच अच्छी है। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि मालिकों का तो सदा यह कायदा है कि जैसे हमारे यहां एक कहावत है कि तू डाल डाल में पात पात। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि कितने ही कानून आप बनावें और कितनी ही कोशिश आप क्यों न करें कि उन कानूनों को सही ढंग से लागू किया जाय, जो मालिक हैं वे कोई न कोई तरीका उन कानूनों से बचने का निकाल ही लेते हैं और ऐसी कार्रवाईयां करते हैं जिस से कि लेबर का अहित हो। जितने भी कानून आप बनाते हैं उनका सबसे ज्यादा जो फायदा उठाते हैं वह मालिक लोग ही उठाते हैं। मैं अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ कि हमारे लेबर मिनिस्टर का और हमारे लेबर मिनिस्ट्री का सिर्फ यह फर्ज ही नहीं होना चाहिये कि वह मालिकों और मजदूरों के बीच ताल्लुकत को अच्छे बनाये

रखे पर उसका यह भी फर्ज होना चाहिये कि वह धीरे धीरे लेबर को इस काबिल बनाये कि वह आगे चल कर मालिकों का स्थान ले ले। इसमें कोई शक की बात नहीं है कि प्राइवेट मालिकों का जो सिस्टम (प्रणाली) है यह एक न एक दिन खत्म होना ही है लेकिन हमारी कोशिश यह होनी चाहिये कि देश की जरूरतों को सामने रखते हुए और कम से कम लोगों को तकलीफ पहुंचाते हुए हम इस सिस्टम को जल्दी से जल्दी खत्म करें।

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

तो जहां तक सिस्टम खत्म होने की बात है आज किसी के दिल में भी कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि इसे एक न एक दिन खत्म होना ही है। हमें चाहिये कि हम इसे जल्दी से जल्दी खत्म करने के लिये अपनी कोशिश जारी रखें।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह अर्ज करनी है कि केवल हम लोग लेबर को मैनेजमेंट में हिस्सा ही न दें बल्कि हमारी कोशिश यह होनी चाहिये कि धीरे धीरे लेबर मालिक बन जाए। जैसा कि टंडन जी ने भी कहा हमारे यहां जो शुगर फैक्टरीज हैं उन में से कुछ कोओपरेटिव बेसिस (सहकारिता का आधार) पर चलाने की कोशिश की गई है और वह कामयाब रही हैं। इसके लिये मैं जो भी इस चीज के लिये रिसर्पोसिबल (उत्तरदायी) हूँ, उनको मुबारकबाद देती हूँ। मैं लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब से दरखास्त करती हूँ कि वह भी इसी पालिसी को अपनायें।

अभी टंडन जी ने रिक्शावालों का जिक्र किया। मैं इस चीज को नहीं मानती हूँ कि रिक्शायें हम लोगों को खत्म कर देनी चाहियें लेकिन लेबर मिनिस्ट्री ने जो एक मूव शुरू की है कि हमें रिक्शा को खत्म करना है और कैसे इसे खत्म करना है, मैं उसका स्वागत करती हूँ। मैं इसे नहीं मानती कि पालकी का उठाना और चलाना और रिक्शा चलाना एक ही बात है। मैं इसे भी नहीं मानती कि साइकिल चलाने में और रिक्शा चलाने में कोई फर्क नहीं है। साइकिल चलाने में भी काफी तकलीफ होती है। मैं खुद साइकिल चलाना जानती हूँ और बहुत सालों तक मैंने साइकिल चलायी भी है। जो माननीय सदस्य साइकिल चलाना जानते हैं वह यह भी जानते होंगे कि कितने साल इन्सान साइकिल चला सकता है और जब उसके पीछे एक बड़ी गाड़ी लगी हुई हो, और एक नहीं, दो

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

नहीं, तीन नहीं बल्कि चार उसमें बैठे हों और सामान भी उसमें रखा हो, तो उसका हैलथ (स्वास्थ्य) पर क्या असर पड़ता है।

श्री० बी० पी० नायर (चिरयिन्कील) : ऊपर चारपाई भी होती है।

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : अपनी जिंदगी में कितने साल तक वह रिकशा चला सकता है यह चीज हमारे सोचने की है। मैं जब साइकिल चलाती थी तो मुझे प्लुरेसी हो गई और काफी दिनों तक मैं अस्पताल में पड़ी रही। डाक्टर ने कहा कि और कुछ नहीं तो कम से कम साइकिल चलाना बन्द कर दो। मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि जब मैं साइकिल चलाया करती थी तो अपने पीछे किसी को नहीं बिठाया करती थी और जो मेरी साइकिल होती थी वह भी मैं अच्युती तरह रखती थी। जिस तरह कि रिकशा होती है और जो लोग इन्हें चलाते हैं, वह सचमुच एक दर्दनाक नज़ारा होता है। पर मुझे यह अर्ज करना है कि साइकिल रिकशा खत्म करने के पहले हमें कई चीजें करनी हैं। आज बेशुमार लोग इस काम में लगे हुए हैं। रिकशा बनाने और रिकशा चलाने वालों के अलावा एक और भी क्लास है जिस को कि मिडलमैन कहा जाता है। ये वे लोग हैं जो रिकशा के मालिक होते हैं। मुझे हैलथ मिनिस्ट्री से यह अर्ज करना है कि पुल्लर्ज (खींचनेवाले) को खत्म करने से पहले वह पहल बीच के जो मिडलमैन हैं उनको हटा दें। मैं अपने अनुभव से आपको यह बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि दिल्ली में भी जो भारत की राजधानी है ६०० रिकशाएँ हैं। इन रिकशाओं के मालिक ३१८ रुपये में एक रिकशा खरीदते हैं और खींचने वालों से पांच रुपये फी रिकशा फी दिन वसूल करते हैं। जिस दिन पांच रुपये फी रिकशा उनको नहीं मिलते हैं, उस दिन एक रुपया पर एक आना व्याज लेते हैं। कई रिकशा वाले भेरे पास आते हैं और अपनी हालत मुझे बतलाते हैं। उनमें से बेशतर लोग तपेदिक के मरीज होते हैं, इस चीज को मैंने महसूस किया है। रिकशा खत्म करने के पहले हमें इस बात की कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि जो रिकशा का लाइसेंस होता है वह मालिक को मिलने के बजाय पुल्लर को या उसकी जो कोओप्रेटिव सोसाइटी है, उसको ही मिले और जो मिडलमैन है, वह खत्म हो जाय। प्लानिंग कमिशन (योजना आयोग) और गवर्नमेंट में कोओप्रेटिव्स के मूताल्लिक जो पालिसी अस्तथार की है, मुझे रंज है, सेबर

मिनिस्टर उस पालिसी पर नहीं चल रहे हैं। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपको बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि दिल्ली में, जो कैपिटल सिटी है बैठकर मुझे ११-१२ महीने इस चीज के लिये लगे कि जो लाइसेंस है उनको कोओप्रेटिव सोसाइटी को ही दिया जाय और मिडलमैन को एलिमिनेट (खत्म) कर दिया जाय। ६०० के ६०० लाइसेंस तो इस सोसाइटी को नहीं दिए गए, हाँ, कुछ एडिशनल लाइसेंस जरूर मिल गए हैं। मुझे यह बात आपको बतलाते हुए भी हर्ष होता है और मुझे इस पर गर्व है कि आज कोओप्रेटिव सोसायटी रिकशा पुल्लर से केवल पांच आने रोज लेती है और वही इस कोओप्रेटिव सोसाइटी को चलाते हैं। तो मैं आप से यह अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ कि रिकशा चलाना एक न एक दिन खत्म होना ही चाहिये, इस बात को मानती हूँ। लेकिन जब तक वह बन्द नहीं होता तब तक मैं चाहती हूँ कि मिडलमैन को फौरन ही और बगैर किसी शकोशुबाह के आर्डर निकाल कर के खत्म कर दिया जाना चाहिये और कोओप्रेटिव सोसाइटीज को यह काम दे दिया जाना चाहिये। इसके बारे में जब हमने चीफ कमिशनर साहब को एप्रोच (पहुच) किया तो उन्होंने हमें बतलाया कि उनके पास इस किस्म का कोई आर्डर नहीं है। इस वास्ते में अर्ज करती हूँ किये एक आर्डर निकाला जाना चाहिये जिस में यह इस्टिमेशन (हिदायत) हों कि तमाम हिन्दुस्तान में रिकशा के लिये जितने भी लाइसेंस दिए गए हैं वे फौरन ही पुल्लर्स को या उनकी कोओप्रेटिव सोसाइटीज को ट्रांसफार (हस्तांतरित) कर दिए जायें।

रिकशा खत्म करने के सम्बन्ध में मुझे अब यह कहना है कि मैं इस चीज को अच्युती तरह जानती हूँ कि हमारी लेबर मिनिस्ट्री ने यह नहीं कहा है कि रिकशा खींचना एकदम खत्म कर दिया जाय। उसने यह कहा है कि स्कीमें बनाई जाय और यह बताया जाय कि कितनी देर में और कस तरह से रिकशा खींचना बन्द किया जा सकता है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ कि ट्रांसपोर्ट मिनिस्ट्री का भी इन रिकशा से गहरा ताल्लुक होना चाहिये। रिकशा के लाइसेंस अकसर म्युनिसिपल कमेटियाँ देती हैं और दूसरी प्रकार के ट्रांसपोर्ट (परिवहन) के लाइसेंस ट्रांसपोर्ट मिनिस्ट्री का एक महकमा देता है। अगर इन दोनों का आपस में गहरा कोओर्डिनेशन (एकसूत्रता) हो तो जो रिकशा खींचते हैं उनको धीरे धीरे दूसरे बिहीकल्स (गाड़ियाँ) जैसे मोटर

साइकिलें हैं और जिनके लाइसेंस हम नये आदमियों को देते हैं, इन को ही दे दिया करें और इन लाइसेंसों को मोटर रिक्शा लाइसेंसिस में तबदील कर दें तो वह दिन आयेगा कि ड्रम किसी के रोजगार को बन्द किये बगैर उस चीज को कनवर्ट कर सकेंगे। यह नहीं होगा कि म्युनिसिपैलिटीज तो अपने यहां उनको लाइसेंस देना बन्द कर दें और ट्रासपोर्ट वाले दूसरों को मोटर रिक्शाओं का लाइसेंस दें और इन भाइयों को न दें।

इसके बाद मैं त्रिपाठी जी की इस विषय में तारीफ़ करती हूँ कि हमारे देश की प्रोडक्टिविटी बढ़ी है। प्लानिंग कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक भी प्रोडक्टिविटी बढ़ी है। टेक्स्टाइल में तो हम टारजेट से भी आगे बढ़ गये हैं। आइरन वगैरह में भी प्रोडक्टिविटी बढ़ी है और २५ से ३३ परसेंट तक बढ़ी है। लेकिन वेजेज वही की वही फ़ीज होकर रह गयी है। हमारी जो नेशनल इनकम है वह भी १८ परसेंट बढ़ी है। जब नेशनल इनकम बढ़ी है और प्रोडक्टिविटी बढ़ी है और लेबर की वेजेज नहीं बढ़ीं, तो यह हमारे लिये बड़े अफ़सोस की बात है। और हमें यह मालूम करना चाहिये कि यह जो बड़ा है वह कहाँ गया है। अगर वह रुपया लेबर के पास नहीं आया तो इसके लिये लेबर मिनिस्टर को कोशिश करनी चाहिये। आज हमारी कैबिनेट को इस पर गौर करना है। हमारे दोनों लेबर मिनिस्टर ऐसे नहीं हैं जिनको लेबर से कोई सम्बन्ध न रहा हो। उन्होंने छोटी से छोटी यूनियन बनायी है और छोटी से छोटी लेबर में काम किया है। और वे मजदूरों की तकलीफ़ों को भली प्रकार जानते हैं। मैं उनसे अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ कि हमने जो लेबर के हितों के लिये कानून बनाये हैं और आज जिन कानूनों की वजह से सोमानी जी मिनिस्ट्री को कम्प्लीमेंट पेश कर सके, वह आज लेबर के रास्ते में बड़े बाधक बने हुए हैं। हमारी गेर्ट्स ने इस बात की कोशिश की कि लेबर को और एम्प्लायर्स को दोनों को कोर्ट्स (अदालत) का फायदा हो सके वे अपील कर सकें। पर आज लेबर और कैपीटल की बराबरी नहीं हो सकती, मैं इस चीज को साफ़ कर देना चाहती हूँ। आज चाहे अदालत की बात हो या कोई दूसरी बात हो उसमें लेबर कैपीटल का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकती। आज हम कहते हैं कि सब के लिये ईक्वालिटी आफ़ आपाचुनिटी (अबसर की समानता) होनी चाहिये। लेकिन लेबर और कैपीटल का जहाँ तक सवाल है उनमें आपस में इक्वल आपाचुनिटी नहीं है। इक्वल आपाचुनिटी तो तब ही हो सकती है जैसे कि दौड़ कराते

वक्त सब को एक लकीर पर खड़ा किया जाता है और साथ साथ दौड़ाया जाता है। अगर कुछ आदमियों को बरसों से आगे की लकीर पर खड़ा कर दिया जाये और उसके बाद कहा जाये कि सब दौड़ें और सब को इक्वल आपाचुनिटी है और जो दौड़ में जीतेगा उसको जीता समझा जायेगा। तो ऐसा करने में जो पीछे से दौड़े हैं उनकी आगे वालों से बराबरी तो नहीं हो सकती। आज हालत यह है कि लेबर पीछे खड़ा है। आज कहा जाता है कि ट्राइबुनल्स से लेबर और कैपीटल अपने झगड़ों का फैसला करा सकते हैं। लेकिन आप देखें कि लेबर और कैपीटल में कितना अन्तर है, उनकी कमाई में कितना अन्तर है उनके रहन सहन की कन्डीशन्स (स्थिति) में कितना अन्तर है। ट्राइबुनल्स से एवार्ड (पंचाट) लेने में, चाहे मामला दो चार रुपये का ही क्यों न हो, सालों लग जाते हैं। मैं समझती हूँ कि यह लेबर के लिए कोई इन्साफ़ नहीं है। जो कंसेज इन ट्राइबुनल्स में जाते हैं उनकी हालत सिविल कोर्ट्स से भी खराब हो जाती है और जो बकील और चीजों में कामयाब नहीं होते वे लेबर में जाकर काम करने लगते हैं और पैसा बनाने लगते हैं। कंसेज में दो दो चार चार और छः छः साल लग जाते हैं। एक कोर्ट से कोई एवार्ड मिलता है तो हाई कोर्ट उसमें देखल देता है और उसके बाद सुप्रीम कोर्ट भी देखल देती है। अगर हमारी हाई कोर्ट और सुप्रीम कोर्ट सिर्फ़ लीगल चीजों का ही फैसला करे तब भी एक बात है, लेकिन वे तो आज क्वेश्चन (प्रश्न) के मैरिट (गुण) में जाती हैं कि जो बोनास मिला वह इतना मिलना चाहिये था या नहीं, जो डिअरनेस एलाउंस (मंहगाई भत्ता) दिया गया वह कितना दिया गया वह ठीक दिया गया या नहीं। जब कोई ट्रेड यूनियन किसी काम को लड़ती है तो उसको कितनी दिक्कत होती है यह वही जान सकता है जिसने यह काम किया है। जिसने यह काम किया है उसको मालूम होगा कि बगैर पढ़े लिखे आदमियों को इफ़्टा करना, उनकी डिमांड्स के लिये कोशिश करना, उनको मार पिटाई करने से, वायलेंस (हिंसा) करने से रोकना कितना मुश्किल है, जब कि मालिकों की तरफ़ से रोज़ कोशिश यह रहती है कि वे किसी तरह से वायलेंस करने पर मजबूर कर दिये जायें। उसके बाद चार पांच साल बाद उनको एवार्ड मिलता है। तो चुपके से हाई कोर्ट का या सुप्रीम कोर्ट का कोई इंक्वायरी आ जाता है। यह कोई नई बात नहीं है। मैं दिल्ली के बारे में जानती हूँ। हमारे यहां दिल्ली होटल वर्कर्स का यूनियन

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

(संघ) था। उसके ८० वर्कर्स को बगैर तनस्वाहक ससपेंड कर दिया गया। लेकिन जब वह मामला ट्राइबुनल को रेफर किया गया तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट से स्टे आर्डर आ गया और वह मामला पडा हुआ है। जब स्टे आर्डर की मियाद खत्म होगी तब वह मामला फँसल होगा। फिर वह अपीलेंट ट्राइबुनल में जायेगा। वहाँ से भी जीत गया तो दूसरी अदालत में जायेगा। वहाँ भी समय लगेगा। इसी तरह से म्योर मिल्स के वर्कर्स का मामला था जो कि चार साल के बाद फँसल हुआ। लेकिन दूसरी कोर्ट ने उस एवार्ड को रद्द कर दिया। इस वक्त दिल्ली में चार कसेज हैं जिनमें सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने दखल दे रखा है। पांच साल में रोज रोज वर्कर्स को कोर्ट जाना पड़ता है जिसके लिये उनकी तनस्वाह कटती है। उनको अपील के लिये लखनऊ जाना पड़ता है। अगर इस तरह से चार चार साल लड़ने के बाद एवार्ड मिलता है तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट उसको स्टे कर देती है। मैं चाहती हूँ कि लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब ऐसी कोशिश करें कि इन फँसलों को जल्दी किया जाय और उनसे मजदूरों को फायदा पहुंचे। अभी जो कानून है उसमें यह प्रावीजन है कि वकीलों को इन मुकदमों से अलग रखा जाय। लेकिन मालिक लोग जो पैसे बालें हैं वे इन वकीलों को एम्पलाय (नियोजन) कर लेते हैं और जब वे एम्पलाई हो जाते हैं तो वे उन मुकदमों में आ सकते हैं। आज आप देखें कि मालिकों की तरफ से ट्राइबुनल के सामने कैसे वकील आते हैं। आपको ताज्जुब होगा कि मालिक लोग डा० इकबाल अहमद, एक्स (भूतपूर्व) चीफ जस्टिस को अपनी तरफ से पेश करते हैं। मजदूर इतना बड़ा तो क्या छोटा वकील भी नहीं कर सकते। डा० इकबाल उन जजों के सामने मुकदमे की पैरवी करते हैं जो कि उनके सर्वाइजेंट रह चुके हैं। अब हमारे लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब को इस तरफ तवज़ह देनी चाहिये कि इन हालात में हम लेबर के इंटरेस्ट को कैसे प्रोटेक्ट कर सकते हैं।

और मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहती हूँ कि अब हमारे जो ट्रायबुनल्स हैं उनकी ट्रेंड (विचार धारा) भी बदलती जा रही है। पहले उनका ऐसा सेंटिमेंट (विचार) नहीं था। पहले जब वह वोनस देते थे तो कहते थे कि वोनस डेफेंड पेमेंट आफ वेजेंज हैं। लेकिन अब एक एवार्ड में यह कहा गया है कि सारी चीजें देने के बाद, मैनेजिंग एजेंसी कमीशन देने के बाद, रिजर्व फंड देने के बाद जो कि ममज़ में आ सकता है, और दूसरी चीजें

देने के बाद वोनस का लास्ट ग्राइडम है जो कि दिया जाना चाहिये। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सचमुच तारीफ़ करती हूँ लेबरर्स के सत्र की। आज यह कहने में कोई फायदा नहीं कि एक पार्टी के लोग यह कहते हैं और दूसरे पार्टी के लोग यह कहते हैं। लेकिन मैं कहूंगी कि उनका सत्र हद से ज्यादा है। शायद वह मजबूरी की वजह से यह सत्र करते हैं। आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० के जो प्रेसीडेंट सबरेकर साहब हैं वह भी परेशान हैं। जो बम्बई में एवार्ड हुआ है उसके खिलाफ उन्होंने प्रोटेस्ट किया है। हमारे भाई त्रिपाठी जी, जो कि बहुत समय से लेबर का काम करते आ रहे हैं और जो किसी बात को बढ़ाकर नहीं कहते, वे भी आज विरोध कर रहे हैं। तो हमें इस और ध्यान देना चाहिये कि हम मजदूरों को किस तरह से जस्टिस दिलायें। हमारे लेबर मिनिस्टर लेबर और मालिकों के रिलेशन्स (सम्बन्ध) अच्छे करने के लिये कोशिश कर रहे हैं। मैं समझती हूँ कि देश को समाजवाद की ओर ले जाने की जिम्मेवारी उनकी भी है। इसलिये मैं उनसे दरखास्त करती हूँ कि वे इस और ध्यान दें और इस तरफ तेजी से कदम उठायें। अगर दो चार रुपये का भी मामला होता है तो मजदूर को चार चार साल उसको फँसला कराने में लग जाते हैं। मैं चाहती हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट कोई ऐसी मेगिनरी बनाये कि ज्यों ज्यों प्रोडक्टिविटी (उत्पत्ति) बढ़ती जायें वैसे वैसे ही बिना स्ट्राइक (हड़ताल) के मजदूरों की वेजेंज बढ़ती जायें।

श्री आर० आर० शास्त्री (जिला कानपुर—
मध्य) माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मजदूर विभाग ऐसा विभाग है जिसका संचालन हिन्दुस्तान के अनुभवी मजदूर नेताओं के हाथ में है इसलिये हर एक व्यक्ति का यह खयाल है कि मजदूरों की समस्यायें श्रम मंत्रियों के सामने हैं और वे इन सब चीजों को अच्छी तरह समझते हैं।
2 P.M.

हमारी एक पंचवर्षीय योजना समाप्त हुई है और रीडम पंचवर्षीय योजना प्रारम्भ हो रही है। पंचवर्षीय योजना को कामयाब बनाने के लिये और राष्ट्र के उत्पादन को बढ़ाने के लिये मजदूरों का क्या महत्व है, इसके सम्बन्ध में कुछ अधिक कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मैं यह जरूर महसूस करता हूँ कि अब वक्त आ गया है कि जब सरकार, मिलमालिक और मजदूर, तीनों के दृष्टिकोण में एक परिवर्तन होना चाहिये और वह परिवर्तन यह कि वे अपने

अपने सक्शनल इंटरस्ट्स (क्षेत्रीय हित) को न देख कर यह देखें कि पूरा राष्ट्र हमारे सामने है, समूचे समाज की हमें सेवा करनी है और फिर उस दृष्टिकोण को लेकर हम काम करें।

सेकेंड फाइव इयर प्लान (द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना) में हमने देखा कि उन्होंने स्वीकार किया कि मजदूरों ने सच्चाई के साथ काम किया और राष्ट्र के उत्पादन को बढ़ाने का उन्होंने प्रयत्न किया। सवाल यह होता है कि अगर राष्ट्र का उत्पादन बढ़ता है और उसमें मजदूरों के सहयोग को स्वीकार किया जाता है तब उस उत्पादन में मजदूरों को कितना हिस्सा प्राप्त है और कहां तक उनको इस बात की प्रेरणा दी गई कि जैसे जैसे राष्ट्र का उत्थान होता जायेगा, जैसे जैसे समाज की हालत बदलती जायेगी, वैसे वैसे तुम्हारे जीवन में भी परिवर्तन आयेगा। जैसे कि अभी यहां पर बहुत से आंकड़े पेश करके इस बात को साबित किया गया कि राष्ट्र का उत्पादन जिस अनुपात में बढ़ा है, उसी अनुपात में मजदूरी नहीं बढ़ी है। सिर्फ ध्यान देने की बात एक है और वह यह कि ठीक तरीके पर मजदूरी का हिसाब नहीं लगाया जाता है। आप सदन में यह आंकड़े पेश करते हैं कि पहले एक मजदूर को १८ रुपये मिलते थे और अब उसको २० रुपये मिलते हैं और आप कहते हैं कि उसकी तनख्वाह पहले की अपेक्षा अब बढ़ गयी है लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसके साथ ही आपको उसकी मंहगाई भी जोड़नी पड़ेगी और आप को दूसरी चीजें भी जोड़नी पड़ेंगी और जैसा कि मजदूर कहते हैं कि उनकी रिअल वेजेज (असली मजूरी) नहीं बढ़ी है और उसकी ओर आपको ध्यान देना पड़ेगा। यह विवाद का विषय है कि मजदूर क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले लोग इस बात को तो महसूस करते हैं कि मजदूरों की तनख्वाह बढ़ी है लेकिन वास्तव में रिअल वेजेज मजदूरों की नहीं बढ़ी हैं जब कि हकूमत हमेशा आंकड़े पेश करके यह साबित करने की चेष्टा करती है कि मजदूरों की तनख्वाह बढ़ गई है, इसलिये मजदूर का हिस्सा उत्पादन में बढ़ गया है।

एक चीज मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि आप स्वीकार कर लें बजाय इसके कि उसको लेकर व्यवसाय के अन्दर कोई लड़ाई झगड़ा हो और बाद में जांच कमिशन बैठे और उसके बाद में आप वेतन की समस्या को हल करें, कहीं अच्छा हो कि आप इस बात को स्वीकार कर लें कि अब वक्त आ गया है कि जब हर एक व्यवसाय के अन्दर इस बात की जांच होनी चाहिये कि इस मौके पर मजदूरों को

कितना वेतन मिलना चाहिये। इसलिये मैं एक मांग यह पेश करता हूँ कि एक वेज कमिशन नियुक्त किया जाय और फिर विभिन्न व्यवसायों के अन्दर जांच की जाय कि मजदूरों को कितनी मजदूरी मिलनी चाहिये ताकि इस तरह के रोजमर्रा के झगड़े व्यवसायों में आपस में न हुआ करें। यह हो सकता है और इस मौके पर यह एक दलील दी जा सकती है कि हम एक नेशनल मिनिमम वेज फिक्स करने की बात करें, तो शायद इस पर यह एतराज होगा कि कहीं कोई हालत है तो किसी जगह की दूसरी हालत है और इसलिये एक नेशनल मिनिमम वेज (राष्ट्रीय न्यूनतम मजूरी) का गवर्नमेंट न माने लेकिन मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या हर व्यवसाय के लिए यह आप नहीं कर सकते हैं कि उसकी जांच करें और यह फिक्स करें कि फलां व्यवसाय में मजदूरों का वेतन इतना होगा।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह कि १९३९ के जमाने से लेकर इस वक्त तक आखिर को इतनी मंहगाई बढ़ी। मंहगाई, मैं यह मानता हूँ कि कभी कभी वह ऊपर नीचे जाती है लेकिन यह कोई उम्मीद नहीं कर सकता कि १९३९ के जमाने में जो मंहगाई थी वह उस जगह पहुंच जाय, यह नहीं हो पायेगा। इसलिये आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि मंहगाई का भत्ता और मजदूरी जो मजदूर को मिलती है, मंहगाई के भत्ते के हिस्से को हम मजदूर क्षेत्र के लोग यह मानते हैं कि ज्यादा कुछ नहीं, तो उसमें से ५० फी सेंकड़ा मजदूर के वेतन में अवश्य मिला दीजिये। मजदूर को अगर प्राविडेंट फंड, ग्रेजुएटी या और जो दूसरी सहूलियतें मिलती हैं, उसका सम्बन्ध बुनियादी तनख्वाह के साथ कर दिया जाता है। सही वाक्या तो यह है कि बुनियादी तनख्वाह तो बहुत कम है, मंहगाई का भत्ता ज्यादा मिलता है और मंहगाई के भत्ते को जो आप अलग रखते हैं तो उससे मजदूर का नुकसान होता है। इसलिये तरीका यह होना चाहिये कि ५० फी सेंकड़ा मंहगाई के भत्ते को आप वेतन के साथ जोड़ दीजिये जिसकी कि वजह से प्राविडेंट फंड, ग्रेजुएटी या दूसरी चीजों में मजदूरों को सहूलियत मिल जायगी और आज जो उसकी बुरी हालत है उसमें मुधार होने में कुछ सहूलियत हो जायगी।

जहां तक बोनस के प्रश्न का सम्बन्ध है, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बोनस का मसला एक ऐसा मसला है जिसको कि लेकर हर व्यवसाय में हर साल कुछ न कुछ मालिकों और मजदूरों में झगड़ा होता है। ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि हकूमत इस बात का फैसला करे और राष्ट्रव्यापी

[श्री अर० अर० शास्त्री]

ढंग से बोनस के बारे में कोई सिद्धान्त निश्चित करे और यह तय कर दिया जाय कि कारखाने के अन्दर अग्र उत्पादन बढ़ता है और मूनाफा होता है तो मजदूरों को उसमें से कितना हिस्सा मिलेगा, इस बात का निश्चय कर लेना चाहिये और ऐसा होने पर मजदूर दिल लगा कर काम करेगा और वह समझ जायगा कि इतना उत्पादन बढ़ने पर हमारी तनख्वाह इतनी बढ़ेगी और हमें इतना बोनस मिलेगा। आज इसका निश्चय न होने से रोजमर्रा इस तरह के लड़ाई झगड़े होते रहते हैं जिनसे कोई भी फायदा न तो समाज का होता है और न व्यवसाय के अन्दर इससे कोई फायदा होता है। साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी देखता हूँ कि यह बात अक्सर कही जाती है कि अग्र व्यवसाय की तरक्की करनी है तो रेशनेलाइजेशन (वैज्ञानिक) होना बहुत जरूरी है। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ रेशनेलाइजेशन करने की कोशिश की जाती है और जिस ढंग से मिलमालिक उसको शुरू करते हैं, उससे मजदूरों में असन्तोष पैदा होता है, और लड़ाई झगड़ा होता है, देश का नुकसान होता है और सब का नुकसान होता है। इसके कारण कानपुर में इतनी बड़ी मजदूरी की हड़ताल हुई जोकि अस्सी रोज तक जारी रही। हुकमत समझती है कि हमने गलती की और हम समझते हैं कि हुकमत की गलती थी लेकिन जो भी हो, रेशनेलाइजेशन के ईशू (विषय) को लेकर जो वहाँ पर हड़ताल चली और उस हड़ताल से राष्ट्र का काफी नुकसान हुआ, इसमें कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता। अग्र आप रेशनेलाइजेशन करना चाहते हैं, तो इस बात की जांच कर लीजिये और इसके लिये हाईकोर्ट के किसी जज को आप बैठाल दीजिये, इस मांग को आप न मानें और २० रोज की हड़ताल के बाद आप हमको मानें, यह मुनासिब नहीं है। अस्सी रोज की हड़ताल के बाद आपने हमारी मांग को माना और अब कानपुर की रेशनेलाइजेशन कमेटी की जांच हो रही है। नागपुर में न मालूम कितने दिनों से हड़ताल चल रही है और मेरा यह खयाल है कि जहाँ जहाँ ऐसी बात होगी वहाँ वहाँ झगड़ा बढ़ेगा। मैं नहीं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह का रोज रोज का झगड़ा बढ़े और उससे हमारे राष्ट्र का नुकसान हो। इसलिये मेरी यह राय है कि सारे देश के लिये सेंटर से एक कंट्रोल बोर्ड बनना चाहिये, एक हाई पावर कमेटी आप नियुक्त कीजिये जो रेशनेलाइजेशन के मसले पर आपस में बहस कर और उसके लिये कोई एक सिद्धान्त

निर्धारित करे ताकि देश के किसी भी कोने से और किसी भी व्यवसाय के अन्दर इस रेशनेलाइजेशन के मसले को लेकर झगड़ा न बढ़ने पाये। हम चाहते हैं कि उसके लिये सिद्धान्त पहले से बने हों और उन्हीं के अनुसार सब जगह पर काम हो। हम रेशनेलाइजेशन के विरोधी नहीं हैं लेकिन जिस तरीके की मशीनों पर और जिस तरीके पर मिल मालिक रेशनेलाइजेशन करते हैं उससे मजदूरों को कोई फायदा नहीं होता और इसीलिये हम चाहते हैं कि उसके लिये कोई सिद्धान्त बनाने चाहिये ॥

जहाँ तक छंटनी का ताल्लुक है आज हम देख रहे हैं कि हमारे देश में बेकारी बढ़ रही है और यह तब बढ़ रही है जब कि हमारे देश में उत्पादन बढ़ रहा है। सरकारी रीपोर्ट के अनुसार आज हमारे देश में बेकारी बढ़ती चली जाती है, प्राइवेट सेक्टर में ही नहीं, पब्लिक सेक्टर में भी बेकारी की समस्या मौजूद है और अभी हमने देखा कि डिफेंस विभाग की मदों पर जब इस सदन में बहस हुई तो इस बात का जिक्र आया कि आर्डिनेंस डिपोज में सिविलियन मजदूरों की बेकारी की समस्या आ खड़ी हुई है और उनकी छंटनी का सवाल पेश है। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि आपको इस छंटनी को रोकना है और देश से बेकारी को बूर करना है और उस हालत में जब आप एक तरफ तो यह कहते हैं कि हम नये नये कामों में २० लाख नये मजदूरों को काम देंगे, तब जो आदमी पहले से काम पर लगे हुए हैं उनको जो आप नाकगियों से निकाल रहे हैं वह कुछ ममझ में नहीं आता है और उसके होते हुए कैसे हमारे दिल से उत्साह पैदा हो सकता है, यह चीज ममझ में नहीं आती है।

एक बात रेशनेलाइजेशन को लेकर मुझे और याद आ गई और वह यह है कि जहाँ आप मजदूरों का रेशनेलाइजेशन करते हैं तमाम मशीनरी का रेशनेलाइजेशन आपने शुरू कर दिया है वहाँ आप मालिकों का जो प्रबन्ध होता है, जो मैनजमेंट होता है उसका रेशनेलाइजेशन आप क्यों नहीं स्वीकार करते हैं? वहाँ पर जो मिल का मालिक होता है वही चीज खरीदता है और अपने ढंग से अपना कारोबार चलाता है और वही सारे शो (काम) का मैनजमेंट करता है और उसमें अपने लड़के बच्चों को हजारों रुपये तनख्वाह देता है, भले ही वह लड़का मैट्रिक पास क्यों न हो, लाखों रुपये व्यवसाय के अन्दर में लग जाते हैं, तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं है कि आप इस बात को देखें कि यह

जो व्यवसाय चलाया जा रहा है, और जो उसका मैनेजमेंट हो रहा है उसका इंतजाम सही है या गलत है? आप चाहे दुनिया भर का इंतजाम क्यों न कर लीजिये और दूसरी सारी समस्याएँ क्यों न हल कर लीजिये लेकिन अगर मैनेजमेंट दुस्त नहीं है तो आप कभी भी उस व्यवसाय को सफलतापूर्वक नहीं चला सकते। इस लिये उसके मैनेजमेंट के रेशनेलाइजेशन की आज आवश्यकता है।

मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि हमारे श्रम मंत्री जी इस बात से सन्तुष्ट हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में मालिकों और मजदूरों के झगड़े कम हैं और चूँकि झगड़े कम हैं इसलिये श्रम विभाग की जो नीति है वह बिलकुल सही है और मजदूर उस से सन्तुष्ट हैं। पिछले साल जब सदन में बहस हुई थी तो श्रम मंत्री जी ने यह कहा था कि सन् १९४७ में इतनी हड़तालें हुईं और इतने दिनों का नुकसान हुआ, सन् १९५४ में इतनी हड़तालें हुईं और इतने दिनों का नुकसान हुआ। और चूँकि कम हड़तालें हुईं इसलिये उन्होंने साबित किया कि हमारी श्रम नीति सही है। उन के तर्क को मैं यों पेश करता हूँ, और उनकी रीपोर्ट से ही पेश करता हूँ, कि सन् १९५३ में ८२४ हड़तालें हुईं और २५ लाख दिनों का नुकसान हुआ, १९५४ में ८६५ हड़ताले हुईं और २८ लाख दिनों का नुकसान हुआ, १९५५ में ९२१ झगड़े हुए और ४८ लाख दिनों का नुकसान हुआ। चूँकि हमारे यहां इतनी इतनी हड़तालें हुईं और इतने इतने दिनों का नुकसान हुआ तो माननीय मंत्री जी की रीपोर्ट के मुताबिक मैं कह सकता हूँ कि अबकी बार वह क्या कहेंगे। मैं इसी दलील के मुताबिक, जिस से उन्होंने सन् १९५४ में साबित किया था कि चूँकि सन १९४७ के मुकाबले में हड़तालें कम हुईं इस लिये उन की नीति सफल हुई, स्वीकार करने को तैयार हूँ कि चूँकि सन् १९५५ में झगड़े बढ़ते चले गये हैं और दिनों का नुकसान होता चला गया है इसलिये उनकी नीति असफल रही है। यह इस बात का सबूत है कि श्रम नीति में कहीं न कहीं कोई खराबी है। इस लिये मैं और भी महसूस करता हूँ कि इस ओर ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है।

सैकेन्ड फाइव इमर प्लेन में यह बात स्वीकार की गई है कि जो वर्क्स कमेटियां आप की काम कर रही हैं वे ठीक तरह से काम नहीं कर रही हैं। मैं भी कुछ दिन पहले श्रम मंत्री जी से मिला था और उन्होंने इसको स्वीकार किया था

कि रेलवे है, डिफेंस है और कई और जगहें [हैं] जहां पर जितनी वर्क्स कमेटियां (कार्य समितियां) हैं वह सन्तोष जनक रूप से काम नहीं कर रही हैं। क्यों नहीं काम कर रही हैं ठीक से इस पर आप को विचार करना पड़ेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि वर्क्स कमेटियों के ऊपर जिम्मेदारी डालनी चाहिये। मेरी राय में अगर उनका काम जितना होना चाहिये अगर वह ठीक नहीं होगा तो वह कभी भी सफल नहीं होंगी।

आखीर में एक बात कह कर समाप्त कर दूंगा। आप को ट्रेड यूनियन के प्रति अपना रवैया बदलना चाहिये, मालिकों का भी और सरकार का भी। हड़तालों से देश की समस्या हल नहीं होती, मुकदमे बाजी से देश की समस्या हल नहीं होती, न झगड़े ही खत्म होते हैं। अब बक्त आ गया है जब कि मालिक और मजदूर दोनों आमने सामने बैठें, अपनी अपनी मुसीबतें एक दूसरे के सामने पेश करें और मामलों को हल करें। इसके लिये आवश्यक है कि मजबूत और शक्तिशाली मजदूर सभायें हों। लेकिन अगर मजदूर क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले मजदूरों को वहां काम करने के कारण नौकरियों से हटा दिया जायगा, तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि ट्रेड यूनियनों कैसे चल सकेंगी? अगर उन की सिक्योरिटी नहीं होगी तो वे कैसे मजदूर सभाओं में भाग ले सकेंगे? हां आप इस बात को सोचिये कि कौन सी यूनियन को माना जाय और किसको न माना जाय। मेरी समझ में इसका एक ही तरीका है कि चुनाव कराइये और उस से इस बात का पता लगा लीजिये कि कौन सी यूनियन को आप मानें और कौन सी को आप न मानें। मैं श्रम मंत्री जी से यही प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि आप की आंखों के सामने सब यूनियनों एक समान होनी चाहियें। जिस यूनियन में मजदूरों का विश्वास हो, उस को माना जाय। हमारी यू० पी० की गवर्नमेंट एक यूनियन को मानती थी, दूसरी यूनियन के लोगों ने इस का चैलेंज किया। वोटस लिये गये, एक यूनियन २७,००० वोट्स (मत) से हार गई। तो बजाय इसके कि वर्क्स कमेटी दूसरी यूनियनों के हाथ में दी जाती, सारी वर्क्स कमेटी को ही खत्म कर दीया गया। अभी मुझे मालूम हुआ कि बिहार के डाल्मियां नगर में दो यूनियनों चल रही हैं। एक तो आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० की है और दूसरी हिन्द मजदूर सभा की। आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० की यूनियन को लगातार सात, आठ वर्षों से

[श्री आर० आर० शास्त्री]

स्वीकार किया जा रहा है। दूसरी यूनियन वालों ने उस को चैलेंज (चुनौती) किया। हो सकता है कि जो कुछ मैं कह रहा हूँ वह गलत हो, और मंत्री जी ठीक ठीक चीज को बतलायेंगे, लेकिन वहाँ के आंकड़े यह हैं। वहाँ पूरे के पूरे वोट्स ४,५०० थे जो कि पड़ने थे। उन में से ३,७६० वोट पड़े। जिन में से ३,४८१ वोट तो हिन्द मजदूर सभा को पड़े और ३०९ वोट आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० को मिले। जिस यूनियन को सिर्फ ३०९ वोट मिले वह तो आज सात आठ वर्ष से रिकग्नाइज्ड अभिज्ञात है, लेकिन जिस यूनियन का साढ़े तीन हजार वोट मिले वह रिकग्नाइज्ड नहीं है।

अम उपमंत्री (श्री आबिद अली) : कहां रिकग्नाइज्ड है ?

पंडित एस० सी० मिश्र (मुंगेर उत्तर पूर्व) : डाल्मिया नगर में।

Shri Namblar : That is the policy of Government.

श्री आर० आर० शास्त्री : मैं गवर्नमेंट की एक बात के लिये तारीफ करूंगा, और मुझे यह विश्वास है, कि वह डिमांडेरी (प्रजातंत्र) में विश्वास करती है, दोनों ही मिनिस्टर भी सोशलिज्म में विश्वास करते हैं इसलिये वह इसको स्वीकार करेंगे कि जिस यूनियन के पक्ष में ६० परसेन्ट (प्रतिशत) वोट जाते हैं उसको रिकग्नाइज्ड करना चाहिये। और इसी उमूल को हिन्दुस्तान के हर व्यवसाय के अन्दर लागू करना चाहिये कि मजदूरों का जिम यूनियन में विश्वास हो उसको ही वास्तव में रिप्रजेन्टेटिव यूनियन मानना चाहिये।

सिर्फ इतनी बात और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज ट्रान्सपोर्ट का बहुत बड़ा महत्व है। आज हम पंचवर्षीय योजना में योग देने जा रहे हैं और ट्रान्सपोर्ट में लगातार साढ़े तीन या चार लाख कर्मचारी काम करते हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से उम्मीद करूंगा वह उन की सर्विस कांडिशनस को ठीक करने के लिये तैयार होंगे। मजदूरी का भी कोई कानून बनना चाहिये और इसकी तरफ भी आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिये कि जो कुछ हो वह पब्लिक सेक्टर और प्राइवेट सेक्टर दोनों के लिये हो। कहीं ऐसा न हो जाय कि पब्लिक सेक्टर के लिये तो कानून बन जायें और प्राइवेट सेक्टर को उससे दूर रखा जाय। कानून बनाया जाय और प्राइवेट और पब्लिक दोनों सेक्टरों पर लागू किया जाय।

हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी शायद इस बात को सुन कर नाराज तो होंगे, लेकिन मैं यह जरूर चाहता हूँ कि कुछ बक एम्प्लायीज (कर्मचारी) के लिये भी यहां कह दूँ। बैंक एम्प्लायीज काफी सफर (भुगतान) कर चुके हैं। उन के लिये नियम बना कर आप से बड़ा भारी काम किया है। लेकिन आप ने बताया है कि जो उनकी तन्स्वाह कटा करती थी वह अब भविष्य में नहीं कटेगी। लेकिन अगर आप कोशिश करें तो क्या यह सम्भव नहीं है कि जिनकी तन्स्वाह को काटने का फैसला किया जा चुका है उन को उस के कटने से बचाया जा सके ? यह बात आपने अच्छी की कि किसी की तन्स्वाह आगे नहीं कटेगी, लेकिन जिन लोगों की पहले से ही सजा के तौर पर तन्स्वाह काटी जा चुकी है उन के डिस्कॉन्टमेंट (असंतोष) को मिटा दिया जाय ताकि बैंक एम्प्लायीज के आपस के सम्बन्ध भी अच्छी तरह चल सकें। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो बैंक एम्प्लायीज का राष्ट्रीय संगठन है उस को साथ ले कर एक ट्राइपार्टाइट (त्रिदलीय समिति) बना दी जाय और उनके सारे झगड़ों को हल किया जाय। मैं सही भावना से विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि जितने मजदूर संगठन हैं देश में वे सब राष्ट्रीयता और देशभक्ति की भावना से प्रेरित हो कर ही काम करते हैं। अगर आज सरकार का दृष्टिकोण मजदूरों के पक्ष में बदलता है तो मैं कह सकता हूँ कि मजदूर भी आज देशभक्ति की भावना से प्रेरित हो कर पूरे समाज की उन्नति करने के लिये तैयार हैं और हमेशा तैयार रहेगा। अगर आज राष्ट्रीय उन्नति की भावना को लेकर सारे काम किये जायें तो मुझे कोई वजह नहीं मालूम होती कि हमारी पंच वर्षीय योजना मफल न हो और हम जो उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहते हैं उस में हम कामयाब न हों।

Shri P. C. Bose (Manbhum—North): It is quite evident from the report of the Labour Ministry that with the development of industries and various other projects including the river valley projects, the scope of activities and the responsibilities of the Labour Ministry have enormously increased. And there is no doubt that they will further increase, with the implementation of the Second Five Year Plan projects.

The Labour Ministry have to their credit a number of legislations and schemes for the welfare of the labourers. I do not want to enumerate all the new legislations that have been passed by this House nor do I want to go into the details of their working, as some of

Service conditions of motor transport workers

Shri N. B. Chowdhury : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need to improve the relations between mine labourers and employers in Barajamda area.

Shri Deogam (Chaibassa—Reserved Sch. Tribes) : I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Chief Inspector of Mines' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Maintenance of roads in mining area around Bara-jamda.

Shri Deogam : I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Chief Inspector of Mines' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Violations of the safety regulations in Mines

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Chief Inspector of Mines' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Inadequacy of deterrent punishment and prosecution for infringement of Mines Act.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Chief Inspector of Mines' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Lack of housing and other amenities for coal miners

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head "Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Need to check corruption in the Exchange offices

Shri Boovaraghasamy : I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Employment Exchanges and Resettlement' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : These cut motions are now before the House.

श्री आबिद अली : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, मुझे इस बात की खुशी है

Shri Namblar : It can be in English; yesterday, the Speaker mentioned that . .

Shri B. S. Murthy : If the hon. Minister is speaking in English, the Deputy Minister can speak in Hindi.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I would not have any objection if they, between themselves, divide like that. I would welcome that. But, I cannot ask him to speak in a particular language. If he chooses to do so, I will have no objection.

An Hon. Member : Division of labour.

ठाकुर युगल किशोर सिंह (मुजफ्फरपुर—उत्तर पश्चिम) : कुछ ऐसे सदस्य भी तो हैं जो केवल हिन्दी ही समझते हैं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Now, when the hon. Members have given a suggestion it is for the Minister to accept it or not.

श्री आबिद अली : आज काफी भाषण हिन्दी में हुए हैं और मेरे सीनियर क्लर्क (बरिष्ठ साथी) देसाई साहब अंग्रेजी में बोलेंगे, इसलिये मैं हिन्दी में बोलने की इजाजत चाहता हूँ ।

मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि मुझे खुशी इस बात की है कि श्रम मंत्रालय के काम के सम्बंध में कोई विरोध या ऐतराज नहीं पाया गया । यह तो विषय सामने है और उसपर कुछ कहना चाहिए । माननीय सदस्यों ने जो कुछ कहा है वह बहुत जरूरी भी था । जहां तक हो सकेगा उनकी सूचनाओं के ऊपर अमल करने की कोशिश की जायेगी । लेकिन मैं यह कह रहा था कि बहुत विरोध नहीं हुआ । इससे खुशी हुई लेकिन संतोष नहीं हुआ । माननीय सदस्य यह भी समझ रहे हैं कि जितना हम कर सकते थे उतना करने की कोशिश की गयी है । बहुत किया है पर उससे बहुत ज्यादा करना है । यह हम भी मानते हैं । अभी शास्त्री जी ने फरमाया है कि हमको संतोष हो जाया करता है । लेकिन यह बात सही नहीं है । मैं आज कह चुका हूँ कि हमको संतोष नहीं होता है । जितना यह बड़ा काम है और जितनी समस्याएँ हैं उनका हमको पूरा ख्याल है और उनके लिये कोशिश तो जारी रहनी ही चाहिए ।

[श्री आबिद अली]

यहां पर जो बातें कही गयी हैं उनके बारे में थोड़ा अर्ज कर देना चाहता हूँ। खास तौर से मैं रिअल वेज (वास्तविक मजूरी) के बारे में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। इसके बारे में श्री तुषार चटर्जी साहब ने और शास्त्री जी ने भी फरमाया था। हमारा यह मतलब नहीं है कि पहले ४० रुपये मिलते थे और अब ६० मिलते हैं इसलिए हम कहते हैं कि रिअल वेज (वास्तविक मजूरी) बढ़ गयी है। शास्त्री जी ने भी फरमाया था कि रिअल वेज कितनी बढ़ी है। जब सन् १९४३ और ४४ के आंकड़ों से तुलना की जाती है सन् १९५० और ५४ के आंकड़ों से तो मालूम होता है कि रिअल वेज ४३ पर सेंट (प्रतिशत) बढ़ी है। पांच वरस में ४३ पर सेंट (प्रतिशत) यानी एक वरस में ८.६ पर सेंट। अब इसके मुकाबले में सन् ४३ और ४४ से सन् १९५० और ५४ में उत्पादन १४ पर सेंट बढ़ा है। आप देखें कि रिअल वेज ४३ पर सेंट बढ़ी है और उत्पादन १४ पर सेंट बढ़ा है। यानी रिअल वेज हर साल ८.६ पर सेंट बढ़ी और उत्पादन हर साल २.८ पर सेंट बढ़ा।

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty : From where are these figures given? Every time the figures are changed.

श्री आबिद अली : I am quoting from Vol. XIII of the Indian Labour Gazette, No. 5, pages 335-36.

इसी तरह से न मालूम किस आधार पर माननीय सदस्यों ने यह कहा कि काम करने वालों की संख्या कम हो रही है। सन् १९३९ में १६,१८,००० काम करने वाले थे, सन् १९५० में २५,००,००० और सन् १९५४ में २५,९०,००० वर्कर (श्रमजीवी) फैक्टरीज में काम करते थे। इसके अलावा जो नये नये काम हुए हैं जैसे रिवर वैली प्रोजेक्ट्स (नदी घाटी योजना) वगैरह उनमें भी बहुत बड़ी संख्या में मजदूर काम कर रहे हैं।

माननीय टंडन जी ने जो फरमाया उसके बारे में मैं अर्ज करूँ कि जब वह बम्बई की मिल का जिक्र कर रहे थे उस वक्त मुझे भी अपना बचपना याद आया। आज से शायद ४१ या ४२ वर्ष पहले मैं कानपुर की एक मिल में मामूली मजदूर की हैसियत से काम करता था। तो मैं माननीय टंडन जी से यह अर्ज करूँगा कि इस चीज को हम भूल तो सकते ही नहीं क्योंकि इस बारे में हमारा प्रत्यक्ष

अनुभव है। उस जमाने में यह होता था कि सुरज मिल में निकलता था और मिल में ही डूबता था। और और भी जो कठिनाइयाँ थीं उनका मैं ने प्रत्यक्ष अनुभव किया है। उसके बाद ट्रेड यूनियन (कामिक संघ) में भी काम किया है। तो सन् १९१४ से आज.....

Shri Nambiar : In which year were you working as a worker in Kanpur mills?

Shri Abid Ali : From 1914 to 1916, in a Kanpur mill as an ordinary unskilled labourer.

Shri Nambiar : Very good; from worker to a Minister. I am happy.

श्री आबिद अली : Thank you; I am also happy that you are happy.

उसके बाद सन् १९१४-१५ से सन् १९५६ तक इसी काम में रहा हूँ। तो उसका जो अनुभव हुआ है उसका सदुपयोग करने की कोशिश हो रही है। ख्याल यह है कि संगठन बहुत मजबूत हुआ है और राष्ट्र की स्वतंत्रता के बाद होना भी चाहिए था। और मजदूरों को उसका फायदा भी पूरा होना चाहिए। देश की उन्नति हो यह तो जरूरी है लेकिन केवल उतने से तो संतोष नहीं है। देश की उन्नति के साथ ही साथ जितने शहरी हैं उनको उसी पैमाने पर उसका लाभ भी होना चाहिए तभी तो देश की उन्नति सच्ची उन्नति मानी जायेगी। इसी चीज को श्रम मंत्रालय और गवर्नमेंट सामने रखते हैं। और ऐसा करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। माननीय सदस्य श्री सोमानी जी ने जो थोड़ी सी तारीफ कर दी उससे हमारी बहिन सुभद्रा जी भड़क गयीं। लेकिन इसकी बजह मालूम नहीं हुई। हो सकता है कि कोई शस्स जो कि उनसे सहमत न हो वह कहीं पर कह दे कि सुभद्रा बहिन, कल आपने फलां काम बहुत अच्छा किया था तो उससे परेशान होने की कोई बात नहीं होनी चाहिए। लेकिन श्रम मंत्रालय का जो कर्तव्य है उसमें किसी के कुछ कहने से फर्क नहीं आता है। हमारा मतलब सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं है कि जब कोई मजदूर संगठन करे और स्ट्राइक (हड़ताल) का नोटिस दे तो हम वहां पहुंच जायें और उनमें आपस में समझौता करा दें। यह बात नहीं है। हम चाहते हैं कि मजदूरों का संगठन बहुत मजबूत हो। हम चाहते हैं कि उद्योग बहुत उन्नति करे और मजदूर और उद्योगपतियों के सम्बन्ध बहुत मीठे हों जिससे कि उद्योग और देश की तरक्की

हो। और उस तरकीब में मजदूरों का जितना हक है वह भी उनको पूरा मिले। इसी तरीके की कोशिश हो रही है।

रिक्शा के बारे में हमारे मोहतरिम (माननीय) टंडन जी ने एक पत्र मुझे भेजा था। मैं ने बड़े उत्साह से उसका जवाब दिया और मैं समझता था कि टंडन जी उससे खुश होंगे कि हम रिक्शा चलाना बन्द कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मुझे यह जानकर आश्चर्य हुआ कि वह इस चीज को जारी रखना चाहते हैं। लेकिन यह तो कोई प्राचीन चीज नहीं है। यह तो अभी हाल में ही शुरू हुई है जिस तरह कि उन्होंने रेल का जिक्र किया। यह रिक्शा तो रेल के बाद आया है। रेगे कमिटी की रिपोर्ट तो माननीय सदस्य ने पढ़ी होगी। उसमें लिखा है कि जो जवान आदमी रिक्शा चलाते हैं उनकी सात से लेकर दस साल की उम्र कम हो जाती है। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें इसको रोकना चाहिए। लेकिन हम यह नहीं कर रहे हैं कि आज जो लोग रिक्शा चला रहे हैं उनको रिक्शा चलाने से एक दम रोक दिया जाये। योजना यह है कि आगे रिक्शा के लाइसेंस न दिये जायें और आहिस्ता आहिस्ता रिक्शा घटते जायें। देश में बड़े बड़े काम हो रहे हैं ये लोग उनमें चले जायें इस तरह की हमारी योजना है।

रेल के बारे में आनरेबल (माननीय) सदस्य ने जिक्र किया कि रेल की वजह से हजारों लोग बेकार हो गये। लेकिन साथ ही साथ साढ़े नौ लाख लोग सीधे रेलवे में काम भी तो कर रहे हैं और इसके अलावा दो तीन लाख और आदमियों को उस सम्बन्ध में काम मिला हुआ है। गंदे काम के करने वालों का यहां पर जिक्र किया गया उसके बारे में मेरा कहना यह है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में तो पाखाना साफ करने वालों को हलालखोर कहते हैं। वही एक काम ऐसा है जिसके करने वालों को हलालखोर कहा जाता है। इन गंदे काम करने वाले आदमियों की तरफ समाज की दृष्टि में तब बदलाव आया जब गांधी जी ने देशवासियों को ललकार कर कहा कि आप अब तक जिसको पतित समझते आये हैं, वह तो वास्तव में पावन है और यह आपकी सरासर भूल है जो गंदगी करनेवाले को तो आप पावन समझते हो लेकिन जो गंदगी को साफ करने वाला है उसको आप पतित समझते हो, इस तरह से गांधी जी ने समाज की दृष्टि में तबदीली की। अब जहां

तक उनके द्वारा यह काम किये जाने या न किये जाने का ताल्लक है, वह न हो तो अच्छा ही है लेकिन वगैर यह काम हुए तो चलेगा भी नहीं।

मोटरोँ के इस देश में बाहर से मंगाये जाने के सम्बन्ध में जो यहां पर कहा गया, उसके बारे में मैं उनको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि अब बाहर के देशों से मोटरोँ का मगांना काफी हद तक बंद हो गया है और अब हमारे देश के भीतर ही मोटर निर्माण का कार्य चल रहा है।

श्री के० पी० त्रिपाठी ने ट्राइब्युनल (न्यायाधिकरण) के सम्बन्ध में जो देर लगने के बारे में फरमाया और देर लगने की बाबत कुछ दूसरे साहबान ने भी फरमाया है, तो मैं उन साहबान को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक धनबाद में केन्द्रीय मजदूर ट्राइब्युनल (न्यायाधिकरण) का सम्बन्ध है, वहां पर एग्जेक डिस्पोजल (श्रीसतन निपटारा) पांच महीने में हो जाया करता है जब कि लखनऊ में तीन ही महीने में डिस्पोजल हुआ है और इतनी जल्दी वहां पर डिस्पोजल इसलिए संभव हो सका है क्योंकि वहां पर ट्राइब्युनल ने थोड़े ही दिन पहले अपना काम शुरू किया है और चूंकि उनके पास पेंडिंग केसेज (निलम्बित मामले) नहीं थे इसलिए तीन महीने के अन्दर डिस्पोजल हो सका है। जहां तक केन्द्रीय श्रम मंत्रालय का सम्बन्ध है कंसिलियेशन आफिसर्स लेबर इंस्पेक्टर्स एंड रीजनल लेबर कमिश्नर्स समझौते पदाधिकारियों (श्रम निरीक्षकों तथा प्रादेशिक श्रम आयुक्त) को हम खुद हिदायत दे रहे हैं कि जहां तक हो सके मामले जल्दी फसल किये जायें और केसेज के डिस्पोजल पर कम से कम वक्त लिया जाय। मैं मानता हूँ कि बड़े बड़े केसेज में देर होती है लेकिन इसके लिये यह कह देना कि यह तरीका गलत है और इसीलिए यह देर होती है, यह बहुत सही नहीं होगा क्योंकि लेबर युनियंस (श्रम संघों) की मार्फत काम करने से भी काफी हमारा वक्त उसमें लग जाता है और वक्त देना भी पड़ता है। अब तो इसके लिये नया तरीका आ रहा है और उसके बारे में एक बिल भी सभा में पेश हो चुका है।

श्री आर० आर० शास्त्री : इस सेशन में क्या उस बिल पर विचार होगा ?

श्री आशिष बस्ती : यह तो माननीय सदस्यों के हाथ में है। जहाँ तक हमारा सम्बन्ध है हम तो चाहते हैं कि यह बिल आज ही पास हो जाय लेकिन यहाँ जो कुछ मामला है वह आप जानते हैं और यह भी जानते हैं कि इसमें क्यों देर लग रही है? हर एक सवाल पर जो कि यहाँ पेश किया जाता है उस पर विचार करने के लिये कुछ घंटों का समय निश्चित किया जाता है और जैसा कि मैंने पहले कहा कि यह माननीय सदस्यों के हाथ में है कि जब यह बिल यहाँ पर विचार के लिए पेश हो तो इस पर कम समय लें ताकि यह जल्दी पास हो जाय, और यह बिजनेस ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी (कार्य मंत्रणा समिति) के हाथ में है कि इस बिल को हाउस में जल्दी पेश करवाये ताकि यह बिल जल्दी से जल्दी पास हो जाय। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल के पास हो जाने से बहुत सी बातें जिनका कि जिक्र किया गया है, देर बगैरह की, वह खुद ब खुद टल जाती हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य ने इसका जिक्र किया था कि एक हजार रुपया या कुछ थोड़ा सा दंड अर्बाड पर ठीक तरह से भ्रमल न करने के लिए हो जाता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने शायद उस बिल की दफा १० की तरफ गौर नहीं किया है जो कि बिल यहाँ पर पेश किया जा चुका है और जिसमें कि ६ महीने तक की सजा रखी गई है कि अगर मैंने जमेट कोई ऐवाड (पचांट) बगैरह पर ठीक से भ्रमल न करे तो उसको ६ महीने की सजा हो सकती है, जर्मना भी हो सकता है या सजा और जर्मना दोनों भी हो सकते हैं, जैसा भी कोर्ट फैसला करे। इन हालात में मुझे उम्मीद है कि अब कोई शिकायत की गुंजाईश नहीं रहती है।

जहाँ तक डी० वी० सी० में रिट्रेचमेंट (छंटनी) का ताल्लुक है, उसके मुताल्लिक एक सदस्य ने फ़रमाया कि इसके बारे में खाता खुलना चाहिए था जिसके मार्फ़त यह काम हो। मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमने यह काम शुरू कर दिया है और एक बहुत सीनियर अफ़सर (बारष्ट पदाधिकारी) मुक़र्रर कर दिया गया है जो कि देखता रहेगा कि कहाँ कहाँ नया काम शुरू होने वाला है और कहाँ कहाँ के लोग बेकार होने वाले हैं और जहाँ नया काम शुरू होने वाला है, वहाँ के लिए उस जगह से, जहाँ कि काम ख़त्म हो रहा है, जो काम करने वाले उधर जाना चाहते हैं पहले उनको लिया

जमया, प्रलभता अगर वह उस नये काम पर नहीं जाना चाहते तो मजदूरी है और जो काम नया हो रहा है उसमें योग्य भादमी पुराने काम करने वालों में नहीं मिल सकते हैं तो नये भादमी रखे जायेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह की व्यवस्था से काफ़ी माननीय सदस्यों को संतोष होगा।

एम्पलाईज स्टेट इंश्योरेंस कारपोरेशन (कर्म-चारी राज्य बीमा विभाग) के बारे में मजदूरों को कुछ नहीं देना चाहिए, यह जो सूचना आप देते हैं, यह बिलकुल अनुचित है और यह कहना कि इस स्टेट इंश्योरेंस कारपोरेशन के आने से पहले मजदूरों को मुफ़्त दवा मिलती थी, यह भी बात बहुत सच नहीं है। यह मैं मानता हूँ कि थोड़ी जगहों पर किसी किसी इक्के इक्के कारखानों में रोजमर्रा की मामूली दवाइयों को देने की सहूलियत रही हो, इस तरह की सहूलियत शायद बहुत से कारखानों में रही होगी लेकिन जहाँ तक कि अस्पताल का ताल्लुक (सम्बन्ध) है, यानी जहाँ तक कि अस्पताल में रोगी को रखने व इलाज करने का ताल्लुक है, इस तरह की व्यवस्था पहले नहीं थी। एम्पलाईज स्टेट इंश्योरेंस कारपोरेशन के बनने के बाद से महंगी से महंगी दवा जो किसी करोड़पति को मयस्सर (उपलब्ध) हो सकती है, वह सब क़ीमती से क़ीमती दवाएँ मजदूरों को हस्व जरूरत दी जाती हैं और इसके अलावा मजदूरों को इस स्टेट इंश्योरेंस कारपोरेशन की मार्फ़त कैश बनिफिट (नकदलाभ) भी मिलता है। खयाल यह है कि थोड़ा सा चंदा जो इसके लिए उनसे लिया जाता है उसके मुकाबले में जो उनको फ़ायदा हासिल होता है वह बहुत ज्यादा होता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि वे माननीय सदस्य खुद भी इस चीज़ को मानते होंगे क्योंकि कारपोरेशन से उनका भी सम्बन्ध है, लेकिन इस पर भी मालूम नहीं उन्होंने इसकी बाबत ऐसा क्यों कहा और मुझे तो उनकी बात को सुनकर जरा ताज्जुब हुआ....

श्री आर० आर० शास्त्री : क्या यह मेडिकल बनिफिट फैसिलिटिज (चिकित्सा की सुविधायें) उनकी फ़ैमिलीज (परिवारों) पर भी लागू करने का विचार किया जा रहा है?

श्री आशिष बस्ती : जी हाँ, वह भी होगा और यह सहूलियत मेडिकल की उनकी फ़ैमिलीज को भी दी जायगी।

में दूसरी बात यह कह रहा था कि कई जगह से इस बात की मांग आती है कि एम्प्लाइज स्टेट कारपोरेशन का काम वहाँ पर जारी किया जाय और कुछ समय में नहीं आता कि उसी ग्रुप के लोग जिस ग्रुप (वर्ग) के कि माननीय सदस्य हैं, उस ग्रुप के लोग इस बात की मांग करते हैं कि जहाँ इसको जारी नहीं किया गया है वहाँ भी उसको जारी किया जाय और दूसरी तरफ हम देखते हैं कि जहाँ पर यह रायज (लागू) है वहाँ के लिए कहते हैं कि मजदूरों को यह पसन्द नहीं है, यह दोनों बातों कैसे साथ साथ चल सकती हैं? जहाँ इस तरह की कारपोरेशन नहीं है, वहाँ के लिए नाराजगी जाहिर करते हैं कि वहाँ पर क्यों नहीं आई और जहाँ रायज है वहाँ के लिए कहते हैं कि यह चीज नामुनासिब है, यह दोनों बातों एक साथ नहीं चल सकतीं...

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (जिला गोरखपुर—दक्षिण) : जहाँ पर यह स्कीम (योजना) लागू है, वहाँ से आपके पास इस सम्बन्ध में क्या रिपोर्ट आती है ?

श्री आबिद अली : यह स्कीम जहाँ पर लागू है वहाँ के मजदूर इस सहूलियत से बहुत खुश हैं और जो दबाएँ उनको मिलती हैं और जो डाक्टरी सहायता उनको मिलती है उससे बहुत खुश हैं और उन जगहों पर जहाँ कि अभी यह स्कीम चालू नहीं हुई है वहाँ के मजदूरों को चूँकि यह मालूम हो गया है कि यह स्कीम और जगह चालू है और कितनी फायदेमंद है इसलिए उनकी तरफ से मांग आती है कि इस स्कीम को उनके वहाँ भी लागू किया जाय। लेकिन मैं इससे भी इंकार नहीं करता कि कभी कभी एक आध आबाज इस स्कीम के विरोध में भी उठ जाती है।

जूट (पटसन) मिलों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों की बेकारी के बारे में भी यहाँ पर जिक्र किया गया। जहाँ तक इस सम्बन्ध से आंकड़ों का ताल्लुक है, उसके अनुसार सन् १९५३ में २ लाख, ४८ हजार मजदूर काम करते थे, सन् ५४ में २ लाख, ४७ हजार और सन् ५५ में भी २ लाख, ४७ हजार मजदूर काम करते थे तो इन दो वर्षों के आंकड़ों को देखते हुए सन् ५३, ५४ में एक हजार का फर्क है और ५४, ५५ में तो वही २ लाख, ४७ हजार मजदूर काम कर रहे हैं

श्री रामानन्द बास (बरकपुर) : १९५१, ५२ में कितन आदमी थे और कितने आदमी उस समय निकाल गये ?

श्री आबिद अली : उस वक्त जरूर कमी की गई लेकिन मैं तो पिछले साल की बाबत कह रहा था

श्री रामानन्द बास : सन् १९५२ में उपमंत्री महोदय को मालूम होना चाहिए कि १५ हजार आदमी निकाल गये।

श्री आबिद अली : खैर जो हो ये बातें तो ५१, ५२ में हुई थी और अब तो हम सन् १९५६ में हैं

Shri Nambiar : Whether steps are being taken to absorb them is the point.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Frequent interruptions do not give a dignified appearance.

Shri Nambiar : But he likes them, Sir.

श्री आबिद अली : May I proceed, Sir? मैं सन् १९५३ ५४ और ५५ की बाबत कह रहा हूँ। अब मैं आगे बढ़ता हूँ और दूसरे प्वाइंट (बात) को लेता हूँ।

जहाँ तक माईस में ऐक्सीडेंट्स (खानों म दुर्घटनाओं) का सवाल है, उसके बारे में हमने यह तो फ़सला कर ही दिया है कि इस काम के लिए ३६ और इन्स्पेक्टर्स रखने हैं ताकि जल्दी जल्दी जांच हो सके लेकिन जहाँ तक कि कुछ मन्बर साहबान ने यह जिक्र किया है कि माईस में ऐक्सीडेंट्स बढ़ते जाते हैं, यह बात सही नहीं है। मैं आप को आंकड़े दूँ। सन् १९५१ में .७७ थे। एक हजार मजदूरों के आघात पर यह लिया गया है, एक हजार पर .७७ डेप्स (मौतें) हुई। १९५२ में .८१ हुई। इस का कारण यह था कि उस जमाने में जो माइन्स उसके पहले स्टेट्स (राज्यों) से थीं वह इस से शामिल नहीं थीं, जैसे मैसूर, हैदराबाद वगैरह। उन्हीं के शामिल होने की वजह से यह नम्बर बढ़ गया लेकिन १९५३ में वह .६५ रह गया और १९५४ में न्यूनतम चिकली की वजह से .७२ हो गया। १९५५ में .६६ डेप्स हुई। लेकिन १९५५-५६ में भ्रमलाबाद का नम्बर शामिल है। अगर इन की तुलना में हम परदेशों के आंकड़े देखें जो कि हम से ज्यादा आगे बढ़े हुए समझे जाते हैं तो मालूम पड़ेगा

(श्री अश्विध प्रसी)

कि आस्ट्रिया में .६६ बीं, न्यूजीलैंड में .७५ इटली में .६१, फ्रांस में .६५, जापान में १.४७, साउथ अफ्रीका में १.५६, कनाडा में २.४० बी, लेकिन इन के मुकाबले में हिन्दुस्तान में एक हजार पर सिर्फ .६५ है। इस से सन्तोष होना चाहिये कि आप की माइन्स डिपार्टमेंट (विभाग) का काम बहुत सन्तोषजनक है।

श्री आल्लेकर (उत्तर सतारा) : इंग्लैंड और अमरीका में क्या फिगर्स (संख्यायें) हैं ?

श्री अश्विध प्रसी : यू० के० में हिन्दुस्तान के बराबर ही हैं यानी .६५ और युनाइटेड स्टेट्स आफ अमरीका (संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका) में १.४६। लेकिन मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि इस से भी हमें पूरा सन्तोष नहीं है। हमारी माइन्स में ऐक्सिडेंट्स (दुर्घटनायें) बन्द हो जाने चाहिये, यह सब लोग चाहते हैं, लेकिन वह बन्द नहीं हो सकते, जब तक माइन्स चलती हैं तब तक ऐक्सिडेंट्स जरूर होंगे। परन्तु हमारा डिपार्टमेंट कोशिश करता है कि ऐक्सिडेंट्स कम से कम हों और उन की भयंकरता कम हो कोशिश यही की जा सकती है।

एक साहब ने लेबर ऐपेलेट ट्राइब्यूनल (अभ्र अपीलिय न्यायाधिकरण) के बारे में जिक्र किया था, लेकिन वह जा ही रही हैं। शायद सुभद्रा बहन ने कहा है कि लोगों को लखनऊ बगैरह जाना पड़ता है। लेकिन मैं ने इस बारे में काफी लिख दिया है, और अब लेबर ऐपेलेट ट्राइब्यूनल खुद दिल्ली आया करेगी, पंजाब जायेगी और जाती हैं। बम्बई लेबर ऐपेलेट ट्राइब्यूनल सौराष्ट्र में भी हुआ करेगी और मद्रास की लेबर ऐपेलेट ट्राइब्यूनल कोचीन, ट्रिवेन्ड्रम और बंगलोर गई थी। उन को यह कह दिया गया है कि जहां केसेज ज्यादा हों, कम से कम दस, बारह हों या अगर एक भी हो तो महत्वपूर्ण हो जिस में कुछ दिन लगे तो वहां जाया करें और वहां अपील सुना करे। मगर यह नहीं हो सकता है कि एक छोटी सी अपील हो जिस में दो, चार घंटों का ही काम हो, या एक दो दिन का काम हो तो भी वह सब जगह घूमा करे। यह सम्भव नहीं है। जहां पर पांच या सात अपीलों होंगी वहां वह जायेगी। दिल्ली में उस का आना मुश्किल था क्योंकि यहां रहने और कोर्ट के लिये मकान नहीं मिलता है। पंजाब में भी जगह नहीं मिलती, इस लिये वहां नहीं जा सकी। यह मजबूरी हो गई।

श्री डी० सी० शर्मा (होशियारपुर)
पंजाब में तो बहुत जगह है।

श्री अश्विध प्रसी : जगह तो बहुत है और दिल भी बड़ा है, लेकिन उस का उपयोग नहीं हुआ तो मैं क्या करूं ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The hon. Minister will be saved from many of these interruptions if he looks towards the Chair.

श्री अश्विध प्रसी : जनता से व्यवहार क-जिक्र किया गया था। हमारे कंसिलिएशन आफि सर्स के दफ्तरों में और एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज में इस बारे में काफी ध्यान दिया गया है और कर्मचारी और अफसरान सब बहुत प्रेमपूर्वक वहां पर व्यवहार करते हैं। लेकिन कभी कोई शिकायत मुमकिन हो सकती है। यह तो मैं नहीं कह सकता कि सब जाने वाले अच्छे हैं या सब जाने वाले खराब हैं या तमाम काम करने वाले ही अच्छे या खराब हैं। लेकिन कोशिश हमारी यह हो सकती है कि कभी कोई खास बात हो जाय जिस के बारे में कोई महत्व की शिकायत हो तो उस पर ध्यान दिया जाय। अगर कोई ऐसी शिकायत करता है जो कि शिकायत करने के काबिल है तो मैं इस का विश्वास दिलाता हूं कि हम खुद आतुर हैं कि इस तरह के मामले हमारे सामने आये और हम चाहते हैं कि वह मामले जल्दी जल्दी तय हो जाया करें और एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज में अच्छी तरह से काम हो, हर दफ्तर में हो, लेकिन अगर कभी कोई थोड़ी बहुत गलती हो जाय तो वह हमें बताई जाय ताकि उस के बारे में हम मुनासिब कार्रवाई कर के इस बात की शिशा कर सकें कि जो भी इस किस्म की शिकायत हों, उन का मौका आइन्दा न मिले।

मैं ने काफी बात ले ली है। और जो महत्व की चीजें हैं उन में अपने सीनियर क्लोर्ग के लिये छोड़ दिया है और वह उन को लेंगे।

Shri B. S. Murthy: I rise to support the Demands. In doing so, I must pay my tribute to the Minister and the Deputy Minister for having registered progress in the year under review. I have been rather disappointed at the snail's progress with which the Labour Ministry has been functioning ever since the days of Independence. I do not think the fault is entirely that of the Minister or

his Deputy. As I said on a previous occasion, the Central Government is treating the labour with stepmotherly affection. Whenever a Bill is brought before the Cabinet, something or the other is pointed out and the Bill is referred back either to the States or to the legal department. In this way much of the legislation that could have been before us is not before us.

Again, I feel that this is the last Demand placed before us as far as the First Plan is concerned. So, it is better to find out the targets with which the First Plan started—that is, so far as the labour is concerned. I think the Labour Ministry placed three objectives before itself at the time of the inauguration of the First Plan—effective administration of labour laws, improvement in the real wages of the working class and subsidised industrial housing programme.

Taking the first, I am afraid that no effective steps were taken to give effect to the first objective. We see that the employer and the employee have not come nearer nor has any effort been made to see that Government takes active steps to compel the recalcitrant employers to give effect to them; they always try to avoid labour legislation. The number of strikes, the number of work-days lost and the number of disputes still pending—they are all an indication that the administration of labour laws has not been fully and effectively implemented during the First Plan.

3 P.M.

Coming to the next objective, improvement in the real wages of the working class, I must say that this also has been neglected. As some of the speakers have already indicated, there is an increase in production, increase in wealth, as far as the economy of the country is concerned. But, to that extent the labour wages have not gone up. Whatever may be the excuse, I think the fault has to be laid at the doors of the Labour Ministry for not having fought for the workers in the factories and the tillers of the soil getting more wages. After all, when the country has registered an increase in production and has shown a rise in the national income, it is the duty of the Ministry as well as the Government to see that the real producer of this wealth gets share out of it. I do not think the Ministry has done anything in this respect.

The third thing is the subsidised industrial housing programme. It is a woeful story. Every time we come before the House with this subject the Minister in charge of this portfolio says: "What can I do. Here is the money. Here are the facilities. We are willing. We have reduced the rate of interest. But, the employers are not coming forward." This is a lame excuse. No employer will come forward willingly and try to help the labour to have a house with all sanitary arrangements. He will only try to exploit as much as he can. It is for the Government to see that lame excuses are not given. We are now trying to start the Second Five Year Plan. We must take into account the fact that, in spite of the Minister and the Deputy Minister being very sympathetic towards the labour, because, they have been labour leaders and trade unionists themselves, nothing tangible has been done, as far as the workers are concerned. Therefore, I think it is time that the Ministry makes up its mind and then work with more vigour in the Second Five Year Plan.

Having said this, I would like to say a few words about one or two other items. The first thing is about the Employment Exchanges. I do not know why the Central Government is anxious to hand over these to the unwilling hands of the State Governments. The State Governments have been all along fighting shy to take over this responsibility in spite of the fact that the Central Government agreed to share 60 per cent of the cost and also to give them a whole set-up already in motion. I do not want that the Central Government should think that the time has come when these Employment Exchanges could be better worked by State Governments. I have my doubts about that. In the case of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes the States have shown a woeful negligence, an apathy which is condemnable, in regard to their administration. They have always been trying to say: "No funds". I am sure, after two or three years, the Labour Ministry will be approached by the States saying that 60 per cent is not enough and the Centre must give 90 per cent. They will say: "Your name and our game. You expend the money, we will administer the whole thing". Therefore, I think it is high time we revise our plans and see that the Employment Exchanges are not handed over to unwilling hands.

In the recent Labour Ministers' Conference at Hyderabad they said that the

[Shri B. S. Murthy]

employment policy must be a national policy, if it is a national policy, why should the States be given a predominant part to make this policy a success? I also want the Ministry to be careful about this. At present the Report shows that in 1954 the percentage of placements effected was 26.6 per cent. In 1955 it is 19.8 per cent. I am afraid, next year it may be less and the next year it may be still less. Still the Central Government says: "Here is the full amount. You spend the money and let the Employment Exchanges be under your guidance."

There is one point—I do not know whether the House will appreciate it, or not. If the Employment Exchanges are in the hands of the Ministers in the States, I am afraid, there will be a lot of nepotism, favouritism, casteism and what not.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): How?

Shri B. S. Murthy: "How?" is the question coming from Dr. Krishnaswami, who is a doyen of the non-brahmin party. Brahmin and non-Brahmin, Harijan and brahmin, are still there. These things will infiltrate into the Employment Exchanges. They have been there and they are going to be there. Therefore, I say, it is better that the Central Government take full courage in both hands and say: "The Shiva Rao Committee might have said anything, we are not going to do it".

You say that under the Second Five Year Plan you want to give more employment opportunities. The public sector is taking a more important part in the Second Five Year Plan. When all these new factors are coming up, there must be a revision in the policy with regard to these Employment Exchanges.

Another thing is, the Employment Exchanges have registered the names of 59,637 Scheduled Caste people, but only half of them have been given jobs. This is the position with regard to the previous year. In the current year it is still less. Out of 69,865 names on the live registers only 21,246 persons have been provided with jobs. The same fate awaits the Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes also.

Shri Boovaraghasamy: There are no figures for Backward Classes.

Shri B. S. Murthy: They do not figure at all.

At the same time, the Employment Exchanges are also trying to imitate the Service Commissions in the States as well as the UPSC. There is one expression in the English language, which is playing havoc as far as the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are concerned, that is: "Not suitable". I wish this expression is removed from the English language, at least it should not be allowed to be used in Government departments. Everywhere they use this expression: "Not suitable". The Employment Exchanges also, I am told, are trying to copy this and thus depriving the few chances the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes people have got in getting employment.

Now I come to one other point and that is with regard to the training schemes. The Report shows that there are not sufficient candidates coming forward to get themselves trained. I want the Minister to find out what is the reason for there being a lack of students.

Again, the report does not contain how many students have been trained and how many of them have been appointed. I think from next year onwards items showing how many persons have been trained and how many have got appointments may also be included.

Another point is this. The Labour Ministry is anxious about motor transport workers but not a word is said about conservancy labour and tannery labour. Even Shri Tandon has spoken about the scavengers. Why should not the Labour Ministry go into the working conditions of these conservancy workers? The municipalities are there. Take, for instance, Madras. In Madras we find a number of reading rooms, a number of maternity homes, a number of libraries, a number of creches, for all, but there is nothing for the scavengers or the conservancy workers. Even good houses have not been provided for them. Therefore, it is a question to which the Labour Ministry must devote more time and greater attention. In the case of tannery workers also, there is a lot of retrenchment and discontent. That question also must be gone into carefully and it must be seen that something is done for these helpless conservancy and tannery workers.

The last point that I would make is about agricultural labour. There are as many as 6 crores of agricultural labourers in India, but every

time the Labour Minister says, "We are conducting some pilot programme; we are conducting some survey," etc. But what is the programme for giving those labourers full employment? At the same time, you must see that no agricultural labourer is subjected to any lack of work and lack of food. Recently, someone was reported to have committed suicide in the Damodar Valley. Every newspaper has printed in bold letters that one man committed suicide because of retrenchment there. But in rural India, hundreds and thousands of people are suffering from want of food, and nothing has been said in the papers about them; the Ministry does not bother about them. Therefore, I would request the Minister to give his earliest attention to this problem and see that even if nothing could be done, at least 12 crores of banjar land or waste land which are available with the State Governments and the Central Government are distributed to them. The Ministry should see that employment is given to them so that production also could thereby be increased.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): I will take up the point which was slightly touched by the hon. Deputy Minister and urge on this House that the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act should be put through before the end of this session of Parliament. It was seven or eight years ago that the Labour Ministry contemplated a comprehensive enactment for regulating the relationship between the employers and employees so that a self-contained code may give adequate protection to the working classes in India. It has a very haphazard progress and almost a chequered history until at last two years ago, I think, it was, I, speaking in one of those debates, urged on the Government to drop the idea of having a comprehensive legislation and at least attend to the most urgent and important issues which are today doing a lot of harm and giving a lot of concern to the workers in India.

I will briefly refer to one or two matters which call for immediate attention. The definition of the worker in the Industrial Disputes Act covers only those persons who are doing manual and clerical labour, and all those who are doing a little extra supervisory work are excluded from the purview of the definition. The result is that today a very large category of employees who deserve and who desire protection of the Industrial Disputes Act are outside the pale of that legislation.

Take, for instance, a *maistry* in a plantation. According to the very learned and wise decision of the Industrial Tribunal, a *maistry* who is supervising the work of another labourer in the plantation is not a workman within the definition of the Industrial Disputes Act. So, even a poor worker who is drawing hardly a rupee and a half is denied the protection of the Industrial Disputes Act. On the other hand, we are extending the definition of a worker in our new legislation, and we must state to our pride that in the category of workmen we have included even the working journalists, educated people and men holding and performing intellectual work. Now, this anomaly has resulted in considerable suffering to the lower category of employees in factories, people who are working as charge-hands and foremen, etc., and they are absolutely at the mercy of the factory managers.

Then there is another very important question which has got to be attended to by the Labour Ministry and it relates to the notice of change. The bulk of the disputes arising in the industrial establishments is on account of unilateral changes made by the employers without consulting the employees. Very often, the plea is taken before the tribunals that there are certain managerial functions and that labour has no right to intervene or interfere and that if the employer does not consult labour on such matters he is entirely within his province or his sphere or his rights.

Recently in Madras a change in the manner of remuneration of the workmen was resorted to by the employer without prior consultation with the employees. The employees apprehended that such a change from the time-rate to the piece-rate would cause serious inroads in their earnings and they protested. But it was contended by the employer that he was still within his authority in so changing the procedure unilaterally, with the result that a prolonged strike ensued. Whatever be the result of the strike, the country has to take note of the hardship and suffering which the workers have undergone during those periods of unemployment and starvation. This is an instance of avoidable hardship, and it is not avoided only because we have not put into the statute certain very necessary provisions to safeguard the rights of workers. Therefore, I would appeal to the Minister to see that this amendment to the Industrial Disputes Act is brought forward at the earliest possible moment and passed at least before the end of this session.

[Shri Venkataraman]

I may also inform the Minister that there are a number of tribunals awaiting the passing of this measure to write their judgments. If the amendment is carried, then certain categories of people would get benefit under the Industrial Disputes Act. But if the amendment is not carried, a large number of persons who have put their case to the tribunal for the fixation of wages, dearness allowance and other amenities will be denied those privileges. Thus, instead of solving a dispute there would be fresh disputes coming in the wake of those judgments.

Before I proceed to the next point, I would like to make a humble appeal to the Members opposite to co-operate in this and see that time is allotted for the passing of the Industrial Disputes Amendment Act as early as possible. Already, these provisions have been examined by representatives of workers and employers. The principles underlying the amendments have been accepted by all parties in tripartite meetings. What actually remains to be done is to put a statutory seal to an almost accepted principle. Unless this is done, I am afraid the disappointment of the workers would be so great that whatever good has been done to them would be lost in that disappointment.

There is another matter about which I have the habit of repeating. So far as the factories are concerned, it is my earnest desire that the number of accidents should be reduced. During the debate on the Railways, I pointed out that the number of accidents in the railway workshops has been increasing and I attributed it to the lack of inspection carried on by the Inspectorate. I have a feeling that because Railways is one part of the Government and the Labour Department is another part of the Government, they mutually agree to either wink over the faults or shortcomings with the result that accidents are going on increasing. It is the duty of the Labour Inspectorate to see that stricter and higher standards are maintained in Government workshops so that they may serve as a model. In ordinary factories also,—I have the figures for 1953 only, which is the latest year of the Year Book—we find there has been increase in accidents. In 1947, the number of accidents was 58,781, that is, 25.4 per thousand and in 1953, it was 93,687, that is 37.06 per thousand. It is true that there has been an increase in the

number of people employed and there should normally be a proportionate increase in the accidents. That there should be an increase even in the ratio is one which passes my comprehension. One explanation which is favourite in the department is that accidents are better reported now than they were before.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : Vigilance.

Shri Venkataraman : I totally disagree. I think the amount of vigilance and reporting in 1947 was as good or as bad as it is today. This is a matter on which I would like the Government to bestow some attention. By the time they come with the Labour Demands next year, they should be able to show a decrease in the number of accidents in factories.

Shri Nambiar : Not on paper.

Shri Venkataraman : I suppose paper figures represent the true state of affairs. Otherwise, we would be left even without a point for criticism. If you say that paper figures are not correct, they may turn round and say that your figures are useless.

I refer next to another important section of labour, namely plantation labour. I have a very soft corner for plantation labour having been one of those pioneers who started the labour movement among plantations. It is good to recall what was the state of affairs at that time. In those days, plantation owners used to regard those estates as private property. They would refuse even to allow an outsider to go into the plantations for the purpose of talking to labour. On one occasion, I had to go for the purpose of forming a trade union. The manager told me that the estate was his private property and that I was guilty of trespass, and asked me to get out. I replied that I was not only a trade unionist, but also a lawyer and that I would challenge him to take proceedings in a magistrate's court for trespass. I said, there was no criminal intention in coming into your property and therefore it would not amount to trespass. But, he had a better answer. He called two of his bulldogs and I had to run for my life.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The lawyer could not requisition his legal knowledge.

Shri Venkataraman : From those days to the passing of the Plantation Labour Act and the formation of a very large trade union is really a great progress.

We feel proud of the progress that plantation labour has made so far. But, it is not all. They have to go a long way before they can catch up with industrial labour in India. In 1951, the Plantation Labour Act was passed. But the rules were not framed. Naturally, the plantation owners were of the view that if all the benefits granted under the Plantation Labour Act were introduced immediately, they would not be able to meet the expenses. That was a point of view which we had to recognise. Therefore, the rules provided for the implementation of the Act in various stages. Today, we have reached a position in which all the rules with regard to health, safety, etc., should be implemented as early as possible. I submit that the time has come when the whole Act has got to be implemented. I have information, which I am not sure whether it is true,—I hope it is not—that if the Government implements all the rules with regard to plantation labour, the plantation owners are threatening to take this matter to the High Court for the purpose of getting a ruling that it is interference with their freedom of trade. If there is any lacuna, I would appeal to the Minister to notice it betimes and take legislative sanction. Plantation labour in South India is alive and alert. It is very anxious that the entire rules should be implemented. If there is any obstruction on the part of the plantation owners in this behalf, I hope the Government would see that implementation is not thwarted.

One word about dock workers. Being myself a member of the Dock Labour Board, I have to register a very serious protest against the very sorry and very poor conditions which are prevailing in the dock areas. In the matter of the payment of the guaranteed minimum wage, at present they are paid only the guaranteed minimum wage for 12 days. This is far too low. Very often, the workers in the docks are unable to make both ends meet. It should be increased at least immediately to 15. I know that the Dock Labour Enquiry Committee has recommended that it should be increased from 12 to 21. That may take a little long. But, as it is, payment of the guaranteed minimum wage for only 12 days leaves them in such a pitiable condition that they are neither able to seek employment elsewhere and earn a living nor live on the earnings which they get from the Dock Board. It is a very urgent need. I trust the Government would look into it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Shri Abid Ali said a little while ago that there has been very little criticism of his Ministry. I want to very strongly criticise his Ministry on one point at this very late stage.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Simply because he said so?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : I might have pointed to certain points in the Ministry's work that was welcome if I had time but on one very fundamental point, I will raise strong objection—because I shall only have a few minutes to speak—on which I feel that the attitude and the active work of the Ministry has been harmful to the cause of labour. That is on the question of trade union unity. Trade union unity is a very fundamental need not only of a section of the workers. It is not a sectional demand alone, but it is also of the utmost importance to the nation itself. As a matter of fact, in the First Five Year Plan it has been admitted that the worker plays a very distinctive role. It says "the worker is the principal instrument in the fulfilment of the targets of the Plan and in the achievement of economic progress generally. His co-operation will be an essential factor in creating an economic organisation in the country which will best subserve the needs of social justice. Certain rights and obligations are associated with this distinctive role." I feel that it is not only a question of increasing the production or the attainment of targets in which the worker plays a very important part, but also that he is the only effective check to the growth of monopolistic concentration of wealth, and that is a point of view which has to be taken into consideration by this Ministry.

If we accept this position, then we have also to accept that the worker must be allowed full rights of developing his trade union, his organisation and to choose whichever union he desires and also try in every possible way to build up trade union unity, because without that it will be impossible to fight Capital with its enormous grip over the entire economy of the country. I would like specially to say that it is amazing that the Congress Party, the ruling party, which is well known to have organised its own trade union, the INTUC, not only organises its own political trade union, but also Ministers of State directly threaten workers who dare to join any other union, especially Red Flag

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

unions. As a matter of fact, it is well known that the Deputy Minister, Shri Abid Ali Saheb only recently on the 23rd January, 1956 told the workers of the Hindustan Aircraft Ltd. Bangalore that their demands were not referred to adjudication because theirs was a Red Flag union.

Shri Abid Ali : It is wrong entirely.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : He said the same thing to the workers of the Bhadravati Iron and Steel Works, also at the Nandidrug Mines of the Kolar Gold Fields. Not only this, but where there are united trade unions not associated or affiliated with any national trade union, either the INTUC, AITUC or UTUC; there we find actually the INTUC comes forward as a breaker of the unity. As a matter of fact, here is a letter written by INTUC, Bombay Branch, trying to break the unity of the Bombay Insurance Employees' Federation. The letter says:

"You will be glad to learn that the INTUC has decided to help employees of Insurance Companies to form independent non-political trade union which will not join Reds on any issue. A union is already organised here by employees themselves.

I am requesting you to help insurance employees in your city and State to form their own unions on similar lines. It is possible that a large number of your friends are employed in Insurance. Please contact them also.

Events are moving fast. It is necessary these employees also move fast. Hence the request to speed up.

Kindly send me names of your friends so that I can advise the union to contact them. Kindly approach Pradesh INTUC/Congress for information. We shall be shortly calling an All-India conference in Bombay. May I request you to give your early attention to this urgent and important question."

The same thing has happened and here unfortunately the Deputy Minister himself is implicated. Shri Abid Ali Saheb was written to by a certain

person who is associated with the insurance workers. He says :

"I had been to Delhi on three occasions in the last few months, but unfortunately could not contact you.

I met Shri Roy of the Delhi Insurance Federation in Calcutta at the time of All-India Insurance Employees' Conference which took place in the last August. I am told he is an INTUC man. We were about 35 to 40 per cent against the Communists and their fellow travellers. One Smt. . . . Congress MLA from Bihar is the president of the State Insurance Employees' Association there. Though she did not attend the conference at Calcutta she has been elected as the Vice-President of the All-India Association. I would request you to explain things to her so that she may consolidate the position in Bihar so that we may get a majority at the time of the next conference."

Shri Abid Ali : Who has written that letter to whom?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : I shall put it on the Table of the House. You can just see then.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Is it a letter addressed to Shri Abid Ali?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : Yes. So, I can cite many instances.

Shri V. P. Nayar : A man is known by his friends.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : I remember what my friend Shri Venkataraman said on one occasion when there was a discussion in this House on the question of trade union recognition. We stated that we wanted all trade unions, whether they belonged to UTUC, INTUC, AITUC, should be recognised. Once a trade union has been formed by the workers and the workers choose that type of organisation or this type of organisation, once we have given them the right of free association, it is only right that all of them should be recognised. Shri Venkataraman said that it was very necessary to have a united organisation, that we should have one union in one industry, and that it would be very difficult to go on negotiating with various unions. There was some

sense in that. After hearing all this, we have put forward the proposition—we are straightforward—that you may take one union in one industry, but what is happening is that it is the INTUC which comes out as the breaker of these unions.

There are two ways of achieving this unity. Let the workers have a secret ballot and decide which union they want to belong to. If it is the INTUC they want, it is O. K. But it is not the job of Government to decide for the workers which type of organisation they should belong to. In the alternative what can be done is, let the workers who belong to the various unions form an electoral college. Let them form one union. Let them elect an executive. Let them have one single united trade union. This is the only way of doing it. What is the use of Shri K. P. Tripathi coming here and saying that they have been fighting for co-existence in the ILO when you cannot apply it to your own workers over here. Whether you like it or not, there are unions, which you may or may not like there are central trade unions, there are workers who prefer not to be in the INTUC. Are you going to force them?

Today what is the type of unionism which the Ministry is directly and indirectly helping. We find that a certain type of legislation is being extolled. On the one hand there is the Tata agreement. What is it except a closed shop union? It is the employers who are going to make the collection of membership dues. Under the dire threat of not being able to hold their jobs, the workers will be forced into it whether they like it or not. On the other hand, we have the Bombay Industrial Act. That also is, I believe, going to be made the basis of another all-India Act in which 50 per cent of union membership will enable them to negotiate on behalf of the entire workers. Not only that. There is no means of consulting the workers. Finally, it is actually going against the right of the workers to choose their own trade unions. In this way, instead of giving the right to the worker to choose his own union, it is the State-controlled union that is foisted upon the worker.

I will give you one last example of what is actually happening. The Iron and Steel workers at Burnpur have formed a union called the United Iron and Steel Workers' Union which is against

the INTUC. The majority of the workers, about 15,000 of them, have formed this union. Every form of intimidation has been brought to bear upon them. They are not recognised by the employers. There is no question of recognition because the law does not enforce recognition. In a way the State helps them. Some 88 cases of intimidation and harassment have been brought against them, but not one case has been proved. Recently we have had preventive detention of the leaders. When I went there, I enquired: has there been any go-slow, any violence, any communal disturbance? Even the District Magistrate had to agree and say: "No, there has been nothing for the last three months" and yet preventive detention was introduced, and the charge-sheet says: "You have taken up the fancied demands of the workers." What were the fancied demands? Those demands have been referred to the tribunal. Are they fancied demands? Some of them have been met by the tribunal. Are they fancied demands? "Certain leftist trade unions have been helping you"—that is also one of the charges. They are flimsy grounds. Yesterday Government itself realised that discretion is the better part of valour and it has been forced to release them. In this way, we find that there is discrimination all along. Even on the question of representation, it is only the INTUC that represents India at the ILO. It is only they who are on the Joint Consultative board; at least, all the trade unions should have been represented, but they are not there. In the case of the Madras Port Trust also, although the most representative union is the AITUC, yet it is the INTUC which is on the board.

Shri Venkataraman: The hon. Member is wrong there. Since she has mentioned this point, I may say that there are two unions, one controlled by Mr. Ayyangar, that is, the AITUC, and the other controlled by certain others. The membership is a matter of dispute, because members, just as they go and sign petitions on both sides, join both these organisations.

Shri Nambiar: The one has 99 per cent membership, while the other has only 1 per cent. membership.

Shri Venkataraman: That is what the others also claim.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let not these differences be settled here and now on the floor of the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: I quite agree. Let us work out a method by which it can be decided whether a union is representative or not. I remember that once an United Iron and Steel Workers Union member told me: "You ask the Minister, and let him tell us what is the proof that he wants to show that ours is the union behind which there is backing of a large majority of the workers. Is it membership? Is it collection? Is it to be decided on the basis of a secret ballot? Let him enunciate some principle whereby it can be proved that a union is the most representative or not." I say that unless you do something in this direction, disastrous consequences would take place. For instance, look at what happened during the Kanpur strike.

You took on the rationalisation committee, a man who was from the INTUC, and who did not hold the brief for the majority of workers. And you know what the result was. The same thing happened in the Empress Mills in Nagpur also.

So, I would say that if you want that there should be industrial peace, that there should be progress, and that the workers should have a very definite part to play in the moulding of policy and in the mopping up of the excessive wealth that is being concentrated in the hands of certain industrial bosses, then the recognition of the union is essential.

Since my time is short, I shall not talk on the question of the increment of basic wages etc. But I should like to deal with one important point, and that is in regard to the payment of bonus. 35 per cent of the disputes are approximately wage disputes. Out of that 35 per cent, nearly 75 per cent are on the question of bonus. I would appeal to the Minister that there must be some statutory provision about the granting of bonus. There have been big agreements in the case of tea, and there have been also other agreements in which the question of bonus has been recognised. But unless we have statutory provisions in regard to this matter, nothing will happen. In the case of the electricity supply concerns, owing to some decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal on the question of wages, the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation, which is a British concern, and which is

a monopolistic concern, making crores and crores of rupees of profits, refused to give bonus to its workers. The same thing has happened in another case also. The Supreme Court has allowed an appeal against the award of the Labour Appellate Tribunal in another case. I think that was in the case of the Muir Mills. So, we find that again the whole question is coming up; the question of the jurisdiction of the court is coming up.

We definitely hold the view,—and even the INTUC resolution which I saw says the same thing,—that where these industrialists have been making huge profits earlier, whether during the pre-war period or during the post-war period, the question of bonus should be regarded as one of deferred wages. One may quarrel with the particular term that is used. But it is definite that one of the peculiarities of the situation is that the bigger the industrial concern, and the more the profits it makes—and there are quite a large number of such concerns—the more it fights shy of giving this bonus.

For instance, in the case of the Burnpur mill with which the Union of Iron and Steel Workers are associated, there has been record production last year and also the year before that, that is during 1954-55. They have earned Rs. 7 crores as profits, but according to the 1947 award, they have given only two days' wages as bonus to every 1 per cent of dividend, the dividends having been worked out on the basis of the amount of capital, the proposed expansion and so on. During the last ten years, or I should say, eight years, not more than 10 per cent dividend has been declared. At one time, the excuse was expansion, and at another time it was that Government did not allow them to give a higher dividend. This concern is giving only about 20 days' wages as bonus, but because there is record production this year, it has given 10 days' wages more, and so it comes to a month's wages. But in the case of the other similar concerns about three months' wages are granted as bonus.

I say that if you are really keen about mopping up the surplus wealth which is accumulating at the top, and if you really want to reduce the disparities, then this question of bonus must be statutorily provided for, so that the employers do not get away by saying that "This is an item of expenditure which we intend to take into consideration."

In conclusion, I would like the Minister to answer the two points that I have raised.

Shri Abid Ali : As a matter of personal explanation, I may submit that, firstly, I was not in Bangalore on the 26th January, but in Madura, and secondly, the statement attributed to me is not mine.

Shri Nambiar : When he was in Bangalore did he make any such statement, whether it was on that date or any other? I also got information to that effect. The date may differ, but the point is whether he said so.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : He says that he denies both.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : I have listened very carefully to the debate that has taken place in this House. There have been compliments paid and there have also been certain criticisms. And the last criticism was, as people would like to put it, very drastic. As far as the compliments are concerned, they are due not to the work of the Labour Ministry, but to the employers and the employees, the State Governments and the Ministries. So, we are not unnecessarily going to be flattered by them.

As my hon. colleague has said, we try our best to help the working class to come up to a level, and to the extent that we have been able to do it, we are satisfied that much more requires to be done.

The hon. lady Member has paid serious attention to the discrimination that has been made against certain unions, and hence she said that politics appear to play some part.

An Hon. Member : A big part.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : Of course, in a democratic State, though trade unions should remain free from politics, yet a certain tinge of politics does enter them some time or the other. But the party that is mainly responsible for bringing politics into the trade union movement is the party to which the hon. Member belongs.

Those of us who have been associated with the trade union movement for nearly three decades and a half know to our cost that during the last two and a half decades, attempts were made at several times for bringing about unity.

That is a good solution. But let the unity not be a unity of tactics, or mere tactical unity, but let it be real unity amongst the working classes. Attempts were made to bring about unity in 1928. In 1933-34 also, attempts were made, and some unity was established. But again, it was disrupted. I would ask the country to judge who disrupted that unity. Again, attempts were made to bring about unity. That unity also was disrupted again because unfortunately some of my countrymen take their policy from some other country. Whatever suits them at a particular time comes in the way of all activities, and not one only. I hope and pray that as a result of the latest reactions that we are finding in the world, our people, and my own countrymen, would not be guided by what is happening somewhere else. And I can assure them that to the extent that I am capable of, I shall be second to none in bringing about trade union unity in this country.

As far as the question of discrimination is concerned, during the last decade, certain trade unions have come up. After scrutinising the membership of the four central organisations, representations are being given. The ILO Convention and procedure lay down that advisers representing the most representative organisation shall be sent as delegates by member-States. That is being done. If I place before the House certain facts regarding the trade union organisations in the country, it will be able to judge of the position.

The scrutinised membership of the various unions were as follows, in the year 1955: INTUC 9,31,968; Hind Mazdoor Sabha 2,11,315, All India Trade Union Congress 3,06,963 and United Trade Union Congress 1,95,242. That is to say, the membership, as scrutinised, of the Indian National Trade Union Congress is even larger than that of all the three other central organisations put together.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey) : How are these figures arrived at and how are they checked?

Shri Khandubhai Desai : They are figures supplied by the central trade union organisations to the Labour Ministry. Then they are scrutinised and the claimed membership is verified.

Shri Punnoose : How is the verification done, by whom?

Shri Khandubhai Desai : The membership claimed by the INTUC was 13,38,607 and the verified membership was 9,31,968; the claimed membership of the Hind Mazdoor Sabha was 4,76,630, and the verified membership was 2,11,315; the claimed membership of the All India Trade Union Congress was 7,89,045 and the verified membership was 3,06,963; and the membership claimed by the United Trade Union Congress was 5,13,623 as against the verified membership of 1,95,242.

Then the question will be asked: what is being done? According to our records, we find that the claimed membership and the claimed unions do not exist because they are not registered. According to trade union law, they have not submitted their annual accounts to the Registrar. That is the first thing. In that way, most of the unions which have claimed that they are unions, do not exist, and that applies to all the four organisations. As far as the INTUC is concerned, you will find that from the claimed membership, one third has been taken out, because on scrutiny it was found that the real claim for the purpose of representation was not 13 lakhs but 9 lakhs. That is the position.

Then a point was made regarding discrimination being practised in the matter of submission of disputes to the tribunal. I have got certain figures which will prove that there has been absolutely no discrimination. The number of applications of the INTUC to the Labour Ministry or to the various State Ministries was 1835, out of which the number of applications sent to the tribunal in the year 1954-55 was 848, that is to say, 46 per cent of the applications were referred to the tribunal. In the case of the AITUC, the number of applications was 1376 and the number accepted for reference to the tribunal was 666, that is, about 48 per cent—more than the corresponding figure for the INTUC. The Hind Mazdoor Sabha sent 903 applications, of which 473 or 52 per cent were referred to the tribunal. So you will find that more applications in percentage were granted for adjudication in the case of the AITUC and the Hind Mazdoor Sabha than the INTUC.

Thakur Jugal Kishore Sinha : What is the percentage of disputes in respect of each central trade union?

Shri Khandubhai Desai : That is exactly what I have stated.

Thakur Jugal Kishore Sinha : I want to know the number of points of disputes.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : These are the applications made by the central organisations to the various State Ministries and the Central Ministry for reference to adjudication.

Shri Nambiar : He wants to know the number of points in dispute.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : I have not got details with me. For that I would have to place before the House all these 2000 or 3000 applications. That is all I have to say on that.

As regards unity, I again say that ultimately unity is going to come about among the trade unions. But I am not one of those who believe that unity as a slogan would have any value. Unity will come about from the rank and file of the working class. I think my hon. friends opposite should also give up some of their old notions and tactics about the trade union movement. Once they give up those things, I have no doubt that trade union unity would not be a slogan but would be a reality.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : He does not take the initiative.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : That will depend upon the spirit in which the initiative may be taken by people on the other side. If they come with a proper spirit, I think they will get the natural response. I am one of those who believe that any tactical approach to unity is bound to fail. If it is not a question of tactics, if it is a question of genuine trade union unity, it is bound to come about.

Thakur Jugal Kishore Sinha : From one side only.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : We are agreed that the differences are too great to be resolved immediately. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Khandubhai Desai : I would now like to deal with the question of industrial relations. Industrial relations have been, more or less, happy during the year under debate. I am glad to find that most of the trade union organisations are adapting themselves gradually to the new spirit in the country. If we want to establish a socialist pattern of society, which the whole House is determined to do, and to have the economy developed in a planned way, there should not, in my view, be any ground

for conflict or class-war mentality. I am one of those who believe—and I think my Government also believe—that industrial property or any productive property does not really belong to private enterprise but belongs to the nation. It is with that end in view that we have got to look at all our activities in regard to legislation, to what extent the passing of a law or the implementation thereof goes towards establishing that psychology in the country. Therefore, I do not think, the old outmoded and outdated notions of strike and conflict have any value today. They are outmoded and should be given up. Although old habits die hard, we are really finding that they are dying away gradually. Both the employers and employees would have to consider that they are co-servants of the community and it is for the Parliament to lay down rules of conduct for both. It is with this end in view that the Planning Commission is considering the question of participation of workers in the management. That has been considered at two or three meetings of the Labour Panel and it has submitted its report to the Planning Commission. Probably, within the next few weeks, that report will be coming before this Parliament for discussion. I should not anticipate the final decision of the Planning Commission with regard to this.

4 P.M.

I am also glad to inform the House that, as a result of the discussions in the Indian Labour Conference and tripartite conferences at various industrial levels, the relations have become smooth. Both the parties have been able to understand each other. It has helped us a great deal. I may say that about three or four days back there was a meeting of the Standing Labour Committee and we have been able to come to definite constructive suggestions. The tripartite committee has agreed that an overall central law for regulating the service conditions of the transport workers must be taken up at the central level. It has also come to the conclusion that legislation on various social amenities, which may be termed as social security legislation, have been introduced in a piecemeal way. Now the time has come for an overall social security legislation whereby all the various schemes that are working today like the Provident Fund, the Retrenchment and Lay-off Compensation scheme, the State Employees Insurance, Holidays

with Pay, all these schemes can be amalgamated into a single scheme so as to make available to the working classes higher amenities from the same Fund or, if necessary, little more funds that may be available. Only a week back that decision was taken and the Ministry will be examining that point very soon.

Various questions have been raised. One of them is whether, after independence, the workers have got a fair deal. That has been agitating the minds of the working classes. I have got certain figures regarding real wages. I am only placing facts before the House to judge. It has been said that productivity has increased and that production has increased and that the workers' wages have not gone up *pari passu*. Obviously, the working classes of this country cannot expect everything that is produced for themselves. There is the community also which has got to share the rise in the national income. The figures show that when we got independence—in the year 1947—the real wages, as compared to 1939 were 78.4. That is, when we started our democratic set-up, the real wages were 78.4 compared to 100 in 1939. Of course, this Government, or the Republic under which we are now, was not responsible for the gap. Whether, after we got independence, we have been able to make up a good deal is the problem for us. The figures, from 1948 went up to 84.4 in 1948, 91.7 in 1949, 90.1 in 1950, 92.2 in 1951 and so on till 1954 when the real wages had been 102.7. That is, all the leeway which we had to make up had been made up in the first three years after independence and in the First Five Year Plan, in addition to the social security measures like the Provident Fund, the State Employees Insurance, the Retrenchment and Lay-off Compensation and Leave with Wages. So, if all these are totalled, we can safely say that the industrial worker today is anywhere from 15 to 20 per cent higher in his standard of living than what he was in 1939.

Shri Nambiar : How can it be? Compared to 1947, even your figures. . . .

Shri Khandubhai Desai : I was saying, compared to 1939, it is 102.7 real money wages as related to the cost of living. In addition, there are the Provident Fund, the holidays with pay, State Employees Insurance and all these come to about 12 to 15.

Shri B. S. Murthy : What about the rise in the cost of living?

Shri Khandubhai Desai : They have been correlated in the real wages. Attempts have been made in the Second Five Year Plan to evolve some plan so that there may not be this trouble and conflict. That question has been engaging the attention of the Labour Ministry. The Labour Ministry has submitted its own plan to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission has consulted the various interests in the Labour Panel and, after discussion, they have come to the conclusion that for the main industries in the country, a wage board should be appointed so as to evolve a formula for the increase in the real earnings of the workers. I hope the Planning Commission will accept the recommendation about the wage board which has been made by the Labour Panel and this Parliament would have enough opportunity to modify, if it so desires, the recommendations of the Planning Commission which will be coming before this House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : Will they also go into the question of the national minimum wage?

Shri Khandubhai Desai : The point has been raised about the national minimum wage. As the House is aware, national minimum wage would have a natural relation to the total national income. It cannot be a figure which will be as high as some people would think. When we come to the question of national minimum wage, we have to take into consideration the total national income of the country. We have also to consider whether that national minimum wage from our national income is made available to almost everybody who puts in his eight hours of work. In that regard I may digress a little. I think hon. Members must have studied very carefully the report of the Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee. You will find that there are in this country about 17·6 million labour families and the income per family comes to Rs. 447 per year. Along with that, there are about 35·5 million families which can be called "cultivator families" in which there are included peasant proprietors as well as tenants, and their income would come roughly to double that of the agricultural labour family. When we come to a national minimum—and these people form together nearly 70 per cent of the population—it would have to have

some relation with these people. They have also to be raised up. Whatever national product, and national income which we get would have to be very evenly distributed. The question of a national minimum will certainly be considered in its proper setting and at the proper time. This is one of the reasons why the States find it very difficult to fix up the minimum wage for agricultural labour, because it must be realised that the agricultural labour, which forms about 22·7 per cent of the population of the country, have got the employers and the small peasants and tenants who form about 45 per cent of our population. They are the employers. If a particular minimum is immediately placed before them, then it would have to come out of that Rs. 447 out of the double income of the agricultural labour, who are also below the standard. That means that we have to see that for our agricultural population, including both tenants and peasant proprietors. The average holding of a tenant or a peasant proprietor is not more than 7·5 acres. There is unemployment and under-employment at the rural level. Therefore, some of us in this House say that if we want to raise the standard of living of the 70 per cent of the people remaining in our villages, we would have to go in, whether you like it or not, for some subsidiary occupations, which they may be able to ply in order to increase their wealth. That is the position.

In the context of the figures and facts which I have placed before you, I think we must re-orientate our thinking.

In the course of the debate, mention was made about the implementation of labour legislation. Efforts are being made to see that all legislations that have been put on the statute-book are properly implemented. As a result of the consciousness that has come over both employees and employers, attempts are being made to evade, and when evasion takes place, there are two actions possible. One is a trade union action, an organisation of workers. They have to see that whenever there is a breach of the law, they do refer the matter to the Government and Government has to make this machinery very effective. I am glad to say that as far as the Government of India and the State Governments are concerned, they have been able during the last few years to strengthen the inspectorate machinery.

It has been said by Shri Murthy, I believe, that the Labour Ministry is being given a step-motherly treatment.

Shri B. S. Murthy : The Central Government.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : I do not think so.

Shri B. S. Murthy : Thank you, Sir.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : The Labour Ministry has got a co-equal footing with any other Ministry, and gets most of its reasonable demands conceded by the Cabinet. It is joint responsibility, and if there is anything wrong in the Labour Ministry, I am responsible for it.

Shri B. S. Murthy : No, no.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : I do not say that anyone else is responsible.

Dr. Krishnaswamy : Hear, hear.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : Some complaints have been made regarding the delay in the disposal of the disputes referred to tribunals. I do accept that, and that is why as Shri Venkataraman has put it, instead of going in for a comprehensive legislation, I say let us try to bring in an amending Bill which deals with the problems of immediate significance. That Bill is before the House and I hope that before we disperse in this session, the Bill will become law. I am happy to inform the House that the Business Advisory Committee have been very kind enough to waive the right and privilege to take it to a Select Committee. They have given 10 hours for passing the Bill into law, and all the Members of the Opposition have been very considerate to me and to the Government and say that we will get the Bill through as early as possible. I am obliged to them. I, of course, on my part give the assurance that before the Bill comes up for discussion, we will have a sort of an informal Select Committee. All those who are interested in the Bill will be invited and we will have a heart to heart discussion, and if any amendments to procedure or other things may be found necessary, I would be very happy to entertain them and do the needful in the matter.

Shri Nambiar : But we will have to get it through a Select Committee at least.

Shri Venkataraman : Not necessary.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : We have discussed that problem, Mr. Nambiar, threadbare in the Business Advisory Committee and they were kind enough to say that we will see the Bill through.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The Hon. Minister has to address the Chair.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : You cannot avoid Shri Nambiar anyway.

A slight reference was made to bank employees. I am in sympathy with it. But we must know exactly how the people under the guidance and lead of the bank employees behaved in January-February. I do not want to go into the tortuous history of the bank dispute. Shri Gajendragadkar had given his Award. This House has passed the Award unanimously, in exact terms of the Gajendragadkar's decision. The parties were free to place their own points of view before the Gajendragadkar Commission, and the Commission made certain recommendations which, on the whole, gave about Rs. 90,00,000 more per year to the workers than what they were getting under the Sen Award. But in the case of a few people, about 12,000 as was already said, certain emoluments of existing wages were reduced. That was the law passed by the Parliament. Nobody sympathises with the bankers when they have not paid. But, then, it is a matter for negotiation and discussion. The Bank Employees' Association took it into its head to tell the people immediately to defy this law and to go in for ugly demonstrations and pen-down strikes; there was even violence in some places to coerce the bankers to give them what they wanted. I do not want to go into that history.

After that, some saner sections of the bank employees said that they repudiated these methods which had been instilled into their minds by the Association. The question must be decided between the banking companies and the workers of the individual banks. They asked me to use my good offices. How can I use that when one side goes on irritating the other side every minute of the day and would not allow the banks to work smoothly? Anyway, about a fortnight back, I had an occasion to go to Bombay when some representatives of the banking companies came to meet me. I said that they should forget the misbehaviour and whatever they have done the bankers should see what is fair and do something which would pacify them. At least the majority of them

[Shri Khandubhai Desai]

were not in the demonstration. I asked them: "Why should you want to treat them on the same level as others? You make a good gesture it will be responded very favourably by the bank employees and they will work better." They said that they would consider this.

The House must know that there are three associations. One is in relation to the State Bank which has got nearly forty per cent of the total. There we are concerned. The others are the exchange banks. Thirdly, there are the other banks and their association. All the three would have to act uniformly. I think they are taking counsel among themselves and I believe, before long, they will make gesture which will be appreciated by the bank employees.

At the same time, I would like to say a word to the bank employees. As I have said in the beginning, let them give up, as all the other industrial workers, their old tactics and old methods of getting things done. Government is always eager and keen to see that a fair deal is given to everybody. We have off and on, come before this Parliament to see that no injustice is done to the employees. Why should they go on in this old traditional method of unnecessary agitation. We have all to put our shoulders together to increase the wealth and to share it. How that wealth is going to be shared is not going to be decided in the streets by demonstrations, strikes, lockouts, etc. That is going to be decided by this sovereign Parliament. We have rightly, I believe, accepted the method of democracy. Though in its initial stages, democracy may look a little tardy, it is the only way out of any conflicts that may arise in the society from time to time. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Nambiar : Only as a last resort they do it.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : I think that we must give up those old tactics and old methods of the right to strike; in place of the right to strike we must have the right to work which has been guaranteed under our Constitution. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Nambiar : Should we give up the right to strike?

Shri Khandubhai Desai : I did not say that. I mean that the slogan must be changed.

There has been some question raised about the housing conditions. I agree that the housing conditions in most of the urban areas are deplorable. Attempts are being made to improve them. During the last three years, about 78,000 houses have been built by the subsidy-cum-loan scheme. Most of these houses were built by the State Governments. The employers have not taken advantage of it. We have spent nearly Rs. 21 crores in building these houses. Housing in the mining area also requires to be pushed up. The Ministry had now decided that instead of relying on the employers to take advantage of it, the Ministry should build houses, not in one colony, but at the place where the mines were situated—a cluster of 20-30 houses. It should be made available to the miners. The Bhuli township, I regret to say, has not fulfilled the objective which we had in view. It is a little far off from the mining area and therefore, the miners decided not to go there. Naturally, they do not want to go to places three or four miles away from the mining area. We have re-orientated our scheme of building houses. I believe, my colleague, the Housing Minister, has stated the other day what his Ministry is thinking; it is examining whether some or most of the employers cannot be made compulsorily to build houses by law. That is under examination by the Housing Ministry and I hope we will be able to take a decision soon.

Shri Venkataraman has said that he had compared the position of the plantations as he saw them seven years back and as it is today. I myself had an opportunity to tour the plantation area of Assam, about a month back. I went there in 1948. I really found a phenomenal change in the economic and social conditions of the plantation labour; it has improved considerably. Much more is to be done yet. I am glad that the Plantation Act has been very fully implemented by the passing of the rules and regulations; they have now become final. It ensures certain health, education and certain other amenities. Ultimately, the Act had to be implemented by the Government. The Assam Government has promised me that the necessary machinery to see to the implementation of the health and the educational schemes under that Act will begin functioning in the near future and I do not think we would have to complain much about the implementation of the Plantation Act.

I had also an opportunity to see the planters. From what they have told me I feel that they are very keen, themselves, on the implementation of the Plantation Act. As I said, I found radical changes in the outlook of both the plantation labour as well as planters in their economic conditions, etc.

Shri Venkataraman : May I invite him to Madras.

Shri Khandubhai Desai : I will come. Perhaps he feels that, in Madras, conditions are not so good. It is for the State Government, for him and for me and for everybody to see that the conditions there also improve.

Before I conclude, I would like to tell the House this. I have not been able to answer a few points. These token cuts have been placed here. I have got all the notes ready with me and I have got a reply. I do not think that they will go by default for want of discussion or debate. Every suggestion and point made in the House will receive not only careful consideration but straight consideration with a view to be implemented.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I will put the cut motions to the vote of the House.

All the cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amount shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of the following heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof: Demands Nos.: 70, 71, 72, 73, 74 and 136."

The motion was adopted.

[*The motions for the Demand for Grants which were adopted by Lok Sabha are reproduced below—Ed.*]

DEMAND No. 70—MINISTRY OF LABOUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,49,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Ministry of Labour'."

DEMAND No. 71—CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,37,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Chief Inspector of Mines'."

DEMAND No. 72—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,52,79,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour'."

DEMAND No. 73—EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES AND RE-SETTLEMENT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,94,51,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Employment Exchanges and Re-settlement'."

DEMAND No. 74—CIVIL DEFENCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,03,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Civil Defence'."

DEMAND No. 136—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,42,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Labour'."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The House will now take up discussion of the Demands for Grants Nos. 51 to 62 and 131 relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs. As the House is aware, 8 hours have been allotted for the Demands of this Ministry.

There are a number of cut motions to these various Demands. Hon. Members may hand over the numbers of the selected cut motions which they propose to move at the Table, within 15 minutes. I shall treat them as moved, if the Members in whose names those cut motions stand are present in the House and the motions are otherwise in order.

The time-limit for speeches will, as usual be 15 minutes for the Members including movers of cut motions, and 20 minutes if necessary, for Leaders of Groups.

DEMAND No. 51—MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,04,79,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Ministry of Home Affairs'."

DEMAND No. 52—CABINET

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,29,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Cabinet'."

DEMAND No. 53—DELHI

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,53,96,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Delhi'."

DEMAND No. 54—POLICE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,93,88,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Police'."

DEMAND No. 55—CENSUS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,91,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Census'."

DEMAND No. 56—PRIVY PURSES AND ALLOWANCES OF INDIAN RULERS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,02,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Privy Purses and Allowances of Indian Rulers'."

DEMAND No. 57—ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,21,43,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Andaman and Nicobar Islands'."

DEMAND No. 58—KUTCH

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,35,36,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Kutch'."

DEMAND NO. 59—MANIPUR

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,17,26,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment the year ending during the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Manipur'."

DEMAND NO. 60—TRIPURA

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,01,20,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Tripura'."

DEMAND NO. 61—RELATIONS WITH STATES

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 38,06,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Relations with States'."

DEMAND NO. 62—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER AFFAIRS

THE MINISTRY OF HOME

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,80,09,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Home Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 131—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,34,71,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Home Affairs'."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Does the hon. Minister like to say anything in the beginning, or will he reply at the end?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant) : I do not want to intrude now upon the time of the House.

Dr. Krishnaswami : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I have moved four cut motions to invite the attention of the Home Ministry to the serious deficiencies in our administrative structure. I would like my hon'ble friend the Home Minister to consider the various problems, and issues that I raise, in a dispassionate manner.

I should like to begin with Sardar Patel's analysis of shortages of personnel in our administration. It is as true today as it was in 1948 when Sardar Patel made the forthright criticism to which I invited attention and which I hope the Government of India will give weight. Sardar Patel remarked:

"During the last few years, however, all this had completely changed and the pendulum had swung to the opposite extreme. The result was that many posts were held by persons who were far too inexperienced to hold them. This reacted adversely on the efficiency of the services in several ways. Where a superintendent lacked experience, all the assistants under him necessarily lacked guidance and training. This accentuated the ill effects of the poor quality and inexperience of assistants. More men were required to do the same work than if they had the requisite experience. This applied also to the higher layers with the result that the demand for staff further increased thereby accentuating the tendency to progressive deterioration of quality. There was, therefore, an urgent need for arresting this tendency and improving the quality at all levels."

I suggest that these problems are still with us and, if anything, have been accentuated. I am surprised that we have not as yet applied our minds properly to the problem of administrative personnel. We have been content to live from hand-to-mouth, instead of realising that the forced marches which we are taking to goals of higher standards of living and greater prosperity envisaged in the Second Five Year Plan—and, possibly, to be continued in the third and

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

fourth Five Year Plans—necessarily involve a radical re-thinking of what we are to do with our administrative structure.

I am one of those who have come to the conclusion that the competitive examination, while it might have its merits, has been suitable for filling vacancies to posts which mature 15 or 20 years hence. As anyone familiar with administrative procedure knows vacancies in services are closely linked with the retirements of administrative personnel; it is on this basis that posts are filled. What I do suggest is that, if we are to do some re-thinking we should not only relate filling in of vacancies to retirements, but should also have a formula or a plan for taking in some reserves so that we might absorb them in our expanding administrative machinery.

Incidentally, I may refer to accelerated promotions, an evil which was referred to by Sardar Patel in his report on Home Affairs for 1948, and which is very much with us. Now accelerated promotions are a bane and, as everybody realises, it has led to a great fall in efficiency. I may point out that these accelerated promotions have had another deleterious effect on the administration. Those who should advise on matters of policy, who should be responsible for briefing Ministers who are accountable to Parliament, have necessarily to take up a great deal more of executive work, with the result that both policy and execution have suffered. All these are evils, no doubt, and the Home Minister might acknowledge them and yet rightly point out to me as to indicate what I have in view; because while he may be in agreement with me on the seriousness of the evils he can demand not only a clarification of the problems but also positive suggestions.

I suggest that the time has arrived when we should envisage an increase in administrative personnel. We should decide to recruit at different age levels from as wide a sector as possible. I said that the competitive examination was not an infallible or sure guide for providing candidates for our services at all levels. I suggest that we should have selections made on the basis of suitability and experience and we should take account of experience of prospective candidates in the private sector when we recruit more men.

In this connection, I should like to suggest that, when we are thinking of a cadre and recruitment at different levels, we should do it on a planned basis and decide to recruit at one juncture by a specially constituted committee assisting the Public Service Commission. This procedure would have two advantages. Firstly, there are better chances of avoiding patronage, the progeny of *ad hoc* selections, as my friend the Home Minister would realise. Secondly, we have to realise that this recruitment has to be objective and comprehend four specific types of classes, the technical, executive, managerial and administrative. The Home Ministry is, after all, responsible for the administrative services of this country. We have to recruit technical staff; we have to recruit the managerial staff; and we have to recruit the administrative staff, which is responsible for advising on policy, particularly in the Secretariat.

Here, I may point out that we should get rid of the pernicious notion that the All India Administrative Services are a special caste, a special hierarchy, as it were, in which jobs are reserved only for members of that particular service, in which public services are free to move about from one area to the other. People in the State Services at different levels certainly have a right to be absorbed in the new Administrative Service. Although it may be difficult for the States Services to spare their best men to the Administrative Service of the Union for a long period, I think it would be practicable to have them lent for specified periods on deputation. A vast to-and-fro movement would do the Administrative Service quite a lot of good. It would enrich the quality of our Services.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

It would also lead, Mr. Speaker, to our realising that this free to-and-fro movement would considerably mitigate the evils of parochialism, which we are denouncing day in and day out. If people in the lower wings of the States Services have a feeling that they are not shut out, that there is great opportunity for their being lent on deputation, they will naturally have a more liberal, wider and progressive outlook. Moreover, let us realise that Delhi is not the epitome of India. There are other places

which certainly are an epitome and represent the civilisation of India. Such mobility will help more effectively to break down these barriers of parochialism which have been reared by the All-India services being a close preserve.

In this connection I should like the Home Minister to pay due attention to the recruitment of Backward Classes, which is enjoined on us by the Directive Principles of the Constitution. As the House realises, we have granted two important concessions to members of the backward classes. We have raised the age-limit for the entry of backward classes and Scheduled Castes candidates into the services; we have also reduced the minimum qualifications that are necessary for their entrance. But, I should like to point out that the real way of making the backward classes in the services, contribute a great deal more to the efficiency of the administrative machinery, is to give them special opportunities for training without affecting either their pay or prospects of promotion. This can be worked into an administrative system which is going to expand and which will require a larger number of people drawn from all grades of the social strata for the purpose of manning the services in the future.

What is the position today? I would like my hon. friends not to misunderstand me for referring to some of these matters in a rather bitter spirit. We have gone to the extreme in creating posts on a temporary basis and then forgotten about them. Like 'Topsy' we expect them to grow and when they behave not quite properly we turn round and admonish them to behave with responsibility. In some departments, I think, the Home Minister can easily verify these figures,—in some departments—40 per cent. of the gazetted officers are on a temporary basis for the past nine years, 50 per cent. of non-gazetted officers have been on a temporary basis for the past twelve years.

Now, I would like to refer to another matter of some importance. We have decided to levy new taxes. Two years ago, we levied a tax on soap—an excise duty. We have levied duties on vegetable oils, we have levied also an excise duty on mill cloth. We have decided upon opening new post-offices, we have decided to open new broadcasting stations. It is curious that for almost all these new tasks for which we require administrative personnel, we have recruited

people on a temporary basis. Can anyone suggest seriously that these duties are going to be of a temporary nature? I do not think anyone can possibly suggest that they will be of a temporary nature. I believe that it would have been wiser and sounder to have evolved a more rational policy and to have recruited them on a permanent basis instead of allowing the people to be on a temporary basis and denying them the benefit of a pension. The great security and charm of Government service is after all a pension. If it is found that for a long period a good proportion of the services are on a temporary basis, I venture to think the morale and efficiency of the administrative services would be sapped.

I suggest that the retirement age could be increased especially as people's expectation of life has increased and we need more men. In view of the expanding needs of administration, the prospects of those lower down will not be jeopardised. Therefore, it would be better to have something like an extension of the retirement age as a matter of general principle. It is wrong to continue the present system of extensions. What has occurred in the administrative hierarchy of Delhi today is that it is done purely on an *ad hoc* basis, and it leads to deleterious consequences, because people almost at the end of their careers are forced to play the role of petitioners instead of bringing the wealth of their experience to bear on matters of policy and advise the Ministries.

I shall refer briefly to the Royal Services Commission in the United Kingdom. I am referring to it only because I feel that there are certain aspects of administration considered by that body which would have to be pondered over by those who have given full support to the theory and evolution of a welfare State. I shall refer to the technical, executive, managerial and administrative services. It is rightly assumed that we should have horizontal mobility, as it were, between these different branches of the services. While I agree that the executive and managerial sides may certainly be brought into the highest branch of administration, with responsibility for advising on matters of policy, I am one of those who hold the view that the technical staff should not be shunted into those administrative services, for two reasons. Technical men at the top would I expect in the future be

[Dr. Krishnaswamy]

paid at least as highly as those in charge of policy-making. But the more important consideration is, that the contribution of a technician to society will be greatest in his special field of competence. That is why, without mentioning personalities, I feel that it is wrong to get scientists into the Planning Commission and attempting to make them administrators. They would contribute more to society if they are in their laboratories than if they are brought into the administration in Delhi where they languish for want of acquisition of new skills.

Secondly, to advise on policy is a complex art and requires abilities of a high order. We have, therefore, like the Jesuits, to catch our administrators young, we have also to cast the net wide to bring in categories which have been hitherto outside the purview of the Indian Civil Service. I suggest that a minimum of ten to fifteen years' experience in a walk of life involving execution and management of an enterprise must be made an indispensable condition for their entering the 'pool'. The net must be wide enough and the bait attractive to include even those in the private sector.

Finally, I must point out, and the Home Minister will agree with me, that civil servants do not expect to be paid at commercial rates. That was what Sir Bridges, the permanent Under Secretary of the Treasury, mentioned while giving evidence before the Civil Service Commission which went into this matter. But he took care to point out that :

"There must be some semblance of fair comparison with other branches of activity".

It is wrong to assume that the administrator's task is simple. Those who advise on matters of policy have to perform a complicated job. I cannot do better than quote from the findings of the Royal Civil Service Commission which reported only six months ago to the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

"The work of the administrator, therefore, taken as a whole, requires in an unusual degree a capacity to master and to marshal details in many different fields at different times, to interpret effectively the ideas and policies of others and to operate a complex administrative machine. It is rare to find these qualities in balanced proportion in

one individual but the Civil Service can never afford to be short of them and must, therefore, provide in its arrangement adequate opportunities for recruiting, training, developing and retaining enough of the exceptional talent required to man effectively its highest ranks. It is, of course, true that not all members of the class carry out the most significant duties of the class all the time. Much of the day-to-day work evenly falling to it, particularly in the grades of Assistant Secretaries and Principal would probably in the outside world be styled "executive". But this kind of limiting qualification is also found in the work of any group of broadly similar staff even in a finely graded service. But it does not detract from the importance of the work of the class as a whole or from the need to ensure an adequate supply of persons capable, at any time, of discharging the characteristic duties of the class".

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel joined the band of immortals by integrating the States. Let us hope that his successor and others in our time will apply their minds afresh to the problem of rebuilding the administrative machinery so that it might be capable of performing the new task that devolves on us. Above all, let us get rid of the pernicious notion of having the All-India Administrative Service as a separate caste.

Mr. Speaker : Shri C. C. Shah.

Shri C. C. Shah (Gohilwad-Sorath) : I am sorry; I am not speaking today.

Mr. Speaker : I do not find any hon. Member standing in his seat. I expected the Whips to give me a list, and the Whips have since given me a list. I call the hon. Members accordingly but if they say they are not ready, it is rather strange. Shri Frank Anthony.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians) : I have a cut motion—No. 1109—which refers to the need for providing specific statutory guarantees for the linguistic minorities. I believe that this matter has assumed a special and vital urgency, more especially because we have or rather we will have before this House soon the States Reorganization Bill. We already have linguistic minorities in the country, but after we have finished rehashing the

country, we will have added appreciably to this number of linguistic minorities. I am glad that both the Prime Minister and the Home Minister have underlined the very special needs for giving careful and ample guarantees to the linguistic minorities. But I feel that their salutary views have not been translated into effect in the draft Reorganisation Bill.

As far as I can make out, there are only two provisions which refer to the minorities. There is, first clause 21(2)-A which refers to the setting up of zonal councils as advisory bodies to make recommendations, among other matters, for the linguistic minorities. Then we have the new article 350-A, according to which it will be the endeavour of the State authorities and local authorities to provide for linguistic minorities at the primary stage, facilities for education in their respective mother-tongues. I feel that in this matter of linguistic minorities, only those who have had the experience and who have known the difficulties and even the disabilities of minorities can really appreciate this anxiety, this desire, for certain specific safeguards in respect of language and of culture and language and culture are the dearest possession of any group. We have seen symptoms of this recently. If large groups running into tens of millions can exhibit their anxiety, then the anxiety of smaller groups must be appreciated all the more by the Home Ministry and the Government of India. The Sikhs, I believe, have been specially fortunate. An exceptional provision has been made for the Sikh community which should go a long way to allaying their fears and their anxieties. Certain cynics have suggested to me that so far as groups are concerned—particularly the linguistic groups—they are accommodated in exact proportion to their capacity or will to make trouble. Other cynics—with these cynics I agree—have suggested that in politics, silent pains evoke no response. I sincerely hope that this norm will not determine the form of the safeguards for the linguistic minorities. I cannot help feeling that there has been no carefully formulated suggestions with regard to safeguards for linguistic minorities largely because most of the linguistic minorities have still to come into being. It is only when the minorities are in being, when they come face to face with day to day difficulties of living and being that they will

realise more and more their difficult and, sometimes, unenviable position. As a member of a minority in being, I am able to speak from experience about the danger of not having specific safeguards for minorities, and above all, of not having categorical statutory guarantees, which are, in the final analysis, justiciable. I feel that, in this matter of framing or suggesting safeguards for the linguistic minorities there is a tendency for a good deal of self-righteousness. There is a good deal of glib talk and glib assumption about secular democracy. Some of us try to set up an illusion that we have a secular democracy in being. Pontifically some leaders even preach to the minorities and pontifically they point to proclamations in our Constitution. They would have us accept the word for the deed. But the minorities know that secular democracy is not a product which can be reared overnight. It is not a mushroom growth. It has to evolve. It is a process which must cover not only decades, in this country, but generations, requiring certain mental attitudes, certain psychological processes. Let us accept this fact that we are still at the very threshold of this progress towards our ultimate goal of a secular democracy. The road is going to be hard, is going to be long, and if we are honest, we will admit this that communalism, casteism, even linguism are endemic in Indian thought, history and tradition, and they will take a long period of uprooting, they will take a long process of uprooting.

I have already referred to these two provisions on behalf of the linguistic minorities. They appear to be the only two provisions in the draft Bill. One refers to the zonal councils. I am not going to decry these provisions. They are there for what they are worth. But I want to analyse them.

In the first place, these zonal councils from their inception are of a purely advisory character, and those of us of the minorities who have had anything to do with advisory bodies realise that *vis-a-vis* Government and Government machinery the advisory bodies are not only usually ineffective, but they are almost certainly usually impotent. And the zonal councils suffer from a double disqualification. In their inception they are advisory. Their recommendations are again of an advisory character. Somebody may say that an

[Shri Frank Anthony]

advisory body can only make advisory recommendations. I say if this provision with regard to zonal councils is to have the semblance of any kind of effectiveness, is to have any meaning or value, you must put some legal and some language teeth into it. For instance, if there is a majority view on the zonal council in favour of a linguistic minority, then that view must be absolutely binding on the Government concerned.

Even if teeth are put into this provision of zonal councils, my fear is this. What guarantee is there that the zonal council will not merely be reflection of the majority party, the party reflecting the linguistic majority? If constitutional guarantees, more than that if guarantees in the Fundamental Rights chapter of the Constitution which are supposed to be unusually sacrosanct have not been able to protect linguistic minorities, then to what extent can we hope that advisory bodies making recommendations will give any real guarantee to linguistic minorities? As I have said, what guarantee is there that these zonal councils will be anything more than an anaemic reflection in policies and views, in oppression and in arrogance, of the linguistic majority in a particular State?

I am able to speak in this matter not only from personal, but from personal bitter experience, and what I say I am saying here in this House not in anger, but more in sorrow. This House is aware of the fact, and I say this objectively, that when a certain State Government was inspired by the motive of destroying the English language, in pursuance of that motive it immediately issued an order seeking to destroy Anglo-Indian and English-teaching schools. Now, it required no legal acumen, it did not require even any commonsense, all it required was a modicum of honesty to look at that provision to see the monstrous injustice and palpable illegality of its character. Yet the spokesmen of that particular Government persisted in trying to circulate the legal canard that that patently illegal order, an order in patent violation not only a Constitutional but of Fundamental Rights, was not only legal but progressive. And a more regrettable feature was this, that a large part of the press which operates under government tutelage, a large part of the press also tried to create this illusion that this

legal canard was in fact not a canard but that what was sought to be done was both legal and progressive. Therefore, we found ourselves in a difficult position.

5 P.M.

What would have happened if there had been these zonal councils? Would the zonal council have taken a view contrary to that of the highest spokesmen of government? Would the zonal council have opposed the view in the sponsored press? On the other hand, the zonal council, if it were there, may have been a liability to the minority concerned. It may have joined in the general official chorus. What I am trying to underline is this. What would have been the fate of this particular linguistic minority? What would have been the fate of the English-teaching and Anglo-Indian schools, if their fate had been vested in some advisory body making recommendations?

Fortunately, they were able to bring this patently illegal order, this attempt by government, juggernaut to overrun the Constitution and the Fundamental Rights, before the court; they were able to bring this fairly and squarely, before the courts because those were statutory rights, justiciable rights, and rights which also fell within the Fundamental Rights chapter. Finally we had to go to the courts. That was what happened.

If you want to inspire any confidence in the minorities, then in all these matters, whatever rights you have must be specifically worded; they must be made statutory, and they must be made justiciable. What would have happened in this case, if the courts were not the final and impartial sentinals on this particular issue? The schools would have disappeared, and the English language which happens to be the language of our community, which I have the privilege to represent, would have been in the process of being effaced.

Arising out of this rather sorry, if not sordid episode, there is another example; and I say I am one of the few people belonging to a linguistic minority already in existence, who can point categorically to examples of what would happen,—and what has happened,—if you did not have constitutional guarantees, guarantees which can be raised in the final analysis before the courts. What happened in this case?

The Congress party was extremely generous to my community, and nobody has been more appreciative of this generosity than I have been so far as the Constitution was concerned. Certain specific safeguards were provided for my community, and one of these safeguards is contained in article 333 of the Constitution. That provision requires that the Governor of a Part A State, may, if he considers it necessary, nominate a person to represent the Anglo-Indian community. Pandit G. B. Pant, the Home Minister was with me, and he had a great deal to do with this, and he helped me considerably in the framing of these provisions. The emphasis was on the word 'represent'. The person, although nominated, because the community was numerically too small to get its representatives in an open election, was to be selected because of his representative capacity. And what happened in this case?

In the State where there is only one unchallenged organisation representing my community for the past forty years, where before this unfortunate, Bombay schools case Government had automatically accepted the nominee of this association, unfortunately, smarting under a defeat—I was not responsible for that defeat, if you look at it in that way, because their illegal order was struck down and exposed by the Supreme Court—Government chose to strike at this small minority, and they chose to ignore not one representative of the community but a panel of six, and to impose a person as a representative, who does not pretend to claim to represent ten people in the Bombay State.

That same sorry story was repeated in the Bengal Legislature also. A person was imposed in spite of these constitutional guarantees, to represent my community in Bengal, a person who had been driven out, if not to the gutter, on to the streets. He was picked up because he chose to join the Congress Party. He was put in and imposed upon community because he was an alleged representative of the Congress Party, not of the Anglo-Indian community.

There are several examples—but I will not labour them—to show that even in the face of statutory guarantees, this is what can happen. Take the case of educational rights. Here again, there is a generous guarantee given. Under

article 337 of the Constitution, the States have certain obligations, mandatory, inescapable obligations, to continue certain grants, but—I say this with regret—two States, the State of Uttar Pradesh and the State of Madras, have patently, illegally made unconstitutional cuts, in flagrant violation of the plain language and phraseology of article 337. For three years, I have tried to secure redress. I have come to this House. The Commissioner appointed by the President has not been able to do anything. The Home Minister has just come here. I have appealed to him. Three years have elapsed and those Governments, the Governments in perpetuating the illegalities, as I say, of Madras and Uttar Pradesh, persist in flagrant violation of the plain constitutional provisions. I know what would happen if I go to the court tomorrow. Those illegalities would be struck down. But do you require minorities to keep on going to the courts and spend time, and what is more, spend money, in order to vindicate their rights? At least, they have this satisfaction of knowing that even if they cannot get the State Governments to see right or even if they cannot get the Centre to set right an obvious and palpable illegality, they have a final court of appeal in this country to which they can go, namely the courts. It is because of that that I am asking that these provisions should be of a statutory and justiciable character.

The second provision and the only other provision with regard to linguistic minorities is that another article 359(A) be put in the Constitution—it is a good provision as far as it goes—it says that it shall be the endeavour of State Governments and of local authorities to provide facilities up to the primary stage for linguistic minorities. But my own fear is that because of lack of financial resources, this will remain virtually a deadletter, like so many of the directive principles in the Constitution. My own fear is that it will remain a deadletter, very much like article 45 of the Constitution. The language of the new article is almost identical. Article 45 says that it shall be the endeavour of the Government to provide free and compulsory education within ten years to its citizens. We know to what extent that directive principle has remained still-born. I am not going to blame anyone if this provision also remains still-born. But I

[Shri Frank Anthony]

submit with emphasis, but with respect, for the favourable consideration of the Home Minister that if there are to be any kind of guarantees for linguistic minorities in the States Reorganization Bill, then their appropriate place is alongside of articles 29 and 30 of the Constitution.

Articles 29 and 30 refer specifically to linguistic minorities, to their educational and cultural rights. What more appropriate decision could there be than to either extend these articles or to add to them? If, for instance, because the State Governments have not the financial resources—and they will not have the resources—to give education to the minorities in their mother tongue, a minority may well establish its own educational institution, what is the position? Under article 30, as now interpreted by the Supreme Court, in the Bombay schools case, every linguistic minority has the right to establish and to administer educational institutions of its choice. No Government can interfere with that right. That is the final dictum of the Supreme Court.

Now, if that is the right which we have given under article 30, that every linguistic minority has the right to establish and administer educational institutions of its choice, then the consequential right should be this, that if they are running their educational institutions, if no one can prevent them from running their educational institutions, surely they must have the right to have an examination through that medium. My own fear is this, that while this right is there and cannot be interfered with, some State Governments—some of them because they have not got the financial resources, and others deliberately and insidiously—may want to efface a particular language or a particular linguistic minority. They may say, 'All right, we have given you this fundamental right. We cannot take it away'. But they may strike at the educational institutions by either not giving the facilities for an examination or if there are facilities by taking them away.

What I am asking for is not only for myself. I am asking this for every linguistic—and potential linguistic,—minority in this country. If the Tamils in Andhra have their educational institutions, they will have the right under article 30 to run those institutions. But

if the Andhra Government says 'We cannot,—and we will not,—give you examination through the medium of Tamil', is it not only fair that the Tamils should have the right to affiliate their institutions to wherever Tamil may be the medium?

All that I am asking is, let something be added to article 30 that it is an extension of their right to establish educational institutions of their choice. That if, in the State, there is no examination in that medium, then those linguistic minority institutions may have the right to affiliate to any other body conducting examination in that medium in any other part of the country.

Finally, I would ask the Home Minister to consider this. The position of the linguistic minorities is not going to be easy. The Home Minister and the Prime Minister have quite rightly made promises of ample guarantees.

At this stage, I do not want to make any precise suggestions, but, I would particularly ask the Home Minister to consider this suggestion that there should be some central agency for considering the difficulties and problems of the linguistic minorities. When I say this, I say it with regret, but I say it objectively that it is only the Centre that has inspired confidence in the minorities in this country. Some States certainly, have been generous; some have been liberal; some have been tolerant; but, all States have not been equal either in their attitudes or in their policies. And, because of this, if real confidence is to be inspired in the linguistic minorities and, I believe that is the intention and desire of the Home Minister—then, I would ask him seriously to consider the setting up of some kind of central agency which will be a sort of appellate authority in respect of problems which linguistic minorities may choose to refer to it.

Shri Achuthan (Cranganur): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to congratulate our Home Minister who is one of the ablest leaders of this country and who has a lot of experience in one particular State as the Chief Minister for nearly two decades, which is rarely the case in any other State, especially my own State. So, I am very happy and hopeful that under his regime, as the Home Minister of the Government of

India, there will be spectacular reforms in the administration of the Central Services as well as in the improvement of the conditions of the Scheduled Castes and the backward communities throughout India.

Coming first to the All-India services, after the creation of Part B States, there was a scheme for upgrading some of these State officers into IAS and IPS services. I agree it is good that some senior service men of the Part B States must be raised to that status. But, was there a general policy throughout all the Part B States or was there an individual policy followed in regard to each State? If there had been a general policy throughout all the States, and if a certain percentage of officers had been promoted to these grades, there would have been no murmur in the country. But, we see that in some States a larger percentage of officers were promoted and in some States a lower percentage were promoted. Because of this there is dejection and ill-feeling. In many States, lists after lists were sent. First, one list was sent; subsequently, another list; and then, another list. There were rejections after rejections. Finally, it comes to this. Officers who may be of the ordinary calibre and capability were, after a service of 15 or 20 years, promoted as IAS. In this particular matter, it has caused a great deal of dejection to a number of senior officers with whom we have to do our work in the States. What is the difference between a Secretary in a State department and a Secretary in a Central department? They have to do the same work under the Constitution. Under the Constitution, certain functions are allocated to the States and certain functions to the Centre. I can understand that there is some higher dignity and status and position in the case of the Central service man. But, the honesty, the earnestness and the integrity that one has to possess is the same in both cases. The Home Minister should see that in all these services a uniform policy is followed.

Then, I come to the pay scales. After the Central Pay Commission report and Gadgil report we see the gulf widened. In certain States the pay scales are very very low. We find that the Central pay scales are very high. What will be the consequence?

When you find in one room of the same building a graduate of the same calibre and ability and integrity doing State service work and getting a pay of

Rs. 50 or Rs. 60, and in the other room of the same building, another graduate of more or less the same calibre and ability doing Central Government work drawing Rs. 130, whose fault is it? Are they not doing the work under the Constitution of India for the same countrymen, for the welfare of the 36 crores of people or for different people? There is a national government at the Centre now. This is a very important matter and I was agitating here in the House for the last two or three years. There is discontent among the State service men that the Central Government people are getting higher pay, disproportionately higher. There may be a little difference, it may be a little higher and that I can understand and appreciate. But the pay of the Central Government people is disproportionately high and the gulf is very wide. That will not do good to the country, and the service men in all States are murmuring and saying: "What are you there for? Do you not see that we are doing the same service to the country as the people at the Centre who are drawing higher pay and yet we receive much smaller pay?" So, there must be a scheme throughout the country by which there should not be much difference between the pay of the Central Service and that of the State Service in any part of the country.

Coming to the selection for the I.A.S. I concede that our youngsters are able boys and they must have their ambitions. They must have their scales of pay consistent with our financial position and consistent with the policy adumbrated by us. I do not know how far it will be correct now to fix up their starting pay at the present high level and the highest pay at Rs. 1,000. Whatever be their feelings, we must see, as the Prime Minister said about two days ago in a speech here in Delhi before the Institute of Public Administration, that the servicemen should be made to feel that they are the lowest men. In fact, the Prime Minister stated that if any humble countryman goes to him, he would welcome him and talk to him but he may not find time for a senior officer to meet him. That must be the feeling in the service men. So, we must see that the so-called high officers, I.A.S., I.P.S. etc., are not given very high salaries or very fat salaries at the very beginning. If the officers feel that they are in very high positions then after ten or fifteen years they may very well feel that they have risen to such a level that there will be nobody

[Shri Achuthan]

there above them, and that is bad. We do not want such officers in our country. A scheme must, therefore, be worked out in a proper manner in this connection.

Coming to my State of Travancore-Cochin, let me say that the States of Travancore and Cochin were integrated in 1949. Even now, after more than 4, 5 or 6 years, the services have not been integrated completely. Some Departments have been integrated, but even now there is murmur, resentment, dejection and disappointment. We get copies of a number of memorials and memoranda sent by the employees. Their demand is that there should be an impartial tribunal or a judicial officer to look into this matter. Let him see, let him examine all these papers, and also all the orders that have been passed by the Government and then say which is right, which has to be revised, which has to be rectified and so on. Some bold steps are required to be taken just now because Kerala State is going to be formed and a portion of Malabar will also be coming into it and the same problem will again be there. Government must be prepared even now to see that after the new States are formed, there will be no room for murmur or disappointment in the integrated services.

Regarding the appointment to the Central Services, we find that appointments are made by the U.P.S.C. and for temporary posts appointments are made by the Secretaries or the Departments concerned, which, I think, is bad. In the small State of Travancore-Cochin, even peons were appointed by the Commission because people did not tolerate favouritism. We estimate our requirements in advance. Suppose we want 50 graduates, even three or six months in advance, of their appointment, selections are made, and memoranda are sent to the candidates to appear before the State Public Service Commission, so that the curse of favouritism and nepotism will not be there.

We find a number of offices in Delhi. A feeling is there in the country that in some region or area there may be some favourable atmosphere and that it should not be tolerated. I am not finding fault with any individual. Whether it is the east or the west or the south or the north, all must feel that all are for the country and should do their

service. We must make it a rule. Things may be done three or six months earlier.

The Central Government requires, during the Second Plan, a number of officers. Let us chalk out a plan—how many graduates, class III servants, class IV servants, etc. we want. We should do that. Not only that. The UPSC should also visit the States. Candidates have to spend a lot of money and trouble in order to come to Delhi and appear before it. Let them go to Madras, Bombay or Calcutta. The neighbouring States can send their candidates to that place. The recruitment should be made sufficiently early so that at any time when the Government requires them, it can send memos so that even a single chowkidar's post will not go unnoticed by the Commission. That is a very important matter. Otherwise, more and more of these will be there and even in this House you can find discussions about these. This should be done for harmonised working in this country.

Coming to the backward classes, one year has passed since the report was submitted. I hope the Government is consulting the State Governments. Apart from the Scheduled Castes and Tribes mentioned therein, a number of others belong to the backward classes. They are expecting much out of the report and waiting for the action that is going to be taken by the Government. Educational facilities and financial assistance must be given to them. Then only can we say that the curse of untouchability has been banished. This curse of casteism and all these things must be removed. I hope the Home Minister will see that, before the end of this session, the recommendations and the action proposed by the Government would be made available to the Members. (*Interruption.*)

In Travancore-Cochin State, there is the problem of over-population and also unemployment. Everybody knows that. Even the politics of that State is affected by that. Unless the Home Ministry should have some schemes to attract capital to that State and also schemes of colonisation in places like Andamans or Nicobar Islands or in other States and start some small-scale and cottage industries, that problem cannot be solved. It will give headache for our able and aged Home Minister. Even Shri Rajagopalachari has prophesied that it will be difficult to tackle that problem. I am afraid that our Home Minister should look into these things sufficiently

early; otherwise, it will be impossible. There must be colonisation schemes. A lot of people are prepared to go to any place—Central India or anywhere. They are prepared to work hard and honestly.

The schemes must be started early. Otherwise, it will be a very serious problem. I do not know what other things will take place during the next elections. I have got my own doubts; even the Home Minister has his own doubts. That problem could be solved if it is tackled properly. Let capital be attracted there. Give concessions to big capitalists to come there and settle there and have their factories there. You must also encourage small-scale and cottage industries.

I think, under the able guidance of the Home Minister and his Deputy, Shri Datar, these things will be kept in view and due consideration and care will be given to solve these problems as early as possible.

Shrimati Khongmen (Autonomous Distt.—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to take part in this important discussion. I have no doubt in my mind that the Ministry of Home Affairs is doing as well as is possible, in the circumstances in which India finds itself, under the able guidance of our respected Pant Ji.

The Report published by the Ministry of Home Affairs is a fairly comprehensive one. It has tried to present all aspects of the works done under the Ministry. But, when I look to the actual achievements in my part of the country, I have, unfortunately, to repeat all that I had said in this connection in previous years.

Whether in the sphere of economic development or in the realm of social services, the hill areas in my part of India have not received adequate treatment. This does not mean that the authorities are unsympathetic or unmindful. They indeed bestow their attention to the problems that exist there. But, in actual achievement, not much is in evidence.

In the field of economic development, the means of extraction and marketing the produce in the hills of Assam and the North-East Frontier Agency are the same. The same old conditions are prevailing. Oranges and other fruits, betelnuts and betel leaves rot in the jungles. There is no means of taking them out. Even if they are taken out they deteriorate on the way before they are marketed. No adequate price is also available for them. So, these hill people are getting poorer and poorer. A scheme for preservation of fruits was under contemplation. I do not know what has become of that scheme.

The age-old practice of jhum cultivation is still continued. Sustained and extensive efforts are not being made to teach the hill people about terraced cultivation.

Mr. Speaker: It is 5-30. The hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

5-30 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Half Past Ten of the Clock on Wednesday the 11th April, 1956.