

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the restoration of places of religious worship in the possession of certain persons or communities to the original rightful owners thereof".

*The motion was adopted.*

**श्री प्रदाता वीर श्रास्त्री :** मैं विल को प्रस्तुत करता हूँ।

**Mr. Chairman:** As regards the next item, Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi is absent.

15.41½ hrs.

**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY BILL\***

by *Shri Narasimhan*

**Shri Narasimhan** (Krishnagiri): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the constitution of an Indian Institute of Archaeology for imparting training in scientific methods of archaeology and in the conservation of historic and artistic works, including research in various branches of Archaeology.

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the constitution of an Indian Institute of Archaeology for imparting training in scientific methods of archaeology and in the conservation of historic and artistic works, including research in various branches of Archaeology".

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Narasimhan:** I introduce the Bill.

15.42 hrs.

**CEILINGS ON SALARY (IN PRIVATE SECTOR) BILL—contd.**

by *Shri A. M. Tariq*.

**Mr. Chairman:** The House will now resume further discussion on the motion moved by Shri A. M. Tariq on the 29th April 1960, namely:—

"That the Bill to provide for ceiling on salaries in private employment be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 15th September 1960".

Out of 2½ hours allotted for discussion of this Bill, 25 minutes were taken up on the 29th April 1960, and 2 hours and 5 minutes are now available.

Shri Keshava may now continue his speech.

**Shri Keshava** (Bangalore City): Last time while I was on my legs in connection with this Bill, I was just bringing to the notice of this House the contents of the Estimates Committee's Ninth Report (First Lok Sabha). Of course, they mentioned in the Report that ours is a Welfare State and the people in our country evaluate service in terms of money and if any more attractive offers are made by the private sector, our talented young men in the public sector simply rush into that sector. Naturally, to whatever extent it may be, there is a depletion of competent and experienced men in the public sector. They have also mentioned in the Report that there are no principles on which the private sector gives employment to its employees. It is a matter for examination. There must be a rationalisation of salaries in the private sector and some sort of qualifi-

\*Published in the *Gazette of India* Extraordinary Part II—Section 2, dated 12-8-1960.

[Shri Keshava]

fication has got to be prescribed. No doubt, all this is true and my good friend, Shri A. M. Tariq, has got his inspiration for sponsoring this Bill from that Report.

But let us be realistic over this matter. In fact, it is a very very complicated matter. Salaries are different even from State to State and from Centre to State. Even in one service, there are umpteen grades of salaries and we have not been able to bring about a uniform kind of salary for a particular kind of work even in one State. I know it for a fact that in the integrated Mysore State, they have come to know how salaries in different States differ. The salaries of officials in the Bombay State, the salaries of the same type of officials doing the same kind of work in the State of Andhra and the salaries of identical officials doing the same kind of work in Madras are entirely different from one another. In that way, it was such an enormous, onerous and responsible task for the Mysore Government to bring about even a sort of uniformity in the matter of salaries of any particular service.

The principle on which my hon. friend wants to have this Bill is that of equal pay for equal work and things of that kind. It is a very complicated problem; much more so is it in the private sector. In fact, it is an accepted truth, if I can say so, that the private sector is to a very great extent responsible for the great production that we are proud of in our country. We evaluate things in terms of money and that is why the salaries that are offered in the private sector give encouragement and initiative for the young men; it gives a sort of incentive for those talented youngsters to put their whole heart into their efforts. That may be one of the reasons why the private sector has been able to contribute more. In fact, our leader was pleased to say that it has contributed tremen-

dously to the production of this country.

Taking into consideration all these factors, it looks as though it is a matter which cannot be done in a day. Of course, for going into it, a Committee may be appointed. But no doubt, it does in a way contradict even the policy of our Government of mixed economy. The private sector also has its place in our country. We have ourselves given it a place and such being the case, how can we at once say that we should wipe out all the distinctions in respect of salaries of people in the public sector in the private sector and bring about a sort of uniformity: it is a sort of restriction that we are trying to impose by means of this Bill. It is a restriction on our activities and as such, it is not a very wholesome feature just at this stage of development in our country.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali):**  
At no stage.

**Shri Keshava:** Let the country develop. In fact, anomalies are there. We are born with anomalies. We cannot, in fact, wipe out all distinctions in life. Even so far as Shri Tariq is concerned, he is short and I am tall; he is thick and I am thin. Anomalies exist everywhere. What we have got to bring about now is a sort of harmony and we have to mitigate the difficulties due to these anomalies. But what does this Bill contemplate? It contemplates bringing about a sort of uniformity. In clause 2, it says:

"The monthly salary paid to an employee in any private concern or firm, or industry shall not be more than the maximum and less than the minimum fixed for the Government employees."

I do not know how at all this matter can be worked out. In fact, there are a number of concerns; there are a variety of industries, the small-scale industries, the large-scale industries,

the medium-scale industries. All kinds of efforts are being put forward by the people of our country in order to pull up the country and industrialise our country and to increase production. At this period of development in our country, this is something very much impossible, even to attempt.

There is the penal clause in which he says:

"Any employer who contravenes provisions of this Act shall be punishable with a fine of rupees 10,000."

**Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur):** Why not imprisonment?

**Shri Keshava:** Somehow he has avoided imprisonment.

**Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir):** They will have special treatment there; so I have avoided that.

**Shri Keshava:** It is a very impracticable proposition that is being put forward. Let us be realistic over this matter. It looks as though there is a phobia for ceilings everywhere. In fact, the Planning Commission wants us to put a ceiling even on the relationship between husband and wife. What is family planning? It is nothing but a ceiling on the relationship between husband and wife.

**Shri A. M. Tariq:** No, no; it is a ceiling on production.

**Shri Keshava:** Whatever it is, there must be a ceiling everywhere. But, this is not the time for this. I think my hon. friend can confine himself to the salutary feature in this Bill. The only salutary feature is this. 'The salary shall not be less than the minimum fixed for Government employees'. I would welcome that feature. Let us have a floor and not a ceiling. That should be the way in which we should help the develop-

ment of the country. I think you will be killing all initiative if only you bring about this kind of uniformity everywhere.

No doubt our State is a Welfare State. It is certainly true that the Estimates Committee report says that the employment of persons will be improved. I wonder how the employment will be improved. Talent has got to be given its due, and we are judging our services only by the money standard. Why should we deprive our young of what is legitimately their dues for their brilliant talents in contributing their quota of service to the development of the country. All these circumstances have to be carefully considered. I think my hon. friend would do well to withdraw this Bill. It is not necessary even to send it for eliciting opinion.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the spirit of this Bill. When Shri Tariq brought this Bill I thought he had in his mind the fixation of a minimum wage in the country.

**Shri Keshava:** He wants the maximum also.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** It is true that some of the private employers are paying such a meagre salary that it is impossible for any one to exist on that salary. My friends who oppose this Bill may oppose it in principle. But I do not see any reason why initiative should be lost. After all this country, if it is really moving towards socialism, has to decide about the minimum and the maximum.

I have read the report of the Pay Commission, which is pertinent on this matter, to see whether they have said anything about the maximum. The previous Pay Commission, that is the Varadachari Commission, mentioned that the maximum should be Rs. 2,000. This second Pay Commission headed by Justice Jagannath Das did not say that. They said that there had been erosion in this particular category of

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

employees getting Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 4,000, and, as such, they never wanted any ceiling to come. If erosion has taken place in those categories of employees getting more than Rs. 3000—Rs. 4,000 it must be seen. I think there is not erosion. But, on the other hand, there has been a landslide in those categories of employees who are getting less.

Shri Tariq wants that no private employee should pay less than what is being paid by Government. Let us analyse what the Government is paying. The Central Government is the model employer. I may bring to your notice certain figures given to me in this House. I put a question as to how many employees are getting Rs. 250 and more, how many are getting Rs. 100 to Rs. 250 and how many are getting less than Rs. 100. The figures are revealing. The answer was, if I am correct.....

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat):** Is the hon. Member talking of the Government or the private sector. The question is that the private sector should be equated with the public sector.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I think the hon. Minister will read the Bill carefully.

If the private employers are asked to pay as minimum what is being paid in the public sector, it is not asking too much. In the public sector, if supposing, there are 18 lakhs of employees, then more than 14 lakhs—14,76,000 people—are getting less than Rs. 100. The salary which is given to the Central Government employee—at least the minimum wage—should be paid by the private employer.

The Textile Wage Board has submitted its report. Now, a Wage Board is being appointed for the jute industry and the plantation industry. The Sugar Wage Board is submitting its

report next month, I believe. What is needed now? We cannot possibly bring this kind of legislation. But, certainly, this matter has to be seriously thought of—whether the employees or workers working in the private sector are also entitled to get the same higher salaries comparable to the Central Government employees. The difference is too much.

Take the case of the ordinary tannery worker. I come from the city of Kanpur where there are 6,000 to 7,000 tannery workers. In these days, when the Government has failed miserably to hold the price line, they are getting Re. 1 a day. They do not get salary; they are paid on 'no work no pay basis.' That is, they are getting hardly Rs. 26 per month. How can worker exist today on Rs. 26?

The Labour Minister Shri Nanda went to see the appalling conditions of the workers—these tannery workers—there; and he was of the opinion that something should be done to these workers.

In the same way, there are the construction workers, people who are engaged in constructing big buildings. What are they getting today? Even the minimum wages under the Minimum Wages Act are not made applicable to them. In the whole country, whatever a worker is entitled to under the Minimum Wages Act, is not paid to him. This Bill, will, certainly, focus the attention of Government to this.

Now let us take the big employers like the Tatas, Birlas and others, private employers whose capacity to pay is not challenged. At least I do not challenge that. What is being paid in those concerns? Take the ordinary sugar factory under Shri Birla. What is the salary that the worker is getting there today? The general feeling in the country is that the Tatas are paying much. But a strike in 1958 clearly revealed that the salaries paid to the permanent

employees are different. The service conditions of temporary employees even in TISCO are far less favourable. Take IISCO—the Indian Iron and Steel Company—and compare the wages paid there. I submit that wage boards have to be appointed for every industry. I am thankful to the Labour Minister and the Government because they appointed wage boards in many industries. They did it in textiles, they are doing it in jute and probably in plantations also. It is time that wage boards are appointed in every industry. That is the only solution to the problem. The minimum wage has to be accepted.

16 hrs.

We have seen what has happened to the unanimous recommendations of the 15th Labour Conference. The other day I was putting a question: what should be our minimum wage? The principle should be accepted whether we are in a position to pay or not—that is a different matter. When the attitude of the Government was made known, Mr. Naval Tata came out with a statement that the Government cannot respect this decision and that it was not binding. The Mill-owners of the textile mills have brought out a pamphlet saying that if Government could not accept that decision, why should it be made to bind them? That is a dangerous thing. Government must see that the minimum wage formula is accepted because all the private employers headed by Tata and others were a party to this decision. If the Central Government has not actually accepted that recommendation, I do not think the time is far off when all the private employers will be flouting that decision.

I disagree with my hon. friend Shri Keshava when he said that the initiative would be lost. After all there should be some limit to the maximum. There should be some difference between the unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled and highly skilled. The wage differential should be there.

But what should it be? It should be considered by us. Can it be Rs. 30 for the unskilled and nearly 300 or 400 for the skilled and Rs. 3000 for the engineer? It cannot be so. We have to consider that the wage differential is properly maintained. The minimum and the maximum should be there. In no country you will find that there is no ceiling to the maximum income of any worker or engineer or technician. There is some maximum as there is also a minimum. It has been said here that the monthly salary paid to an employee of a private concern or firm shall not be more than the maximum or less than the minimum fixed for the Government employee. It may not be like this. Supposing the Government is so rigid that it does not want to pay its employees more? should it stop the private employer from paying his employees more? That should not be. I think Shri Tariq actually means that there should be a ceiling on the maximum. The Pay Commission formula of a minimum wage which has become today the ideal before the others should not be accepted. I want to know from the hon. Minister whether 56 n.P. theory is really correct and realistic. Can we possibly purchase 32 ounces of food out of it—15 ounces of cereals, 3 ounces of pulses, six ounces of green vegetables, 1½ ounces of ghee or butter—they do not mention dalda but pure ghee or butter—1½ ounces of sugar or gur and 4 ounces of milk and one ounce of groundnut. This is the Pay Commission formula. They wanted to give the employees some sort of a fruit! So, they went out of their way to suggest that this was the proper fruit. They searched for a fruit which could contain all the food values from A to Z and they found that groundnut was the only thing that was good!

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Is it a fruit?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I do not know. I am only saying that in 56 n.P. 32 ounces cannot be purchased. That is my honest submission. In

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

theory it may be correct. But if this 56 nP. is applicable to all the private employees, it will be difficult for any wage board to take a decision. He says that this Bill should be circulated. Let the opinion of all people be sought and let us see whether something could be done for the private employees also.

I also suggest that a commission should be appointed to see the condition of all these employees where the wage boards have not been appointed. According to the decision of the Labour Conferences, wage boards will be appointed only in some industries but the vast majority of these workers who are not getting even a minimum wage will not be benefited. What will happen to them? A survey should be made to ascertain whether the wages are being paid correctly and what is the wage. Is it not a fact that today in our country even the minimum wage is not being paid? It is a very serious matter to be considered by this Government. I support the spirit of this Bill. It should be circulated to elicit public opinion so that we may get the expert opinion of the veteran trade unionists from this and that side or even from outside. I congratulate Shri Tariq for saying this despite the opposition from his own Party Members.

**Pandit K. C. Sharma:** Sir, I do not find much of logic in this Bill. There are two questions here. One is that the private employees' salaries should not be higher than those paid to the Government servants; the other is that it should not be less than salaries paid to the Government servants. So far as the former question is concerned, it is the philosophy of the private sector that a few people climb up. They pave the way to others who stand down and the facilities and the luxuries that the few get in course of time are available to those standing down below as soon as those standing down below climb up. The few that were on the ladder climb further and further up. To the extent

that a community is developed, to that extent all members of the community enjoy the comfort and luxury. For instance you have to analyse the development and progress of the USA. A few people get the benefit of industrial development. They got cars and palaces and many comforts which the other people could not even dream of at first. The few were on the top. The people down below climbed up. It is as if the man is on the top of the tree and he sends down the rope and the man standing down below climbs up again and the man who is already on the top climbs further up. This is the philosophy of the private sector. To limit it to the Government organisation level is to deny the rule of progress in the private sector and to do away with the role of the initiative. The psychological incentive goes away. In the State the principle of recruitment is different because State services are manned on the basis of merit and fitness, and fitness includes character and loyalty to the State. In the case of private sector, loyalty to the private sector does not arise. There the moving motive is profit, luxury in life. That profit and luxury are not available by providing salaries on a par with those of government servants, because the basis itself is different. In every Constitution a citizen has a liability and obligation to accept State service in preference to the much more lucrative private job because he being a citizen enjoys certain fundamental rights. As I said, the basis of government service is quite different from the basis of service in a private concern. Therefore, the rule does not apply in the same degree and in the same way in both the sectors.

So far as the question that these fat emoluments and fat salaries are paid to evade payment of income-tax to the State is concerned, well, this is a question of social consciousness and sense of social responsibility. For this we have to wait patiently till that social consciousness and sense of

social responsibility is developed to that stage when all citizens in the country realise their responsibility to the land of their birth. No law can help it, only a development of social consciousness can help it.

So far as lower services are concerned, well, it is a very good thing that none should be paid so low as to make him not work the next morning to the best of his capacity. But there is a stage in the development of a country where under-employment and unemployment is so much that it is perhaps much more in accord with the social good that half a bread is better than no bread at all. We are at a stage where we have not got full employment, and by law we cannot stop people running after even half a bread. You cannot force people not to work when they want to work and get half a loaf of bread. You cannot ask them to go starving and not work and get half a loaf of bread. Because there is not enough of employment, this rule is impracticable, and whatever is impracticable should not be put down in a statute.

With these words, Sir, I submit that it is useless and because it is useless it should not be pushed further.

श्री म० चं० जैन (कैयल) : चेयरमैन साहब, मैं इस बिल की हिमायत करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि श्री तारिक ने इस बिल को लाकर हमारे सारे देश की और देश को नुमायन्दगी करने वाली हमारी इस सरकार की तवज्ज्ञ देश की एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या की तरफ खींची है। और इसलिये मैं तारिक साहब को इस बिल को हाउस में लाने के लिये बधाई देता हूँ।

इस बिल में क्या बात है? अभी अभी मेरे दुर्जुर्ग साथी, पंडित कृष्णा चन्द्र शर्मा इस बिल की मुवालिफत में बोल रहे थे और मैं हैरान था कि किस तरीके से वह इस बिल को

एक युजलैस बिल कह सके। इस बिल का उमूल क्या है। हो सकता है कि इस बिल की भाषा में हुँड़ रद्दोश्वर को जहरत हो। पर अभी तो श्री तारिक यही कहते हैं कि यह बिल पब्लिक औरीनियन जानने के लिये सरकुलेट किया जाये। इस पर राय आम्मा आंगनी और लोग इस पर अपने अपने संजेशन देंगे। तो इसमें अभी देर होगी और इसकी भाषा में आगे सुवार हो सकता है। लेकिन जो इस बिल का सिद्धान्त है उसको शर्मा साहब या और कोई सदस्य कैसे मुवालिफत कर सकते हैं। और अगर कोई मुवालिफत करेगा तो मैं उस मुवालिफत को समझने की कोशिश करूँगा।

जहाँ तक मैं इस बिल को समझता हूँ यह दो बातें चाहता है। एक बात तो यह है कि आज जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर में तनखाव हैं वे पब्लिक सेक्टर के मुकाबले में बहुत ज्यादा हैं। यह चीज़ न हो। इसी तरह से जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर काले छोटी तनखाव वालों को, जिनका काम कि उसी स्तर के सरकारी कर्मचारियों के समान है, वेतन देते हैं वह उतना ही होता चाहिये जो कि उसी स्तर के सरकारी कर्मचारियों को दिया जाता है। इन दोनों बातों के नीचे जो सिद्धान्त है उसको मानने में शर्मा साहब को या किसी अन्य मेम्बर को क्या एराज हो सकता है। अगर इस उसुल को हम न माने जैसा कि अभी हो रहा है तो इसका क्या नतीजा हो सकता है। वैसे तो एस्टी-मेट्स कमटी की रिपोर्ट में इन नतीजों को दिया गया है, लेकिन मैं उनको फिर हाउस के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि इसके क्या क्या नतीजे निकल रहे हैं और क्या क्या नतीजे निकलेंगे एक तरफ हम एक आदमी को पब्लिक सेक्टर में दो हजार रुपया तनखाव देते हैं और उसी लियाकत के आदमी को उसी तरह के काम के लिये प्राइवेट में पांच हजार रुपया दिया जाता है। ऐसी हालत में जो आदमी

## [श्री म० चं० जैन]

पब्लिक सेक्टर में काम कर रहा है उसके मन में यह भावना पैदा होगी कि मुझे कम तनस्वाह मिल रही है। हमने अपने संविधान में यह बात लिखी है कि एक जैसे काम के लिये एक जैसा ही वेतन मिलना चाहिये। आप देखें कि वही काम टाटा के स्टील प्लाट में होता है और वही काम हमारे दुर्गापुर या भिलाई कंगरह के कारखानों में भी होता है। लेकिन टाटा के कारखाने के जनरल मैनेजर को दस हजार रुपया मिलता है और दुर्गापुर के कारखाने के जनरल मैनेजर <sup>को</sup> उसी काम के लिये तीन हजार दिया जाता है। इस विषमता को आप कैसे हक-बजानिव करार दे सकते हैं। इसका लाजिमी नतीजा यह होगा कि जो आदमी पब्लिक सेक्टर में काम कर रहा है, उसको जरा भी गुंजाइश हीगी वह प्राइवेट सेक्टर में चला जायेगा। और इस तरह से पब्लिक सेक्टर की एकीकृती कम होगी। हमारा प्रौद्योगिकी कम होगी। हमने इसके साफ माने यह है कि इस बजह से सारी नेशन सफर करेगी। अगर हमारे देश में इस किस्म का उसूल चलेगा कि पब्लिक सेक्टर में कम तनस्वाह हो और प्राइवेट सेक्टर में ज्यादा हो तो लाजिमी तौर पर वही नतीजा होगा जो कि मैंने अभी बताया है। इसका लाजिमी नतीजा यह होगा कि जहां गुंजाइश होगी पब्लिक सेक्टर का आदमी प्राइवेट सेक्टर में चला जायेगा, और जहां उसको ऐसा करने की गुंजाइश नहीं होगी वहां उसके मन में असंतोष रहेगा कि मैं भी काम करता हूं लेकिन मुझ को कम तनस्वाह मिलता है। यही बात गवर्नरेंट के भिन्न भिन्न मुहकमों के एम्प्लाईज में भी देखी जा सकती है जहां कि तनस्वाह में इस प्रकार की विषमता है। मिसाल के तौर पर अभी जब हम यूनीवर्सिटी प्रांत्स कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर विचार कर रहे थे तो यह जिक्र आया था कि प्रोफेसरों को कम तनस्वाह मिलती है। नतीजा यह होता

है कि जो लड़के वी. ए. या एम. ए. में फस्ट ब्लास पास होते हैं, और जो टाप करते हैं, उनको मौका मिलता है तो वे आइ. ए. एस, और दूसरे कम्पटीशन्स में भाग लेते हैं। और उस्तादों का काम करने के लिये, जिनको हमने गुह कहा है, वह लोग नहीं जाते जिनके पास बहतरीन इलम है। इसकी बजह यह है कि इनकी काबियत के आदमियों को दूसरी नौकरियों में ज्यादा तनस्वाह मिलती है।

इसी सिलसिले में मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि एक बड़ा कारण विवार्थियों और अध्यापकों में अच्छे ताल्लुकात न होने का यह भी है कि वह प्रोफेसर वहां मूतवातिर रहते ही नहीं। जहां उनको मौका मिलता है वे कालिज को छोड़ कर दूसरी तरफ चले जाते हैं। यही बात और भी ज्यादा प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पब्लिक सेक्टर के बारे में लागू होती है। इसलिए जहां तक इस बिल के सिद्धान्त का ताल्लुक है वह सही है और इस बिल को सरकुलेट करने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए।

मेरा विश्वास है कि इस हाजस की इस्टी-मेट्रस कमेटी ने भी इसी बात को कहा है। उन्होंने प्लारिंग कमीशन से कहा है कि इस मामले को गम्भीरता से स्टडी कराये और देखे कि किस हद तक हमारे देश में इसको लागू किया जा सकता है। मैं चाहता हूं कि इस पर गवर्नरेंट जल्द से जल्द गौर करे।

इसी तरह से लो पेड एम्प्लाईज की बात है। एक तरफ ऊंची जगहों पर जो लोग काम कर रहे हैं उनको खींचने के लिए, प्राइवेट सेक्टर ज्यादा ऊंची तनस्वाहों देता है। या जहां उनके बाई भतीजों का सवाल होता है उनको बड़ी बड़ी तनस्वाहों दे दे कर जनरल मैनेजर आदि बना देते हैं। ऐसा बैलेंस शीट में शाटा दिखाने के लिए किया जाता है। अगर उनके रिस्तेदारों से ज्यादा काबिलियत का भी कोई और आदमी वे रखते हूं तो उसको

कम "तनल्वाह" देते हैं और उसके मुकाबले में अपने रिक्तेदारों को तीन, चार, पांच गुनी तनल्वाह दे देते हैं। इन चीजों से समाज में असंतोष पैदा होता है और हम चाहते हैं कि इस असंतोष को दूर किया जाये। हमारे समाज में असंतोष का यह भी एक कारण है कि जो आदमी किसी सरमाएदार के कारखाने में नौकरी करता है उसको ज्यादा तनल्वाह मिलती है दूसरे को जो पब्लिक सेक्टर में काम करता है उसी काम की कम तनल्वाह मिलती है। इस पहलू पर सरकार जितनी जल्दी गौर करे उतना ही अच्छा है।

इसी सिलसिले में मैं आप से एक बात और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। सारे हिन्दुस्तान में इस बात पर बहुत जोर दिया जा रहा है, प्लाईंग कमीशन ने भी इस बात पर जोर दिया है। नागपुर में कांप्रेस पार्टी ने भी इस बारे में प्रस्ताव पास किया कि लैंड पर सीर्लिंग हो। मुख्तलिक सूबों में असेम्बलियां इस बारे में कानून भी बना रही हैं। लेकिन जहां तक बड़ी बड़ी इनकम्प का सवाल है उन पर हम कोई सीर्लिंग नहीं लगाना चाहते। बहुत सारे सेक्टर हैं जिनमें लोगों की इनकम बहुत ज्यादा है लेकिन सारे सेक्टर्स का तो इसमें जिक्र नहीं है।

**Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):** Sir, there is no quorum in the House.

**Mr. Chairman:** The bell is being rung.—Now there is quorum. The hon. Member may resume his speech.

ओ मू० चं. जैन : मैं यह चिक कर रहा था कि इस कंट्री ने, इस पार्लियामेंट ने इस बात को मान लिया है कि लैंड पर सीर्लिंग लगाई जाये और इस के साफ़ मानी ये हैं कि जहां तक देहतियों का ताल्लुक है, देहत में रहते हुए उन की इनकम पर सीर्लिंग लगाने का निश्चय कर लिया गया है। तो कोई वजह नहीं है कि देहत में रहने वालों की इनकम पर सीर्लिंग हो और शहर में रहने वाले जितनी

आमदनी चाहें कमायें। इस में कोई जस्टिफिकेशन नहीं है। एक देहती होते हुए—आज-कल में शहर में हैं, इस में कोई शक नहीं, लेकिन देहत में जन्म लेने और उस से बड़े गहरे सम्बन्ध होने के कारण मैं कह सकता हूँ कि देहत में इस की वजह से बड़ी रिजेन्टमेंट है। वे लोग सीर्लिंग को इतना ज्यादा बुरा नहीं कहते। वे कहते हैं कि हम पर तो सीर्लिंग लगा दी गई है, लेकिन शहर के रहने वाले चाहे जितनी आमदनी कमायें, उन पर कोई सीर्लिंग नहीं है, इस में कोई जस्टिफिकेशन नहीं है। जहां तक श्री तारिक के बिल का ताल्लुक है, उस में शहर के हर एक सेक्टर पर सीर्लिंग लगाने की बात नहीं है—उस सिर्फ़ एक इम्पार्टेन्ट सेक्टर की आमदनी पर सीर्लिंग लगाने का इरादा किया गया है। श्री तारिक का मोशन यह है कि इस बिल को राय-आम्मा के लिए सर्कुलेट किया जाये। लेकिन उसके अलावा मैं पह चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक इस के प्रिसिपल का ताल्लुक है, वह गवर्नमेंट को कुबूल कर लेना चाहिए। इस बिल का ताल्लुक प्राईवेट सेक्टर की सर्विसेज से है। उन वजूहार की बिना पर, जो कि मैंने अभी इस बिल की हिमायत में बयान की है, गवर्नमेंट को इस बिल के सिद्धान्त को कुबूल कर लेना चाहिए। इस सदन ने इस मुल्क में एक सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ़ सोसायटी बनाने का सिद्धान्त माना है—एक ऐसा समाज बनाने का सिद्धान्त माना है, जिस का ढांचा समाजवादी हो। मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह बिल ऐसा समाज बनाने की तरफ़ एक कदम होगा। मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने पिछले दस बारह बरसों में मुख्तलिक ऐसे कदम उठाये हैं, जिन की बदौलत हम आहिस्ता आहिस्ता समाजवादी ढांचे के समाज की तरफ़ जा रहे हैं। जाती तौर पर मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट उन कदमों को तेज़ कर सकती थी और उसको तेज़ करने चाहिए। आज देश के मुख्तलिक हिस्सों में प्रग्र असंतोष है, तो उस का एक बड़ा कारण यह है कि हम हैब्ज़ पर पाबन्दी लगाने के

[श्री मू० च० जैन]

लिए और हैव नाट्स को उन के हुक्क देने के लिए जो कानून बना रहे हैं, वे इतने ढीले हैं कि जिन हैव्ज के लिलाफ वे कानून बनते हैं, वे तो नाराज होते ही हैं, क्योंकि उन के लिलाफ हम कानून बनाते हैं, लेकिन जिन हैव नाट्स को हम फ़ायदा पहुंचाना चाहते हैं, उन को फ़ायदा नहीं पहुंच रहा है, जो कि उन को पहुंचना चाहिए था। इस का नतीजा यह है कि दोनों तरफे के हम से नाराज होते हैं। मिसाल के तौर पर टेनांसी लेजिसलेशन को लें। हम ने लैंडलार्डज को नाराज किया, क्योंकि हम ने उन के हुक्क के लिलाफ कानून बनाये, लेकिन जैसा कि प्लार्टिंग कमीशन के लैंड रिकार्ड वैनल की रिपोर्ट, आल इंडिया कॉर्पोरेशन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट और नंदा साहब की रिपोर्ट से साफ चाहिए होता है, जितने टेनांट्स पिछले कुछ अंतर से में बेदखल हुए हैं, उतने पहले कभी नहीं दुए थे। मैं यह चाहता हूं कि देश में सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसायटी कायम करने के लिए जितने इकैनिटिव तरीके से हम चल सकते हैं, हमें चलना चाहिए, जितने कदम हम आगे बढ़ा सकते हैं, ते हमें बढ़ाने चाहिए। यह बिल भी उस तरफ एक इम्पार्टेन्ट कदम है, जिस को उठाने में हमारी गवर्नमेंट को हिम्मत से काम लेना चाहिए और इस बिल की हिम्मत जाओ। यहां तक इस मकसद है कि इस बिल को पब्लिक ओपीनियन के लिए समूलेट किया जाये। जहां तक इस मकसद का ताल्लुक है, इस हाउस के किसी भी सेक्वेशन से इस की मुख्यलिपत नहीं होनी चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस मोशन की पुराजोर हिम्मत करता हूं।

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Mr. Chairman, Shri A. M. Tariq has brought in this Bill and I purposely and deliberately brought all thought and consideration that I was capable of on the Bill especially in view of the fact

that Shri Tariq is a Member who is not here on the popular approval as we are but because of his outstanding merit he has been nominated to this House.

**Shri A. M. Tariq:** He says that I am not here on popular approval,—

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I said he is not here on the aproval of the illiterate and poor masses, as we are, but that bacause of his outstanding merit he has been nominated by the President, to be here.

**Shri A. M. Tariq:** That is more creditable. If the hon. Member is elected by the people who are not educated and who are really illiterates, as he said, I have been nominated by a person who has been elected by this House. So, it proves that if the hon. Member is fine. I am superfine. (Laughter) I am nominated by a person who is more educated than the hon. Member.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** That is what I conceded before hand and that is why I give my utmost consideration to your Bill. I must confess that I feel really surprised to find that such an outstanding Member should come with such a funny Bill. Look at the Bill. He has said that in the private industry, the salaries of the employees should be equal to the salaries of the employees of Government. I do not know to which Government he is referring to. Is he referring to the Government of Jammu and Kashmir or the Central Government?

**Shri A. M. Tariq:** For the information of the hon. Member, I have said that it shall be extended to the whole of India except the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Probably my hon. friend has not gone through the Bill.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** The point is, to which Government are you referring? There are so many State Governments and they have their own em-

ployees and their own pay scales. You want to bring about parity or equality between the salaries of the employees in private industry and the employees in the Government. To which Government are you referring? Government of Bihar, Government of India, Government of U.P. and so on and so forth—which Government has he in mind? Even among Government employees in the States and in the Centre, there are so many disparities. This is one of the points which is sometimes raised whether there should not be equality of salaries of employees in the States and in the Centre. This indicates how defective and ill-conceived and ill-drafted the Bill is.

In the course of his speech, he has put forward three pleas or arguments in support of his Bill. The first is, since the private industries are allowed to give any amount of salary to their employees and officers, this practically unrestrained power in the hands of the private industry results in bringing about certain corruption among the Ministers and high officers. If the Ministers are so degenerate and degraded that they must get their relations employed on a salary which their relations do not deserve in the private industry, then I would advise Shri Tariq that the reasonable course was to have brought out a motion of no-confidence against the Government and the members of the Government. Instead, he has come with this funny Bill.

He says, the officers of Government, after their retirement or even before their retirement, go over to the private industry, because the private industry use them as their agent in procuring business for them. On the floor of this House and also outside, all the members of Government, from the Prime Minister down to the Parliamentary Secretary, cry hoarse over the integrity and the character of the services. If our services are so fine in integrity and character and in their behaviour and sincerity, how

is it that as soon as a man retires or even before he retires, he lends the weight of his personality, which he has earned in the course of his service, and he allows himself to be used as an agent by some private industry? That indicates that there is something fundamentally wrong with the personnel of our administration.

As he has pointed out and as many Members have pointed out, our officers are used by the private industry as their agents. Therefore, it reflects on the character and the integrity of the administration about which we make so much in this House and outside also. So, the proper course was to have an inquiry into the character and integrity of the personnel of the administration to see why it is that these people should so much degenerate themselves as to go in as agents of a private industry or commercial house.

In this House one day the matter was discussed whether a high officer, on retirement, should be allowed to take any job in the private industry or not. It was said, for one year he cannot and after one year he can. If we can have a rule that when high officers of Government retire, they should leave peacefully unless they are offered some job by the Government, then certainly there should not have been any need for this Bill and that would have been more logical, proper and more adequate. But the Government has not come out with any assurance, much less any rule or Bill in that direction.

There is another point that officers also get their relations like sons and in-laws appointed in the private industries on salaries which are much higher and disproportionate to the merit of the men employed there. I have not gone into it, but I think it is true, because this thing has come out from all sides of the House. Therefore, naturally, this is an indication of the fact that our services are corrupt, because an officer who is enjoying an office has the competence to give

[**Shri Rajendra Singh]**

favour to the industrialists and to big business. That indicates that stringent measures should be taken against such officers who have used their offices for procuring jobs for their relations and family members in private industries. Simply because you put a limit on the salary of the employees in the private sector, you are not going to overcome this difficulty.

So, I submit, let there be an inquiry headed by some high people in whose integrity and character the country has confidence and faith. If any officer has been found who has used the power given to him to get favours for his relations, such officers should be taken to task immediately and deterrent punishment should be given to them.

But there is another element. Wherever private enterprise is allowed, it has a certain inherent element of corrupt practices. It has only one motto in life and that is profit. So long as an individual has the constitutional right to earn profit, naturally he will indulge in all sorts of corrupt competition to boost up his profits. Now, certain business houses employ some retired officers of Government or their relations or the relations of Ministers to procure business for them. But it should be considered that as long as private enterprises have legal sanctity behind them, naturally that element of competition shall continue there and you cannot overcome it by just coming out with this piecemeal legislation. Therefore, the proper course is to limit the activities of the private sector to an extent whereby such competition or such unfair practices could not be indulged in. If you look at the First Plan, Second Plan or Third Plan, what you find is . . .

**An Hon. Member:** Third Five Year Plan.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I said "Third Plan", which is the same thing as Third Five Year Plan. I did not mean a third class plan. Here also what do you find? One of the objectives of the planners was to bring about equality among the incomes of the people. During the course of the ten years, and even during the Third Plan period we are finding that the disparity has gone almost too far. From personal experience I can say the turnover of one big business house was Rs. 4 crores in 1947. The same business house, in the course of these twelve years, has a turnover of Rs. 100 crores.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Which is that concern?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Please do not make me embarrass you by mentioning names. So, when the income has gone up on one side, the real wage of the working class is falling down. There has been so much of erosion that you find discontent and resentment all over the country. Merely because the Government servants strike has failed it could not be argued that the employees are behind the Finance Minister or the Prime Minister. It may be that out of fear, out of apprehension people may not go out against the Government, may not go on strike but the hearts of the people are full of resentment and anger against this Government. What is the reason? The reason is that while the wages of the people at the low strata are shrinking, people on the top, whether they are officers or Ministers or big businessmen, are flourishing by leaps and bounds.

Therefore, if you sincerely want to bring about a society of equals, equals economically, socially and politically, then the private sector has to be limited to an extent where corruption and indulgence in all sorts of unfair practices would be made impossible. Now the Third Plan figure is estimated to be Rs. 10,000 crores out of

which Rs. 400 crores, that is nearly two-thirds. (Interruptions)

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member may go on.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I find they are interrupting me. My friend, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh is an irrepressible man.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** That is unparliamentary. You can only say "the hon. Member".

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** But that is what the Chair tells me every time. Therefore, my submission is that instead of coming with such scrappy things, which have no meaning, Government itself should come out with a comprehensive Bill which can meet the situation squarely. Instead of sending this Bill for eliciting public opinion I think the better course, the prudent course, the proper course, would be for the Government to bring a comprehensive Bill if it has any feeling for socialism, for creating a society of equals, for eliminating corruption and unfair practices from the national life of this country. Otherwise, this Bill has no meaning other than giving undue popularity and publicity to Shri Tariq.

**श्री बज्रराज सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) :** सभापति जी, यद्यपि श्री तारिक का बिल बहुत सीमित और बहुत संकुचित दृष्टिकोण का है तथा बहुत दूर जाने वाला नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी उस के पीछे जो सिद्धान्त है और भावना है, उस का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं मानता हूँ कि पदि जिस शक्ति में यह बिल है उस में वह पास कर दिया जाय तो उस से नीचे तबके वालों को बहुत हानि होगी। जहां तक ऊपर वालों का सवाल है, उन को कोई विशेष फायदा होने वाला नहीं है, लेकिन यह मानते हुए कि मूल्क में सभी लोगों की आमदनियों के ऊपर कुछ सीमा बन्धनी चाहिये कि इस से अधिक

आमदनी नहीं होगी, मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ।

जहां तक इस में यह कहा गया है कि गवर्नेंट सर्विस में जितनी तन्त्रवाह होती है, ऊपर का वेतन हो या नीचे का वेतन हो, खास तौर से ऊपर का जितना वेतन है, उतना वेतन भी अगर हम उन लोगों को देता चाहते हैं जो कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में नौकरी करते हैं, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आज की परिस्थितियों में वह बहुत लाभदायक नहीं होगा। ऐसी हालत में हमें कोई ऐसा तरीका ढंडना चाहिये जिस से कम से कम आमदनी किसी आदमी की १०० रु. महीने से कम न रहे और अधिक से अधिक आमदनी या वेतन १,००० रु. महीने से अधिक न रहे। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि श्री तारिक का बिल इस बात को नहीं पा सकेगा क्योंकि जहां तक सरकारी वेतन का सवाल है, वह तो ४,००० रु. माहवार तक जाता है यदि हम देश के राष्ट्रपति के वेतन को छोड़ दें। लेकिन जो प्राइवेट एम्प्लायर्स आज हैं वे कितनी ऊंची ऊंची तन्त्रवाहें आज देते हैं और ऐसी ऊंची तन्त्रवाहें देते हुए जो सरकारी नौकरों में लोग हैं उन को भी अपना तरफ कैसे प्रभावित कर लेते हैं अगर इस पर आप व्याप दें तो बहुत ही चमत्कारिक बात मालूम होगी। मेरे सामने कुछ आंकड़े हैं जो अधिक पुराने नहीं, सन् १९५५ के हैं। सन् १९५५ में हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार के बड़े बड़े अफसरों और मिनिस्टरों के रिश्तेदार, खास तौर से लड़के, जिन की उम्र बहुत कम थी, कितनी ऊंची ऊंची तन्त्रवाहें पा रहे थे यह देख कर ताज्जुब होता है। उस वक्त के हमारे पाकिस्तान के हाई कमिशनर होने वाले थे श्री सी० सी० देसाई, जो आज बिड़ला साहब के यहां पहुँच गये हैं रिटायर होने के बाद और उन से १०,००० रु. तन्त्रवाह मिलती है फी आफ इनकम टैक्स, साथ ही दूसरी सहूलियतें उन को मिलती हैं। उन के लड़के जिनकी उम्र २३ साल की है, वह भी आई० सी० आई० में १३०० रु. माहवार पा रहे हैं।

**Mr. Chairman:** May I request the hon. Member not to bring in names of persons? If he wants to support the measure he can advance arguments generally instead of bringing in the names of persons who are not here to explain their position. They may not agree with the facts, as mentioned by the hon. Member or they may have some other explanation to offer. Therefore, I would request him not to bring personal matters. He can argue the case on the merits of the Bill, as this is a simple Bill.

**श्री ब्रजराज सिंह :** मैं तो सिर्फ़ सिद्धान्त की बात ही कह रहा था और उस में यह उदाहरण स्वरूप कह रहा था। मैं किसी पर कोई लांछन नहीं लगा रहा था न कोई चार्ज लगा रहा था।

**Mr. Chairman:** That may not be fair. The mention of names in this context reflects on the character of that person, or his father, or somebody else. So, where is the necessity for bringing in a matter like this in an ordinary Bill of this nature? If on some important political question he feels it is justifiable to attack any person or any Government he may do so and take the consequences. But here it is absolutely immaterial whether A's son is there or B's son-in-law is there. If the principle is accepted that he wants a maximum and minimum of salary in private service on the basis of public service, on that arguments can be advanced without bringing in names of persons who are not here to defend themselves.

**Shri Narayananarkutty Menon (Mukandapuram):** It was quite an innocent remark.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** His contention is that every person should get appointments like that.

**Shri Narasimham (Krishnagiri):** What could not be said directly should not be said indirectly.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** I do not want to say anything indirectly.

**Mr. Chairman:** I hope he will refrain himself from making any references to persons who are not here to defend themselves.

**श्री ब्रजराज सिंह :** मेरा उद्देश्य इस उदाहरण को देने से सिर्फ़ यह था कि सदन यह देख ले कि किस तरह से प्राइवेट सेक्टर में बड़ी बड़ी तन्त्वावाही दे कर सरकार से वे कुछ प्रलोभन पाते हैं और उचित या अनुचित लाभ उन की तरफ से दिये जाते हैं। मेरे सामने जो आंकड़े हैं, उन में एक आदमी नहीं, कम से कम ३०, ३५ ऐसे लोग हैं जिन के लड़के २०,०००, २२,००० या २५,००० रु० तक पा रहे हैं। वे बाहर से पढ़ कर आये हैं, और यह भी पूरा विश्वास नहीं है कि वे पढ़ कर आये भी हैं या नहीं। एक साहब तो ऐसे हैं जिन को हिन्दुस्तान की किसी भाषा का ज्ञान नहीं है। बिल्कुल बाहर बाहर रहे हैं, उन की २० या २१ साल की उम्र है, लेकिन ३,००० रु० में किसी कम्पनी में नौकर हैं।

सभापति महोदय, अगर आप देखिये तो जितनी आयल कम्पनियां हैं, पेट्रोल वर्गीरह की, जिन के बारे में इस सदन में सवाल उठाते हैं और हमारी सरकार जो इतनी शक्तिवान हो चौहे कि जब चाहे फौरन आर्डिनेन्स पास कर सकती है, चाहे किसी पालियामेन्ट के मेम्बर को एक साल के लिये बन्द कर सकती है बिना मुकदमा चलाये, वह किस तरह से नपुंसक हो जाती है इन कम्पनियों के सामने कि इस से हमारे यहां तेल आने को है और यहां की कम्पनियां उस तेल को साफ करने से मना कर देती। आखिर स के दौड़े क्या बजह है? ज्यादातर कम्पनियां जो हैं वे बड़े बड़े अफसरों के बच्चों को तीन तोन हजार रुपया माहवार की तन्त्वावाह पर भरती कर लेती हैं। अगर स तरह का वित्त पास हो जाए

जिस में यह नतीजा हो जाये कि जो सरकारी नौकरी में मिलता है, जितनी सीमा है, उस से आगे कोई प्राइवेट एम्प्लायर नहीं दे सकेगा तो में समझता हूँ कि इस तरह के जो प्रत्योभन दिये जाते हैं जिन से समझ में भ्रष्टाचार फैलता है, जिन से पक्षपाता की गुंजाइश रहती है, वह दूर हो सकेंगे। इनलिये मैं चाहता या कि मैं यह दिखलाऊ कि बार बार इस तरह की बात उठती है, और अफसोस की बात यह है—जमापति जी, मैं प्रोत्यायर्डों के नाम पर जो नियम है उन के बारे में कुछ नहीं कह रहा हूँ, लेकिन आप की आज्ञा का पालन करते हुए, उन का नाम नहीं लगा—लेकिन अफसोस का बात है कि जब सीरिय लगाने की बात चलती है इस क्षेत्र में, तो किसी को प्रोत्याहन नहीं मिलता। अगर इस की कोई सीमा होती है तो मैं उस का समयक हूँ क्योंकि बिना सीरिय लगाया हुए हिन्दुस्तान जैसे मुल्क में जहां गरीबी है वह बड़ी है कि नहां चल मिलता है। यह गृष्मकालीन बात कह दी जानी है कि जो ऊंचे हैं उन्हें नीचे लाने को ज़रूर नहीं, नीचे वालों को ऊपर ले जाना है। अगर हम यह देखें कि जब हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजना चल रही है, उन के परिणामस्वरूप कितने लोगों की आमदिनियों को हम बढ़ा सकते हैं, तो इस नतीजे पर पृथक्के गे कि इन पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के फलस्वरूप हम देश की आबादी के, जो ५० या ६० लाख प्रति वर्ष के हिसाब से बढ़ रही है, जीवन स्तर को अभी भी ऊंचा नहीं कर सकते हैं। हमारी दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना पूरी होने की है। इन दो पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के नतीजे पर हम विचार करें तो हम को मानूम होगा कि इन के फलस्वरूप गरीब गरीब हुआ है और अमीर अमीर हुआ है। दलील यह ही जाती है कि जो ऊंचे वेतन हैं उन को हम नीचा नहीं लाना चाहते, जो नीचे हैं उन को ऊपर ले जाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि आप नीचों को ऊपर नहीं ले जा सकते जब तक कि आप ऊपर वालों

को नीचा न करें। मैं तो यह पसंद करता कि इस बिल में यह व्यवस्था होती कि ऊंचे और नीचे वेतनों में एक और दस से ज्यादा का फर्क न हो। अगर हम किसी आदमी को कम से कम सी रूपया देना चाहते हैं तो ऊंचे से ऊंचे आदमी को हमें एक हजार में ज्यादा नहीं देना चाहिये। इस सम्बंध में उदाहरण पेंड करने के लिये हमारे राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने १० हजार के वेतन को छटा कर ढाई हजार कर दिया है। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में बिना इन्कम टैक्स के बहुत ऊंचे वेतन दिये जाते हैं जोकि सरकारी नौकरी के वेतन के मुकाबले में बहुत ज्यादा होते हैं। इनलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सिद्धान्त को सरकार को मान सेना चाहिये। इस में सरकार की कोई हानि नहीं है। खास तौर से जबकि सरकार ने देहाती जनता के सम्बन्ध में इस सिद्धान्त को माना है। जहां तक हमारे देश का सवाल है, यहां की ६६ प्रतिशत जनता जमीन पर निर्भर करती है। आप जमीन पर सीमा लगाने जा रहे हैं। सारे मुल्क में यह चीज चल रही है। लेकिन जो और दूसरे सेक्टर हैं, वाह वह सरका॑ नौकरी के हों या प्राइवेट सेक्टर में एम्प्लायमेंट के, उन में वेतन की सीमा नहीं बांधी जाती। इस का परिणाम यह होगा कि हमारे देश की आबादी का जो बढ़मत है उस में असंतोष फैलेगा। वह बहुत आगे चल कर सरकार की नीतियों का विरोध भी कर सकता है। इनलिये यह तो सरकार के हित में है कि वह इस सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार कर ले। जहां तक जमीनिय का सवाल है इस का सिद्धान्त बहुत अच्छा है लेकिन इस को प्राइवेट सेक्टर में क्यों नहीं लागू किया जाता। प्राइवेट सेक्टर तो क्या सरकार इस को पब्लिक सेक्टर में भी लागू करने को तैयार नहीं है। इसी कारण सरकार के सामने यह समस्या है कि इस को प्राइवेट सेक्टर में कैसे लागू करे। हम जानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में शोड़ी तत्त्वाह पाने वालों की संख्या बहुत ज्यादा है और बड़ी तन-

[**श्री बजराज सिंह]**

स्वाह पाने वाले थोड़े से हैं। उन थोड़े से लोगों को खुश करने के लिये आप इस सिद्धान्त को नहीं मान रहे हैं। इस से देश की उन्नति और विकास पर असर पड़ता है। इस और भी सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये।

15.55 hrs.

[**SHRI JAIPAL SINGH in the Chair]**

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क में तीन आयल कम्पनियां हैं। हम चाहते थे और हमारा सन् १९५६ का ईंडिस्ट्रियल पालिसी रिजोल्यूशन भी यह था कि अयल की पब्लिक सेक्टर में लाना चाहिए। लेकिन यह बात तो दूर रही। लेकिन जो हम रिफाइनरीज कायम कर रहे हैं, जो नया अन्वेषण कर रहे हैं उसे भी प्राइवेट सेक्टर के असर से दूर रखने की बात नहीं सोच रहे हैं। आज हालत यह है कि जो तेज हम रूस से मंगाते हैं उसको साफ करने के लिए हम रिफाइनरीज को मजबूर नहीं कर सकते। आज हालत यह है कि जिसका भी इन आइल कम्पनियों से प्रत्यक्ष या अप्रत्यक्ष सम्बन्ध है उनको उंची तनस्वाहे दी जा रही है। एक लड़का जो कि २२ साल का है और जो अभी कालिज से निकल है, अगर वह सरकारी नौकरी के लिए प्रतियोगिता में बैठे तो उसको सौ रुपए की नौकरी भी कठिनाई से मिलेगी, पर उसी की कम्पनी में तीन हजार रुपया दे दिया जाता है। उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि भ्रष्टाचार फैलेगा।

**एक माननीय सदस्य : भ्रष्टाचार क्या प्रब नहीं है।**

श्री बजराज सिंह बहुत है। लेकिन इस तरह से वह और ज्यादा बढ़ता है। इस चीज को रोकना उसको कम करने का एक तरीका हो सकता है। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि इस बिल के सिद्धान्त को मान लेना चाहिये।

मैं मानता हूँ कि हर जगह भ्रष्टाचार है लेकिन उसको खत्म करने का तरीका भी तो निकालना चाहिये। अगर प्राइवेट एम्प्लायर अपने यहां लोगों को बड़ी बड़ी तनस्वाह दें तो भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ेगा। सरकारी नौकरों में इससे असंतोष होता है। अक्सर एसा देखा जाता है कि जिन लोगों को सरकार रिटायर कर देती है उनको इन प्राइवेट कम्पनियों में ज्यादा तनस्वाह पर रख लिया जाता है। मुझे मालूम है कि एक साहब की सरकारी नौकरी से रिटायर हुए हैं, उनको बिडला ने तीन हजार रुपया देकर अपने यहां रख लिया है। इस बारे हैं हमें सोचना पड़ेगा। अगर यह सिद्धान्त मान लिया जाए कि इससे ज्यादा तनस्वाह किसी भी आदमी को नहीं दी जा सकेगी, तो अभी जो यह प्राइवेट सेक्टर ने ज्यादा तनस्वाह देकर अनुचित लाभ उठाने का प्रयत्न होता है यह बन्द हो जायगा। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल का स्वागत किया जाय।

मुझे ताज्जब हुआ कि बहुत से लोगों ने इसका विरोध किया है। कहा जाता है कि इसको मानने से प्राइवेट इनशिएटिव खत्म हो जाएगा। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि ४३ करोड़ लोगों के इनिशिएटिव के बारे में पहले सोचना चाहिए जिनके इनिशिएटिव के बिना देश का विकास नहीं हो सकता। हमें थोड़े से लोगों के बारे में ही नहीं मोचना है। अगर आप इन थोड़े से ही आदमियों का स्वाल रखेंगे तो आप जनता के इनिशिएटिव को तोड़ देंगे। आज हालत यह है कि इस देश में छोटा आदमी अपना विकास नहीं कर सकता उसकी पनपने का अधिकार नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हम इस बिल की भावना को स्वीकार कर लेते हैं तो हमको मौका मिलेगा, उन लोगों को पनपाने का, उनकी उन्नति कराने का। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार की तरफ से इसका कोई विरोध न हो और यह बिल जनता की राय ज नने के लिये सरकुलेट कर दिया जाए। सभापति महोदय, आपने मूझे लिस्ट को पढ़ने से

रोक दिया है लेकिन वह ऐसी चीज है कि जिससे हमें ....

सभापति महोदय : उसे पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

17 hrs.

श्री बजाज सिंह : इससे बहुत से एहस्य खुलते और पता चलता कि हमारी सरकार का काम किस तरह चलता है और किस तरह से लोग अनुचित लाभ उठाने की कोशिश करते हैं । लेकिन आप नहीं चाहते इसलिये मैं इसको नहीं पढ़ता । मैं केवल इतना ही कहूँगा कि इस बिल के उसूल को स्वीकार करके हम भ्रष्टाचार को दूर करने का एक तरीका निकाल सकते हैं । यह तारिक साहब का बिल बहुत सीमित है, इससे कोई बहुत ज्यादा काम बनने वाला नहीं है । लेकिन इसका सिद्धान्त सही है और अगर इसको मान लिया जाए और जनता की राय जानने के लिये भेज दिया जाए तो जनता की राय मालूम पड़ जाएगी और फिर इसको यहां जादा सुधरे हुए रूप में लाया जा सकता है ।

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member from Gurdaspur. After that I will call the hon. Member from Pali.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):** Mr Chairman, I do not think there will be found anybody in this House or outside this House to oppose this Bill.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Here is one already!

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I think that the opposition to this Bill does not mean anything as this Bill asks for something which is very very harmless. This Bill, if I understand it aright, is more educative than penal. It is more a piece of propaganda than a piece of legislation. It is more a cry for something which should be attained than a cry for something that is just now

attainable. Therefore I think that Shri A. M. Tariq who is a realist has put forward this Bill in such a way that it will not hurt anybody and it will not harm anybody.

But what does he want from us? He wants only this, that we should give our stamp of approval so far as its circulation is concerned. I think there should be no opposition to that. So many books are being circulated; so many newspapers are being circulated; so many magazines are in circulation; so many journals are in circulation. And if this small Bill consisting of about two pages is also circulated, I think nothing catastrophic or revolutionary is going to happen.

**Shri Narayananarkutty Menon:** What will be the catastrophe if it is not circulated?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Therefore, I think that those gentlemen who have opposed this Bill have read more into it than is really intended. I do not think that this Bill is going to do all those things about which some of my friends have been apprehensive. What are those things about which they have been apprehensive?

We live in a world of inequality. There is inequality of size; there is inequality of education; there is inequality of income. Our whole world is encompassed by inequality. It is true. But I want to ask one question:—Are we not here to abolish that inequality progressively? I think our Constitution lays it down. The policy of the Government lays it down. The declared objectives of our Five Year Plans lay it down. Therefore, why should anybody feel afraid if this Bill tries to abolish some kind of inequality?

And I say that there is inequality to be found between the private sector and the public sector. I wish that to be put an end to as early as possible. You cannot live in two world in the same country; you cannot have two scales of salary in the same country; you cannot have two standards in the

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

same country. I think we must try to attain a uniformity of standards, a uniformity of practices and a uniformity of, I should say, appointment: and all that kind of thing. That is what we should do and aim at? Have we done that?

I think all our talk about socialist pattern of society does not mean anything. Therefore, this Bill seeks to abolish inequalities, in the first place. It also aims at bridging the gulf between the private sector and the public sector in terms of salaries, in terms of appointments, in terms of promotions, in terms of all those things. I think it is a very desirable thing to do and I do not think anybody should come in the way.

There are some friends of mine who have been talking about fabulous salaries which some persons have been getting in the private sector. It may be true. If some lucky persons get fabulous salaries in the private sector, I do not know what to say. But these friends do not know that the private sector is like a city or like a village which has a few *pucca* buildings but which consists mainly of thatched cottages, tumble-down cottages and huts which are crumbling down. There may be some persons who might afford to buy Rolls Royce cars at a cost of eighty thousand rupees; they are in the private sector. There are persons who could swim in pools in their own homes; they are in the private sector. There are persons who have dozens of servants at their command; they are in the private sector. There are persons who keep an army of dogs and a large number of horses. Who are they? They are in the private sector. They make money. And they spend that money. They spend it ostentatiously.

Now, this Bill aims at the abolition of ostentatious consumption, conspicuous consumption in my country. It is this which strikes at the very roots of our national life.

This is all at one end of the scale, people getting very high salary. But look at the other end of the scale. Shri A. M. Tariq, I think, knows it very well, as every Member of this House does, that of all kinds of services in this world private service is the least desirable. You get very meagre salary. You get irregular promotions. There are no rules for keeping you in service. You may go to the office in the morning and find a letter awaiting you at your desk which says that your services are no longer required. Private service is a kind of a jungle where the laws of the jungle prevail. There are lions there, and small sheep also. (An Hon. Member: Tigers also). What my friend Shri A. M. Tariq wants is this, that the lions should be tamed and the sheep should be made full of life. That is what he wants. I think there is nothing which can be said against this desire. After all, the private sector should not claim to itself those advantages which are not the lot of everybody; nor should it claim to itself those disadvantages which are not the lot of everybody. Therefore, this Bill works both ways. It works for lopping off something from the tall man and it works for adding an inch or two to the stature of the small man. I think the intention of this Bill is very noble and it will help the small man much more than the tall man. This Bill will go against the tall man. I think there cannot be any two opinions about the principle enunciated in this Bill. But, I do not know what kind of procedure will be adopted to put this principle into effect. Shri A. M. Tariq in his own way has tried to simplify the problem. In fact, he has tried to oversimplify the problem. He has said that a Committee should be appointed.

**Mr. Chairman:** Will he please conclude?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** All right, Sir. I was submitting very respectfully that

this Committee will mean a dilatory process. It will mean something not conducive to the achievement of the result in the shortest space of time. But, I think public opinion, the people to whom this Bill may be circulated, will be able to suggest some other way. I think, with all its shortcomings, this Bill is welcome and I hope that even if this Bill is not passed, the private sector will take a warning from it that minimum wages and maximum wages have to be regularised and they cannot be treated in a way which is not scientific and proper.

I, therefore, welcome this Bill. I want that it should be circulated so that the people should know that there are some persons on the floor of the House who know that this private sector needs a little tightening up, needs a little guidance in the matter of appointments, salaries and other things.

**Mr. Chairman:** Now, I shall call the hon. Member from Pali and then I shall call the hon. Minister.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** May I know what time I can take?

**Mr. Chairman:** Ten minutes.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** Mr. Chairman, when I first looked at this Bill, I thought it was the thoughtless exuberance of the hon. Mover which was reflected in it.

**An Hon. Member:** Thoughtless?

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** That was my first reaction to it. But, as I listened to certain speeches, particularly that of Shri M. C. Jain, I felt that really an important problem has been posed before us. I knew that, in the background, there was the opinion expressed by the Estimates Committee though it was as far back as 1953-54 when they had posed the problem which was likely to affect the public services. I do not think for a

moment that the Estimates Committee would countenance the remedy which has been suggested by my hon. friend. It is not so simple as that. As a matter of fact, I just scratched my head because I believe this important question was also very thoroughly examined by the last Pay Commission. As early as page 24 of its very valuable report you will find a copious reference to this particular problem.

This question has been raised in many other countries also, and in the U. K. the Priestley Commission which went into the entire affair has thoroughly examined this question. In the few minutes you have allowed, it will not be possible for me to go into the entire gamut of it, to give you the principles which have been considered and the considered opinion to which the highly eminent persons represented on this commission have come to. They have not been able to find an easy solution to it. The Estimates Committee has also only posed a question, they want the Planning Commission to look at it and do something about it. The Pay Commission has also gone into it and said they cannot go into it more than they have done.

So far as the Bill is concerned, I think it will have to be rejected out of hand. At the same time, this problem does require thorough consideration. Some very eminent persons who appeared before the Pay Commission had suggested the appointment of a bigger commission to go into the entire question at the national level, since the Pay Commission was restricted in its terms of reference and could not examine the whole question. I endorse that suggestion, and I think Shri Tariq would do well to withdraw this Bill requesting Government to appoint such a commission to make further enquiries into the matter and come to conclusions.

**Shri M. C. Jain:** Provided the Government accepts your suggestion.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** I am giving my views.

This Bill is no solution at all. It raises so many difficult problems, creates more difficulties than it solves. It was said that sons of Government servants are in the private sector and are paid high salaries. That problem will not be solved even if the Bill is accepted. It is suggested that a youngster who is recruited there and given a certain start will continue to get the same sum all the time. That will not solve the problem. It is a very wrong approach to the whole question. I do not at all agree with it.

It has also been suggested that while the Pay Commission took into consideration various factors, it did not take into consideration the maximum salary in the public sector, and my hon. friend suggested that it should be cut down to Rs. 1,000. I think it is absolutely fantastic. The Pay Commission has definitely and very pointedly dealt with this question at great length and in a very lucid manner.

I would like these friends who talk of socialism and socialisation to look at the country which is the origin of socialism. Let us look at the salaries that obtain in the USSR. There are people who get 350 to 400 roubles at the lowest level, and there are people whose remuneration is as much as 25,000 to 30,000 roubles, who have bank balances. Nobody denies that. The Soviet Union had started at an earlier stage with the view that they should give nobody more than 500 roubles, everybody should travel by the ordinary bus etc. With the gradual passing of time they have realised that it is an absurd proposition even in that hard-boiled Communist country, and today the position is as I have described it. But, still, we should not draw conclusions from this, because the economy is different in the two countries. Anybody who is

getting even 30,000 roubles there cannot use this money to exploit the community and get something out of this money. That money cannot be utilised for that purpose. We also understand that the man who is getting 400 roubles gets so many other amenities. As the hon. Prime Minister very rightly pointed out the other day, let us have all these necessary amenities which have got to be provided for the Government servants. But I think that this talk about ceiling is not at all practicable. In which country under the sun, whether it be a communist country or a socialist country or a capitalistic country, has such a ceiling been fixed?

There are various methods of cutting down the income, such as by taxation measures, by super-taxes and by many other things. Still, I do not rule it out. The only important question at the present moment is whether the public sector will be able to find necessary recruits, and whether the public sector does offer such attractions that the right type of people will be able to come in. I think at present the position is not such that the right type of people are not attracted towards the public sector, barring, of course, a dozen jobs or may be about 25 jobs in the private sector. At present, the tendency for everyone is to get into the public sector.

In this connection, I would like to invite the attention of the House to one thing. Let us examine the number of applications which were received when we formed the management pool. We wanted about two hundred people. But how many people from the private sector, who were drawing far larger emoluments, tried to go into the public sector and tried to get into Government service? In the Pay Commission's report itself, various other factors have been pointed out. I know of a personal relation of mine who was here in Delhi in the private sector, getting about Rs. 1500 p.m. He went to Bhilai on a salary of Rs. 700 or Rs. 800 or Rs. 900 p.m.

So, at present, the magnetic force is not on that side, that is, on the side of the private sector. Even now, Government service continues to be a prized job in this country. So, at present, this problem of diversion of right type of men to the private sector does not arise at all. I do not know whether it will arise at any future stage, but that is really an important question, and I wish that this question is examined in this light.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I have been listening to the debate very carefully, and I find that as it is quite obvious, a Bill of this nature has only got a mixed reception in this House. The scope of the Bill is to regulate the salaries in the private sector, or, as the hon. Mover calls it, to have a ceiling on salaries in the private sector. And the main purpose is to provide for the maximum as well as the minimum salary scales in the private sector.

The hon. Mover, although he elaborately discussed about the undesirability of very high salaries in the private sector, did not touch on the question of minimum scales in the private sector. This point was taken up by one hon. Member opposite, and he twisted it to urge his points about the Pay Commission's report on the salaries of Government servants and Government employees.

The question of the minimum wage in the private sector is an important one. I attach more importance to it than to the question of bringing down the maximum of the salary scales in the private sector. But I would not agree with the hon. Member who said that we have ignored the point or that we are not taking care of the minimum wage in the private sector.

If we read the report of development in the past, we would come to the conclusion that although in what I would call the sweated industries, like the tanning industry in Kanpur—Kanpur is well-known for its sweated industry—the wage scale is low,—and I would urge on the conscience of the House and on trade unions or public

opinion to see that the trade unions and public opinion are so strong as to see that the wage level goes up in these sweated industries—we cannot determine the general wage level or the general pattern by taking the example of the sweated industries like tanning or other industries. In these matters, the question of fixing a minimum is very important, but it is a difficult one also. I say this because although, for example, in some of the States under the Minimum Wages Act—which is a concurrent subject—the minimum wage for certain industries like the biri industry which used to be—say, 4 annas per day has been increased to say, a rupee per day or more, a four-fold increase, it is still very low; we have to see the capacity of the industry to bear it. That is the limiting factor. Fixation of any minimum wage has to be guided by the fact that we cannot burden the industry so much that the industry goes completely off the track resulting in a situation where the labourers are worse off.

So the limiting factor is the condition or the economics of the industry i.e., how much the industry can pay. If we take the example of the sweated industry of tanning in Kanpur, we cannot determine the general wage nor come to any conclusion about the general level of minimum wage in other industries. There are progressive industries. If we go into the Wage Boards in various industries that are being appointed or that might be appointed, we will get another picture. Take, for example, the cotton textile industry. The minimum wage in a place like Bombay is now about Rs. 120 per month. It is slightly less in Ahmedabad. That is a case of a progressive industry where the minimum wage has gone up progressively in the last few years as a result of the progressive policy followed by Government.

Similarly, we have the report of the Wage Board for the cement industry. It will be implemented in due course.

(Shri B. R. Bhagat)

The Wage Board's Report concerning the sugar industry is about to come. We are going to have a Wage Board for the jute industry which will submit its report. So there is a conscious effort to go into the question carefully and examine all the pros and cons, how much the industry will bear, what is the productivity of labour and what is the general economic situation. We are trying to determine the minimum wage taking these into account.

Similarly, a number of States have implemented the Minimum Wages Act. There is the Shop and Commercial Establishments Act. Conditions of employment vary from State to State. A general regulation or a general law for the whole country will be meaningless.

So in regard to the minimum wage or the minimum of the salaries to be paid, emphasis should be placed, and is being placed, both under the Minimum Wages Act and in the Wage Board Reports on that aspect both for the organised industries, the progressively organised industries, and the sweated industries of which much more care should be taken because the wage level there is low. But always the limiting factors are the economics of the industry, the general condition of productivity and other factors.

**Shri Narayananarkutty Menon:** Is the hon. Minister saying that the fixation of a minimum wage is governed by all these considerations including productivity?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I am not joining issue with my hon. friend, because it is only a side issue which can be taken up for discussion at the time we debate the general labour policy or discuss the Minimum Wages Act. I am only pointing out that this Bill emphasises both the maximum scale as well as the minimum scale of salaries. The hon. Mover did not speak about it. I am glad the hon. Member

pointed out that aspect. I am only saying that both in the organised industries as well as in other industries, there is actually a tendency for the minimum wages to go up.

Now, coming to the main burden of this Bill, listening to the debate I summarised it into 4 points. The first point made by those who supported the Bill is that the difference in the pay-scale in the private sector and in the public sector nullifies the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Incidentally, I have before me an extract of the Ninth Report of the Estimates Committee. It mentions two things. The Bill is based on that. The first recommendation is about ceilings on salaries in the private sector. The second is about the employment of retired government servants in business.

Taking the second recommendation first, we have carefully examined it and the Government have formulated rules in 1956 about the employment of government servants and their relations, sons and daughters and their dependents, and the rules are very strict. The Ministry of Home Affairs have issued instructions in January 1956 that whenever the sons, daughters or other dependants of Class I officers of the Government of India wish to accept appointment with private firms with which the officers had official dealings or other important firms having official dealings with the Government of India, the fact should be reported to Government by the officers concerned and Government permission obtained for such employment. These rules barring employment or barring opportunities for the sons, daughters and other relations of government servants are very strict.

Orders have similarly been issued that retired government servants belonging to the All-India services or Class I services of the Central Government if they want to obtain employment in the private sector within 2

years of retirement should secure the permission of government.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Why should there be such restrictions? If it is bad, it is absolutely bad.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** We consider that it is not *prima facie* bad unless certain other conditions are there just as, the government servant while in office had organised the company or the firm with which he goes into employment later. A government servant, when he retires, may have other obligations. He may be in a fit condition to work. There should be no *mala fide* intention. We give permission after looking into all these cases. We cannot debar a person who is in vigorous health, and who has got a lot of experience from seeking employment and force him not to do work.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** That way the remedy is....

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. Let the hon. Minister proceed.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Certainly, his income is very much reduced and he may have his obligations. We cannot force him not to work. We go into all these questions and give him permission. After two years of retirement the permission is not necessary because after that period the employment is not deemed to have been as a result of any benefits given by him when in office.

The first recommendation—having equal pay for equal work—is a very large issue and it has very indeterminate factors. The conditions of work may be different; the work may look apparently to be equal; but the conditions of work may be different—the tenure of service, the retirement benefits and the social status in that employment and all that. It is a well-known fact that persons with higher salaries in the private sector accept employment in the Government on a lower salary because the resultant

benefits are there: higher social status, security and other considerations. In the private sector, the motive is profit. In the public sector the motive is service. You cannot apply the same rule for the two services. Apart from the practicability, reasonableness or desirability of these proposals, what is the position today? Let us consider it. In spite of the fact that we do not want to have a blanket regulation or legislation to control the scale of pay in the private sector, we have adopted a number of measures to bring down the higher salaries in the private sector. All foreign companies have to submit to the Government every year a report on the salary scales they give to the Indian personnel and what proportion of higher salaries are given to the Indians. That is what we call the Indianisation of the branches of foreign firms in India. At the beginning of 1959 there were only 55 Indians employed by foreign-owned or controlled companies earning a salary of more than Rs. 5,000. The number of foreigners earning the salaries above that level was about 662. Should we ask these firms to reduce the salaries of Indians employed there? There is also another consideration. On the one hand we have been pleading that there should be equality. The House has been asking that more and more Indians should be appointed in the branches of the foreign firms here. In the case of the non-Indians, their salary is determined by levels obtaining in their own country and standards of living, technical qualifications possessed by them and so on. If we reduce the salaries of Indians occupying high positions in foreign firms and not of the non-Indians, the disparity increases.

**Shri M. C. Jain:** May I ask a question?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I do not want to be interrupted. If any question is to be asked, it should be at the end and I am prepared to answer it.

The second point that emerged from the discussion is that the pay scales

offered by the petroleum companies and some other big companies are far better than the higher salaries earned under the Government. That was the point made by the hon. Mover.

17:39 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Government servants are consequently tempted strongly to secure employment in business houses for their relatives and for themselves after their own retirement. The third point is that very attractive terms offered in the private industry for the recruits would affect recruitment to the public service. The last point has been dealt with in the Pay Commission's report in paragraphs 14 to 23 of Chapter VIII. The Commission expressed the opinion that as long as there were three candidates with first class degrees for every vacancy, and the examination results themselves did not show a fall in the level of performance of the candidates, there should be no cause for anxiety. It is true that there were four first class candidates for every vacancy in the higher public services. Now it is three. To that extent there has been a fall in the number of first class candidates. As long as the number is three for one post there should not be any case for anxiety. The general conclusion of the Pay Commission was that "while the quality of recruits to the public services needed to be watched carefully, there was no reason to think that the higher services were not getting recruits of the required standard".

Sir, the hon. Member said that the salaries given by the oil companies are demoralising to the government servants, they offer the temptation of giving employment to their sons and relatives and so on. One hon. Member made a charge that we as a Government are crumbling before the oil companies. It is not a fact. The record of our Government shows that we have only been very firm in dealing with the oil companies. If you see the records of the oil companies, the power that they wield, you will find that it is not only this Government that has got to be very careful but even the

progressive States or the advanced countries like America or Europe have also felt the power of the oil companies. Therefore, it is not as if this problem is there only in this country. Because they are gigantic combines they are naturally conscious of their power, they are conscious of the strategic importance that they hold in the economic life and, therefore, it is but natural that they tend to exercise that power. But it is equally true that this Government has stood up to it. This Government has been very firm and it has not allowed them to go against the national interest. So to make this charge against Government is to belie the facts, to ignore the facts, and it is highly regrettable.

A suggestion was made that the Bill may be withdrawn but the Government should appoint a commission. Sir, I have stated the facts. I do not know what purpose the commission will serve. A few years ago the House passed the Companies Act. We have a series of sections in the Companies Act which regulates the remuneration of the managerial cadre. For example the remuneration of the Managing Director, the technical directors or the directors is referred to the Advisory Commission under the Companies Act. They take into account the general position of the company, the financial and other resources of the company before fixing the salaries. Therefore, whenever they fix the salaries of the managerial staff they see to it that the salaries are in proportion to the financial and other resources of the company and, to that extent, there has been a tendency to bring down the salaries.

Similarly, there is another provision that no company can pay to their managers including the technical managers and directors more than 11 per cent. of the profits. Therefore, if a company is a big one having enormous profits it may pay higher salaries. But we have another check that no company even if it makes a very large profit, should ordinarily pay to its Managing Director or whole-time

directors more than Rs. 10,000 per month. All these checks we have tried to enforce.

It has been said, or rather a misconception has come in that if we bring down the high salaries in the private sector we will be going a step forward towards socialism. The concept of socialism is not as crude as that. We in this country, the Government, have been following a policy of socialism as adumbrated in the three Plans. Socialism as an organisation is more a science than mere expressions of opinions that if we do a particular thing we will bring in socialism. It is an organisation for increased production and rapid economic development of the country.

**Shri M. C. Jain:** And not of distribution?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Distribution is another means by which we act. But by mere distribution, we cannot achieve results. I am saying that our efforts have been to bring down the salaries and the salaries have been brought down, but by itself it will not bring in socialism. Socialism can be brought in by rapid economic development of the country which we want to achieve.

Again, it has been said that while we have introduced ceiling on land, we have not introduced ceiling on salaries. I say that the two are entirely different. The question of land or its importance in the economic organisation of the country or the production of the country is entirely different. There are scarce land resources, whereas the urban income or ceiling on salaries is a separate question. The two should not be mixed and it should not be said that because we have introduced a ceiling on land we are in favour of the existing salaries, and that we do not want to introduce a ceiling on salaries. The two are entirely different. The facts are different. We are trying to bring down salaries which are un-

deserved and which are undue. But the fact remains, as I said at the beginning, that the motive in the two sectors is different. In the public sector or in the Government, the motive is service while under the private sector the entire motive is based on profit. These two aspects should be borne in mind. I do not say that if you increase the salaries, that will entail an automatic increase in efficiency and in production or a greater incentive. That may or may not be so. But the fact remains that we are in the mixed economy. When we are having a private sector, we accept that so far as the private sector is concerned, the prime motive for development or incentive will be profit, and as long as that motive is there, all those who are employed there will see to it that the company makes larger and larger profits. Naturally, the incentive is that they would like to have a better share. Otherwise, what would be the result? The result will be worse and a very retrograde one. That is, on the one hand, those who finance the company, the financiers, will get more dividends and better returns, while the managerial cadre, the persons to manage, the scientists, the technicians and the business administrator, the intelligent, progressive group in the private sector, will be depressed, because they will not get their due.

So, what we tried to do in bringing in the Companies Act was to introduce progressive company management, by abolishing the managing agency system and introducing the system of secretaries and treasurers and thus divorcing management from ownership. Ownership will be bettered if we do this and it will result in a better incentive. We want to build up a managerial sector; we want to build up a good cadre of management, with technicians and scientists and others. But that will have a bad incentive in the scheme of things in the private sector, because, if there is the profit motive, they must have a better share of the profit, and that can only be by a reasonable scale of salary.

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

Secondly, the taxation angle is there. If they reduce the salaries of those people, directors or the managers—the technical directors or the technical managers and other employees—what would happen is, they would get more in terms of perquisites. The salaries may be low but the demand is there. Everyone knows that; everybody even in the public sector projects knows how difficult it is to find suitable hands for technical management. There will be for another ten years at least—along with our educational and other development taking place—always a shortage of technical and scientific personnel, a good, efficient, managerial cadre. If there is a shortage for it, there will be a greater and greater demand. So, if we reduce or depress their salaries, what will happen? It has been the experience not only in this country but in other countries also, socialist or capitalist, where the scientists or the engineers are so much in demand,—including the Soviet Union and the United States of America—where they want development and want to go ahead, they have all to pay a price for it and to pay higher salaries for these specialists. So, to equate socialism with lower salaries is to ignore the basic fact of modern life, of modern scientific life, today. That is why, as some hon. Members have said, in the Soviet Union, the scientist or the technical manager is paid as high a salary as 30,000 roubles. Similarly, engineers and technical personnel in the advanced countries are paid higher salaries. If we want to do the same thing, if we want to progress rapidly towards industrialisation, we have to pay the price. The first step towards socialism would be rapid industrialisation, rapid production and rapid economic development, but all the same having an eye to the fact that as far as possible and as much as we can, there should be equalisation of income. To that extent, our attempt is there.

I was speaking about the taxation angle. If their salaries are reduced,

they will get benefits in kinds—perquisites—and they will escape taxation. So, what we gain in one, we will lose in another. So, from all these points of view, I think, whatever may be the object, the purpose would not be served by a legislation of this kind.

Moreover, I know there are anomalies in the salary structure of the private sector. But Government's view is that these anomalies cannot be corrected by trying to lay down a structure of salaries in the private sector through a legislation of this kind envisaged by the hon. Member who has moved this Bill. His proposal will involve a stupendous administrative and organisational task, fixing the salaries of thousands of private employees and ensuring that these scales of pay are in practice enforced. An hon. Member has just complained that the minimum wage is not being enforced. So, if we have this legislation, as the hon. Member says, for every industry and every firm, there will have to be a committee which will go into the salary scale. How are we going to enforce it? It will mean a stupendous administrative and organisational task. Also, attempting to prescribe salary scales for private employees will introduce excessive rigidity and in practice, any such legislation will be wholly unpracticable and completely unworkable.

From all these points of view, I would request the hon. Member to withdraw this Bill.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** According to the recommendation of the Pay Commission, the age of superannuation has gone up by three years, from 55 to 58. I hope that since Government has accepted it as an award, it will surely accept this recommendation also. According to this recommendation, the pensionary benefits also have gone up. So, with this increase by three years in the superannuation age and with these increased pensionary benefits,

will it too much if Government stops the Central Government employees from taking jobs in the private sector after retirement?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** That is a specific point of view and I am not willing to commit myself to it. That is entirely a separate question.

**श्री अ० म० ता० क :** जनाब स्पीकर साहब, मैं जिस वक्त इस बिल को हाउस में लाया था तो मेरे समने यही सवाल था कि हमारे मुल्क में तमाम लोगों के साथ किसी काम को पाने में मसाबी तौर पर इंसाफ नहीं होता है।

**Shri Jhulan Sinha (Siwan):** Sir, the time for this bill is up.

**Shri A. M. Tariq:** I shall take only two minutes, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right.

**श्री अ० म० तारिद :** आज की बहस में चन्द मंम्बर सहिबान ने मेरे इस बिल की मुख्यालिकत की और चन्द ने हिमायत की लेकिन इस बात को सभी ने कबूल किया है कि जहां तक मक्कतद का तालुक है, वह सही है और हमें उसकी हिमायत करनी चाहिये। धानरेवल मिस्टर साहब ने जवाब में कहा है कि कम्पनियों में जो गैर-मुल्की लोग यानी अपेंज या फोरनसं काम करते थे, उनकी तनख्वाहें बहुत ज्यादा थीं और हमारे लिये यह मुश्किल नहीं है कि चूंकि अब वहां हिन्दुस्तानी हैं तो हम तनख्वाहों को नीचे लायें। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस जवाब में जवाजियत नहीं है। इसकी वजह यह है कि हमारे मुल्क में जब वाइसराय होता था या गवर्नर जनरल होता था या कमाण्डर इन-चीफ होता है तो उन सब की तनख्वाहें मौजदा तनख्वाहों से कहीं ज्यादा थीं और उनको कहीं ज्यादा रियायतें मिली रहीं थीं। सवाल मुल्की या गैर-मुल्की का नहीं है। मक्कद सिर्फ यह था कि प्राइवेट कम्पनियों में जिस तरह लोगों को लिया जाता है, तनख्वाहें चाहे पांच हजार या

दस हजार दी जायें, उसके लिये हुक्मत को कोई बोंद बनाना चाहिये जैसे पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन है वर्ना हुक्मत पर यह घब्बा लगता है कि चूंकि उनका वहां इनभलुएंस है। इसलिये वे अपने आदमी वहां लगवा लेते हैं। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को बतलना चाहता हूँ कि खुद उनकी बजारत के बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि एक लेडी जो वि. ओ० एस० डी० हैं उनको बम्बई से तबदील किया गया और कई दफा होम मिनिस्टरी ने ऐतराज किया इस पर लेकिन उसकी बात नहीं मानी गई और सिर्फ इस वास्ते नहीं मानी गई कि उनकी शादी एक ऐसे साहब की हुई है जो आयल कम्पनी में बहुत बड़े डायरेक्टर हैं या बहुत बड़े अफसर हैं। इस तरह की जो बातें हैं। इनसे बदनामी होती है। इस तरह के केसिस की एक लिस्ट अखबारों में भी छपी थी। उसमें कहा गया था कि बड़ी बड़ी आयल कम्पनीज के अफसरों के रिट्रेडारों को तीन तीन और चार चार हजार तनख्वाह पर लगाया गया है। आपने रूल बनाया है कि दो साल रिटायरमेंट के बाद तक कोई नौकरी नहीं कर सकता है। भगव मिस्टर देसाई जो हमारे पाकिस्तान में हाई कमिशनर थे रिटायर होने के बाद ही एक प्राइवेट कम्पनी में इतनी बड़ी तनख्वाह पर लग गए जितनी कि प्रेजीडेंट साहब को भी नहीं मिलती है और यह तनख्वाह भी इनकम-टैक्स की। साथ ही कार मुफ्त, मकान मुफ्त और दूसरी कई रियायतें उनको मिलतीं।

अभी हमारे एक जनरल रिटायर हुए और वह एक और कम्पनी में लग गए। सवाल यह है कि जो कोरप्शन है उसको हमें रोकना है। पहले यह बात सिर्फ आई० सी० एस० अफसरों तक ही थी लेकिन अब जनरलों तक भी पहुँच गई है। प्राइवेट कम्पनियों में रिटायर होने के बाद वे लग जाते हैं। हम समझते हैं कि वे लोग इस काबिल अब नहीं रहे हैं कि नौकरी करें और उनके आराम का एक वक्त रखा तो ऐसा क्यों होता है यह हमें देखना है। लेकिन जो असली सवाल है वह यह

## [श्री अ० म० तारिक]

है कि जो बड़ी बड़ी तनखाहें दी जाती हैं बगैर किसी बोर्ड के होने के या बगैर किसी मुकाबले के, वे हमारे दिल में शक पैदा कर देती हैं। हमारे यहां पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन हैं और बावजूद ऐतराजात के कोई भी उसकी नीयत पर शक नहीं करता है। लेकिन आपके यहां यह नहीं है। अगर आपको इनफ्लूएंस है तो आप किसी भी बड़ी कम्पनी में नौकरी हासिल कर सकते हैं। इसके हमारे पास सबूत हैं।

श्री दो० च० शर्मा : कौन ?

श्री अ० म० तारिक : जो चाहे कर सकता है। अगर आपका भी इनफ्लूएंस है तो आप भी कर सकते हैं।

शर्मा जी ने कहा कि इन कम्पनियों में जंगल का राज है। यकीनन वहां जंगल का राज है और इसने हमें मजबूर किया है कि हम तहकीकात करें और सोचें कि इस कोर्पशन की बदनामी को जो हमारी हकूमत पर आती है और कभी कभी रियासतों के वज्रीरों पर भी आती है केसे दूर किया जा सकता है। कहा जाता है कि स्टॅण्डर्ड वैकुम आयल कम्पनी में फलां साहब के लड़के नौकर हैं, मैनेजर हैं, डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैनेजर हैं। तो जो इस तरह की वातें हैं इनको हम बिल्कुल खुला नहीं छोड़ सकते हैं। वज्रां साहब ने कहा कि इससे कुछ नहीं होता है। मैं मानता हूँ मगर मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे बहुत बड़ी बदनामी मुल्क पर आती है। मैं पूछता चाहता हूँ कि एक बीस बाईस साल का नौजान लड़का जो कभी हिन्दुस्तान में रहा भी नहीं वह यहां पर तीन हजार रुपये की नौकरी पा सकता है और वह भी बिना किसी कमीटीशन के? अगर कमीटीशन हो तो गरीब आदमी की ओलाद है वह भी उसमें बैठ सकती है और मुकाबले में आ सकती है। तो यह जो कर्पशन है मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह दूर हो और यह जो मायुसी लोगों में छा जाती है, यह न छाये। मेरी यह जो मोशन थी इस बिल को मश्तहिर करने की इसको तो कम से कम कबूल कर लिया

जाना चाहिये था लेकिन चूंकि वह भी नहीं किया गया है इस वास्ते मैं इस बिल को वापिस लेता हूँ।

श्री अ० म० तारिक : क्या आप बिल को वापिस ले रहे हैं ?

श्री अ० म० तारिक : जी हां। दरिया में रहना और मगरमच्छ से बैर, यह कैसे हो सकता है।

[श्री अ० म० तारिक - अ० टारिक - जलाप]

स्पीकर साहब - मैं जैसे वक्त इस बिल को हालों के सामने लाया तो वह मेरे सामने यहीं सूल तोहा के हमारे मैले मैले ताम लोगों के सामने क्षुम्भ क्षम्भ को पाने मैं मैसारी और अचानक नहीं होता है।

Shri Jhulan Sinha: Sir, the time for this bill is up.

Shri A. M. Tariq: I shall take only two minutes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

श्री अ० म० तारिक - आज की

भृत मैं चल्द मैर साहबान ने इस बिल की مخالفत की और चल्द ने असाधित की लिकन अस बत को सही ने लेव किया है कि जहां तक मैसद का تعلق ہے وہ مصیح ہے औر ہمूں اس کی حمایت کرنی چاہئے - آزبیل میسٹر صاحب نے اب्दे جواب مैں کہا ہے کہ کسہلیوں میں جو فیروں ملکی لوگ یعنی انگریز یا فارینگڈ کام کرتے تھے - ان کی ملکوں میں بہت زیادہ تھیں اور ہمارے لئے یہ ممکن نہیں ہے

کہ چونکہ اپ وہاں ہندوستانی ہیں تو تو ہم تلخوادوں کو نیچھے لائیں - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس جواب میں جو اقتیت نہیں ہے - اُس کی وجہ یہ ہے کہ ہمارے ملک میں جب وائسرائے ہوتا تھا - یا گورنر چنرل ہوتا تھا یا کمانڈو ان چیف ہوتا ہے تو ان سب کی تلخوادوں موجودہ تلخوادوں سے کہیں زیادہ تھیں اور ان کو کہیں زیادہ دعائیں ملی دھنی تھیں - سوال ملکی یا عیور ملکی کا نہیں ہے - مقصد صرف یہ تھا کہ پرائیویٹ کمپلیوں میں جس طرح لوگوں کو لیا جاتا ہے - تلخوادیں چاہے پانچ ہزار - یا دس ہزار دی جائیں اُس کے لئے حکومت کو کوئی بورڈ بلانا چاہئے جیسے پہلک سروس کیشن ہے وہ حکومت پر یہ دھبا لگتا ہے - ہمارے سیکریٹریز پر یہ دھبا لگتا ہے کہ چونکہ ان کا وہاں انفلوائینس ہے اس لئے وہ اپنے آدمی وہاں لکوا لیتے ہیں - میں ملستر صاحب کو بتلانا چاہتا ہوں نہ خود ان کی وزارت کے بارے میں یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ ایک لیقی جب کہ او - ایس - قی - ہیں ان کو بیکنی سے تدبیل کیا گیا اور کمی دفعہ ہوم منسٹر نے اعتراض کیا اس پر لیکن اس کی بات نہیں مانی گئی اور صرف اس واسطے نہیں مانی گئی کہ ان کی شادی ایک ایسے صاحب سے ہوئی ہے جو اُنل کمپلی میں بھٹ بھٹ کریکٹر ہیں یا بہت بے افسر ہیں - اس طرح کی جو باتیں ہیں

لن سے بدنام ہوتی ہے - اس طرح کے کھسون کی ایک لست اخباروں میں بھی چھپی تھی - اُس میں کہا گیا تھا کہ بوری بوری اُنل کمپلیز میں افسروں کے دشہ داروں کو تیس تین اور چار چار ہزار تلخوادا پر لکایا گیا ہے - آپ نے دل بلایا ہے کہ دو سال دیتابیریمیٹ کے بعد تک کوئی نوکری نہیں کر سکتا ہے - مگر مستردیسائی جو ہمارے پاکستان میں ہائی کمشنر تھے دیتابیر ہونے کے بعد ہی ایک پرائیویٹ کمپلی میں اُنلی بتو تلخوادا پر لگ کئے جانی کہ پریزیدنٹ صاحب کو بھی نہیں ملتی ہے اور وہ تلخوادا بھی انکم ٹیکس فری - ساتھ ہی کار مفت مکان، مفت اور دوسری کئی رعایتیں ان کو ملیں -

ابھی ہمارے ایک چلول دیتابیر ہونے اور وہ ایک اور کمپلی میں لگ کئے - سوال یہ ہے کہ جو کوپیشن ہے اسکو ہمیں دوکنا ہے - پہلے یہ بات صرف اُنی - می - ایس افسروں تک ہی تھی لیکن اب جنریلوں تک بھی پہنچ گئی ہے - پرائیویٹ کمپلیوں میں بعد دیتابیر ہونے کے وہ لگ جاتے ہیں - ہم سمجھتے ہیں کہ وہ لوگ اب اس قابل نہیں رہے ہیں کہ نوکری کیں اور ان کے آدم کا ہم نے ایک وقت رکھا تو ایسا کیوں ہوتا ہے یہ ہمیں دیکھنا ہے - لہکن اصلی سوال ہے وہ یہ

## [ہو اے - ایم - طارق]

ہے کہ بتو بتو بتو تلخواہیں نہیں جاتی ہیں بغیر کسی بودہ کے ہولے کے یا بغیر کسی مقابلے کے - وہ ہمارے دل میں شک پیدا کرتی ہیں - ہمارے بہار پبلک سروس کیشیں ہے اور باوجود اعترافات کے کوئی بھی اس کی نیت پر شک نہیں کرتا ہے - لیکن آپ کے بہار یہ نہیں ہے - اگر آپ کا انفلواینس ہے تو آپ کسی بھی بتو کھٹکی میں نوکری حاصل کر سکتے ہیں - اس کے ہمارے پاس نبوت ہیں -

اوی ڈیو ڈیو ڈیو : کوئی ؟

شروع اے - ایم - طارق - جو چاہے کر سکتا ہے - اگر آپکا بھی انفلواینس ہے تو آپ بھی کر سکتے ہیں - شوما جی نے کہا کہ ان کمہلیوں میں جلٹکل کا دلچ ہے - یقیناً وہاں جلٹکل کا دلچ ہے - اور اس نے ہمیں مجبور کیا ہے کہ ہم تحقیقات کریں اور سوچیں کہ اس کوپیش کی بذناہی کو جو ہماری حکومت یو اتنی ہے اور کبھی کبھی ریاستوں کے وزیروں پر بھی اتنی ہے کیسے دو کیا جا سکتا ہے - کہا جاتا ہے کہ ستینڈوڈ ویکم ایل کسھی میں والی صاحب کے لئے نوکر ہیں - ملیجھر ہیں - قسٹرکٹ ملیجھر ہیں - تو اس طرح کی باتیں ہیں ان کو ہم

بالکل کھلا نہیں چھوڑ سکتے ہیں - وزیر صاحب نے کہا کہ اس سے کچھ نہیں ہوتا ہے - میں مرتا ہوں مگر میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس سے بہت بتو بدنامی ملک ہر آنی ہے - میں پوچھتا چاہتا ہوں کہ ایک ۲۰ - ۲۲ سال کا تو جوں لوکا ہو کمہی ہلدوستان میں دھا بھی نہیں وہ بہار پر تین ہزار دوپتے کو نوکری ہا سکتا ہے اور وہ بھی بہلا کسی کھلائیش کے - اگر کھلائیش ہو تو جو غریب اُدی کی اولاد ہے وہ بھی اس میں بیٹھ سکتی ہے اور مقابلے میں اسکتی ہے - تو وہ جو کوپیش ہے میں چاہتا ہوں یہ دو ہو اور یہ جو ایویشی لوگوں میں چوہا جاتی ہے یہ نہ چھائے - مہدی یہ جو موشن تھو اس بل کو مشتمل کرنے کی اس کو تو کم سے کم قبول کر لے گا جاہلیگی تھا لیکن ہونکہ وہ بھی نہیں کھا گیا ہے اس واسطے میں اس بل کو واپس لیتا ہوں -

امدادگار مہدوہ : کیا اپنے اپنا ویلن واپس لے لیتا ہے ؟

شروع اے - ایم - طارق - جی ہاں - دریا میں دھلا اور مگر مچھے سے بیرہ پہ کیسے ہو سکتا ہے -

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw the Bill?

Several hon. Members: Yes.

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.