

Volume I

No. 1 - 21



Thursday
19th June, 1952

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Part I - Questions and Answers)

CONTENTS

Members Sworn [Cols. 2—18].

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price Six Annas (Inland)
Price Two Shillings (Foreign)

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part I—Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

Acc. No. 25027...
Date 18.11.2014

1049

1050

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 19th June, 1952.

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

AID FROM CANADA

*1016. **Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether any negotiations are proceeding between the Government of India and the Canadian Government for mutual agreement on projects for direct assistance from Canada; and

(b) whether any aid was received from Canada during 1951-52?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) Yes Sir.

(b) During the year 1951-52, the Canadian Government provided economic assistance to India under the Colombo Plan to the tune of 15 million Canadian dollars. Of this 10 million Canadian dollars is being received in the form of 114,000 tons of wheat, the sale-proceeds of which is being used in financing the Mayurakshi Project as agreed upon between the Indian and the Canadian Government. In addition, a number of buses and lorries for the Bombay State Transport Corporation is likely to be received, the approximate value of which would be about 4.5 million Canadian dollars. The question of supply of some equipment for the Mayurakshi Project valued at about 0.5 million Canadian dollars is under discussion.

109 PSD

ORDNANCE FACTORIES

*1017. **Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Ordnance Factories could produce any other material besides war material during the year 1951-52; and

(b) if so, what material and of what value?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopalaswami): (a) Yes.

(b) A statement showing the more important items produced during the year 1951-52 is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 35]

Work to the extent of Rs. 110.5 lakhs in value was done for other Government Departments and the trade during 1951-52.

ZINC SPELTER INDUSTRY

*1018. **Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether any Committee was appointed to examine and suggest proposals for the establishment of Zinc spelter industry in India; and

(b) if so, whether the Committee has made a report by now?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) Yes, Sir. A copy of the Notification constituting the Committee and defining its functions is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 36]

(b) The Committee has not yet completed its work.

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

*1019. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to

state how far the building construction of the Indian Institute of Technology at Kharagpur has progressed and when it is expected to be finished?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): Approximately 30 per cent. of the Building programme has been completed. The staff quarters are expected to be completed by June, 1953 and the main Institute building by the end of 1954.

PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH ORGANISATION

*1020. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) how much has been spent up to date on the Psychological Research Organisation;

(b) what are the Projects taken up by the Organisation and with what results; and

(c) whether all the officers of the Organisation are Indians?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopalaswami): (a) Approximately Rs. 4 lakhs.

(b) The projects deal with test construction and standardisation, Follow Up, improvement of selection methods and training of selection staff.

The new tests have been specially devised to suit Indian students. The system of selection is progressively improving and becoming more and more systematic, definite and accurate.

(c) Yes.

FERTILIZERS

*1021. **Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether an agreement for the supply of fertilizers by the U.S. Government under the Indo-U.S. Technical Co-operation Agreement has been signed;

(b) if so, the quantity of fertilizers to be supplied; and

(c) when the supply will be made?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) 108,000 tons.

(c) It is expected that the fertilizers will begin to arrive from July 1952 and the supply will be completed by February 1953.

SCHEME OF TRAINING IN PRINTING

*1023. **Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** (a) Will the Minister of Education be pleased to place on the Table of the House a copy of the Scheme of training in printing drawn out by the All-India Council for Technical Education and approved by Government?

(b) How many institutions for training in Printing Technology have since then been established both as Central and Regional Organisations?

(c) What is the number of trainees (State-wise) who were admitted for training in the institutions mentioned in part (b) above?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) A copy of the scheme is placed in the Library of the House.

(b) None.

(c) This does not arise.

APPLICATIONS TO REHABILITATION FINANCE ADMINISTRATION

*1024. **Shri Vidyalkar:** (a) Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Government have received numerous complaints to the effect that,

(i) the applications received by the Rehabilitation Finance Administration are not disposed of expeditiously, and that it takes a long time for an applicant to be granted loan during which interval he consumes most of his own capital; and

(ii) that the enquiries of applicants are not properly and expeditiously attended to?

(b) If so, what action do Government propose to take in the matter?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): (a) (i) It is a fact that numerous complaints are received regarding the delay in the disposal of applications and the disbursement of sanctioned loans. As, however, the Administration have so far received 65,650 applications and a majority of these were received within a short period, a fairly long time must necessarily elapse before an applicant's turn for being dealt with can come. Disbursement also takes time because the applicants have to fulfil various terms and conditions like the securing of premises, trade licences, etc.

(ii) This is incorrect.

(b) The administration have already taken various steps to expedite disposal and have in fact increased the rate from about 500 per month about 2 years ago to approximately 2000 per month. The State Governments have also been exhorted to give priority to loanees of the Administration in the matter of allotment of premises, quotas of controlled commodities, power connections and licences. As a result of this and the relaxation of the terms and conditions attached to the loans, disbursements have also improved from about Rs. 7 lakhs to Rs. 14 lakhs per month. Further acceleration will need considerable expansion of temporary staff which would be risky and undesirable.

COAL DEPOSITS IN MADHYA PRADESH

*1025. **Sardar A. S. Saigal:** (a) Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a survey of the coal deposits of Madhya Pradesh was made by the National Fuel Research Institute, Jealgore to assess the potentialities of establishing a steel industry?

(b) What is the finding of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research on coal analysis and test?

(c) Is it a fact that valuable deposits of iron ore and lime-stone lie in Madhya Pradesh?

(d) Is it a fact that extensive coal deposits in Madhya Pradesh and Vindhya Pradesh are particularly suitable for steam raising and for the manufacture of synthetic oil by the Fischer-Tropsch process?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (d). The findings of the survey have been published by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research in a publication entitled "A Preliminary Survey of Madhya Pradesh Coals." A copy of this publication available in the Library of the House.

(c) Yes, Sir.

विदेश भेजे गये हरिजन विद्यार्थी

*१०२६. **डा० सत्यबाबू:** (क) क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि गत पांच वर्षों में विदेशों ने प्रविधिक प्रशिक्षण के लिए प्रत्येक राज्य से कितने हरिजन विद्यार्थियों ने छात्रवृत्ति के लिये आवेदन

भेजे थे और प्रत्येक व्यवसाय में प्रशिक्षण के लिए प्रत्येक राज्य के अभ्यर्थियों को कितनी छात्रवृत्तियां प्रदान की गई थीं।

(ख) स्वीकार किये गये आयव्ययक में हरिजन विद्यार्थियों की छात्रवृत्तियों के लिये क्या किसी निश्चित राशि का उप-बन्ध किया गया है, और यदि किया गया है तो कितनी राशि का ?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) The information is not available, as applications of candidates for Overseas Scholarships are not classified State-wise or communitywise. One Scholar from West Bengal belonging to the Scheduled Castes was sent abroad for training in Radio Engineering in 1947-48, and a second Scholar selected from Mysore did not avail himself of the scholarship.

(b) A provision of Rs. 17.5 lakhs has been made in the current year's budget for post-Matriculation scholarships in India to students of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other Backward Classes. Out of this amount, it is proposed to allocate Rs. 8,75,000 for students of the Scheduled Castes.

अरबंकडू कार्डाइट फैक्टरी के मजदूर

*१०२७. **श्री बीरस्वामी:** क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या नीलगिरि स्थिति अरबंकडू कार्डाइट फैक्टरी के मजदूरों को पहाड़-भत्ता दिया जाता है; और

(ख) यदि दिया जाता है तो कितना ?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopalaswami): (a) They are not given any allowance called Hill Allowance, but are entitled to special house rent and compensatory allowances.

(b) The rates are as follows:—

	Compensatory Allowance	House Rent Allowance	Total
For persons drawing pay of:—	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Below Rs. 55	3	5	8
Rs. 55 to Rs. 100	5	7	12
Rs. 101 to Rs. 106	7	6 to 1	13 to 8
Rs. 107 and above	10	...	10

SECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

***1028. Shri Madiah Gowda:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state what points will be referred to the Secondary Education Commission, for its consideration and report?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): The Commission will examine the entire system of Secondary Education in the country, with special reference to the points contained in the statement which is laid on the Table of the House, together with any other relevant points which the Commission itself may decide to include within the terms of reference.

STATEMENT

Terms of Reference of the Secondary Education Commission will include the following points:

- (1) To examine and formulate the aims and objects of Secondary Education in India with reference to the present position in the country and from the point of view of developing qualities of leadership needed in different walks of life.
- (2) To consider the question of the diversification of Secondary Education and the establishment of unilateral and multilateral schools.
- (3) To determine the duration of Secondary Education and its relationship to Primary and Higher Education.
- (4) To examine the existing Syllabus of studies and methods of instruction and the type of text-books used in Secondary Schools and suggest improvements in them.
- (5) To consider the place of the Federal Language, the regional languages and English in Secondary Education.
- (6) To consider the procedure to be adopted for selecting pupils for Secondary Schools.
- (7) To consider the nature of examination to be held at the end of the Secondary stage and its status for purposes of admission to the Universities.
- (8) To consider the steps to be taken for training an adequate number of teachers and the question of their salaries and conditions of service.

(9) To consider the question of exercising better control and supervision over private Secondary Schools and ensuring proper standards and conditions of work in them.

(10) To consider the financial implications of establishing the proposed system of reorganised Secondary Education.

(11) To consider any other matters relevant to the terms of reference.

INCOME-TAX INVESTIGATION COMMISSION

***1029. Prof. Agarwal:** Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount spent so far by Government on the working of the Income-Tax Investigation Commission;

(b) what the total amount of additional income-tax realized so far by the Commission as a direct result of its labour;

(c) how long the Commission is expected to continue work; and

(d) how many cases are still pending before the Commission?

The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi): (a) Expenditure incurred on the Commission upto 31st March 1952 amounted to about Rs. 30 lakhs. The exact figure is not yet known.

(b) The Commission does not realise any income-tax. The tax realised so far by the Income-tax Department on the concealed income found out by the Commission is Rs. 4.73 crores out of a total liability of Rs. 19.28 crores.

(c) According to the present orders, the Commission is to function till 31st December 1952. The question of its continuance beyond this date is under the consideration of Government.

(d) The number of cases still pending with the Commission is 813.

बिघटित सैनिकों के परिवारों का

पुनर्व्यवस्थापन

*१०३०. श्री एन० एल० जोशी क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) भोपाल राज्य की बरेली तहसील में विषदित सैनिकों के कितने परिवार बसाये जायेंगे :

(ख) अब तक वहां पर कितने परिवार बसाये जा चुके हैं और

(ग) क्या उसी प्रकार की कोई दूसरी योजना सरकार के विचाराधीन है?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopalaswami): (a) 90.

(b) No families have so far gone to Bhopal yet as the houses for settlers are under construction. As soon as these are ready, families will be brought by the ex-servicemen. So far 40 ex-servicemen have been settled there.

(c) Similar schemes have been sanctioned in Rampur (U.P.), Afzalgarh (U.P.), Mysore, Madhya Bharat, Punjab, Hyderabad, Bombay and Madras while two more are under consideration in Travancore-Cochin and P.E.P.S.U.

COMPENSATION FOR WAR DAMAGES IN ASSAM

***1031. Shri L. J. Singh:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 866 asked on 7th September, 1951 and state whether war damages referred to therein did include the damages wrought as the result of the enemy action?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopalaswami): Yes.

NATIONAL CADET CORPS

***1032. Shri Sanganna:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) the existing strength of the National Cadet Corps in each State of India; and

(b) how many of the National Cadets have so far been recruited for the regular army service?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopalaswami): (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 37]

(b) 27 have just been granted Commission of whom 14 were selected direct against vacancies reserved for the National Cadet Corps and 13 came in the normal way along with other candidates by appearing at the UPSC examination. 18 cadets have

been selected so far against reserved vacancies for the next course due to start in August 1952.

ZINC

***1033. Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta:** Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) what are the main sources of Zinc in India and where they are located;

(b) what is the total requirement of Zinc in India;

(c) if all the sources are tapped, what percentage it would meet the requirement; and

(d) what are the by-products of Zinc and how they are utilized?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) to (d). A statement giving the desired information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 38.]

INDIAN NAVY

***1034. Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) if ships of the Indian Navy have been visiting the ports of friendly countries;

(b) the names of the ports so far visited and the nature of the welcome received; and

(c) if any Chinese ports have been recently visited, or are being or have been considered for such visits?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopalaswami): (a) Yes.

(b) I lay a statement on the Table of the House giving the names of the ports visited by ships of the Indian Navy after the attainment of Independence. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 39]

The local population in every port visited was very pleased to see Indian ships and accorded a very warm welcome to all officers and men wherever they went.

(c) No.

CONTROL OVER EXPENDITURE

218. Shri M. L. Dwivedi: Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have framed necessary rules and regulations to ensure that the Spending Ministries exercise proper checks and show complete responsibility in the matter of budgeting and keeping control over expenditure;

(b) whether the Ministries have been instructed to take appropriate action in cases of laxity; and

(c) whether Government propose to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the rules and regulations?

The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi): (a) and (b). Yes Sir. The rules and regulations regarding budgeting and control over expenditure are contained in Chapter V of the Central Government compilation of the General Financial Rules and in a number of instructions issued by the Ministry of Finance.

(c) Copies of all these rules and instructions are available in the Library of the House.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

219. Shri M. L. Dwivedi: Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) the steps taken by Government to implement the recommendations of

the Public Accounts Committee as contained in their 1951-52 First and Second Report;

(b) whether the suggestions contained therein have been considered; and

(c) if so, whether Government propose to lay on the Table of the House a statement containing the list of "actions taken", "under consideration", and "proposals found to be unacceptable"?

The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi): (a) to (c). The reports relate to the period 1948-49 and unfinished Accounts of 1947-48 (post-partition) and have only been recently received from the Parliament Secretariat. The recommendations relate to different Ministries who will no doubt subject them to a prompt examination, the results of which, according to the normal procedure, will be printed as an Appendix to the next Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Block 'G'
Acc. No. 25027...
Dated 20.11.2014

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

2117

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 19th June, 1952

*The House met at a Quarter Past
Eight of the Clock*

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

8-15 A.M.

DEATH OF SHRI VIDYA SAGAR
PANDYA

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed further, I have to announce to the House the sad news of the demise of Shri Vidya Sagar Pandya who died in Lucknow on the 16th instant after a prolonged illness. He was a Member of the old Central Assembly.

The House will join with me in conveying our condolence to his family. The House will stand in silence for a minute to express its sorrow.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS
FOR GRANTS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Works, Housing and Supply to reply.

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): Sir, at the outset I must concede that the House has been rather generous with me in the matter of their criticism of the various activities of my Ministry. A certain amount of criticism in the nature of the circumstances is inevitable. The activities of this Ministry, as this House is fully aware, comprise a very wide field. Most of the activities touch not only the other Ministries but also the public at large. In such circumstances a certain amount of criticism is inevitable, and I must confess that it came to me rather as a pleasant surprise that the amount of criticism was neither great in volume nor intense in nature. Without going into minute details, I will

77 P.S.D.

2118

try to touch upon within the short time at my disposal, certain aspects of the criticism which has been levelled by my hon. friends in the Opposition; I will also try and reply to certain points of criticism made by Members of the Congress Party, whose suggestions I have taken note of.

As is natural, the Central Public Works Department was the main target of criticism, and the usual line of attack was its proverbial wastefulness, as remarked by one of the oldest Members, for whom I have great respect and admiration. Then the system of getting works executed on contract came in for a good deal of criticism. Something was also said about the departmental charges. So far as this last item is concerned, I may straightaway say that there is a great amount of confusion and lack of information amongst a certain section of this House. It is not correct, as was suggested by some hon. Members yesterday, that the departmental charges are of the order of 17½ per cent. Recently the whole of the structure with regard to the rate of departmental charges was re-examined, and a slab system has now been introduced. According to this system, nine and a half per cent. is the rate of departmental charges with regard to works of the value of over Rs. five lakhs. Regard being had to the volume of works undertaken by this Ministry, that actually, in practice, comes to be the normal rate of the departmental charges. It is true that for works of the value of less than Rs. five lakhs the rates are higher and there is a graduated slab, but by and large, regard being had to the conditions prevalent as also the costs incurred on the organisation—in the framing of estimates, in the execution and in the supervision—if all these factors are taken into consideration, these departmental charges of nine and a half per cent. cannot be regarded as excessive. As compared to the departmental charges prevalent in other

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

States, these figures are not in any way excessive: if anything, they are extremely low. I have had occasion to look into this matter, and I can confidently say that the departmental charges, which comprise a wide range which is inevitable in the circumstances of our country, where professional engineers are not easily available and they cannot be engaged on job work or for part-time work, these expenses do not in any way compare unfavourably with similar costs that have to be incurred in other parts of the world, including those towards which certain sections of the House have got leaning, and a certain amount of partiality. Therefore, I submit that so far as the criticism with regard to the excessive nature of these departmental charges is concerned, it is based partly on lack of knowledge about the prevalent facts here as also lack of appreciation of the comparative position as it obtains in other States in this country and in other countries.

A lot has been said about the system of contracts. Personally I myself have a great deal of criticism to offer on the method of getting works executed on contract. But in the existing circumstances in the country and in the present stage of its development, some agency for construction is necessary. A purely Governmental organisation both for the purpose of supervision as also for execution will be inadequate. There is lack of manpower. And then there is the question of mobilisation of labour, both skilled and unskilled. All these circumstances are there, and therefore if in that sphere of activity, namely, the organisation and the actual development of an agency for construction, the field is left to private enterprise. I think by and large it cannot be said to be a grievously wrong decision. There are good contractors as well as bad. But regard being had to the nature of work which they execute, the amount of profit which is actually taken into consideration in framing the estimates is not higher than six per cent. or so; and this cannot be termed very excessive. I may be permitted to mention that recently there has been a definite improvement in the situation, because actually the tenderers have quoted figures which are from two to three per cent. lower than the estimates, and the contractor's share of profit will therefore correspondingly decrease.

There is scope for improvement no doubt and I am aware of the criticism as also the recommendations made

from time to time for improving the contract forms and for strengthening the supervisory control. So far as examination of the contract forms is concerned—the question that was raised by my hon. friend Mr. B. Das—the matter is already engaging the attention of Government not only in this Ministry but in other Ministries as well, and I can say that every step will be taken to make these contract forms more rational and to ensure that there are internal checks as also the maximum possible amount of supervision in the actual execution of these contracts.

Then a good deal has been said by two of my hon. friends on the Opposition benches with regard to the retrenchment which they think is being undertaken in the Central P.W.D. particularly among the work-charged staff. Sir, you will kindly recall that a few days ago certain employees of the C.P.W.P. work-charge staff staged a demonstration. I have gone into the facts of that case and feel surprised that such a small matter should have been exploited in the manner in which it was actually done in this particular case. Actually the nature of the work at the hands of the C.P.W.D. is such that the entire staff particularly at the lower rung, cannot be placed on a permanent basis. The nature of the work is such that it is fluctuating; sometimes there is more work at our hands, sometimes less. Therefore a certain amount of elasticity has got to be there. Within these limitations, however, I may assure the House, through you, that the C.P.W.D. have done all that could possibly be done to better the lot of all members of the work-charged staff. This particular demonstration arose out of this incident. There are officers' messes which are mainly catering to the needs of the Defence Services. The demonstrators insisted that a certain change should be brought about in the staffing of the messes. They said that the officers should be asked to arrange for their private servants and they should pay for their services, thus making a departure from the system of certain community services which prevailed earlier. That necessitated the retrenchment of 108 workers on the work-charged staff. The C.P.W.D. did their best to absorb all these hands which were retrenched under circumstances beyond the control of the C.P.W.D. They offered alternative employment to all of them and actually 79 of them availed themselves of that offer and were absorbed in other wings of the C.P.W.D. Only 29 were left, and even with regard to them alternative employment was offered although on muster roll and not on the work-

charged system. But they refused to accept alternative employment. I place these facts for the consideration of the House and say that such a minor problem of 29 members of the work-charged staff, when we have got a total strength of 9,000 odd at our hands in Delhi, was hardly a matter to occasion the display of those huge banners, and actually one of the hon. Members in the Opposition tried in an irrelevant manner, to raise that point even on the floor of this House. In the interests of those employees, I will suggest to my hon. friends who, I presume, are solicitous for the betterment of their conditions that if those employees are left alone, we will look after them much better. But when they are instigated and goaded on to a course of action which is neither in their own interests nor in the interest of the State, it creates complications. Otherwise, there was absolutely no substance in the grievances and it was meant merely to rake up imaginary grievances.

An Hon. Member: What about the Stationery and Printing Department?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Sardar Swaran Singh: I was mentioning the C.P.W.D. and I will certainly mention the point with regard to the retrenchment in the Printing and Stationery Department. Besides this the Ministry has undertaken certain measures to ensure that the "leakages" are reduced to a minimum and that the work is executed in the best possible way and in a very straightforward manner. There is a Works Advisory Board which consists of officers of the Engineering Department, of the Finance Department and of the Ministry of Works, they jointly sit and scrutinise every contract and then contracts above a certain amount are further examined at a higher level. All this has resulted in the straightening out of many intricate matters and in greater confidence amongst the people, the contractors and all others concerned.

Then the methods of testing that are shortly going to be adopted will go a long way to act as a check in the execution stage of these works. Mortar and material, all these things can be checked in the laboratory which is about to function in Delhi. I may also add that the recent recruitment through the Union Public Service Commission has yielded encouraging results. The younger members of the staff and the younger graduates in engineering are upto the mark and the increasing numbers from that source have definitely strengthened the organisation.

Now while on the C.P.W.D., I may also refer in passing to the question of M.Ps.' bungalows. My learned friend Mr. Basu made a grievance of the leaking of water from the upper roof that he was occupying. This is such a minor matter that it hardly requires any notice. The whole project is to be judged from a larger point of view, and I can say that by and large there is a great amount of satisfaction so far as these M.Ps. flats, as also the type of furniture provided, are concerned. And, Sir, you were kind enough to help us in finalising the designs about furniture and about the type of accommodation that has been provided.

Some Hon. Members: What about rents?

Sardar Swaran Singh: I know my hon. friends are very anxious to know about the rents and have been pressing me from time to time that something should be done on that score. I am glad to inform the hon. Members that a decision has been taken which I feel has placed the whole position on a rational basis. You are aware that in view of the prevailing circumstances the cost of construction of the old bungalow-type houses was lower but so far as these flats are concerned, their cost of construction was greater. According to the rules and the percentages which are the basis for calculation of rent, the rate of rent of the new flats having regard to the accommodation, works out to a higher figure as compared to the rent of these bungalows. What has now been decided is that the entire accommodation should be pooled together and the total rent distributed *pro rata* among the different types of accommodation. This will have the effect of slightly increasing the rent of M.Ps.' bungalows but result in reduction of the rents of the flats. This, to a certain extent, will remove the headache of the Ministry; the great pressure to which we are subjected by the preference shown by every Member who is naturally anxious to secure the allotment of a bungalow, will decrease to a certain extent. The entire range of bungalows and flats will be pooled and rents will be placed on a rational basis. Apart from this rationalisation, we have also decided that in future the M.Ps., Members both of this House as also of the Council of States, may be treated as being on duty throughout the year. This decision, I submit, is a fair one because of the increased and continuing responsibility of the hon. Members. Their work is more or less wholtime and therefore they are entitled to continuous

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

accommodation in Delhi. Therefore, the criticism which has been levelled at us, namely, that when the session is over the hon. Members are made to pay higher rents, will disappear, and I am sure this decision will be greatly appreciated by all sections of the House.

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): Did the hon. Minister consult the two House Committees before this arrangement was arrived at? The House Committees are there to advise him.

Mr. Speaker: I may answer that question. Both the House Committees and the Speaker were consulted on this.

Sardar Swaran Singh: For the satisfaction of the hon. Member I may inform him that not only were these Committees consulted but this was the insistent demand of the hon. Members themselves, and Government have done nothing more than to accept their demands.

Now a few words about the Supplies and Disposals Wing of this Ministry. On this not much has been said now, greatly to my surprise, because so far as this aspect of the activities of the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply is concerned, it has in the past been exposed to a great volume of criticism. The policy which has been consistently followed, both with regard to procurement, (which is the same thing as purchases), inside the country and out of it, as also in the matter of disposals, is a policy which is conducive to the best interests of the economy of the country. On the purchase side, the policy has consistently been to so marry the demands from the various Ministries at the Centre, from the States and from semi-government institutions that any element of competition is eliminated so that each Ministry or each department may not be competing for the same goods at the same time and in the same markets, thus resulting in the swelling up of the prices. We have succeeded in our policy to a very great extent. I know this has resulted in delays, in criticism and in pressure, but those who have to take a decision in the bigger context of the All-India picture have definitely to do so in the best interests of the general economic set-up of the country, and I am glad to say that this object has been secured to a very large extent.

So also in the domain of our purchases from abroad. There again, the purchase policy has been so formulated that, in the first instance,

any demand that is received from any of the purchasing parties, whether it is the Centre or a State or a semi-government authority, is carefully scrutinised to see if these purchases cannot be made inside the country, and orders with regard to foreign goods are placed only for those items which cannot be procured locally, consistent with economy and quality of material. Even on the question of quality Government are always prepared, in suitable cases, to relax the rigid standards of specification and are also prepared sometimes to give a price advantage. Recently, it has been decided that a special concession should be shown to cottage and small-scale industries and that our purchase policy should be such that maximum encouragement is afforded to cottage and small-scale industries. A Resolution to that effect is in the process of being issued. I will not take the time of this House to go into the details of that policy but, suffice it to say, that it has been framed in such a manner that, ensuring basic considerations like quality and delivery dates, the products of cottage and small-scale industries are given preference over products of other manufacturers in purchases for Government requirements. This is a very recent decision; it is not just a pious decision which is to remain on paper but arrangements are being made to see that the policy actually obtains in practice. The position will remain under constant review from time to time, and if it is found that the principle is being departed from effective steps will be taken to ensure that the new policy which Government are now embarking upon of giving preference to cottage and small-scale industries is enforced. I may also mention that in the case of these products Government may be willing to relax some of the specifications and be prepared even to give a price advantage. This, the House will appreciate, is not a small decision, and those of my learned friends who in season and out of season are bent only upon criticism will also realise that the decision is something which is in the best interests of the country, because the development of cottage and small-scale industries is a matter of prime importance in the rural development of our country.

Now a few words about retrenchment in the Stationery and Printing Office, a matter which my friend sitting in the back bench on that side of the House felt so very impatient to learn about. I am certain his figures are entirely wrong, but I may say that in that part of the House

figures do not cut much ice. As I have said, his figures of retrenchment in the Stationery and Printing Office at Calcutta are entirely wrong; there is no truth in the allegation that he has made that as many as 10,000 workers are being retrenched. Actually what happened was this. Some time back on the recommendation of.....

Shri Raghavaiah (Ongole): I referred to the C.P.W.D., not to the Stationery and Printing Office.

Sardar Swaran Singh: If that is the figure for the C.P.W.D., then his 10,000 I will show, is equal to 108 out of which 79 have been absorbed and 29 were offered muster-roll employment. That is the sum total. I am glad he has receded from the position which he originally took with regard to the huge figure he gave about the Printing and Stationery Office at Calcutta. I do not know what is the figure he sticks to. I presume he does not stick to any figure. (*An hon. Member: Zero.*)

According to the information in my possession, not a single man has been retrenched from that office.

Shri Raghavaiah: I gave the figures from the memorandum of the Press Employees' Union, Calcutta.

Sardar Swaran Singh: Yes, the difficulty with my hon. friend is that he goes by just a piece of paper which may have been handed over to him by any of these bodies, and he does not care to verify the figures at all by a reference to the Ministry or to me. I am always available to my hon. friend. We may differ in regard to opinions, we may not agree upon policies, but I am pretty certain that we should agree on mathematics at least. If only he had passed on those figures to me, I would have got them checked up and passed on the right information to him. According to my information, what happened was a very simple thing, and I am sure the House will greatly appreciate the step that was taken by us in pursuance of the recommendations of the Estimates Committee. A Departmental Committee was set up to effect reorganisation in the Stationery and Printing Office. This Committee went into the entire matter and suggested what economies could be effected by the shifting of presses and hands. I do not want to go into the details of these proposals, but I only want to say that in pursuance of the recommendations made by this Committee, we took swift action for reorganisation, which resulted in the shifting of hands from one place to another. But there

was absolutely no question of retrenchment, and not a single person was retrenched as practically everyone was found alternative employment in the Department. This is hardly a matter upon which there was any scope for my hon. friend to wax eloquent as he did. The greatest misfortune is that those irresponsible informants of my hon. friend are somehow given greater credence than the solemn statements, backed by figures, made by us, and I share the grievance of the hon. Minister of Finance on the question of figures. Somehow or other mathematics and arithmetic are set at nought and vague allegations which are made by certain self-styled organisers of these unions are given greater credence. I have nothing further to say on this matter.

There is one more important matter to which I should like to refer and that is housing, about which I am pretty certain that the House would like to know something. Housing is going to be a very important part of the activities of this Ministry—housing not merely in the general sense of the term, i.e. housing for Government servants and Government offices, but housing for the people at large. That is our ambitious programme. How we are going to execute it, how we are going to accomplish it—that is a matter which at the moment is engaging the active attention of Government. Actually, there is a provision in the Budget for a considerable sum of money for industrial housing. I am not going into the details of that scheme at this stage, because they do not form the subject matter of any of the Demands just now under consideration. But, broadly the scheme is to help the clearance of slums, particularly in the industrial areas. It is confined to industrial areas, and the Centre is realising its responsibility towards contributing its share in the matter of relieving this great blot from which the country is suffering today. I refer to lack of houses, or the existence of unsatisfactory houses, in the industrial areas. The scheme is being worked out in consultation with the State Governments, because the State Governments, the employers and the Centre—have all to contribute towards it, and I am sure that a satisfactory formula will be evolved and a suitable machinery set up to find out what is best in the interest of the scheme and what should be the machinery for its effective and efficient execution.

Apart from industrial housing, housing in general, i.e. clearance of slums and rural housing, is also engaging

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

the attention of Government. The main question will be that of finance. But apart from finance, there are other matters also which, if properly investigated, will go a long way to remove this great grievance of the general population of this country.

In this connection, I may add that Government are contemplating to bring forward a legislative measure so that a Central Housing Board and Regional Housing Boards could be set up and the enforcement of responsibilities of the various parties concerned may be placed on a legal basis. Government's responsibility in this matter is great, but greater still is the responsibility of the people. To a very large extent, particularly in the case of the people in the middle-income bracket, the enterprise will have to be private. The State will come to their aid for securing proper sites and materials, and, in certain cases, perhaps also give a certain amount of financial help in one form or another. But the whole thing depends upon the cooperation that is extended by the people and the enthusiasm that is evoked amongst the general population.

Sir, I may be excused for having transgressed the limit of my time. Within the short space of time available to me, I have not been able to touch on all aspects. I have touched upon only certain important ones, and there are some small matters of detail which I have not been able to refer to. I may assure the hon. Members that all the points raised by them will be properly investigated into and suitable action taken. If within this short space of time I have not been able to present the picture of the working of this Ministry with greater lucidity and in greater detail, the fault and the imperfection are entirely mine, and certainly not of my Ministry.

Shri V. N. Tivary (Kanpur Distt.—North cum Farrukhabad Distt.—South): What about printing the proceedings of this House? There has been inordinate delay.

Sardar Swaran Singh: I will certainly look into it, and it will be expedited.

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): Sir, at the very outset I would like to seek your indulgence as also the indulgence of my colleague the Minister of Labour if I transgress the time allotted to me. The points which have been raised have been many and even if I were to answer them only cursorily, or even only a

few of them, I will take much more than the half an hour that has been allotted to me. Moreover, for effective production I have to depend upon the goodwill and hearty cooperation of my colleague the Labour Minister and I do not want to trespass upon his time and earn his illwill at the very outset!

It has been a matter of gratification to me that the creation of this new Ministry of Production has been welcomed on all hands. Not only every Member of this House who spoke, but also the Press and the public have welcomed the creation of this Ministry with open arms. It is indeed a matter of great privilege to me that I should have been chosen for taking up the reins of this new Ministry. I would like to offer my warm thanks to the congratulations that my good friend Mr. B. Das, who is one of the oldest Members of the House, extended to me. He also expressed the hope that, the State from which I come, namely Mysore having a fine tradition in the industrial field, particularly in the matter of setting up and sponsoring State enterprises and State industries, my experience there will stand me in good stead. I also feel, without any vanity or any sense of self-congratulation, that such experience as I might have had in the matter of dealing with these State concerns in Mysore may stand me in good stead in the course of the discharge of my new responsibilities.

Some Members have referred to the content, the jurisdiction, or, if I may say so, the scope of this Ministry. No doubt the scope of Production is very vast and very comprehensive. Take for example food production, which is the most important sector of production. That surely does not come within the scope of this Ministry. That responsibility is shouldered by my hon. colleague Mr. Rafi Ahmad Kidwai. Confining myself to the Industrial sector only, it is not as if production of all types and of all varieties comes within the scope of this Ministry. Many an industry comes under the private sector. For example, cloth, cement, paper, sugar, and so on and so forth—all these industries have generally to be fostered by private enterprise. And, properly and justifiably they are within the scope and competence of the Ministry of Industry and Commerce. Even with regard to State undertakings, to which the Production Ministry has to confine itself, it is not as if all State sponsored industries in the whole of the country come within the jurisdiction of the Production Ministry at the

Centre. Hon. Members may be aware that in States like Mysore for example, Hyderabad, to some extent in Travancore and in certain other States also, there are State sponsored industries. They are being looked after by the respective States, with varying degrees of success, and this Ministry has no direct control over them. If anything, there is only the task of coordination which has to be done by this Ministry.

So, the scope of this Ministry—I will not say it is very limited, I will come to that—is restricted in a way, or rather confined to certain specified spheres only. Even here, it was pointed out by some Members and a query was put “Why is it that certain State sponsored industries have not come within the scope of this Ministry?” I do not want to go into that question now. It will not be necessary. It is a matter of internal adjustment. One hon. Member said that this Production Ministry was a “residue Ministry”. If the hon. Member was a good student of chemistry he would have known that even residues are very valuable and of great use. In fact it is not a residue Ministry in the sense perhaps he understood it to be or he wanted us to understand. Even granting that the Hindustan Aircraft Ltd. is not within the scope of the Production Ministry but under Defence under the very able guidance and control of my hon. colleague Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar, nor the Telephone industry which is under the efficient care of my hon. colleague Mr. Jagjivan Ram, nor again, if I may refer to it, the Chittaranjan Locomotive workshop which is a Railway owned industry under the able care of my hon. colleague Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, making allowance for all these—and in passing may I say that there is nothing rigid about this allocation, it is all flexible and we will feel our way and see what has got to be done—even the concerns left over, the “residue”, as it was called is of a very vital significance.

9 A.M.

I do not want to list all the industries that are to be handled by this Production Ministry. There are about eight or nine of them. Added to them, there are the vital articles like salt and coal. All these come under this Ministry. My friend Mr. Das said that my hon. colleague Rajkumari Amrit Kaur has handed over to me the Housing Factory baby. Well, it has been handed over to me; so also other babies. Altogether under my charge there are now about ten or a dozen babies, so many industrial concerns. They are all getting on very well and

I may assure this House that I will try my best to see that they grow properly, that they come to manhood and that they play an active role in the building up of our country.

Then a reference was made, or rather a query was put by an hon. friend: All right, this Production Ministry has been constituted. The President also referred to it in his speech. Is that all? Is the Government self-complacent by merely making a statement that the new Ministry has been created and feeling that they have done a wonderful thing? To this I would say in all humility: No Government have no such feeling of complacency whatsoever.

With regard to policy it was asked: Where is the policy, where has it been enunciated? In regard to that I will at present say only this. When I come to the end of my speech I will briefly refer to what the policy of the Government has been and will be with regard to the setting up and fostering of State enterprises and industries. But at present I would refer the hon. Member and this House to the Industrial Policy statement made by the Government of India in 1948, later on clarified by my leader the hon. the Prime Minister sometime in 1949, April I think. These two statements put together contain the Industrial policy of the Government of India.

Having made these general observations I would like to take the House through some of the remarks made by some hon. Members with regard to some of the State enterprises which are now under my charge. I will first take up Sindri. One hon. Member asked “What is this Sindri? You estimated a capital outlay of Rs. ten and odd crores. Now you have already spent Rs. 23 crores. The capital is to mount up to Rs. 30 crores. Is this wise estimating? Is this the caution and care exercised by the Government of India in building up this industry?” And he said in the end that if this is the way our national resources and the financial resources of the Government of India are frittered away then God help us—or something to that effect. Well I must say that the hon. Member, with all due deference to him, is not very well informed. It is true that the capital outlay has gone up. I would like to know which industry—which State sponsored industry in any corner of the globe, which private industry for the matter of that has kept within the limits of the original estimates. No doubt there have been variations. But if my hon. friend had any experience

[Shri K. C. Reddy]

of how these industries are set up and fostered, he would not have been so categorical and sweeping in his statement. I would like to say that in the setting up of this industry all possible human care has been taken. No doubt, there might have been variations, there might have been pitfalls here and there. In a national industry of this complex nature how can we say that we are perfect? There will be pitfalls. We have learnt from past experience, and we are going to improve hereafter. But we should not lose sight of the main thing when we take up a detail here and there and make a generalisation. With regard to Sindri I want to say that it is one of the finest national industries that this country has established and we can be proud of this industry. This industry is the biggest in Asia and human talent, human energy, national resources and foreign aid have all gone into the building up of this industry. An annual output of 3,50,000 tons of ammonium sulphate we will be able to produce by the end of this year. Our production will reach this maximum by about the end of October or I think by about the end of this year. All things are going on well. It is forgotten that production of this fertilizer will add effectively and definitely to our potential food production. One computation is that this would enable us to produce an additional one million tons of food grains. And we are going to save annually foreign exchange of about Rs. ten crores. Is this a point which can be brushed aside by generalizations and condemnation lock, stock and barrel? It is also forgotten that this industry is a basis for a heavy chemical industry later on in the country. Very few people, I am afraid, seem to be conscious of it. Some of the critics who want to condemn state enterprise and also some other hon. Members referred to the Defence industries. It is forgotten that this fertilizer industry when it is fully developed, has a Defence potential value. If we bear all these facts in mind, I do not think there is any justification for this wholesale condemnation of this new factory. I would request the hon. Member to refer to the brochure which has been published by the Ministry in connection with the Sindri Fertilizer in 1950. I think that if he cares to walk into the library and see the necessary papers, he will have fully documented details as to why the estimates went up, as to what the factory is doing now and what it proposes to do in the near future. There is no time for me; otherwise I would have taken the House

through all the details and convinced even my hon. friend. Even the hardest critic would be convinced that we have done well. The Government of India have also on hand the question of utilization of the bye-products, e.g., Calcium Carbonate Sludge. Proposals have been practically completed to manufacture cement out of the Calcium Carbonate Sludge. It is also proposed to reduce costs by other ways. And the setting up of a coke oven plant has been recently sanctioned at a cost of about Rs. two and a half crores. There is a proposal to set up a new Urea plant. There are several aspects of this factory, which are likely to be developed, but owing to limitations of time, I cannot take them up at present. I will take another opportunity of acquainting this House, if necessary, with further details about this factory. Once again, I want to say that this factory is one about which we can be proud.

Then I come to the Machine Tools Factory. I was amazed when one hon. Member asked: Why this waste of money? Where was the need for this machine tools factory? Why should we not utilize our financial resources for other purposes? I think it was Mr. Basu from Diamond Harbour who put these questions. I am sorry and I hope he will not misunderstand me when I say that he has not gone fully into these questions. He ought to have known what was the scope of this machine tools factory. He said that there were already existing factories and private enterprise could have been entrusted with this task. There are 16 graded and 100 ungraded private factories. They are producing machine tools of a kind worth about Rs. 40 lakhs per annum. They manufacture simple and primary tools and not the modern precision tools which are necessary not only for general use but also for Defence and Railways. This factory proposes to fill the lacuna. It proposes to produce the modern and precision tools worth about Rs. four crores per annum and when production goes into full swing, we would be producing 300 high speed lathes, 460 milling machines and 240 heavy duty drilling machines. A gear cutting shop and foundry also will be set up. It is a very vital industry and I would like to implore all hon. Members including the critics to understand that it is a very essential industry and everyone should help to create a fund of goodwill for the progress and prosperity of this industry instead of mud-slinging or criticizing it in the way one or two hon. Members have unfortunately done.

Then I come to oil refineries. In this connection I want to say a word

about the hon. Member from East Godavary, who faced this Assembly for the first time, who as he stated was like a bride facing the husband for the first time. And he pleaded for gentle handling: I am all for gentle handling but the hard hitting indulged in by the hon. Member was such that though I am tempted to hit rather hard, I will respond to his appeal to treat him gently! Regarding the oil refineries he more or less said: You have mortgaged this country though I think he did not use that very language. He said that we have done a blunder in entering into an agreement with certain companies for refining crude oil. Perhaps he described the agreement as 'most scandalous' or something like that. I would like to say only this much so far as this is concerned. I have gone through the records. I had not the privilege of being associated with this matter from its formative stage. I assure this House and particularly the hon. Member that every possible care has been taken to secure as advantageous an agreement as possible with these foreign interests. And I want to say this: When production of refined oil starts, for which purpose we have entered into an agreement with Standard Vacuum Oil Company and Burmah Shell Company and later on we are likely to enter into an agreement with Caltex, we will ultimately produce oil which will be more or less sufficient for our requirements. This country which is now somewhere in the end of the list of countries producing the oil will come up somewhere very high in the first twenty countries. That will be a record and I want to inform non. Members—I do not know if I can place the agreement on the Table of the House—there is no objection to give the salient features of the agreement. If the hon. Members were to go into the agreement, they will find that all possible care has been taken. My hon. friend referred to the 25 year period. Originally the firm wanted 30 years but we cut it down to 25 years and we have secured as many advantages as possible. I may say that although concessions have been given to these companies, they were given solely keeping in mind the national interest of this country and if you weigh the balance of advantages and disadvantages, I can say confidently that we have secured more advantages than incurred disadvantages by way of grant of concessions. I think my hon. friend Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani when she was making a speech in connection with the Demand for Defence or External Affairs debate said that the All India Manufacturers' Organisation

had taken exception to this agreement. The opinion of the All India Manufacturers' Organisation is one which is entitled to respect, but I do not know the exact criticism that they had made. I have been trying to find it out for the last four or five days I have not been able to do so; except for an announcement in the radio, there is no document available and when I see that criticism, I shall certainly go into it and see whether there is any basis for their criticism.

Then I come to Penicillin and D.D.T. factories. It is not possible for me to go into the details of the capital invested or of the agreement entered into. As regards D.D.T. we will be producing about 700 tons against the country's requirement of 1,000 tons. One point was made by my hon. friend, Mr. Das. He asked: Why this State enterprise? What will happen after 15 years?

Shri B. Das: I asked about the Penicillin factory and not about other factories.

Shri K. C. Reddy: I am referring to Penicillin and D.D.T. I can say this much that those are also very essential factories. In fact, if we have to combat the disease and better the health of our people, it is absolutely necessary that we must produce our own penicillin and D.D.T. It is a matter of opinion whether it should be taken up as a State enterprise or whether it should have been entrusted to private enterprise. But, when we have to enter into agreements with International organisations like the W.H.O. and U.N.I.C.E.F., the balance of advantage dictates that we had better run it as a State enterprise rather than leaving it to private enterprise. The question was asked, what will happen in this after fifteen years? I would ask this question with regard to so many other plans of man. What will happen to such and such a thing after 50 years? What will happen to them after 100 years? We cannot look at this question in this way. Suppose the whole concept changes, and the whole world changes. What happens? If after ten years penicillin becomes useless and some other thing takes its place, we cannot help it. For the present, we want it, and we want it badly. We are importing it and spending lots of money, and valuable foreign exchange. Why should we go on importing? The capital to be invested on this enterprise is not very heavy. I do not see any reason why we should not have gone ahead with that.

Next, I come to the Vizagapatam Shipyard. It is a very big industry. I think it was the hon. Member from East Godavary who said he was like

*[Shri K. C. Reddy]

the new bride and who asked for delicate handling, who said that the Vizag shipyard has been handed over to a French company.

An Hon. Member: Is that Parliamentary, Sir?

Shri K. C. Reddy: He asked, what will happen to our sovereignty? Our Army is commanded by Englishmen, our shipyard by French men; our oil refineries by Americans; where is our sovereignty; how can we maintain a neutral policy if this sort of thing is going on? I can only tell him this much. We are living in a modern world. If one wants to shut himself up in an ivory tower and thinks that he can do everything by himself, I will only say that he is living in some kind of paradise which I do not want to describe. There should be healthy inter-dependence. There should be give and take. Financial help, if it comes on our terms let us take it. Technical help, we must take. That is the way to build up the country. With regard to the Vizag Shipyard, I am afraid he was absolutely off the rails and quite wrong when he said that we have handed over this Vizag Shipyard to a French firm. That is far from the truth. We have not handed it over. It is still under our control. A limited liability company has been brought into existence, in which the Government have certain shares, the Scindias have certain number of shares. A Board of Directors has been constituted. This French company has been approached to give us technical assistance, give us designs, etc., on certain terms acceptable to us. If my hon. friend says that we have handed over this Vizag Shipyard to a French company, I can only say that that is far from the truth.

Some Hon. Members: Do not take it seriously.

Shri K. C. Reddy: All sorts of well-informed criticism, we have to take seriously. This being the first time, I am a little too enthusiastic to reply to all kinds of criticism. Possibly later on, I know what I have got to do with all such criticisms.

No reference was made to the National Instruments and Telephones Cable factory. Much has been said on the floor of the House about the Housing factory. I have gone through all the proceedings on the floor of the House regarding this factory and the several questions and answers also regarding this. Mr. Das pointed out that this was an unwanted baby handed over to me. I can only say this—let me not be misunderstood—that sometimes babies get an attack of

measles, or small pox or some illness. May be, this Housing factory had some such attack. Now, it has recovered. We want to build it up and we want to make the best use of it. It is to this aspect that I am addressing myself today. Personally I feel that there is a good future for this factory and the new proposals that we have before us with regard to it will re-organise the factory for the good of the country.

I have dealt with all the State enterprises, except for the Nahan Foundry, to which I need not refer at the present stage. Now, I come to coal. Certain criticisms have been made with regard to the policy that we are pursuing with regard to coal.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta North-West): If the hon. Member speaks a little less galloping, we could understand it better.

Shri K. C. Reddy: With regard to coal, I shall refer to one or two important points that have been made. I am afraid I have no time and I cannot go into details. But, I can say this much that so far as our coal resources are concerned, in their entirety, we have sufficient stocks in our country. Both our present findings and our prospective findings have created a feeling of assurance in our minds that we have enough stocks. I cannot give figures because it will take time. A specific point was made with regard to metallurgical coal. I think it was my hon. friend from Diamond Harbour, Mr. Basu who said that what the hon. Prime Minister said the other day with regard to metallurgical coal, that we have enough stocks, was not quite correct. He said that he wanted to contradict that statement. I am afraid that that is a statement which is not capable of being contradicted. I would ask your indulgence and the indulgence of the House to give some figures, subject to verification and correction later on. The position is this, as given out in the coal working party's report and other documents. We have so far as metallurgical coal is concerned, about 2,000 million tons. At the present rate of consumption of 3 million tons for iron and steel industry only, it will last for.....

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair*]

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I say a word, Sir? There was a mis-print in the paper which I had handed over to the hon. Minister. I wanted to tell him that it was a mis-print.

Shri K. C. Reddy: I am aware of that. In fact, I was basing my remarks on the figures given in the report of the Working Party on Coal and certain other documents which are now before the public. Generally speaking, I can say that our present reserves of metallurgical coal, on various computations, will last for many years. If the consumption is three million tons, it will last for so many years; if we consume ten million tons, it will last for so many years; if the consumption is 50 million tons, it will last for so many years; that is the calculation. By and large, I am in a position to say that though we cannot say that we have a surfeit of this coal, we have enough to create a feeling of confidence and assurance in our minds that we need not be worried about the future. In fact, we are in a position even now to export a little quantity and earn valuable exchange. There is nothing wrong in that. When I say that though we have not got a surfeit we have enough reserves, we are not complacent over the matter. We are taking all possible steps to conserve this metallurgical coal by various methods such as washing, stowing, blending, etc. I am not in a position to go into the details; but I can say this much that we are taking action on the various recommendations that have been made in that report.

I would have liked to refer to certain other matters regarding coal; but I have no time. For example, there is a lot of complaint from several quarters that they are not getting enough coal for brick-burning purposes, etc. The bottleneck, I am afraid, is transport. We are doing our best in collaboration with the Ministry of Railways to remove the bottleneck as soon as possible and we hope to give better results in regard to distribution later on.

A point was made by my hon. friend Mr. B. Das with regard to Benzole. I have gone into the whole question. I shall go into the question further. I want to assure him this. Whatever agreement might have been entered into with the Burmah Shell, it is under examination now. In view of the fact that we have ourselves gone in for a coke oven plant in Sindri, we have got to dispose of this by-product, Benzole. It is against this background that we have been examining this question. I can assure the hon. Member that we will enter into a new sort of an agreement as early as possible, as soon as circumstances permit.

I am sorry that I cannot go into the other questions. I have got only a

few minutes left for answer, and I would conclude by referring to one or two other points only.

Already my hon. friend Mr. Singh, speaking from these benches, has referred to the great progress that we have made with regard to salt. During the last 100 years, this country was not self-sufficient in regard to salt, and it is a matter for gratification and jubilation, if I may say so, that during the last three years we have not only become self-sufficient, but we are in a position to export appreciable quantities of salt to foreign countries. This year, I believe we are exporting 63 lakh tons of salt outside and earn foreign exchange. It is a matter on which we can certainly congratulate ourselves.

One or two hon. Members said—I think it was again Mr. Basu from Diamond Harbour—that our making money out of this business of salt is abominable. I can tell him straightaway that the Government do not desire to make money out of this, are not consciously making money out of this, but the real position is this: what we are collecting from these manufacturers is a small cess and the other day my hon. friend Mr. Singh also pointed out that against three annas and odd per maund before, now it is about four pies and odd which we are collecting by way of this cess. This cess is not collected by the Government in order to fill its coffers. Not at all, that is not the object. The Government of India gives some assistance to the manufacturers of salt. They are giving them some technical advice. We want to establish a salt research station as early as possible. There are other experiments going on at Wadala in Bombay and certain other places, so that we can help the salt industry to produce better quality salt. This cess is collected and utilised for all these purposes. It is more or less service at cost rendered to these manufacturers of salt. If there is a small surplus which we have earned in this connection, certainly it should not be construed to mean that it is a device that has been plotted, or howsoever you may characterise it—by my hon. friend the Finance Minister in order to swell his receipts. I can tell, subject to correction, that we are contemplating to constitute a special fund and if that materialises, then even the slender basis on which this criticism has been based will not be there.

Then I would like to say that so far as salt is concerned, we are improving the quality gradually. Within two years we would be in a position to give the best quality of salt to our

[Shri K. C. Reddy]

countrymen. I have referred to export also already.

Now a word about rock salt. Here also, we are applying our mind to the production of rock salt in Madi. In the Planning Commission Report one crore of rupees has been provided for this purpose and we have provided Rs. ten lakhs for this year in the Budget. Production of rock salt will fulfil the requirements of the fastidious people who want a better kind of salt, and in that aspect also, I think we will be self-sufficient.

I have got now to refer to two important points, and then close my speech. There was a pointed reference made to what have come to be known as "scandals". I think it was my hon. friend Mr. N. R. Naidu, who said it is time that we constituted a Ministry of Scandals. I looked up the dictionary this morning to find out what exactly is the meaning of the word "scandal", and I was very pleasantly surprised to find that one of the meanings is "malicious gossip, back-biting". I do not want to be too hard upon these critics, but this talk of scandals has been going on for too long a time. It is not as if the Government of India is not alive to any legitimate criticism and will not fully probe into any allegations made by hon. Members in this House or by the public outside. The Government of India are more particular than anyone else that there should be a clean deal, that transactions should be irreproachable in every sphere of our national activity. But when very serious allegations are made, may I, in all humility, make an appeal not only to such hon. Members of this House who are constantly making these allegations, but also to the wider public. If I may, that they should sift the facts before they resort to what I may call "scandal mongering". In the doings of a big Government, in the task of building up a great nation when we have to deal with large projects and so on and so forth, there might be certain things here and there, but that should not be made the peg on which to hang such a sweeping generalisation and say that scandals are happening every day and that a Ministry of scandals should be constituted. It is a job which I leave to the hon. Member if and when he happens to come and sit in the Treasury Bench. He said also when referring to the agreement with oil companies: "Is this Government going to remain in office for 25 years? Are they so optimistic? What right have the Government to enter into such an agreement for a period of 25 years?" I can only say that my

hon. friend does not know the nature of these agreements, how they are entered into etc. I can say with confidence that so long as Government goes on doing good things, the Government can, confidently look forward to a long lease of life, may be even 25 years.

Then a reference was made to the price and labour policy. I do not want to go into that question now—I am finishing in five minutes—the price policy is a very important one, but I would like to leave it untouched at present. In regard to labour policy, I would only say this much that if we have to succeed in our vital task of increased production, we have to make labour contented. And I will assure my hon. colleague, Mr. Giri who is heading the Labour Ministry, that so far as relations between labour and industry on the production side are concerned, there will be complete co-operation. Mr. Das made a very happy suggestion which coming from the Government benches would not have been taken in the same spirit as it has been taken coming from him. He said we talk of minimum wages. What about minimum production? Have production targets been set? All this has to be done. I do not think labour is so unpatriotic as to say: "Give us minimum wages, we will not work", especially after we have got freedom. There might be things here and there to make them feel so, but I have supreme confidence in the healthy attitude of our labour, and I am quite sure that with proper service conditions, they will deliver the goods and will produce to the maximum extent in a spirit of patriotism.

The last point is this. The question was asked as to what is the policy of this Government with regard to production and industries. I have already invited the attention of this House to the policy statement made in 1948—the Government of India Resolution on Industrial Policy. There is hardly much that I can add to it, and I would respectfully ask the hon. Members of this House, such of those who have not yet read it, to make a close study of that document. It will indicate in very lucid terms as to what the policy of the Government is. That policy still stands. That policy has not been changed in any material particular in the last three or four years. I may say that that policy is not a doctrinaire policy, is not a policy which has in mind only abstract ideologies. It is a realistic policy. It is, if I may say so, a pragmatic approach to the industrial problem of our country. While not being too realistic, while not being wedded to this ideology or that,

we want to concentrate on achieving results which will ensure the good of the country. If I may illustrate it by an example, I will say this. If the choice were left to me between nationalising existing private concerns in the realm of the manufacture of steel etc., and the alternative of going in for a new iron and steel plant, I would, at any rate, go in for a new plant to be set up and run as a State industry instead of diverting our resources for the nationalisation of the existing iron and steel industry in the private sector. That illustration will show clearly as to what the policy of the Government is with regard to this problem. I want to say that so far as the industrial policy of the Government of India is concerned, every effort will be made towards the very desirable end of producing more and more goods in our own country in order to raise the standard of living of our countrymen. We have to take of course, certain risks. Certainly we shall have to take risks. But I say we will take measured risks, and not reckless risks. I would also add that we shall not hesitate and we shall not be faint-hearted. It is said that no faint heart has ever won a fair lady! We will take risks no doubt, and will go ahead courageously. Of course there will be caution,—but only to the necessary extent. So by not being wedded to any particular ideology, we will go ahead with confidence and courage, we shall take financial assistance whenever it is necessary, we shall train our men, and spend the necessary money and material to build our industries. We shall take the technical know-how and other facilities offered by any country, but as has been mentioned by my hon. friend Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari the other day and by our leader the hon. the Prime Minister, we shall see that our national interests will not be forgotten, that our national interests will be supreme; subject to that overall condition, we shall receive assistance from other countries, whether it be in the realm of finance or technical knowledge. I shall now conclude by saying that our task in the next few years will be to march forward with as much speed as possible, compatible with the resources of men, material and money that we have; we shall march forward to produce more and more in order to make the lives of our countrymen happier and happier.

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

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): May I ask a question with regard to the Sindri factory? If the capital has gone up by about 150

per cent. has the estimated cost of production per ton gone up, and how does it compare with the present market price in the world?

Shri K. C. Reddy: With your permission, Sir, let me answer this point. So far as the cost of production is concerned, it is too early to say as to what the ultimate cost of production will be. Only when the full target of production has been reached, it will be possible for us to say as to what the cost of production will be.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put all the cut motions to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Ministry of Works, Production and Supply' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Ministry of Works, Production and Supply' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Ministry of Works, Production and Supply' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Ministry of Works, Production and Supply' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Salt' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Salt' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Works, Production and Supply be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands Nos. 95, 96, 99, 100, 101, 130, 131, 97, 98 and 132 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[As directed by Mr. Deputy-Speaker the Motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P.P.]

DEMAND No. 95—MINISTRY OF WORKS, PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,27,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Works, Production and Supply'."

DEMAND No. 96—SUPPLIES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,72,04,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Supplies'."

DEMAND No. 99—OTHER CIVIL WORKS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,11,26,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Other Civil Works'."

DEMAND No. 100—STATIONERY AND PRINTING

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,41,45,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

DEMAND No. 101—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF WORKS, PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 38,23,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Works, Production and Supply'."

DEMAND No. 130—NEW DELHI CAPITAL OUTLAY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,44,91,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'New Delhi Capital Outlay'."

DEMAND No. 131—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON BUILDINGS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,08,07,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Buildings'."

DEMAND No. 97—SALT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 88,15,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Salt'."

DEMAND No. 98—STAMP CANCELLING AND PRINTING INKS MANUFACTURING FACTORY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,97,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Stamp cancelling and Printing Inks manufacturing Factory'."

DEMAND No. 132—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF WORKS, PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,64,02,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated

Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Works, Production and Supply'."

DEMAND NO. 63—MINISTRY OF LABOUR

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,29,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Labour'."

DEMAND NO. 64—CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,95,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953 in respect of 'Chief Inspector of Mines'."

DEMAND NO. 65—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,30,04,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour'."

DEMAND NO. 66—EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES AND RESETTLEMENT

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,08,04,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Employment Exchanges and Resettlement'."

DEMAND NO. 67—CIVIL DEFENCE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 83,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated

Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Civil Defence'."

DEMAND NO. 122—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,09,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Labour'."

Refusal of Supplies

Shri K. Subrahmanyam (Vizianagaram): I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced to Re. 1."

Condition of Jute Industry labour

Shri Tushar Chatterjea (Serampore): I beg to move:

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

Implementation of labour legislation

Shri Kelappan (Ponnani): I beg to move:

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

Labour policy with special reference to reduplication of Labour Department work—Central and States

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): I beg to move:

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

Unemployment caused by retrenchment in the factories

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

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

General Policy

Shri N. R. Naidu (Rajahmundry): I beg to move:

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

(i) Failure to improve conditions of Labour.

(ii) Problem of unemployment.

Shri Kandasamy (Tiruchengode): I beg to move:

(i) "That the Demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(ii) "That the Demand under the head 'Employment Exchanges and Resettlement' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How much time would the hon. Minister require for his reply?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): I would like to have from 45 minutes to one hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, the discussion will go on up to 12 or 12-15 P.M. We shall have about two and a half hours for the discussion. Not more than 15 minutes will be allotted to each Member who wishes to speak. If any hon. Member takes less than 15 minutes, such a thing is quite welcome. The House will now proceed to.....

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, I would like to move my cut motion.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member, I am afraid, has missed the bus. Anyhow, he can move his cut motion. Policy with regard to the employment of Scheduled Castes.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: I beg to move.

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed to a discussion of the Demands as also the cut motions.

श्री तुषार चटर्जी : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं हिन्दी में बोलना शुरू कर रहा हूँ, इसलिये कि जहाँ तक अंग्रेजी का सवाल है उस में मेरे लिये कहना और भी मुश्किल है। मैं तो चाहता था कि यहाँ हर एक सदस्य को अपनी मातृ भाषा में कहने की मंजूरी मिले। मैं स्पीकर साहब से अर्ज करूँगा कि आगे के लिये मुझे अपनी मातृ ज़बान बंगला में कहने की मंजूरी दी जाय ताकि मैं अपने क्यालात को अच्छी

तरह और पूरी तरह यहाँ पेश कर सकूँ जो कि जरूरी है। अब मैं हाउस से अर्ज करूँ कि अगर मैं टूटी फूटी हिन्दी बोलूँ तो भी मेहरबानी कर के हाउस मेरी बातों पर थोड़ा सा ध्यान दे।

जिस सवाल पर मैं कहने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ वह है सरकार की लेबर पालिसी (Labour Policy) इस बात को सोचते हुए शुरू में ही मेरे दिल में यह सवाल उठ रहा है कि क्या इस को लेबर पालिसी बोलना ठीक है या लेबर विरोधी पालिसी बोलना ठीक है, क्योंकि जहाँ तक मौजूदा हालत से इस चीज को समझा जाय तो मुझे तो भालूम होता है कि यह लेबर पालिसी हो नहीं सकती। अगर इस को कोई ठीक नाम दिया जाय तो वह लेबर विरोधी पालिसी ही होगा। आज की हालत देखिये। चारों तरफ एक ही आवाज उठ रही है कि जो बेकारी की चोट सब जगह मजदूरों पर आ पहुँची है उस चोट से मजदूर कैसे बचें। इसलिये चारों तरफ शोर मच गया, आवाज उठी। लेकिन सरकार के कान में यह आवाज पहुँचती है या नहीं यह तो मुझे मालूम नहीं है। मामूली मजदूर नहीं, मध्यम वर्ग के जो किरानी लोग हैं, एम्प्लॉईज (employees) हैं, उन के ऊपर बेकारी की चोट पहुँच गयी। और फिर यह बेकारी भी कोई मामूली बेकारी नहीं है। इकानामिक स्लम्प (economic slump) की वजह से जो बढ़ती हुई बेकारी आज हमारे देश में दिखाई पड़ती है उसी बेकारी के बारे में मैं कहता हूँ। चारों तरफ मिल बन्द होने लगे, शिफ्ट (shift) बन्द हो रहे हैं, तांत बन्द होने लगे और हज़ारों की तादाद में मजदूर निकाले जा रहे हैं। यह तो आज देश की हालत है। इस बात पर इसी हाउस में सवाल उठा। इस बात

पर चारों तरफ से कितनी चिल्लाहट हो रही है, मजदूरों की तरफ से, एम्प्लॉयज की तरफ से, कितनी मांगें उठ रही हैं। न मालूम सरकार के कान में यह बातें पहुंचती हैं या नहीं। मुझे तो याद है कि कुछ महीनों पहले इस स्लम्प के बारे में फ्रायनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा था। जब काम कम हो रहा था, जब कारबारी लोग चिल्ला रहे थे तो जहां तक मुझे याद है फ्रायनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा था कि कोरियन वार की वजह से बड़े बड़े कारबारी लोगों ने नफ़ा किया। अब नफ़ा कुछ घटते वक्त इतनी चिल्लाहट ठीक नहीं है। तो इस के माने यह है कि सरकार की तरफ से भी यह सच्चाई मानी गयी है कि कोरियन वार में जो भारी मुनाफ़ा कारबारी लोगों ने उठाया उस के बदले जो स्लम्प आया तो इस में कारबारी लोगों को ज्यादा चिल्लाना ठीक नहीं है। इस के बारे में यह मालूम होना चाहिये कि इस हालत को अगर देशवासियों की नज़र से हम देखें तो इस में तमाम देश-वासियों के स्वार्थ को बराबर देखना जरूरी है। अगर इस हालत को हम ठीक से समझें तो ऐसी भारी बेकारी को हमें एक नैशनल क्राइसिस (National crisis) के हिसाब से समझना चाहिये। जब बढ़ती हुई बेकारी चारों तरफ चल रही है, जब इस के खिलाफ चारों तरफ आवाज़ उठ रही है, जब घर घर में, बस्ती बस्ती में, कारखानों कारखानों में बेकारी की पुकार सुनाई दे रही है तो इसे तो एक नैशनल क्राइसिस के हिसाब से समझना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं सरकार से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इतनी खराब हालत में भी, इतनी बदतर हालत में भी, तमाम देश में जिस की चोट पहुंच रही है, तमाम लेबर फ़ोर्स (labour force) के ऊपर जिस की चोट आ पहुंची है, इस हालत में भी क्यों सरकार ऐसे नैशनल क्राइसिस को

हल करने को कोई कदम नहीं उठाती। मैं सरकार से साफ़ यह पूछना हूँ कि इस बढ़ती हुई बेकारी को संभालने के लिये क्यों नहीं अनएम्प्लायमेंट डोल (unemployment dole) का बन्दोबस्त किया जाता है? यह मेरा भीषा सवाल सरकार से है। सरकार बड़े पैमाने पर, बहुत जोर से, बहुत हिम्मत से कहती है कि हम वेलफ़ेयर स्टेट (Welfare State) बनावेंगे। हां, वेलफ़ेयर स्टेट बनाने की आवाज़ ठीक है। लेकिन वेलफ़ेयर स्टेट किस के ऊपर भरोसा करके बनाई जायगी? जो प्रोडक्टिव फ़ोर्स (productive force) है, जहां लेबर फ़ोर्स है, जो लेबर फ़ोर्स आज बेकारी की चोटों से तितर बितर होता जा रहा है, क्या इसी की बिना पर, क्या इसी हालत पर वेलफ़ेयर स्टेट बन सकती है? अगर वेलफ़ेयर स्टेट के बारे में सरकार कुछ बोलना चाहे तो पहले मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस बदतर हालत में क्यों अनएम्प्लायमेंट डोल के लिये बन्दोबस्त नहीं किया गया?

यहां इस हाउस में बहुत से मेम्बरों ने श्रम मंत्री से यह सवाल पूछा था और मैंने भी उन से सवाल पूछा था, तो जवाब यह दिया गया कि हां हम सुनते हैं कि तहज़ाने बन्द हो गये हैं। परन्तु मेरे सवाल के जवाब में मुझे बतलाया गया कि हुगली और हावड़ा जिलों में छँ मिलें बन्द हो गयी हैं, दो महीने से छँ मिलें बन्द हैं और जिस के कारण कम से कम छँ हज़ार मजदूर जो उन में काम करते थे, बेकार हो गये हैं। मैं मजदूरों के बीच में काम करता हूँ, इसलिये मुझे अच्छी तरह से मालम है कि इन मिलों के बन्द हो जाने की वजह से कम से कम छँ हज़ार मजदूर आज बेकार पड़े हुए हैं। आखिर यह जो छँ मिलें दो महीने से बन्द पड़ी हैं और जिस के कारण छँ हज़ार मजदूर बेकार हैं, उन के बन्द

[श्री तुषार चटर्जी]

हो जाने का क्या कारण है और उसका क्या नतीजा हुआ ? उन छह हजार बेकार मजदूरों के परिवारों के भरण पोषण के लिये और जिन्दा रखने के लिये सरकार की ओर से क्या इन्तजाम किया जा रहा है ? इस के बारे में कोई जवाब नहीं है । जहां तक मुझे याद है, यहां वह डॉक्यूमेंट (document) भी है जिस में सरकार ने जवाब दिया है कि, 'गवर्नमेंट हैव नो इन्फार्मेशन' (Govt. have no information) में ने सरकार से पूछा था कि उन बेकार मजदूरों को कुछ हर्जाना वगैरह दिया गया या नहीं, वह जो दो महीने से मिले बन्द हो जाने की वजह से बेकार पड़े हुए हैं उन के लिये सरकार क्या कर रही है, तो इस के जवाब में सरकार यह कहती है कि 'गवर्नमेंट हैव नो इन्फार्मेशन' इस से मालूम होता है कि सरकार की पालिसी लेबर-हितैषी न होकर लेबर-विरोधी है । लेकिन वही सरकार जब क्रियान वार खत्म हो जाने से बाजार मंदा होने लगा और चटकल मालिक लोगों ने सरकार पर दबाव डाला कि आर्थिक मंदी के कारण सरकार एक्सपोर्ट ड्यूटी (export duty) कम करे, तो उस को कम करना पड़ा क्योंकि अगर एक्सपोर्ट ड्यूटी सरकार कम नहीं करती तो चटकल मालिकों के कारखाने बन्द हो जायेंगे, और उसके कारण वश हजारों काम करने वाले मजदूर बेकार हो जायेंगे, सरकार उन की बात मान गई ।

शिवत राज्य मंत्री (श्री त्यागी) :
कारखाने अगर बन्द हो जायेंगे तो मजदूर बेकार हो जायेंगे ।

श्री तुषार चटर्जी : हां कारखाने बन्द हो जायेंगे, लेकिन सरकार समझती नहीं, यह हिसाब जोड़ने को कभी सरकार तैयार नहीं होती ।

बाबू राम नारायण सिंह : अकल नहीं है ।

श्री तुषार चटर्जी : यह चटकल मालिक लोग जो आज अपने कारोबार में थोड़ी मंदी आने की वजह से परेशान हो गये हैं और उन लोगों ने शोर मचाना शुरू कर दिया कि मुनाफ़ा घट रहा है, इसलिये सरकार हमें कुछ मदद दे और एक्सपोर्ट ड्यूटी में कमी करे । यह सरकार हिसाब जोड़ने के लिये कभी तैयार नहीं होती कि चटकल मालिक लोगों ने गये पच्चीस सालों में कितना मुनाफ़ा कमाया ? मैं इस बारे में थोड़ी बहुत जानकारी रखता हूँ और मैं चटकल मालिक लोगों के कैपिटल (capital) और इन्वेस्टर्स (investors) अखबारों को पढ़ता हूँ तो पाता हूँ कि पिछले पच्चीस सालों में उनका जो इन्वेस्टेड कैपिटल (invested capital) है वह तीन गुना हो गया है । आज कारोबार में थोड़ी मंदी आने से ही यह लोग चिल्ला रहे हैं कि हमारा मुनाफ़ा घट रहा है और सरकार से मदद मांगते हैं । मेरा कहना यह है कि सरकार चटकल मालिकों को राहत पहुंचाने के बारे में तो सोच रही है, लेकिन हजारों की तादाद में आज जो मजदूर बेकार पड़े हुए हैं, उन के लिये सोचने के वास्ते सरकार के पास वक़्त नहीं है । आज मजदूर वगैरह हर्जाने के भूखों मर रहे हैं, उन की हालत को बहतर बनाने के लिये सरकार को फ़ुरसत नहीं मिलती । सरकार की वज़ारत इतनी मजबूत है और दुरुस्त है कि दस रोज़ की सरकार को मोहलत दी जाती है और उस से पूछा जाता है कि मजदूरों को कोई हर्जाना मिला या नहीं मिला, लेकिन इस के बारे में सरकार की तरफ़ से कोई इन्फार्मेशन नहीं दी जाती । वाकई

10 A. M.

कैसी दुस्त और क्राबिल सरकार है। मैं सरकार से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप जो यह कहते हैं कि हमारे पास रुपया नहीं है, तो फिर इन प्रिन्सेज वगैरह के आराम के लिये आप को जब पैसे की जरूरत होती है तब आप के पास पैसा कहां से आ जाता है? उस समय आप के पास पैसा आ जाता है, लेकिन जब बेकारों को बचाने के लिये पैसे की जरूरत होती है, तब सरकार के पास रुपया पैसा नहीं रहता है। मेरा कहना है कि सरकार को इस बेकारी की समस्या को नैशनल क्राइसिस के हिसाब से देखना चाहिये और उस को तै कराने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये और बड़े कारोबारी लोगों पर दबाव डाल कर मजदूरों को अनएम्प्लायमेंट अलाउन्स (unemployment allowance) दिलाने का बन्दोबस्त करना आवश्यक था।

अभी परसों आनरेबुल मिनिस्टर से मुझे यह जवाब मिला कि हाँ चटकल में मजदूरों को अनएम्प्लायमेंट बोनस दिया जाता है। लेकिन मैं अजब करूंगा कि वह मेरे साथ चटकल इलाके में चले, वहां मैं साबित कर दूंगा कि सरकार का यह डायूमेंट जवाब बिल्कुल ठीक नहीं है। असल में हालत यह है कि मजदूर निकाले जा रहे हैं, बेकार हो रहे हैं और छांटे जा रहे हैं उन को कोई अनएम्प्लायमेंट बोनस नहीं मिलता है। मैं जानता हूँ जैसा कि बहुत आदमी जानते हैं कि इंडियन जूट मिल्स असोसियेशन किसी क्रायदे से हिसाब में कोई इधर उधर करके जो मजदूर वहां काम करते हैं उनमें से ज्यादातर मजदूरों को नॉन परमानेंट (non permanent) या टेम्पेरी (temporary) हिसाब से रखकर इस कानून से बचने की कोशिश करते हैं और यह जो जवाब मुझे मिला उससे यह मालूम हांता है कि ज्यादातर

चटकल मजदूर जिन की मालिक छांटे कर देंगे वह ज्यादातर चटकल मजदूरों के बारे में कुछ हिसाब इस में नहीं देंगे। उन के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा गया, उन को कुछ बेनीफिट्स या अलाउन्सेज मिलते हैं या नहीं, इसके बारे में आनरेबुल मिनिस्टर के जवाब में कुछ नहीं है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has exceeded his time:

श्री तुषार चटर्जी: मेरे पास और कुछ ज्यादा कहने को तो वक्त है नहीं। सिर्फ मैं एक दो प्वायंट्स का यहां जिक्र कर के छोड़ देना चाहता हूँ। वेजेज (wages) के बारे में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांस्टीट्यूशन में लिविंग वेजेज (living wages) के बारे में जो बात लिखी गयी है, वह अब कहां निकल कर चली गयी, मुझे तो मालूम नहीं है। सेन्ट्रल पे कमीशन (Central pay Commission) ने जो रेकमेन्डेशन्स (recommendations) की थीं वह लड़ाई के पहले की हालत पर विचार कर के की थीं और वह आज की हालत को देखते हुए किसी तरह लिविंग वेजेज नहीं कह सकते और लड़ाई के पहले के हालात में जिस को सेमी स्टारवेशन (semi-starvation wages) वेजेज कह सकते थे, उस को भी हर एक मजदूर के लिये लागू करने को सरकार तैयार नहीं है।

ऐसे चटकल मजदूरों को ६३ रुपये मिलते हैं, टेक्स्टाइल (textile) के मजदूरों को एकदम लोएस्ट वेज (lowest wage) की बात मैं करता हूँ कि उन को ५२ रुपये मिलते हैं। हुगली में सूतकल में ऐसे मजदूर हैं जिन को ४५ रुपये मिलते हैं और मजदूर औरतें ऐसी हैं जिन्हें ३२ रुपये से ज्यादा नहीं मिलता। लेकिन अब तक इस बात पर ध्यान नहीं दिया। चारों

(श्री तूषार चटर्जी)

तरफ़ यह मांग हो रही है कि सेन्ट्रल पे कमीशन की रिक्मेन्डेशन्स को लागू करने के लिये सरकार कार्रवाई करे, जिस में इतनी खराब हालत में भी मजदूर अपने को बचाने की कुछ कोशिश कर सकें। ऐसे भी गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लॉईज़ हैं जिन को सेन्ट्रल पे कमीशन की रिक्मेन्डेशन्स को अपने ऊपर लागू कराने का हक़ है, उन की हालत ऐसी है कि आज की कास्ट आफ़ लिविंग इन्डेक्स (cost of living index) को देखते हुए पे कमीशन की रिक्मेन्डेशन्स लागू करना जरूरी है, लेकिन उन रिक्मेन्डेशन्स को उन पर लागू नहीं किया गया।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He must conclude now. He has taken 20 minutes. (English translation of the above speech)

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: Sir, I am going to deliver my speech in Hindi because it would be difficult for me to convey my ideas to the House in English. I would have liked if everybody would have been allowed to speak here in the House in his own mother tongue. I would request the Chair to allow me to speak in the House in my own mother tongue, i.e., in Bengali, in future, so that I may be able to express my ideas in a more lucid manner which is an essential thing. Now I would request the House to lend me its ear notwithstanding that I am going to speak in Hindi in which I am not so proficient.

The topic/on which I have to speak is the labour policy of the Government. The very first question that comes to my mind in this connection is whether it would be appropriate to call it the labour policy of the Government or the anti-labour policy of the Government; because under the present day circumstances one feels that it cannot be the labour policy of this Government; and if at all it is to be given any appropriate name, it should be called the anti-labour policy of the Government. See what is happening these days. On all sides there is only one cry and the people ask how our country would escape from the clutches of unemployment which is threatening the whole labour class. So there is a cry all around and a voice has been raised against it. But I do not know whether that voice has reached the ears of the Go-

vernment or not. This is the case not only with the ordinary labourers but with the middle class employees as well. Again, the present phase of unemployment too is not an ordinary phase. My reference is towards the growing unemployment that we find in the country today and which is the result of the economic slump prevailing in the country. Mills are closing down; some of the factories have stopped many shifts. Looms have begun to close down and labourers are being thrown out of job in thousands. This is the condition prevailing in the country today. A question on this subject was raised in this House. There is a cry from labourers and other employees, several demands have been put forth. It is not known whether the Government have at all heard of all these things. I remember the hon. Minister of Finance referred to this slump some months ago. When the volume of work was decreasing, when business circles were crying, the hon. Minister had said that the business men have earned enormous profits as a result of the Korean War and it was not befitting for them to cry so much when their profits were going down. It means that the Government too have realized this fact that the businessmen have earned enormous profits due to the Korean War and it was not proper for them to cry when their profits lessened due to the slump. It should be known in this connection that we should look at this problem from a national point of view keeping in view the interests of all the people who inhabit this land. If we see this condition in the right perspective, we would have no hesitation in treating it as a national crisis. When growing unemployment is all around us, when there is a cry and when every house and hamlet and mill echoes that cry, it should be treated as a national crisis. But I would like to ask the Government why do they not take some steps to resolve that crisis in spite of the fact that it has affected not only our labour force so severely but also the whole country. I ask the Government why arrangements for unemployment doles have not been made to check the miseries of growing unemployment? This is the direct question that I ask from the Government. The Government declare with all the emphasis at their command that they are wedded to the evolution of a welfare state. To form a welfare state is all right. But whom would you take into confidence for the formation of a welfare state? The productive force or in other words the labour force is being shattered by the effects of unemployment. Can a

welfare state be formed on that ground? If the Government would say anything about the welfare state, I would ask them why no arrangements have been made for the unemployment doles in such a bad situation. Many Members of this House including myself asked a question from the Minister of Labour and in reply to that we have been told that they had heard that some godowns had been closed down. The other day, in reply to one of my questions, I was told that six mills have closed down in Hooghly and Howrah. Six mills are closed for the last two months and this has rendered at least six thousand labourers jobless. I have worked among labourers and I know it fully well that at least six thousand workers have been thrown out of employment because of the closure of these mills. After all what was the reason of their not working for the last two months rendering six thousand labourers jobless and what have been its results? What arrangements are being made by the Government to maintain the families of those six thousand labourers who have been thrown out of employment? No answer is being given to this question. So far as I remember the Government's reply has been that, "they have no information", and there is also some document here containing this reply. In reply to my query whether any compensation has been paid to the labourers who are jobless for the last two months on account of the closure of those mills, we have been told by the Government that they have no information. It shows that the Government's policy is not pro-labour but anti-labour. But when stalemate in the Korean War brought slump conditions in the country the jute millowners brought pressure upon the Government to reduce the export duty. The Government had to submit to that pressure. Because had the Government not have agreed to their view the jute mills of the Capitalist millowners would have closed down, and would have rendered thousands of workers jobless. The Government accepted their request.

The Minister of State for Finance (Shri Tyagi): If the mills would close down, the labourers would be thrown out of work.

Shri Tushar Chatterjee: Yes, the mills will close down; but the Government do not seem to realize that. Sometimes the Government are not prepared to go into its implications.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): They have no sense.

Shri Tushar Chatterjee: The Government have never been prepared to calculate how much profits these millowners, who were embarrassed by a small fall in prices on account of the slump conditions and who cried for state help and for reduction of the export duty, have earned during the last five years. I have some information on this subject. When I read about the capital and the investments of the millowners in the newspapers I find that their invested capital has multiplied three times during the last twenty-five years. But now with a slight slump in the market these very persons cry that their profits have gone down and ask for help from the Government. My submission is that while the Government are considering the desirability of giving relief to the millowners, they have no time to consider the plight of those thousands of workers who have been thrown out of work. Labourers are starving but the Government have no time to improve their lot. The administration is so strong and up-to-date that even when a notice of ten days is given and a question is asked whether or not some compensation has been paid to the labourers, we are not given any information at all. Indeed, what an efficient Government it is! I would like to ask the Government that when they say that they have got no money, wherefrom do they get it when they have to pay huge amounts by way of privy purses to the princes? At that time they manage to get money but when the question of giving relief to the labourers comes in, the Government have no money. My submission is that the Government should treat the problem of unemployment as a national crisis and should try to solve it. They should urge upon the big businessmen that it is essential to give unemployment allowances to the labourers.

The other day one of the hon. Ministers said that unemployment bonus was being paid to the labourers in the jute mills. But I request him to come with me to any jute mill area. I would prove to him there that the Government's statement is not correct. In fact the position is this that workers are being thrown out of work, they are being retrenched and are being rendered jobless, but they are not being paid any unemployment bonus whatsoever. I know, as many others also do, that the members of the Indian Jute Mills' Association in order to save themselves from the clutches of law keep most of the labourers as non-permanent or temporary hands with the help of this or that rule interpreting it in

[Shri Tushar Chatterjee]

their favour. And the answer that I have got shows that the employers will not give any account with regard to the labourers who have been re-trenched in the jute mills. Nothing has been said about it. The hon. Minister has not said anything in his reply whether or not they receive some benefits or allowances.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has exceeded his time.

Shri Tushar Chatterjee: I have not got time to speak more. I would only put forth one or two points and stop there. Some mention has been made in the Constitution about the principle of living wages. I do not know what has been the fate of that principle. The recommendations of the Central Pay Commission were made on the basis of pre-war conditions; and the scales recommended by the Commission can no longer be held as living wages in the present day conditions. The Government are not prepared to sanction for the labourers even those scales of wages which could have been categorized as semi-starvation wages in the pre-war days.

Generally speaking a labourer in the jute mills gets Rs. 63/- a month while a labourer in the textile mills gets only Rs. 52/- per month. I am speaking about the lowest wages. In Hooghly there are some labourers in the cotton mills who get only Rs. 45/- per month, and the women labourers do not get more than Rs. 32/- a month. But with all that no attention has been paid to this problem. People demand that the Government should take steps to implement the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission as soon as possible so that the labourers may try to get themselves out of their present plight. There are certain Government employees as well who are covered by the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission. Keeping in view the present cost of living index their condition demands that the recommendations of the Pay Commission should be applied to them immediately. But unfortunately this has not been done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He must conclude now. He has taken 20 minutes.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): I am sorry, Sir, I was not in the House when my cut motion was read out. Will you kindly allow me to move it now?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Will the hon. Member kindly resume his seat? I really wonder as soon as the question hour is over or the first hour is over, hon. Members leave the House immediately. It seems there is something wrong with the hon. Members. Therefore I would urge not only upon the hon. Member but all hon. Members of this House to see that they be in the House and not merely go and sit in the lobby. After all we must realise that we have come here from long distances and we must attend to our legitimate duties. That will be not only in the interests of the hon. Members themselves but in the interests of the country as a whole and the speakers who are speaking here. I cannot understand what is the object of their going and sitting in the lobby instead of attending to their legitimate duties. It is for this purpose they have been sent and lakhs and lakhs of rupees have been spent and hot contests have been fought and therefore it is rather strange as to what business these hon. Members have outside the House.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: What about Ministers?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ministers have got other work but the hon. Members have got no other work than this work. Possibly I will have to recommend to the speakers to note down the hours which the hon. Members spend during Parliament and outside for the benefit of their constituencies. I am prepared to allow the hon. Member to move his cut motion as I shall not take advantage of small matters here and there but I would rather earnestly appeal to hon. Members to attend to their legitimate work in the interests of the country as a whole. Now the hon. Member can move his cut motion.

Hardships of labour employed in the textile mills of Sholapur and Barsi.

Shri S. S. More: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This cut motion is now moved by Mr. More. We will have discussion on this also. Now I would call upon Mr. K. L. More to speak.

Shri K. L. More (Kolhapur cum Satara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I rise to oppose the cut motions and support the Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of Labour. In this connection I take this opportunity to make some observations.

When I was going through the pages of the Report on the Working of the Ministry of Labour, I was much impressed by the brilliant activities that are carried out by this Ministry. At the very outset I like to congratulate the Government for its achievements in the field of enacting labour legislations. The Plantation Labour Act, 1951 provides for the welfare of labourers and for regulating the conditions of work in tea, coffee, rubber and cinchona plantations in the first instance. The Employees Provident Funds Ordinance, 1951 which is now replaced by the Employees Provident Fund Act, 1952 is the second labour legislation. And third one is the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as amended which provides particularly for the appointment of banking experts on the Tribunal adjudicating upon disputes in banks. This is most important. And then there is the Industrial Disputes Appellate Tribunal Act, 1950. Then I come to another legislation, the Employees State Insurance Act, 1948. This provides for cash benefits in case of sickness, maternity and employment injury and medical care of reasonable standards for each insured labourer. Then there is the Minimum Wages Act. Then there is another legislation i.e., the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 which regulates payment of wages to a certain class of persons employed in factories, railways and other industrial establishments. Then I come to next legislation which is the Indian Mines Act and the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Act. These are some of the important legislations which are being implemented vigorously in the interests of labouring classes.

Then I like to turn to the Ministry's welfare activities. There is a provision in the Budget of 1951-52 for the general welfare. In this connection particularly I like to mention the welfare in mica, welfare in plantation and dock workers.

As regards industrial housing a substantial sum was budgeted last year and this year also. As regards the training schemes conducted by the Government, I would like to say that much is being done to solve the unemployment problem by imparting training to men and women and ex-Servicemen in technical and vocational trades. The Government deserves our congratulations in view of its marvellous achievements in spite of the insurmountable difficulties that it had to face, e.g., refugee problem, famine and earthquakes, floods and then Defence which was our primary and first consideration.

Then I would like to speak a few words about our all vexing problem of unemployment. Millions of our countrymen are without work, without any employment. Hundreds and thousands of our people—educated, uneducated, agriculturists, non-agriculturists—do not get any work when they have a desire to work. They do not get any opportunity to obtain some job or means of livelihood for no fault of theirs. This is a sad plight and this must be remedied immediately. The problem of unemployment which has assumed a terrific form must be cured without any delay. What is the remedy? What is the specific remedy? What is the solution for this? How can we relieve these poor half-starved and half-naked and shelterless people of our country? The full and solid solution of this unemployment problem lies in the full swing implementation of the Five Year Plan. Our country will be flooded in production and will be rich in industry. It will lead to the opening of every avenue of the means of livelihood adequately. This is a long term remedy. We want to have an immediate approach to this problem. The Government is doing much for supplying services and getting rid of this unemployment problem. It is a great task but I would like to put my humble suggestion to the Government that this must be done as quickly as possible. Unless some strong measures are employed* to provide work for the unemployed and land to the landless there would not be any enthusiasm or vigour to achieve the everlasting prosperity of the country. The agricultural labourers are the real prey to this unemployment. The agricultural class forms the major part of the population of our country, and therefore it is high time now that the whole energy and activity of the Labour Ministry should be focused round agricultural labour. We know the Ministry of Labour is wholly engrossed in solving the problem of organised labour—even their day to day problems are absorbing the attention of this Ministry. This is all due to their organisations whose voice is powerful. But the poor agricultural labourers are unorganised and scattered; they are ignorant, they are dumb and their voice is not audible. Hence the Ministry's activities should hereafter be directed towards these agricultural labourers even at the cost of organised labour such as that engaged in factories, railways, etc. There is a dire necessity for launching on an all pervasive and intense activity on the part of the Ministry through the State agency

[Shri K. L. More]

to grant lands and agricultural facilities to these landless labourers. The Minimum Wages Act which is a legislation intended to improve the lot of the agriculturist is not a sure remedy in this case.

Then there is another class, the lower middle class, which is hard hit by the unemployment problem. An intensive programme must be set on foot to combat their poverty and provision should also be made to give them work. There is also the other class, namely the retrenched workers. A scheme should be prepared so as to enable them to maintain themselves. They should get some subsistence allowance for the period for which they are without any work.

I shall now place before you some observation regarding the sanitary labour engaged in municipalities and corporations. They are utterly neglected, their housing problem is not solved by these local authorities. They have to work in dirt. This kind of labour has become the work of the Scheduled Castes—the other Castes do not go in for it—and they have by force of circumstances to do this work. But their conditions are not taken into consideration by the local authorities. Their lot must be improved and I would request Government to pay special attention to this class of people.

Lastly, I would draw the attention of Government to the Directive given in the Constitution and embodied in the Five Year Plan. The Directive refers to the right to live. This right to live must be implemented from this very moment; because the Five-Year Plan will have to take some time for its completion it is better that a beginning in that regard is made now. There is another thing in regard to this Directive. There should not be any accumulation of wealth or profits. The profits in factories, mines and industries must be divided gradually among the workers. If that is done and also if the Labour Ministry directs its full-fledged attention towards the landless agriculturists then there would be bountiful and the problem of unemployment can be solved in no time.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बहुत संतोष हुआ कि आज आप ने बहुत दिन बाद मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया। इस हाउस में हमारे शिड्यूल

कास्ट फ़ेडरेशन के बहुत कम आदमी हैं। वह किसी ग्रुप (group) के साथ नहीं हैं। मुझे ऐजुकेशन (Education) पर और दूसरे विषयों पर भी बोलना था। आज जो आपने मुझे लेबर (Labour) पर बोलने का मौका दिया है इस के लिये मैं आप का शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ।

हिन्दुस्तान में जितनी बड़ी बड़ी फ़ैक्टरियां और कारखाने हैं उन में ज्यादातर अछूत लोग काम करते हैं। उन के लिये जितना गवर्नमेंट की तरफ़ से मदद होनी चाहिये उतनी नहीं हो रही है। छूत छत का मामला बड़े बड़े कारखानों तक में चलता है। अहमदाबाद, बम्बई और नागपुर में कई वीविंग मिलों में अछूतों को इसलिये नहीं नौकरी दी जाती कि उन के मुंह से सूत लग जाता है। हम ने इस बारे में बहुत सी मीटिंगों की और कान्फ़ेसिज की लेकिन कुछ ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है। आजकल जो कोई ज्यादा बोलता है उसी की बात सुनी जाती है। यहां पार्लियामेंट में जो कुछ बात हम अपोजीशन ग्रुप (Opposition group) से कहते हैं उस पर अमल नहीं होता है। लेबर को टेकनिकल ट्रेनिंग (technical training) और एंप्लायमेंट (employment) देने के लिये पहली पार्लियामेंट में हमारे डा० पंजाबराव देशमुख जी एक बिल लाये थे पर वह पास नहीं हो सका। वह फिर उस बिल को लाये हैं। मेरा ख्याल है कि जब तक लेबर को टेकनिकल ट्रेनिंग नहीं मिलती तब तक उन का भला नहीं हो सकता है। अगर ऐसा नहीं होगा तो वह हर समय मजदूर रहेंगे और मजदूर रहते हुए उन का कोई भला नहीं हो सकता है। उन को कुछ न कुछ ट्रेनिंग की बहुत आवश्यकता है। अगर इस समय

कोई मजदूर नौकरी से अलग हो जाता है तो वह कोई बेकार हो जाता है। अगर उस को कुछ टेकनिकल ट्रेनिंग मिल जाय तो नौकरी से अलग होने पर वह कुछ अपना काम कर सकता है।

दूसरी बात मुझे अपने स्वीपर (sweepers,) लोगों के बारे में कहनी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हजारों वर्षों से वह इस काम को कर रहे हैं। अब आप लोग क्यों न उस काम को करें। ऐसा तो कोई क़ानून नहीं है कि हरिजन ही इस काम को करते रहें। अब जब कि हमारा देश आजाद हो गया है और सब को नागरिकता के अधिकार मिल गये हैं जो ब्राह्मण मजदूर हों वह भी क्यों न थोड़ा सा मेहतर का काम करें और जो मेहतर अच्छा मजदूर हो वह कुछ दूसरा काम करे। इन लोगों से कारखानों में और फ़ैक्टरियों में जो लाजमी तौर पर यह काम लिया जाता है यह मेरी दृष्टि से बहुत खराब है। इसके बारे में गवर्नमेंट को कुछ न कुछ अच्छा इन्तिजाम करना चाहिये।

दूसरी खास बात मुझे एम्प्लायमेंट (employment) के बारे में कहनी है। जैसे एम्प्लायमेंट ऐक्सचेंज (employment exchanges) में लोगों को बहुत नौकरियाँ दी जाती हैं और उस की रिपोर्ट आती है लेकिन वहाँ जो एम्प्लायमेंट आफ़िसर्स बैठे हुए हैं वह ऊँची जातियों के हैं और शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों के साथ कई जगह पर अन्याय होता है। जो लोग ऊँची जाति के अफ़सर बने बैठे हैं वह कई जगह पर शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट वालों के साथ अच्छा बरताव नहीं करते हैं। मैं जलगांव एम्प्लायमेंट ऐक्सचेंज गया था। मैंने पूना में भी कम्प्लेंट (complaint) की और शोलापुर में

भी की। यहाँ पर ६-६ महीने और साल साल भर तक लोगों की सुनवाई नहीं होती। जो लोग मेट्रिक हैं और क्वालीफ़ाइड (qualified) हैं उन को नौकरी देने का भी ठीक इन्तिजाम नहीं है।

जातिभेद हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत प्रबल है। अछूतों के नाम पर दुनिया में कई नारे लगाये जाते हैं, दुनिया में बहुत सी संस्थाएँ, हरिजन सेवक संघ वगैरह के नाम से खोली जाती हैं, लेकिन हमारा जो काम होता है वह अमल में कम होता है और बोलने में ज्यादा होता है।

इसी तरह से इम्प्लायमेंट ऐक्सचेंज का हाल है। नौकरी में हमें साढ़े बारह परसेंट मिला हुआ है तो इम्प्लायमेंट ऐक्सचेंज में ठीक ठीक काम होना चाहिये। हमारे श्री गिरी साहब जो मजदूरों के मंत्री हैं वह नये हैं और अभी नया काम संभाला है लेकिन मुझे आशा है कि जो हम लोगों का सवाल है उसे वह सामने रखेंगे और मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि वह हम लोगों की मदद करने के लिये सब कुछ करेंगे और इम्प्लायमेंट में हम लोगों का ख्याल रखेंगे।

इस के बाद मुझे यह कहना है कि जो डेलिगेशन (delegation) विलायत वगैरह दूसरी जगह जाते हैं उन में जो मजदूरों के बारे में होते हैं उन में तो थोड़े थोड़े लोगों को लेते हैं लेकिन और जो डेलिगेशन होते हैं उन में नहीं लेते। गवर्नमेंट का ध्यान मैं इस तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूँ और कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम देश के वाशिन्दे हैं, देश हमारा है और यह स्वतंत्र देश है इसलिये इस देश में कोई भी काम हो उस में हम को भी हिस्सा मिलना चाहिये। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि हम लोगों की भलाई के लिये मंत्री महोदय इस तरफ़ ध्यान देंगे।

[श्री पी० एन० राजभोज]

इसके बाद मुझे यह कहना है कि पाकिस्तान में जो लेबरर्स हैं उन में ज्यादातर भंगी हैं और वहां से उन को यहां आने नहीं दिया जाता। उन की वहां हालत बहुत खराब है। बटवारे के पहले हमारा एक दलित फ़ेडरेशन था जो कि सारे देश के लिये था लेकिन अब वह अलग रह गया है। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार इस बान की कोशिश करेगी कि वहां जो भंगी हैं उन को यहां लाया जाये क्योंकि उन की हालत वहां बहुत खराब है। बहुत से लोग तो बोलते हैं कि वे मुसलमान बन चुके हैं। तो जो हमारे मजदूर या मजदूरों के नाम से दूसरे देशों में काम करते हैं उन की हालत सुधारने के लिये आप ज्यादा ध्यान दें। ऐसी अपील मैं गवर्नमेंट से करना चाहता हूँ।

इस के बाद मुझे यह कहना है कि इंडियन नेशनल ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस, जो गवर्नमेंट ने शुरू की है, यह कांग्रेस की एक संस्था है, यह मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधियों की संस्था नहीं है। ट्रेड, यूनियन कांग्रेस के बारे में मेरा कहना यह है कि वह मजदूरों का हित करने वाली नहीं है। कांग्रेस जैसे और कई प्रकार की संस्थायें खोले हुए हैं, जैसे एक हरिजन सेवक संघ निकाला, दूसरी चर्खा संघ निकाला, उसी तरह से तिसरी ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस मजदूरों के नाम से निकाली है। तो मैं डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब का ध्यान इस तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी जो कार्यवाही हो रही है वह देश के लिये अच्छी नहीं है। जब तक आप हम लोगों को विश्वास में नहीं लेंगे और अपना मनमाना काम करेंगे तब तक देश का भला नहीं हो सकता है। इसीलिये जो जल्दबाजी यह काम करने के लिये हो रही है वह दुर्दिन

की आंखों में धूल डालने के लिये, मिट्टी डालने के लिये है, और फिर दुनिया में बताते हैं कि हम मजदूरों का बहुत भला कर रहे हैं। हम उसे प्रतिनिधि संस्था नहीं मानते। हमारे यहां एक हड़ताल हुई थी तो उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे मेम्बर हो जायें तो हम कुछ करेंगे। एक दृष्टि से हम को आनन्द भी होता है और दूसरी दृष्टि से दुःख भी होता है कि यहां हमारे ७२ प्रतिनिधि अछूतों के हैं। वे तो गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ़ बात चीत नहीं करते क्योंकि उन को आवाज उठाने का अधिकार नहीं है लेकिन जिस पार्टी के नाम से मैं चुनाव में आया हूँ उस से मुझे अधिकार है कि जहां तक हमारे अछूतों का सवाल है हम आवाज उठावें। जो देश के सवाल हैं उस में तो हम देश के साथ हैं ही लेकिन जो अछूत के सवाल हैं उन में हम को आवाज जरूर उठानी है। इसलिये मैं हाउस से और सब से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो हजारों वर्षों से गिरी हुई जाति है उसको ऊपर उठाने की कोशिश करें। गांधी जी का नाम तो आप हर वक्त लेते हैं लेकिन गांधी का जो आदर्श है, जो तत्वज्ञान है, उस को अमल में नहीं लाते। अगर आप गांधी जी के सच्चे भक्त हैं तो उस को अमल में लाइये। जब हमारे डाक्टर अम्बेडकर लेबर मिनिस्टर थे तो उन्होंने कई क़ानून बनाये और हमारे भाई जगजीवन राम जी उस को अमल में लाये। लेबर के बारे में जगजीवन राम जी ने कुछ किया है लेकिन जो कुछ किया है उस को बनाने वाले और उस को असली रूप में करने वाले डाक्टर अम्बेडकर थे।

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: That is reflected glory.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : यह तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी विजय है और मुझे उम्मीद है कि जो अछूतों के बारे में सवाल हैं उन को हल किया जायेगा। हमारे देश में करीब ५-६ करोड़ अछूत हैं और उन में से मजदूरों की संख्या ज्यादा है। मेरा कहना है कि मजदूरों की संख्या बढ़नी चाहिये और उन को ग्रेचुटी (gratuity) वगैरह भी मिलनी चाहिये। दिल्ली में जा कर देखिये, मजदूरों की क्या हालत है। मैं परसों मोरी गेट गया था। जमुना के किनारे महाराष्ट्र के और दूसरे दूसरे स्थानों के हरिजन बैठे हुए थे। उन को रहने के लिये मकान नहीं है। मकान का सवाल एक बहुत बड़ा सवाल है, उस के लिये भी वाम होना चाहिये। प्लानिंग कमीशन (Planning Commission) ने बड़ी बड़ी योजनायें लिखी हैं लेकिन मजदूरों के बारे में, अछूतों के बारे में कोई अच्छा प्रबन्ध उन में नहीं है। इसी वास्ते दिल्ली के मजदूरों की स्थिति भी बहुत खराब है। वे रास्ते में सोते हैं, उन को रहने को मकान नहीं है। देश आजाद हो गया है लेकिन हम लोग अब भी परतंत्र हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक हम कोई कंस्ट्रक्टिव काम नहीं करेंगे तब तक उन की हालत सुधर सकना बहुत मुश्किल है।

जो मिल मालिक हैं वह अपनी मनमानी करते हैं और मजदूरों को परेशान करते हैं। कलकत्ता में इतने काम हैं वहाँ बहुत से मजदूर बेकार हैं, शोलापुर और वाशी की मिलों में बहुत से लोग बेकार हैं और मिल मालिक मनमानी कर रहे हैं, इसलिये उन के ऊपर भी प्रतिबन्ध होना चाहिये। मिल मालिकों को करोड़ों रुपये मिलते हैं लेकिन वे गरीबों का भला नहीं करते। इसलिये मैं हाउस से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि

मजदूरों का भला होना चाहिये और हमारे अछूतों का जो छुआ छूतपन है वह नष्ट होना चाहिये और इसलिये यह कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि उनकी गवर्नमेंट में इम्प्लायमेंट की जो स्थिति है वह सुधारें और यह सुधार तब हो सकता है जब हम उन के रीयल रिप्रेजेंटेटिव को रखें। यही मैं हाउस से प्रार्थना करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार इस पर ध्यान देगी। इतना कह कर मैं भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: Sir, I am glad you have given me an opportunity to speak after so many days. There are very few representatives of the Scheduled Castes Federation in this House and they too are not affiliated with any group. I wanted to speak on Education and other matters also. I thank you very much for giving me time to speak on labour.

The majority of workers in big factories throughout India is that of the so-called untouchables. They are not getting the help that they ought to from the Government. Untouchability is rampant even in big factories. These so-called untouchables are not employed in weaving mills in Ahmedabad, Bombay and Nagpur, because while working yarn comes in contact with their lips. We held many meetings and conferences but no heed was paid to them. Only those are listened to who have a loud voice. Nothing that we on the opposition benches say in this House is acted upon. Dr. Punjab Rao Deshmukh had introduced a Bill in the last Parliament with the object of making provisions for imparting technical training and providing employment to labour. But that Bill could not be passed. He is again bringing forward that Bill. I think that labour welfare would be an idle dream unless arrangements are made for technical training for labour. They would always remain unskilled labourers and cannot make any progress in that capacity. They need

[Shri P. N. Rajabhoj]

to be trained. If they are trained they can do something for themselves even if they are thrown out of employment.

Another thing I have to say is in connection with sweepers who have been doing this work from centuries. Why should you not take up this work now? After all, there is no such law under which they have to continue in their age old profession. Now that our country is free and everybody has equal rights, why should not Brahmin labourers work as sweepers for some time and sweepers who are good workers otherwise, adopt some other profession? These people are compelled to do this work in factories and I think that the Government should remedy the situation.

About the employment exchanges which provide employment to many people and publish reports, I may point out that all the high officers are caste Hindus and justice is not done to the scheduled castes at many places. The caste Hindus do not meet out good treatment to those belonging to the scheduled castes. I went to the Jalgaon Employment Exchange and also made a complaint at Poona and Sholapur Exchanges. These are places where complaints are not paid any heed to for months together. There is no appropriate arrangement for providing employment even to qualified matriculates.

Casteism is very strong in India. Many slogans are raised in the name of untouchables. There are many institutions for them like the Harijan Sevak Sangh but they all talk too much and work too little.

The same is the position of scheduled castes with regard to employment. It is true that 12½ per cent. posts are reserved for scheduled castes but the employment exchanges should work properly to give it a practical shape. I hope that our new Labour Minister Shri Giri would not lose sight of scheduled castes and would do whatever he can to see that scheduled castes get their proper share in Government employment.

Let me point out that in the Labour Delegations sent abroad, some representatives of Labour are included but they are not included in others. I want to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that we are citizens of our free country and we should get a share in the affairs of the country. I hope that the hon. Minister would give some thought to this question.

I want to draw the attention of the Government towards the plight of sweepers in Pakistan who are not being allowed to come to India. The Partition has split the Depressed Classes League which was an All India body. I hope that the Government would try to bring back these sweepers from Pakistan. Many people say that they have changed their religion to Islam. I appeal to the Government to try to better the lot of those of our citizens who are working as labourers in other countries.

I want to say that the Indian National Trade Union Congress started by the Government is a Congress organisation and is not representative of the workers. I hold that I. N. T. U. C. does not work for the benefit of the labourers. The Congress had started many organisations e.g. the Harijan Sevak Sangh, the Charkha Sangh and then it started the I. N. T. U. C. I want to draw the attention of the hon. the Deputy-Speaker towards the fact that such things are not in the interests of the country. As long as the Government do not take us into their confidence and go on working as they please, no good will accrue to our country. The haste in forming such organisations is to dupe the people, and then they claim that they are working for the welfare of the people. We do not consider the I. N. T. U. C. to be a representative of labour. There was a strike in our parts and the strikers were told that the I. N. T. U. C. could take up their case only if they enrolled themselves as its members.

I am pleased that there are as many as 72 representatives of the scheduled castes in this House. I regret that they cannot raise their voice against the Government. But the party on whose ticket I have been elected to this House has given me a mandate to raise my voice on the question of scheduled castes. There are other questions also but this is the main question on which I have to raise my voice. I request the House to try to better the lot of this section of the people which has been down trodden for centuries. You utter Gandhiji's name very often but you do not act upon the essence of his teachings. If you are a true follower of Gandhiji put his teachings into practice. When Dr. Ambedkar was Law Minister he got many laws passed and those laws were put into effect by Shri Jagjivan Ram. Whatever the latter has done in connection with Labour was really conceived by Dr. Ambedkar.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): That is reflected glory.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: I think this is our victory and I hope that the problems of the scheduled castes would be solved. The number of scheduled castes in our country is five to six crores, the majority of them are workers. I want that the number of workers should go up, and they should be given gratuity etc. The condition of workers in Delhi is unspeakable. I visited Mori Gate day before yesterday. Harijans of Maharashtra and other places are living on the banks of the Jumna. They have no houses to live in. The housing problem is a serious one and should be tackled. The Planning Commission has drawn up big schemes but there is no provision for workers or scheduled castes in those plans. That is why the condition of workers in Delhi is very bad; they sleep on the footpaths. The country is free but we are still slaves. I do not think we can improve our condition unless we do something constructive.

The millowners behave like autocrats and harass the workers. There is so much of work in Calcutta but many workers are unemployed there. Many people have been thrown out of employment by owners of Sholapur and Barshi mills. This tendency ought to be checked. The millowners earn crores but they do nothing for the welfare of the workers. I appeal to the House that we should work for the welfare of the workers, for removing casteism and untouchability and for giving proper share to the scheduled castes in Government employment. This can be done only when their real representatives are included in the administration. I hope the Government would pay attention to this. With this I conclude.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The country has noted the fact that my hon. friend Shri Giri has come to his high office after thirty years of experience as a trade unionist. The country is also watching the early steps which the hon. Minister of Labour has taken since he assumed office. I remember the days, twenty years ago, when my hon. friend inducted me into one of those railway labour strikes in Andhra Desa. Those were the halcyon days of the Indian national freedom fight, and any strike undertaken or executed according to plan was given a high priority in the estimates of the people. I quite recognize that today in Free India we have got to place a new construction on this particular problem. I have had the pri-

vilage of watching very closely, as a junior colleague, the activities of my hon. friend the Labour Minister during the past few years. When he was not entrammelled by office my hon. friend was eloquent about the enunciation of the rights of workers, and more so the need for protection of those rights. But I have noticed—and I am saying this with great deference to him—that whenever he came to office he has developed a very easy felicity for enunciating certain nostrums.

Shri B. Das: He has become responsible.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I think that I am quoting him correctly, and if I am wrong I would ask him to stop me right now. When he was Minister of Labour in the Madras Government a few years ago he made one of those famous speeches at Trichinopoly the effect of which—if I do not do him an injustice—was to circumscribe the right of workers to strike. I hope I am not putting any uncharitable interpretation as to what the reactions were when he made that statement as Labour Minister. I am prepared for the moment to forget this and to come to a more recent statement of my hon. friend the Labour Minister. I am quoting from the Free Press of India and this is the quotation as printed in that paper. This is supposed to be the speech delivered by my hon. friend on the 2nd of June in Bombay while addressing the All India Manufacturers' Organization. Here are the words as given in the paper in direct quotations: "I do not believe much in legislation. I believe more in understanding and conventions between the two, namely the employer and labour". To my mind this is a very dangerous doctrine. If the hon. the Labour Minister's speech has been properly reported it constitutes to my mind, as one who has devoted considerable attention to labour legislation in this country during the past twenty-five years, a dangerous departure from the accepted principles of approach of the Government of India towards the problem of the workman's movement in this country. I would like to have an assurance from my hon. friend that the intention behind his words is altogether different from the way in which people like me have understood the meaning of those words.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): You have understood him correctly.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Have I? I am glad my hon. friend from the

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

other side endorses that I have not been ungenerous in my estimate of the inwardness of meaning of the words used by my hon. friend the Labour Minister only a few days ago this month.

Why do I make a reference to this problem? I will illustrate my worry through analysing as briefly as possible certain developments which are taking place in this country all round. In particular, I would refer to the administration of the Industrial Disputes Act.

As a trade unionist myself, I have recently had occasion to appear before an Industrial Tribunal for a long period of eleven months. I need not mention the names of the dispute or the name of the company or the labour union—if it is wanted I am prepared to give them—because I want to conduct the proceedings, as far as I am concerned, with a sense of dignity and responsibility. I am quoting from paragraph 2 of an order passed by the Industrial Tribunal at Vijayawada on the 17th of January, 1952. I am quoting directly without any—what you call—lifting the reference out of the context:

“The reference was made by the Government on 28th July, 1951, and it was received on 1st August, 1951. Notices for filing statements were issued on the same day. The organisations (namely the labour organisations) filed their statements on 29th August, 1951. The management took three adjournments and filed their reply statement on 19th October 1951—(that is, about three months after the Industrial Tribunal started actually). From that date, time was taken on several occasions for production of accounts, and till now the ledgers of the Company have not been produced.....”

Finally, the Tribunal says—and I am quoting again the actual words of the order:

“This attitude on the part of the Company has created bitterness in the labour organisations.”

Why do you permit abuse of the workings of Tribunals appointed under the law of the land?

The theory sought to be propounded by my hon. friend the Labour Minister at Bombay will be dangerous in its implications. It has been accepted during the past thirty years, at any rate as far as the regime of the International Labour Organisation to which we are parties is concerned, that labour is the weaker partner. Labour has a right to be protected.

Otherwise, all these Acts put on the statute book, the Minimum Wages Act, the Employment of Children Act, the Factories Act, the Arbitration Act and so on and so forth—I can catalogue them further—would have no meaning at all. I would therefore ask my hon. friend the Labour Minister to tell us frankly and fairly whether there is any departure in the policy of the Government of India towards labour. If so, it is better stated right now, now that we are disposing of the Demands for Grants for his Ministry. If there is any departure, I am sure both labour and capital, that is the employer, would readjust their views and their attitude to Government. For I am convinced that if there is a departure, the tripartite machinery set up in this connection, the triangular approach to a solution of the industrial and labour questions, would be destroyed. And I am sure it is not the intention of my hon. friend that this tripartite machinery should be destroyed.

Having taken up this question of industrial disputes, I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend to section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947. The operation of the Tribunals—as I have said earlier, I have personal knowledge of the operation of these Tribunals in more than one case—has been such that there is hardly any possibility for labour to get a quick disposal of the disputes in question. Section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act makes provision for the appointment of Judges of High Courts to these Tribunals. I have not come across any instance—barring perhaps the Banks Tribunal in Bombay—where otherwise on an all-India national basis Industrial Tribunals have been given the assistance of Judges of High Courts. I make a reference to this for one reason, namely that my hon. friend the Labour Minister when he was recently in Bombay was presented with a memorandum by certain employers' interests that section 33 of the Act should not be abrogated and that in fact it should be strengthened, namely that the appellate tribunal must be there and so on and so forth; whereas, if I do not misread the position in this country, all responsible labour organisations want to abolish this appellate tribunal jurisdiction, for the reason that the procedure becomes vexatious and costly and would not lead to justice, which the workers are entitled to, as speedily as possible. I do sincerely hope that the hon. the Labour Minister would devote his

time to an examination of the implications of sections 7 and 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act and arrive at decisions which are not inimical to the interests of labour.

I have recently heard it said that my hon. friend since he assumed office has come to certain conclusions. If I am misinformed I stand corrected. One such thing was stated to be his decision not to bring before the House in this session the Trade Unions and Labour Relations Bills. I would like to know what his intentions are. If he is not going to bring these particular Bills in respect of which there has been such a tremendous amount of controversy in the country during the past several months. I am sure every one will be with him.

The other thing I have heard it said is that it is his intention to enforce the Minimum Wage legislation, particularly with reference to agricultural labour. I have before me the Minimum Wages Act of 1948. Part II of the Schedule attached to the Act is a very important instrument of social policy on the part of the Government of India, namely the gradual and progressive application of minimum wage legislation to agricultural labour. I would like to know how exactly the mind of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour has been working in this direction, because, as I have said earlier, he seems to have made up his mind on certain points and he is proposing to take certain action very soon in respect of them.

With your permission, Sir, I would like to analyse certain facts and figures bearing upon this question of industrial and social welfare, because I believe in the need for a complete re-orientation of the policy of the Government of India to the labour problems of this country. According to the *Indian Labour Gazette* of March 1952 there is a progressive decline in the number of workers on strike and in the number of man days lost. I have listed them down:

1938	50 lakhs	of man days lost.
1946	127 lakhs	"
1948	78 lakhs	"
1949	66 lakhs	"
1950	128 lakhs	"
1951	35 lakhs	"

What does this show? To my mind, as a trade unionist it occurs to me, that labour today in this

country after the advent of freedom is more responsible and responsive to the treatment given both by the employer and the State.

Here is a breakdown analysis of absenteeism in figures in this country. I do not wish to weary the House with too many details. They are clubbed together under four heads.

In the iron and steel industry the percentage of absenteeism has dropped in 1948 from 14.3 to 10 per cent. in January 1952. In the cement industry from 12.2 per cent. in 1947 it has dropped to 10.2 in January this year. In the matches industry from 12.4 per cent. in 1947 it has come down to 8.4 per cent. in January this year. And, finally, in the Ordnance factories from 10.6 per cent. in 1947 it has come down to 7.8 per cent. early this year.

Shri B. Das: The hon. Member ought to have taken the coal industry.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: My hon. friend has referred to the coal industry and I wish I had time. That supplies another index of responsible Indian labour to get a move on and not to impede the activities of the Government of India in the field of national reconstruction. And finally, I come to the coal industry about which my hon. friend, Mr. Das was good enough to remind me. Here is a paragraph from the *Labour Gazette* of the Government of India for March 1952. It says that labour productivity in the coal industry has increased from 0.33 in 1950 to 0.34 in 1951. I do not wish to weary the House with further details, apart from making a general observation on these three types of indices, i.e.,...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has two minutes more.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: As regards industrial disputes, absenteeism and labour productivity, they clearly demonstrate that labour in India today is militant and it is alive to its rights and duties, and that it is fully conscious of those rights. It is prepared to make compromise with honour and I am only anxious here to invite the attention of my hon. friend, the Labour Minister, to the need for a proper handling of the labour situation in this country, and I do hope sincerely that he would not drop the expedient of getting the assistance of legislative machinery in order to build up the rights of the workers. Finally, I look forward to

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

the day when profit-sharing and labour co-partnership become the sheet anchor of State policy, without which we in this country cannot bring about the revolution or evolution that we want in the sphere of industrial and social welfare. I talk with some sense of responsibility. I am not talking to the hustings. I quite realize the seriousness of the occasion, and I sincerely hope that very soon the Government of India would introduce the necessary legislation to bring pressure to bear on these issues. I do hope that my hon. friend, the Labour Minister would devote more attention to this problem than even to the other problems.

During the past 25 years, during the course of which I had the privilege of working as a Trade Unionist, I have come across instances of lack of unity on the part of the Trade Union Organizations which are leading the workingman's movement. In the case of one of the Unions with which I have been connected, I had the privilege of conducting a strike in February this year, and the strike was completely successful. (An Hon. Member: What strike?) Ship-yard. I am the President of that Union. As a result of that strike, we got Rs. nine lakhs paid by the Government of India when my hon. friend Mr. Gadgil was in charge. I am only trying to make an appeal to all the Trade Union Members who happen to be in this House to declare a truce on the Trade Union Front for a period of five years, without which, to my mind, whatever might be done or might not be done by the Government, there would not be any possibility for us to step up industrial production. In my Unions I have made it a point, a principle which cannot be altered under any circumstance, namely, that there is no place for politics. Political organizations are there. I had lived for a number of years in the Congress. My hon. friend, Mr. Rajabhoj has made much of the character of the I. N. T. U. C. I do not wish to labour that point. I do not want to attack any type of Trade Union Organization in this country. There are four or five such which are now claiming the honour of being the leaders of the workingman's movement in this country. I want them to help the worker to march forward, to get the benefits which he is entitled and not to fall a prey to the debacle of the Textile strike which occurred two years ago in Bombay, which was broken not by the might of the employer, not

by the guns of the Government of India or the Bombay Government, but by the lack of unity among the Trade Union movement in our country.

Shri Venkataraman: Labour is one of the few subjects which cuts across party politics in this country. Though some of the friends are now sitting on the opposite side in this House, we are working shoulder to shoulder in the Trade Union field, so that a debate on this subject assumes a somewhat farcical air when we try to criticize the Government for what it has done or has not done. We have in the Minister for Labour one who has been in the Trade Union field for nearly 30 years and who till the other day has voiced the grievances of workers in much stronger, much fiercer language than what we with our small experience or with our education could have done. My hon. friend, Mr. Rajabhoj referred to certain organizations in this country and said they were part of the Congress. I had nothing but amusement. There are organizations in India based on Trade Union lines, working independently of political affiliations, notwithstanding the fact that certain members who are working in those particular organizations have political affiliations with parties in this country (*Interruption*). Ignorance leads always to a certain amount of assumption which it is very difficult to reason out. There are people who are associated with the Hind Mazdoor Sabha, who are members of the Socialist Party and there are people who are associated with the Hind Mazdoor Sabha who are not members of the Socialist Party. Likewise there are members in the Indian National Trade Union Congress who are associated with the Congress and there are others who are not associated with the Congress in the political programme.

An hon. Member: They could be counted on finger tips.

Shri Venkataraman: It only shows the catholicity of outlook of this organization, with even a handful of people. It only proves that the organization does not push out others for political reasons. I would like my hon. friend to remember that and practise it in the organization with which he is connected. Let us take the argument of my hon. friend, Mr. Rajabhoj, namely that certain organizations are part of the Congress. The Indian National Congress has got a department of its own, called the Labour Department. The

Provincial or Pradesh Congress Committees have got organizations known as labour sections or departments of that organization. I happen to be connected with one such Pradesh organization for the last several years but it has nothing to do and no connection whatsoever with the Indian National Trade Union Congress. It is absolutely an independent body like any other labour organization functioning in this country. Therefore when people try to throw mud either out of ignorance or imperfect understanding of the policies underlying the several organizations in this country, it becomes a necessary and painful task to clear that.

Mr. Rajabhoj also said that some legislation which his leader Dr. Ambedkar had formulated, the hon. Mr. Jagjivan Ram merely enforced. On the other hand, our complaint was that the hon. Mr. Jagjivan Ram did not enforce some of the legislations. Take for instance the Trade Union Amendment Act. It was passed at the time when Dr. Ambedkar was in office as Labour Minister. But, it was not enforced by the hon. Mr. Jagjivan Ram. There were very few legislations which the hon. Dr. Ambedkar introduced which were subsequently enforced by the hon. Mr. Jagjivan Ram. On the contrary, Mr. Jagjivan Ram introduced in this country an era of beneficent legislation spread over a period of five years during which he brought India to the level of the most advanced countries in the matter of labour legislation. The country owes and labour in this country owes a deep debt of gratitude to the hon. Mr. Jagjivan Ram for having placed on the statute book such beneficent legislation as,—I need not go into the details—the Minimum Wages Act, the Plantation Act, the Employees State Insurance Act, etc.

I know that my hon. friend from Calicut, representing the Socialist Praja Party has given a cut motion to criticise the Government for non-implementation of the several pieces of legislation. If I may anticipate, the criticism seems to be that although the hon. Minister had put on the statute book several pieces of legislation, very good to look at, they have not been implemented to the extent necessary. For the people who understand and appreciate what has been done, my answer is simple. If the criticism as a Trade Unionist is that we want greater emphasis to be laid on implementing the legislation, that we want greater emphasis should be laid by the administration

in quickening the pace of applying the beneficent legislations that have been passed in this country, I am one with him. We, like Oliver Twist, always ask for more. We trade unionists are never satisfied with the existing conditions. If we were satisfied, we would not be in the trade union.

Shri B. Das: What a confession!

Shri Venkataraman: But, if the criticism of my hon. friend is that the Government have not done what they could have done or what they should have done, I am afraid the case cannot be sustained by my friend. If my hon. friend's arguments were correct that within this period, you should have put on the statute book only a few pieces of legislation and implemented them rather than enacting a number of legislations, that would create a certain amount of dissatisfaction in the other sections of labour. It would be impossible to keep them within reasonable satisfaction. Take a specific instance. Suppose the Labour Ministry had taken up only the Minimum Wages Act and spent all its energy in enforcing that Act throughout the country, my plantation labour would not be satisfied. They wanted eight hours' work; they wanted facilities. They could not afford to wait until the Ministry had satisfied the claims in regard to the enforcement of the Minimum Wages Act. Our life is not so compartmentalised as one can wait till the other things are done. Our life is so progressive that we have to march on all fronts. In doing so, it may be that we are a little slow in enforcement. But, nevertheless, an attempt is made to march abreast in all sections of labour as far as possible. Take the Employees State Insurance Act. I would have loved that this Act were inaugurated in Madras. Not because I come from that State; but because I think there are greater facilities for enforcing that enactment in that place than elsewhere. There are a greater number of doctors, better organisation of Trade Unions, and so on. But, it is a matter of discretion and certainly any person who happens to hold the office of Minister should be allowed to judge where, how and in what stages it should be extended.

11 A.M.

The next point I would like to deal with is the criticism of my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram. He

[Shri Venkataraman]

wanted to know whether there has been a change of policy in this Government with regard to legislation. If I remember aright, all the Trade Unions in this country regardless of the section to which they belonged, have wanted a change in the matter of legislation. They wanted that this compulsory arbitration should go. They wanted lesser and lesser resort to law courts in the settlement of labour disputes. They wanted that so far as bi-partite agreements are possible, they should be encouraged. They certainly did not want to become slaves of law courts and lawyers. If my hon. friend says that we must have more and more legislation as a means of solving the disputes between labour and capital, I totally disagree with him, and I think organised labour opinion in this country will also totally disagree with him. If a dispute arises between an employer and the employees and it is made clear that if they do not come to a settlement, there would be a strike, the employer would begin to think half a dozen times before he takes the final step which would break the negotiations. Likewise, the employees or the Trade Unionists will think a number of times before they also break off the negotiations. Now, we have provided a court, very much like the Small Cause Court to which most of us go if a man borrowed Rs. five or Rs. ten. The management take the case from court to court, from the tribunal to the appellate tribunal, from the appellate tribunal to the High Court, and from the High Court to the Supreme Court and then to eternity. There is a wholesome check that the strike infuses both in the minds of labour and in the minds of capital. I am one of those who are not afraid of strikes. Strike has been the weapon through which the world labour movement has advanced. Therefore, let us not put too much faith in the organisation of tribunals, appellate tribunals and so on for the resolution of our disputes. I would ask the Labour Minister to make his position very clear in this House because we look forward to him, as a Trade Unionist, to be able to come forward and say that unless the parties come together on a bi-partite agreement basis, they cannot hope to get any help from the Government which they may need from the Government. Therefore, I welcome this proposed change in the policy to be adopted in respect of settlement of labour disputes.

I have a few other suggestions to offer. The procedure envisaged

under the Industrial Disputes Act is, as my hon. friend said, circumlocutory. That is because the procedure is based on the Civil Procedure Code. Though the Tribunals are not bound to follow the Civil Procedure Code, yet, by reason of the fact that they have come from the judiciary, they have always preferred to follow the Civil Procedure Code and so have delayed the proceedings. I must congratulate my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram that he has been able to solve a dispute in ten or eleven months. I know of disputes which have not been solved for two years.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: If I may interrupt for a moment, not through the tribunal, but by other means.

Shri Venkataraman: Thank you very much. I thought he gave me a catalogue of the dates relating to the tribunal.

Therefore, if any new procedure is going to be set out for the purpose of settling the disputes, I would prefer that the new procedure should be such as would be direct, and as would leave no scope for dilatory tactics.

Some of the hon. Members wanted Judges to preside over these tribunals. I have great regard for Judges. I have practised as a lawyer. But, I think they are hopelessly unfit to be members of the Industrial Tribunals. They have spoiled many cases without understanding the principles involved. As one who goes through at least 120 or 150 cases of the tribunals every month to publish my *Labour Law Journal*, I can say that in most of them the decisions are far from the realities of the case.

I know of cases in which labour has been more dissatisfied, and in which capital has been more dissatisfied, and have ultimately come to a reasonable settlement among themselves ignoring the decision of the Tribunal. Sir, we want a personnel capable of understanding the industrial psychology, capable of appreciating the economic consequences involved in the changes sought—a personnel which will cut across all legal and technical formalities and which will be able to adjust the dispute in the best interests of both parties. Therefore, Sir, if the Government is really going to revise its policy with regard to the Tribunal, I would suggest that they appoint as members of the Tribunal not those who have got merely judicial experience, but those who have plenty of experience in the administration of

labour legislation, trade unionists and also certain persons well versed in cost accounting and so forth.

Now I come to the question of agricultural labour. Though the Minimum Wages Act was passed in 1948, the time for implementation of the Minimum Wages Act to agricultural labour has been extended from time to time. I know that it is going to be the gravamen of the charge by my hon. friend, the Member from Calicut. But we must realise one thing; there are no trade unions organised in agriculture and whatever legislation may be passed by the Government, they are not likely to be of much use or benefit to the agricultural labour unless we develop proper Trade Union Organisation in those specialised fields of activity. We may have laws, but the laws do not work by themselves, they have to be set in motion, and only Trade Unions can set them in motion, and our organisation of agricultural labour is so poor that any amount of legislation is not likely to bring large benefit to them. But that by no means is an excuse for the Government delaying the implementation of the Minimum Wages legislation with regard to agriculture. The delay occurred, if I may say so with great respect, through the Finance Minister and his Planning Commission. They thought that the implementation of the Minimum Wages legislation would throw the spanner into the life of the rural community. Sir, that really threw the hammer at the head of the agricultural population.

The result was that certain time was taken by the Planning Commission to study the consequences—the probable consequences—of implementing the Minimum Wages legislation on the agricultural community, and ultimately, I am glad to say, they came to the conclusion that the Minimum Wages legislation can be implemented in certain areas and in respect of certain specified occupations and that it should be done before the end of 1953.

There are one or two handicaps from which labour now suffers. The supervisory staff who are engaged in industrial undertakings have been excluded from the purview of the Industrial Disputes Act, thanks to the decision of the Appellate Tribunal. They interpreted the definition of a workman in so strict a manner as to include within its scope only a person who does manual, i.e., physical or clerical labour, and all those who did a little more than that have been excluded from the benefits of the Industrial Disputes Act. Sir, this has cut the whole labour into

two camps, the supervisory camp and the working class. This is not to the interests of the nation, this is not to the interests of the working classes. Unless an amendment to the Industrial Disputes Act is brought bringing the whole class of supervisory staff—those persons who are less in status than that of the Manager—within the definition of the Industrial Disputes Act, there is likely to be a cleavage in the Trade Union movement, certain Trade Unions starting under the supervisory and technical staff, and others going on against them as working class organisations. No such distinction, to my knowledge, exists in any other country, and it is up to you now to see that the mischief which is done by the decision is nipped in the bud.

Then there is the question of retrenchment. Now, we are practically coming to a slump period and everywhere there is a threat of closure of several establishments. And those people who have worked hard in those industrial establishments should not be merely left to the kind mercies of the employers, to their own fate, if they are thrown out of employment. I would suggest that the provision which has been there in the Bill, i.e., the Labour Legislation Bill, for some time, viz., that in the case of retrenchment every worker should be given 15 days gratuity for each year of service, should be implemented as soon as possible. If there is any delay in the implementation of this provision, it will be a case of justice being delayed, of justice being denied, because most of the workers are at the present moment facing a grave crisis of retrenchment.

Lastly I would join with my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram in saying that you bring about a Trade Union unity in this country. The hon. Minister has been associated with several Trade Unions in this country—the AITUC; he has friends in the H. M. S., and he has also been associated with the INTUC. He is the best person in the country who is capable of bringing about unity among the several groups. People who are interested in the history of the Trade Union movement have only to refer to the Nagpur Resolution and the part Mr. V. V. Giri, as he then was, played in bringing about a trade union unity. This is just the time when as Labour Minister he should set himself the task of bringing about trade union unity in this country so that democracy may be protected in this land. Labour and Trade Union Organisations are among those who are genuinely interested in democracy. They fight against the reactionary forces and totalitarian tendencies both of the

[Shri Venkataraman]

right and of the left. A real, healthy Trade Union movement is the greatest safeguard for democracy in this country and we would be very happy if the Hon. Minister could exert his influence in achieving that trade union unity in this country.

श्री विद्यालंकार : मुझे इस बात पर बहुत हैरानी हुई कि यहां पर बहुत से मामलों को बजाय इस के कि हम उन को पोजिटिव (positive) तरीके से सोचें नेगेटिव क्रिटिसिज्म (negative criticism) किया जाता है और बहुत सी बातें इस किस्म की कही जाती हैं जिन का वास्तविकता से कोई सरोकार नहीं। मुझे इस बात से और भी ज्यादा हैरानी हुई जब कि इंडियन नेशनल ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस पर यहां एतराज किया गया। यहां पर यह भी कहा गया है कि पिछले पांच सालों से जो लेबर लाज (labour laws) बनाये गये हैं उन पर अमल नहीं हो रहा है। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उन कानूनों पर अमल क्यों नहीं हो रहा है। दर असल जितने भी कानून आप इस तरह से बनावें उन पर तब तक अमल नहीं हो सकता जब तक कि मजदूरों का संगठन मजबूत न हो। मजदूरों के संगठन के ऊपर ही इन कानूनों पर अमल होना निर्भर करता है।

आज हमारे यहां ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट (Trade Union movement) की क्या हालत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज हमारे यहां ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट इतना कमजोर है जितना पहिले कभी नहीं था। इस की क्या वजह है कि आज यह ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट इतना कमजोर हो गया है। पिछली लड़ाई के दिनों में कुछ पोलिटिकल पार्टियों (political parties) ने ट्रेड यूनियन को अपने मकसद हासिल करने के लिये एक अखाड़ा बनाया था। उस समय उन लोगों ने उस 'वार' (war) को पीपुल्स

वार (People's war) कह कर मजदूर को उस युद्ध में घसीटना चाहा और उन्होंने इस नारे के द्वारा मजदूरों को अपनी राजनैतिक पालिसी के अनुसार चलाने की कोशिश की। इस तरह ट्रेड यूनियन को पोलिटिकल लाइन्स (political line) में लाने की कोशिश की गई जिस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि मजदूरों की संस्थाये कई किस्म की यूनियनों में बंट गई। उन पार्टियों ने हमेशा स्लोगन (slogan) तो यह दिया कि "workers of the world unite" मगर उन की नीति का यह नतीजा निकला कि वर्कर्स (workers) कितने ही छोटे छोटे ट्रेड यूनियनों में बंट गये, और युनाइटेड (united) होने की जगह डिवाइड (divide) हो गये। मगर आज इंडियन नेशनल ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस के ऊपर एतराज किये जाते हैं जिस ने कि इस ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट को नान पोलिटिकल लाइन (non-political lines) पर लाने की कोशिश की।

पिछले पांच सालों में जितने कानून यहां पर मजदूरों के लिये बने मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई भी गवर्नमेंट उस पर गर्व कर सकती है। पिछले ५० सालों में सब मिला कर भी किसी भी गवर्नमेंट ने मजदूरों के लिये इस तरह के कानून नहीं बनाये जितने कि इन पांच सालों के अन्दर इस गवर्नमेंट ने मजदूरों के लिये बनाये और उन को फायदा पहुंचाया। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बात पर कोई भी शक नहीं कर सकता। मैं अपने दूसरे साथियों से सहमत हूँ कि इन्डस्ट्रीयल डिस्प्यूट एक्ट (Industrial Disputes Act) और ट्रिब्यूनल्स (Tribunals) बहुत देरी में फ़ैसला दे रहे हैं। मगर इस के साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितने भी फ़ैसले ट्रिब्यूनल्स ने दिये हैं, उन में अनेक आर्दश फ़ैसले दिये हैं। इन फ़ैसलों से कई ऐसे ह

कायम हुए हैं जिन्हें ट्रेडीशनल लॉ (Traditional law) का नाम दिया जा सकता है। उन से मजदूरों के हकों की हिफाजत करने में बहुत मदद मिली है और जो हक मिले हैं उन को अब कोई कानून भी नहीं छीन सकेगा।

तो मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यह कहना कि मजदूरों के लिये कोई काम नहीं हुआ या मजदूरों के कानूनों पर बिल्कुल भी अमल नहीं हुआ ठीक नहीं होगा। अगर मजदूरों के कानूनों पर अमल नहीं हुआ तो उस की बजह यही है कि मजदूरों की ट्रेड यूनियन्स को कमजोर किया गया और वह कमजोर रहीं। मैं खुद कई ट्रेड यूनियन्स के साथ सम्बन्ध रखता हूँ। मजदूरों की तरफ से मतालबे रखे जाते हैं। उस वक़्त दूसरी पोलिटिकल पार्टीज़ के लोग आते हैं और उन में छीना झपटी होती है और मजदूरों को एक तरफ़ से दूसरी तरफ़ खींचने की कोशिश करते हैं। बग़ैर सोचे हुए मजदूरों की माँगें रखी जाती हैं। यह नहीं देखा जाता कि यह माँगें मंजूर भी हो सकती हैं या नहीं। न ही देखा जाता है कि मजदूरों की यूनियन मजबूत है या नहीं। न ही सोचा जाता है कि मजदूरी किस बात के लिये ज़रूरी तौर पर फ़ाइट (fight) करना चाहते हैं और किस के लिये फ़ाइट नहीं करना चाहते हैं। जब इन लोगों से प्राइवेट में बात की जाती है तो कहते हैं कि हम तो पोलिटिकल मक़सद से यह काम करते हैं। अगर मजदूर कामयाब हो गये तो हम उस का क्रेडिट (credit) ले लेते हैं और अगर नाकामयाब हुए तो हम इस का कुसूर गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर डाल देते हैं। यह निगेटिव पालिसी (negative policy) है और मजदूरों के हित में नहीं है। इस तरह से तो कोई भी मजदूरों का कानून कामयाब नहीं हो सकता है।

मैं इस बात को कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट की इस वक़्त जो पालिसी है वह बिल्कुल पाज़िटिव पालिसी है। मैं यह नहीं मानता कि मजदूरों और उद्योग-पतियों के झगड़ों के सम्बन्ध में कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी न्यूट्रल (neutral) है। यह झटई झलत है कि गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी न्यूट्रल है। गवर्नमेंट की पाज़िटिव पालिसी है और इस वक़्त वह मजदूरों के हित की तरफ़ बाइस्ड (biased) है। जितने कानून पिछले दिनों बने वह मजदूरों के हित में बने। अगर कोई ख़ामी रही तो इसीलिये कि, जैसा मैं ने कहा कि मजदूरों का संगठन कमजोर रहा, जिस की बजह में पहिले बयान कर चुका हूँ। इस वक़्त इस हाउस के अन्दर जो भी दल हैं या जो भी मजबूत दल हैं उन में से कोई भी कैपिटलिज़्म (capitalism) का हामी नहीं है और ऐसा कोई नहीं है कि जो प्रोडक्शन (production) के अन्दर कैपिटलिज़्म को लाना चाहता हो। कैपिटलिज़्म के मुख्य लक्षण यह हैं कि प्रोडक्शन न सिर्फ़ जनता के या वर्कर्स के हित में हो बल्कि कुछ क्लासेज़ (classes) के, कुछ समूह लोगों के हित के लिये किया जाय। दूसरा फ़ीचर (feature) उस का यह है कि आय का विभाजन ऐसा हो कि वह अमीर को अमीर बनाता जाय और गरीबों को गरीब बनाता जाय और जो गरीब काम करने वाले हैं उन के पास पैसा न पहुंचने दे। तीसरा फ़ीचर यह है कि अगर रेशनलाइज़ेशन (rationalisation) हो, और उस के लिये खर्चों में कटौती हो तो वह वेजेज़ (wages) ही मुनाफ़े में से न हो। जो भी कटौती हो वह समूह लोगों के मुनाफ़ों में से न हो पर गरीब का करने वालों की वेजेज़ में से हो। चर्चा में समझता हूँ हमारी यह डेफ़िनिट पालिसी (definite policy) है, हमारी गवर्नमेंट की यह डेफ़िनिट पालिसी है कि प्रोडक्शन

[श्री बिद्यालंकार]

में इन फ्रीचर्स को दूर किया जाय। जो कानून बने हैं उन का मकसद यही है कि इन फ्रीचर्स को दूर किया जाय। मैं अपने लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब से कहूंगा कि वह कोशिश करें, और मुझे यकीन है कि वह वृद्ध ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट के अगुआ रहे हैं, वह इस बात की कोशिश करेंगे कि हमारे प्रोडक्शन में से यह फ्रीचर दूर हों और मजदूरों को उन का सही हिस्सा दिलाया जाय और उन को सही सवह पर लाया जाय।

अभी कहा गया है कि इस बात की जरूरत नहीं है कि नये कानून बनाये जायें बल्कि जरूरत इस बात की है कि जो पोजीशन (position) हमने हासिल कर ली है उस को कांसालीडेट (consolidate) कर लिया जाय। जो कानून हैं उन को समल में लाया जाय और उन को समल में लाने के लिये हमारी डैफिनिट (definite) और डाइनेमिक पालिसी (dynamic policy) होनी चाहिये और उस डाइनेमिक पालिसी का मकसद यह होना चाहिये कि मजदूरों को आगे बढ़ाया जाय।

पिछले दिनों यह कहा गया कि कैपिटल (capital) को इन्सेंटिव (incentive) की जरूरत है। जो फिगर्स (figures) भी लंका मुन्दरम् ने दिये हैं उन से यह साबित है कि पिछले पांच सालों में मजदूरों ने अपना पार्ट (part) अदा किया है, मजदूरों ने पूरी तरह से प्रोडक्शन (production) को बढ़ाने की कोशिश की है, मजदूरों ने हड़तालों को कम करने की कोशिश की है और उन्होंने ऐब्सेंटीइज्म (absenteeism) को कम करने की कोशिश की है। लेकिन मुझे इस बात का अफ़सोस है कि दूसरी तरफ़ से यानी कैपिटलिस्ट्स (capitalists) की तरफ़ से पूरा रैस्पॉन्स (response) नहीं हुआ। उन की तरफ़ से वह कोशिश नहीं की गई जो कि प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाने

के लिये होनी चाहिये थी। यह कहा जाता है कि कैपिटल को इन्सेंटिव की जरूरत है लेकिन अगर कैपिटल को इन्सेंटिव की जरूरत है, अगर कैपिटल को प्रोत्साहन की जरूरत है तो लेबर (labour) को भी प्रोत्साहन की जरूरत है, और लेबर को प्रोत्साहन तभी मिल सकता है जब कि लेबर का जो कुछ अधिकार है वह उस को दिया जाय और हमारी पालिसी 'बाइस्ड' हो लेबर की तरफ़ न कि कैपिटल की तरफ़। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी पालिसी हिचकिचाहट की होनी चाहिये, वैसील्लेन (vaccination) की नहीं होनी चाहिये बल्कि हमारी पालिसी डैफिनिट होनी चाहिये। मेरी राय है कि इस मामले में हमारे सेंटर की गवर्नमेंट और कुछ स्टेट्स की गवर्नमेंटों में कोऑर्डिनेशन (co-ordination) नहीं है। कुछ स्टेट्स के अन्दर अभी तक यह समझा जाता है कि शायद अभी तक हमारी पालिसी प्रो-लेबर (pro-labour) नहीं है बल्कि प्रो-कैपिटल (pro-capital) है। मैं हैरान हो जाता हूँ उस वक़्त जब कि मजदूर कहीं इकट्ठे होते हैं, या मजदूर कहीं पर अपनी मांग रखते हैं, या कहीं पर वह अपना नोटिस (notice) देते हैं, तो उसी वक़्त पुलिस वाले उन के आसपास फिरने लगते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह चीज़ें बन्द होनी चाहियें। मैं जानता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की यह पालिसी नहीं है मगर कुछ स्टेट्स में कुछ लोगों को जो यह शिकायत है दूर की जानी चाहिये और इस बात की कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि अगर मजदूर कोई ऐजीटेशन (agitation) करते हैं तो उन के लिये गवर्नमेंट की तरफ़ से किसी किस्म का डिस्कुरेजमेंट (discouragement) नहीं होना चाहिये।

हमारी पालिसी यह होनी चाहिये कि हम लेबर को मोबिलाइज (mobilize) करें। अगर हम लेबर को मोबिलाइज नहीं

करेंगे, और इस तरह प्रोडक्शन को प्रोत्साहन नहीं देंगे तो हमारा प्रोडक्शन बढ़ नहीं सकता आज जो सब से बड़ी समस्या हमारे सामने है वह प्रोडक्शन की है। जब तक हमारा प्रोडक्शन नहीं बढ़ता है तब तक हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति में सुधार नहीं हो सकता। आज कोशिश यह होनी चाहिये कि मेहनत करने वालों को उत्साहित किया जाय। और यह हम सब लोगों की जिम्मेदारी है कि आज लेबर में उत्साह नहीं है। उन को आज यह विश्वास नहीं है कि जो कुछ वह पैदा करते हैं उस में उन को अपना पूरा हिस्सा मिलेगा। उन को जो यह विश्वास नहीं है उस के लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत बड़ी जिम्मेदारी उन पोलिटिकल पार्टीज की है जो कि कांग्रेस के विरुद्ध काम करती हैं। वह मजदूरों के अन्दर यह भाव पैदा करते हैं कि मौजूदा गवर्नमेंट मजदूरों की नहीं है और मजदूरों के हितों के विरोध में है। उस का नतीजा यह होता है कि मजदूरों का उत्साह भंग होता है। आज के दिन हिन्दुस्तान में इस राष्ट्र के अन्दर जो व्यक्ति लोगों के हौसले को पस्त करता है, लोगों का उत्साह नहीं बढ़ाता है बल्कि उत्साह को कम करता है वह देश की तरक्की के रास्ते में रुकावट पैदा करता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज हमारे लिये और विरोधी दल के लिये भी और उन तमाम लोगों के लिये, जो कि देश की तरक्की चाहते हैं, मजदूरों को यह विश्वास दिलाना जरूरी है कि जो कुछ काम हो रहा है वह उन के हित में है और जो कुछ वह करेंगे उस में उन को पूरा हिस्सा मिलेगा।

इंडस्ट्रियल डिसप्यूट्स ऐक्ट और दूसरे कानूनों के मुतालिक बहुत कुछ कहा जा चुका है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जहां उन के इम्प्लीमेंटेशन (implementation) का

सवाल है उस में भी उन्नति की जानी चाहिये। मैं जानता हूँ कि कभी कभी कैसेज छः छः महीने या दो दो साल तक चलते रहते हैं और मैं अपने तजुबों से यह कह सकता हूँ कि उद्योगपति इस बात की कोशिश में रहते हैं कि मामला ट्रिब्यूनल में चला जाय या अपीलेंट कोर्ट (Appellate Court) में चला जाय क्यों कि वह पैसा खर्च कर सकते हैं और बाबू इस तरह से न्याय को खरीद सकते हैं। इसलिये मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि इस में कोई ऐसी कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि इन कैसेज का फ़ैसला एक्सपिडीशस (expeditious) हो।

जहां तक फ़ैक्टरी ऐक्ट (Factory Act) के इम्प्लीमेंटेशन का ताल्लुक है मेरा सुझाव यह है कि जो इन्स्पेक्टर हैं उन की तादाद बहुत कम है और इसलिये जो चीजें फ़ैक्टरियों के अन्दर देखी जानी चाहियें वह नहीं देखी जा सकतीं। इसलिये इस बात का भी प्रबन्ध किया जाना चाहिये कि नान बाफ़िशियल विजिटर्स (non-official visitors) भी वहां जा सकें और देख सकें इस से वह फ़ायदा होगा कि फ़ैक्टरियों की हालत बहुत सुधर जायगी।

मैं समझता हूँ कि इस समय तीन चीजों की तुरन्त आवश्यकता है जो कि करनी हैं। एक तो यह कि जो मजदूरों की ट्रेड यूनियनस हैं उन का रिकोगनीशन (recognition) फ़ौरन होना चाहिये। दूसरे कैपिटलिस्टिक देशों तक में इस कानून का इम्प्लीमेंटेशन हो रहा है फिर यहां क्यों न होना चाहिये ? दूसरी बात यह है कि एक तरफ़ा वेजेज में कमी नहीं होनी चाहिये। अगर वेजेज में रिडक्शन (reduction) करना है तो यह कंसिलियेशन मैशिनरी (conciliation machinery) के जरिये होना चाहिये और जब तक कि लेबर डिपार्टमेंट इस की इजाजत न दे दे उस वक्त तक वेजेज में कमी नहीं होनी चाहिये

[श्री विद्यालंकार]

इसी तरह से यूनीलेटरल रिट्रेंचमेंट (uni-lateral retrenchment) के बारे में भी होना चाहिये। इस वक्त हमारे देश में रिट्रेंचमेंट एक बड़ी समस्या बन गई है और खास तौर पर जब से स्लम्प (slump) आया है तब से यह समस्या बहुत बढ़ रही है। इस के साथ ही खास तौर से मैं इस तरफ भी तबज़्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी जो बड़ी बड़ी स्कीमें (schemes) चल रही हैं जैसे भाखरा नागल, हीराकुड वगैरह, और खास तौर से मैं भाखरा के बारे में जानता हूँ, कि यहाँ पर जो लेबर काम करती है उस पर कोई भी लेबर लाज (labour laws) लागू नहीं होते हैं, न फ़ैक्टरी ऐक्ट (Factory Act) ही लागू होता है न पेमेंट आफ वेजेज ऐक्ट (Payment of Wages Act) लागू होता है और न दूसरे लेबर लाज लागू होते हैं। उस का नतीजा यह होता है कि दस हजार लेबर उन फ़ायदों से, उन अधिकारों से, वंचित हो जाती है जो कि उस को मिलने चाहियें।

मेरा सुझाव यह है कि फ़ैक्टरी (factory) की जो डिफ़िनीशन (definition) है उस को कुछ फ़ैला कर गवर्नमेंट के जो रिवर वैली प्रोजेक्ट्स (river valley projects) हैं और जहाँ लेबर का कन्सेन्ट्रेशन (concentration) है वहाँ पर लागू करना चाहिये। मुझे भाखरा और नागल का तजुर्बा है, वहाँ ऐसे अवसर आते हैं, जब कि वर्कमेंस कम्पेन्सेशन ऐक्ट (Workmen's Compensation Act) का बहुत लोगों को फायदा नहीं पहुँचता। कई केसेज (cases) होते हैं, कई एक्सीडेंट्स (accidents) होते हैं लेकिन मजदूरों को कोई राहत नहीं मिलती। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस की पूरी तरह से जांच की जाय और वर्कमेंस कम्पेन्सेशन ऐक्ट को पूरी तरह से लागू किया जाय। इसी के साथ साथ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट के जो काम हैं, पी० डब्लू०

डी० (P.W.D.) है, गवर्नमेंट की फ़ैक्टरीज हैं और दूसरे जो काम हैं, उनमें गवर्नमेंट के अपने मुलाज़िम हैं जिन की बड़ी भारी तादाद है। मैं यह जानता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की यह पालिसी नहीं है लेकिन वह लोग जो कि गवर्नमेंट के काम को चला रहे हैं अब भी शायद उन के दिमाग पुराने जमाने में हैं, और वे नये जमाने की पालिसी को शायद अभी नहीं समझ सके हैं। नतीजा यह है कि वे मजदूरों के साथ ठीक सलूक नहीं करते हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि पुराने पी० डब्लू० डी० कोड के अन्दर तब्दीली की आवश्यकता है और दूसरी चीजों में भी तब्दीली की आवश्यकता है। जहाँ गवर्नमेंट के मजदूर हैं वहाँ गवर्नमेंट को कैपिटलिस्टों की तरह काम नहीं करना चाहिये बल्कि सही तौर पर उन को वह रास्ता दिखाना चाहिये जो कि दूसरे उद्योगपतियों के लिये नमूना बने।

इसी तरह से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि फ़ूड सबसिडी (food subsidy) से जो हालत पैदा हुई है उस के सम्बन्ध में मजदूरों को काफ़ी शिकायत है। कम से कम इतना अवश्य होना चाहिये कि जो लोग दो सौ रुपये से कम वेतन पाते हैं उन को पुराने भाव पर अन्न दिया जा सके। इस किस्म का कोई न कोई प्रबन्ध अवश्य होना चाहिये।

मैं कुछ और चीजें भी कहना चाहता था लेकिन समय नहीं है। अंत में केवल इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि आइन्दा साल में यदि हम लोग कुछ भी अमली तौर पर मजदूरों के सम्बन्ध में कर सके तो मैं समझता हूँ कि मजदूरों को इस बात का काफ़ी विश्वास करा सकेंगे कि यह राज्य उन के लिये है और दर असल उन का अपना राज्य है यह भावना उन के अन्दर पैदा हो सकेगी।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri Vidyalankar (Jullundur): Sir, let me express my surprise to find so much negative criticism being voiced here rather than a positive approach being made to the various issues facing the House. Many things are said here which have no bearing on the reality of the situation. My surprise increased when I found that not even the Indian Trade Union Congress was spared from such criticism. It has been stated that the various labour laws are not being implemented. I, however, want to know what is the reason for that. The fact is that no labour laws can be fully implemented until a strong labour force is organised. Implementation of such laws depends largely on an organised labour force.

What is the present state of trade union movement? My feeling is that the trade union movement is so weak as it has never been at any time in the past. What is it that has rendered it so weak? During the last World War, many a political party used the various trade unions as a tool in the achievement of its objectives. Those people wanted to drag the workers into the war in the name of a 'Peoples' War'. They used this slogan in order to tie the labour to the chariot-wheel of their political policy. An attempt was thus made to organise the labour on the political lines with the result that the labour organisations were split up into numerous institutions. The common slogan of these smaller organisations was "Workers of the World unite", but in actual effect as a result of their policy, the workers were split up in many trade unions and instead of being 'united' they got 'divided'. Objections are, however, being raised against the Indian National Trade Union Congress which has striven to organise the trade union movement on non-political lines.

I hold that any Government can legitimately feel proud of the many legislations that have been enacted during the last five years. In the last fifty years, not all the governments put together have put through such legislations for the working classes as our Government have succeeded to enact and thereby benefit the workers. I think this is a matter the truth of which nobody can doubt. I agree with my other hon. friends that the tribunals set up in pursuance of the Industrial Disputes Act, take a long time in deciding the cases. Yet I want to add that the tribunals have delivered many noteworthy judgments. By virtue of

these decisions many rights have been conceded which may verily be termed as "traditional law". These laws have gone a good way to protect workers' rights, that no law will ever be able to take away from them.

I, therefore, maintain that it is not correct to say that these laws have done no good to the workers or that the provisions of various labour legislations have not been implemented. The failure in implementation is due to the fact that labour organisations have been weak throughout. I have connections with many trade unions. Certain demands are put forward by the workers from time to time. A number of organisations take advantage of the situation and there is a tug of war between them to win the workers' support. The demands are made without proper thinking. Seldom attention is paid as to whether or not the demands could be accepted at all. Neither any consideration is given to the strength of a particular union. Moreover it is hardly kept in view as to what are the essential demands of the workers for which they are determined to fight as against the non-essential demands for which they are not so keen to launch a fight. A private talk with the union workers reveals their political objectives behind the agitation. In case of success all credit is claimed by the unions while the blame for failure is hurled upon the Government. This is a negative policy which is hardly conducive to the workers' good. Taken that way, no labour legislation can ever be expected to yield good results.

I want to assert that the policy of our Government is definitely a positive one. I do not believe that the policy of our Government *vis-a-vis* the disputes between the workers and the capitalists is a neutral one. It is absolutely without foundation to say that the policy of our Government is neutral. Government have certainly a positive policy and it is biased in favour of the workers. All legislations enacted during the recent years have been in their interest. If at all there was any flaw anywhere, it was the weak nature of the workers' organisations, reasons for which I have already stated. No party or group or, for that matter, any powerful party or group in this House supports capitalism or is in favour of introducing it in the field of production. The main feature of capitalism is that it aims at individual or class interest in production rather than have before it the public or the workers' interest. Its second feature is that it enriches those who are already rich enough and makes the poor poorer

[Shri Vidyalankar]

still. It prevents the flow of money into the hands of those poor persons who are able to work. A third feature is that in case of rationalization, an attempt to effect economy in expenditure is directed at the worker's wages rather than at the profits. It means that the rich persons' profits cannot be touched whereas any deductions may be allowed from the workers' wages. So far as I can see, it is a definite policy of our Government to remove these features. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Labour to see that these features are removed. I know that he has been a veteran leader of the trade union movement. I trust that he will do his best to remove these features and get for the workers what is rightfully theirs, thus ameliorating their condition to a certain extent.

It has just been stated that the need is not for the enactment of new legislations but that what is required is the consolidation of the position which we have attained. What is needed at present is to give the provisions of present legislations full effect and adopt to that end a definite and dynamic policy aimed at the all-round betterment of the workers.

Recently the need for providing incentive to capital was urged. The figures quoted by Dr. Lanka Sundaram prove that the workers have done their part of the job during the last five years. They have done their best to increase production, to restrict the number of strikes and reduce absenteeism. I, however, regret that the response from the capitalists has not been reciprocal. The efforts on their part to increase production have not been what they should have been. If capital needs incentive, it is equally necessary for the workers and it can only be given by conceding to the workers their rights and by following a policy which may definitely be biased in favour of the workers and not in favour of the capitalists. For that reason, I hold that the policy of hesitation and vacillation will not do. We must pursue a definite policy. I also maintain that proper co-ordination in this respect does not exist between the Centre and the various State Governments. In a number of our States an impression seems to work that our policy continues to be pro-capitalist rather than pro-labour. It surprises me to note that whenever there is a gathering or meeting of the workers where they voice certain demands, the policemen appear in the vicinity immediately. I feel that such things should be stopped. I am aware that it is not the policy of the Government, but some people in a few

States do resent such things and their complaint in this respect should be removed. The Government should avoid discouraging the workers in their agitations as far as possible.

Our policy should be to mobilise the labour. Without mobilising the labour and without giving proper encouragement to the working classes for increasing the production, the object of an increase in the production cannot be achieved. Today the biggest problem facing the country is that of production. Till there is an increase in our overall production, no hopes for an improvement in our economic situation can materialize. The need of the time is to encourage those who are actually toiling. If enthusiasm is absent in the workers, the responsibility for that has to be shared by all of us. They are not sure of receiving their due share for the efforts they may make to achieve the target of increased production. I think the blame for that must largely rest with the political parties opposed to the Congress. They instil a feeling among the workers that the present Government is not their own and that it is on the contrary opposed to their interests. This takes away their enthusiasm. In the present day conditions of the country, any person, who discourages the workers and brings their morale down instead of raising it, is certainly an obstruction in the way of the country's progress. I feel it is incumbent upon us all—irrespective of the fact whether we belong to the party in power or to any of the opposition groups—to assure the workers that whatever is being done is in their interests and that they will get their due share in all they may exert to achieve.

Much has been said about the Industrial Disputes Act and such other legislations. I feel it is high time that we make efforts in the matter of their implementation also. I am aware that at times cases remain pending for even two years. Further, I say it from my own experience that the industrialists always endeavour to have the case referred either to the tribunals or to the Appellate Court, because, being moneyed persons, there they can purchase justice. I therefore want that some steps should be taken to have an expeditious disposal of the cases.

So far as the implementation of the Factory Act is concerned, I feel the number of inspectors appointed for this purpose is very inadequate and, as such, the kind of inspection that should be carried out there is not being done. Arrangements, therefore, should be made for the non-official visitors also who should be given authority to visit

these factories. It will bring about wholesome improvements in the working conditions of the factories in general.

I feel that just at present there are three vital needs for which we have to provide. Firstly we should accord recognition to the various trade unions, secondly keeping in view that these legislations are being implemented even in the capitalist countries, we should not feel hesitant to do the same. The third thing is that unilateral decisions for reductions in wages should not be allowed. If at all a reduction becomes necessary, it should be decided through the conciliation machinery and the reduction should be enforced only after the Labour Ministry has given their permission. The same principle should hold good in the matter of unilateral retrenchment. Just now the problem of retrenchment has become of the gravest importance in this country and, in particular, since the recent slump. Another matter to which I want to draw your attention is that the various labour laws are not made applicable to the manual workers engaged in a number of big schemes, viz. Bhakra, Nangal, Hirakud etc. I want to lay particular emphasis on the Bhakra project. Neither the Factory Act nor the Payment of Wages Act nor any other labour legislation is applicable to their case. The result is that as many as 10,000 workers are deprived of the benefits that have been given under these laws.

I suggest that the definition of "a factory" should be a bit liberally amended and made applicable to the various river-valley projects as also to the undertakings where there is a concentration of labour. I have some experience about the Bhakra Nangal project. Many an occasion arises when the workers there cannot avail of the benefits accorded to them by the Workmen's Compensation Act. There are several cases and accidents, but the workers are unable to get any relief. I want that a full investigation should be undertaken and subsequently Workmen's Compensation Act should be applied in the fullest measure. Besides, there is a large number of workers employed in the various Government undertakings, in the P.W.D. and in Government factories. I know it is not their policy, yet the persons in charge of the Government undertakings do not seem to have discarded their age-old notions. They have not appreciated the trends of these changing times. The result is that their treatment towards the workers is not good. I feel that

modifications in the old P.W.D. Code are called for just as they are essential in some other respects. The Government should not treat their own workers in the way the capitalists do. They should rather create conditions which may set an ideal for the private industrialists.

Likewise I wish to say that the workers have a complaint in regard to the position created by the withdrawal of food-subsidies. The least we should do is that persons drawing less than Rs. 200 per mensem should be allowed to purchase their ration at the old rates. Some such arrangements must be made.

I wished to refer to some more points but my time has run out. In conclusion I want to say only this much that any practical efforts on our part during the coming years towards the amelioration of workers' conditions can make them feel that this is a Government of their own in the real sense of the term.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): My task has been considerably lightened by my hon. friend, Mr. R. Venkataraman, who anticipated my criticisms and answered them. My difficulty is that while he in some measure accepted the validity of my criticisms, he said there was no necessity for me to enunciate them.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Will you restate them?

Shri Damodara Menon: I would say that to some extent, he intelligently anticipated them. Therefore, he was full of explanations which were very much in the nature of an apology. He became also to some extent philosophical and he said life was not compartmentalised or something to that effect. I agree with him that we cannot compartmentalise life or for that matter any of the major problems that confront the country. But my difficulty is that in solving labour problems, in implementing legislation that has already been placed on the Statute Book the Government has been following a policy which tends to sidetrack the issue and also give a false hope to the labourers. Mr. Venkataraman, to some extent, admitted that. He said: 'If we do not legislate, some sections of labour will remain unsatisfied and therefore it is to satisfy all section of labour that we are bringing forward all these pieces of legislation and placing them on the Statute Book.'

[Shri Damodara Menon]

Now, I do not think the labour population of this country, the working class, will be satisfied by mere legislation. The satisfaction comes only when these Acts are implemented. Now, my difficulty with our Congress Government has always been this: they promise very many things, they take the edge off our criticism by even passing legislation, but when it comes to implementation they really slide back. Here also the Government and the Labour Minister—I am not referring to Mr. Giri but to the previous Labour Minister—have been enunciating certain principles to which we cannot take any exception. But it is in the implementation of those principles that we find that the Government are not serious.

* * * * *

What I mean is that when we enunciate certain general principles and when we place new hopes before the public by even enacting legislation on that basis, it is up to us to see that they are really implemented. Now my friend said that in regard to the Minimum Wages Act and several other pieces of legislation the Government would in the course of a few years probably implement them. Well, my criticism about this implementation has been, therefore, to a large extent admitted by my friend. I would remind you here that this criticism is also generally accepted by the Congress High Command, for I read in the Election Manifesto of the Congress issued in July, 1951 the following statement. They admit that there is much room for improving the implementation of labour legislation and then this Congress Manifesto goes on further to say that "the machinery and procedure relating to arbitration and adjudication of disputes should be so improved as to secure their settlement based on the principles of social justice and with the least expenditure of time and money. Legal technicalities, formalities and appeals should be reduced to the minimum". Now, this is what the Congress Manifesto itself says.

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.-South):
You do not agree with it?

Shri Damodara Menon: I do agree with it. But you do not implement it. That is my criticism. Therefore my criticism is what is accepted by the Congress itself. And when I plead that it must be implemented, they need not be apologetic and they need not give excuses.

*Expunged as ordered by the Deputy-Speaker.

Now, my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, pointed out that there must be a radical revision of the Congress policy regarding labour. I agree with him. In examining this question, we must look to the attitude of the Government regarding their relationship with labour as well as the employers. The attitude of the Government when the Britishers were ruling here was one of hostility to labour. I can quote Mr. Giri himself who said—I think it was in 1932—that the moment a dispute was apprehended, the police and the magistracy rushed to the rescue of the employer while the workers were left to their own devices to fight against oppression. That was the experience of labour, the working classes when the Britishers were here. I do not say that there has not been any change, but I want the Government to examine whether the change has been of such a nature as to make a difference. I think it was the other day that a discussion was raised on the floor of the House about the firing resorted to against railway employees at Gorakhpur. In the State of Travancore we have the recent experience of the police and the magistracy resorting to firing at Pasumalai. We can cite many other instances after the attainment of independence where the arms of the executive Government have always been stretched for the protection of the employers and very often to the detriment of the workers. This policy really must undergo a change. I do not mean to say that the Ministers at the top are not aware of that fact. Probably they are. But down below, when it comes to execution of policy, the magistracy and the police even today are adopting the old policy. Whenever a strike takes place, they get panicky. And when there is no strike, generally the Government machinery is so indifferent that they do not go into the difficulties of the workers.

My hon. friend Mr. Venkataraman was at pains to show that the I.N.T.U.C. Organisation had nothing to do with the Congress. I do not want to contest that issue with him, but I hope he will not contradict me when I say that the I.N.T.U.C. has been receiving a kind of fostering care at the hands of the Government which is in the nature of help. I can even say, it is a paternal care, tender care, that they have been receiving. (Interruption.) Yes, an hon. Member corrects me and says it is maternal care. Now, there have been appeals on the floor of the

House both from my friend Mr. Venkataraman as also from Dr. Lanka Sundaram that there must be unity in labour ranks. Every one desires unity. But so long as there is some kind of partiality towards a trade union which supports the Government always, can there be unity? I can show examples where the Government has shown some kind of partiality to the I.N.T.U.C. In Bombay, the Government has gone on amending the Industrial Relations Act with the express purpose of giving to the I.N.T.U.C. the sole right of representing textile workers in Bombay. In Uttar Pradesh, the Government framed rules giving representation solely to the I.N.T.U.C. and authorising the I.N.T.U.C. to nominate representatives on works Committees.

Shri Venkataraman: It is because they represent the largest section of the workers in the country.

Shri Damodara Menon: My hon. Friend has posed a question now. The claim of the I.N.T.U.C. is that they represent the largest section of the workers. How can that be tested?

Shri Venkataraman: Test it by inquiry.

Shri Damodara Menon: I put it to the Hon. Minister that when there is a conflict between two labour organisations as to their representative character, we should put it to the test by a referendum. That is the most democratic way of settling a dispute. I want to know whether, when they give representation and also grant favours and invite labour to send representatives, they will apply this test and select for recognition only those Labour Union which command the majority of the workers in any particular industry. I suggest to the hon. Labour Minister that if that procedure is adopted, probably the criticism that the Government is following a policy of encouragement and partiality to the I.N.T.U.C. will disappear.

My hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram pointed out that the Labour Minister has made a statement recently wherein he has said that legislation may now not be given so much importance. When I read the statement, I did not understand it in the way Dr. Lanka Sundaram understood it. When we are dealing with the problem of industrial peace, it is primarily our concern to consider the two aspects of industrial peace. One is the preventive aspect, and the other, the curative aspect. Now, in all problems concerning health, it is the tendency to give prominence to the preventive aspect more than to the curative aspect. When I refer to the prevention aspect

in labour relations, it must be the concern of all of us—the trade unions and also the Government—to see that we evolve such machinery within an industry as will make it possible for us to prevent industrial unrest arising. That would be the best way of solving the problem. Now, Government have under the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 instituted works committees. I think their idea is to see that representatives of Labour and of employers sit together and solve their problems so that it may not be necessary for them to put the curative process into operation. Now, my difficulty is this. These works committees have been a thorough failure in this country. The reason for that is, first of all, the employers do not want them. And the other difficulty is that Government have not given them sufficient powers so that they can be effective in any industrial disputes. If you want these works committees to be effective, or any such organisation like the Whitley Councils in England to be effective, you must keep in mind two principles—two preventive principles, I will call them. One is democracy in industry, and the other is profit-sharing. If you apply these two principles and allow these committees to work on that basis, it would be possible for them to be effective. Today they cannot discuss major problems of policy—of work, of wages. All these things can be settled in these committees only if there is democracy, if election are properly conducted, and also if these committees function in such a way that there is the principle of profit-sharing. Profit-sharing implies that the employer accept the principle that the employee is a sharer in the business and is equally entitled to a portion of the profits. That principle has to be accepted. Now my hon. friend say that there is the bonus system. But today bonus is merely regarded as *ex gratia* payment. It must be considered as a right, and it must be based upon the principle of profit-sharing.

Then, I come to the other aspect, the curative aspect. Here also I must say the Government's policy has thoroughly failed. My hon. friend has already referred to the industrial tribunals, which are functioning in such a way that they have really lost the confidence of the Trade Unions. My hon. friend narrated one of his experiences. I know of several cases where industrial tribunals have spent more than two or three years in giving an award. And now, because of the institution of the appellate tribunal, the

[Shri Damodara Menon]

difficulties have been multiplied. Trade Unions are very poor and they cannot afford to take up litigation in distant places and employ so many lawyers. The legal details have gone to such voluminous proportions that it is not possible for the tribunals to function effectively. So, I agree with the friends who pointed out—and Mr. Venkataraman also agreed—that these industrial tribunals must be scrapped, or that they must be so modified that they can function effectively.

There is another aspect of Labour Union activity to which I want to make a reference. I mean the social security aspect of trade unionism. The Government have been trying in a mild way to introduce it. There is the Employees' State Insurance Act. Previously the Congress Organisation in their Election Manifesto of 1935 particularly referred to it; they said that the Congress, when it came into power, would take measures to see that unemployment and sickness benefit would be provided. But in their latest Election Manifesto that portion has been omitted. I do not know how it has been done. In any case the Government's attitude and also the way they have been dealing with the problem of social security leaves room for much improvement and invites much criticism. Here also delaying tactics are adopted. The Employees' State Insurance Act was passed in 1948, and it is going to be put into practice only in 1952, and that too, only in Delhi and Kanpur. Unless we are able to give unemployment relief and institute other social security schemes, you cannot say we are living in a progressive State or dealing fairly with labour.

One more point and I shall finish. The legislative enactments or legal remedies will be effective only when we have arrived at the stage when the working class will be able to have ample share in government. I will go further and say that these remedies will be effective only when the voice of the workers will be predominant in our Legislatures. Then alone these measures will be successful. I do not know what the views of the Government are in these matters.

I will just quote what our leaders were thinking previously. I will quote what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said when he presided over the tenth Session of the All India Trade Union Congress. He exhorted the labourers to hold fast to the ideal of a Socialist

order of society in which the interests of the workers will be supreme. And Mr. V. V. Giri in his Presidential address—I think in 1932 to a Labour Conference—said:

"We should not rest satisfied until we have established a Socialist State and if we remain satisfied with anything short of it, we deserve to be called as 'reformists'. If we do anything to prevent or impede securing our legitimate demands, no matter what our professed creed might be, we deserve to be called 'agents of capitalism'."

I do not know what Mr. Giri's views are at present. (Interruption).

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: We are going to hear him now.

Shri Damodara Menon: I hope that when he is getting mixed up with the mixed economy, he will not turn himself to be a reformist because the labour policy is mainly dependent upon economic policy. I do not use the other term "an agent of capitalism" and I hope he will not be like that. I would request him to mark those words which were uttered by him with such sincerity when he was one of the leading lights of labour movement in the country. I only remind him of this in the hope that when he is implementing labour legislation and also when he is thinking of new legislation and framing the Government's labour policy in general, he will not go far astray from these ideals which he held so dear at one time.

श्री गणपति राम : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता होती है कि आज आप ने मुझे भी अपनी भावनाओं को व्यक्त करने का अवसर दिया और इस के लिये मैं आप का आभारी हूँ। साथ ही साथ मैं अपने पार्टी व्हिप (Party whip) का भी आभारी हूँ कि उन्होंने भी आज मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया।

मैं आप के समझ तथा हाउस के समझ इस बात को रखना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में आज पक्कीसों किस्म के श्रमिक रहते हैं और उन की समस्याएँ भिन्न भिन्न हैं।

यद्यपि बहुत से मजदूर ऐसे हैं जिन की समस्याएं कुछ माने में तो एक सी हैं लेकिन बहुत मानों में वह अलग अलग भी हैं और जिन का हल करना आवश्यक है, जैसे कि आज खानों में काम करने वाले मजदूर हैं, चाहे वे कोयले की खानों में काम करने वाले हों, चाहे लोहे की खानों में काम करने वाले हों, या सोना या मैनगेनीज या टिन की खानों में काम करने वाले हों। इस के अलावा फ़ैक्टरी वर्कर्स (factory workers) भी हैं, चाहे वे काटन मिल में, सिल्क मिल्स में या बूलने मिल्स में काम करते हों। वैसे ही शुगर मिल्स के लेबरर्स हैं, टी फ़्रील्ड लेबरर्स हैं, पोर्ट डांक लेबरर्स हैं, और रेलवे वर्कर्स भी हैं। फिर एग््रीकल्चर लेबरर्स तथा और भी लेबरर्स हैं जो छोटे छोटे उद्योग धन्वीं में लगे हुए हैं। इन के अलावा ऐसे भी श्रमिक हैं जो कि म्यूनिसिपैलिटी के अन्दर सैनीटरी लेबरर्स (sanitary labourers) कहे जाते हैं। कुछ ऐसे भी श्रमिक हैं जो कि चमड़े का काम करते हैं या पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० में हैं।

उन की समस्याओं पर अन्य महानुभावों ने जरा भी प्रकाश नहीं डाला है। मैं उन विषयों पर आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि उन के लिये भी आप का ध्यान होना चाहिये। यद्यपि मैं जानता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की करीब ९० फ़ी सदी जनता देहातों में रहती है और उस में से करीब ७० फ़ी सदी आज श्रमिक का काम करते हैं लेकिन जब मैं देखता हूँ कि उन श्रमिकों के लिये सरकार की तरफ़ से कितना ध्यान दिया गया, तथा पिछले वर्षों से अब उन की क्या उन्नति हुई है, तो मुझे जितनी प्रसन्नता होनी चाहिये उतनी नहीं होती। मैं आप के सामने कुछ फ़िगर्स रखना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ पर कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर सन्

१९३९ में १६,२६,९४२ वर्कर्स प्रति दिन काम करते थे वहाँ पर आज यद्यपि ४८ लाख लेबरर्स प्रति दिन काम कर रहे हैं, लेकिन यहाँ पर आप यह देखें कि सन् १९४९ में २४,३३,९६६ वर्कर्स प्रति दिन काम करते थे। आज जिस पैमाने पर लेबरर्स की समस्या हल होनी चाहिये थी उस पैमाने पर हल नहीं हो सकी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज जितने श्रमिक हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर हैं उन में से पांच प्रति शत से ज्यादा की समस्या हल नहीं हुई है। अभी बाकी श्रमिकों की समस्या हल करने के लिये सरकार को काफ़ी ध्यान देना होगा।

जहाँ तक काटन मिल्स का सम्बन्ध है आप देखें कि सन् १९४९ में प्रति दिन काम करने वाले मजदूर ७,३४,६०२ थे, रजिस्टर में जिनका नाम दर्ज था वह ८,०३,०३८ थे। सन् १९५१ में प्रति दिन काम करने वालों की संख्या ७,१४,४७९ है वहाँ रजिस्टर में जिन के नाम दर्ज हैं उन की संख्या ७,८५,१३४ है। जनवरी सन् १९५२ में जब कि रजिस्टर में उन की संख्या ८,०६,७४८ है, प्रति दिन काम करने वालों की संख्या ७,२९,८७८ है। मुझे इन फ़िगर्स को देख कर सन्तोष नहीं होता क्योंकि जिस पैमाने पर प्रति दिन काम करने वाले मजदूरों की संख्या बढ़नी चाहिये थी उस पैमाने पर आज नहीं बढ़ सकी है। सरकार को आज ऐसे साधन अस्तित्व में आने चाहिये जिस से कि उन के ऊपर जो मिल मालिकों की तरफ़ से या काम कराने वालों की तरफ़ से जुल्म ढाये जाते हैं वह कम हों और श्रमिकों में यह प्रोत्साहन पैदा करना चाहिये कि उन की संख्या दिनोंदिन बढ़े।

जहाँ तक कोयले की खानों के मजदूरों का सवाल है आप देखें कि सन् १९५१ में ३,३८,७०९ मजदूर प्रति दिन काम करते

[श्री गणपति राम]

ये वहाँ सन् १९५२ में आज ३,४९,४३० मजदूर काम करते हैं। आज जब कि देश स्वतन्त्र हो गया है और देश में कौयले की तथा और भी दूसरे खनिज पदार्थों की आवश्यकता है तो जिस पैमाने पर मजदूरों को लगाना चाहिये और उन की संख्या को बढ़ाना चाहिये उस पैमाने पर मजदूरों की संख्या में उन्नति नहीं हुई और उन को उस काम में नहीं लगाया गया।

हम देखते हैं कि जहाँ मिल मजदूरों की तरफ़ तो सरकार का ध्यान कुछ पैमाने पर दिया गया है, लेकिन देहातों में काम करने वाले श्रमिकों, जिन को खेतिहर मजदूर कहा जाता है, जिन को ऐग्रियन लेबर (agrarian labour) कहा जाता है, जिन को ऐग्रीकल्चरल लेबर (agricultural labour) कहा जाता है और जो सदियों से सताये गये हैं तथा जिन का आज भी संगठन अब तक नहीं हो सका है और जिन को आज भी उचित मजदूरी नहीं मिल पाती है, उन की ओर सरकार का ध्यान नहीं गया है। हम देखते हैं कि आज भी उन को छुट्टी के घंटे में कोई राहत नहीं मिल पाती है। आज भी उन के लड़के बच्चे काम करने के बावजूद भी पूरी मजदूरी नहीं पाते हैं। आज भी उन से बेगार ली जाती है, यद्यपि कांस्टीट्यूशन (Constitution) के अनुसार यह नाजायज है, उन के लिये आज सरकार को ध्यान देना होगा। क्योंकि आज हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर देहातों में काम करने वाले ऐग्रियन लेबरर्स की संख्या ज्यादा है। जहाँ तक कि मिल लेबरर्स (mill labourers) का सवाल है उन के लिये सरकार ने बहुत सा क़ानून बनाया है। मुझे तो यह कहते हुए प्रसन्नता होती है कि सरकार ने मिल

लेबरर्स के लिये एम्प्लॉईज प्रोविडेंट फ़ंड ऑर्डिनेंस (Employees Provident Fund Ordinance) जारी किया, यद्यपि यह बात अवश्य है कि जिस पैमाने पर उन को राहत मिलनी चाहिये थी उस पैमाने पर नहीं मिली है। या तो मिल मालिक ध्यान नहीं दे रहे हैं या सरकार की तरफ़ से जिस पैमाने पर ध्यान देना चाहिये उस के अन्दर कोई ढिलाई है।

मैं वह भी कह सकता हूँ कि आज बहुत सी मिलों में झगड़े हो जाते हैं और आज भी बहुत से मजदूर झगड़ा हो जाने पर निकाल दिये जाते हैं। उन की मांगें उचित होती हैं और उन को फिर से मिलों में रखना चाहिये लेकिन कुछ ऐसे भी अवसर देखे जाते हैं कि उन की उचित मांगों के रहते हुए भी वह मिलों में फिर नहीं रखे जाते। मैं सरकार से यह अनुरोध करूँगा कि ऐसे झगड़ों को हल करने के लिये या तो सरकार की तरफ़ से कोई आरबिट्रेशन (arbitration) होना चाहिये या मिल मालिकों और मजदूरों के बीच समझौता कराने के लिये कोई ऐसा साधन अस्तित्व में करना चाहिये जिस से वह मजदूर जो कि हड़ताल करने पर या कोई ऐसा काम करने पर निकाल दिये जाते हैं, न निकाले जायें। मिनिमम वेजेज ऐक्ट (Minimum Wages Act) पर मेरे बहुत से भाइयों ने प्रकाश डाला है, हालांकि वह क़ानून पास हो गया है लेकिन आज भी यह देहातों में चालू नहीं किया जा रहा है और आज भी देहात की जनता और देहात के मजदूर उस क़ानून से कोई फ़ायदा नहीं उठा रहे हैं। मुझे तो रिपोर्ट आन दी बकिंग आफ़ मिनिस्ट्री आफ़ लेबर को पढ़ने से यह

भी मालूम हुआ कि उस का इम्प्लीमेंटेशन (implementation) ३१ दिसम्बर, १९५३ तक के लिये छोड़ दिया गया है, हालांकि मेरे विचार से तो उस को और पहले लागू होना चाहिये था। मुझे तो यह कहते हुए अफ़सोस होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जहां पर इतनी संख्या में लेबरर्स रहते हैं, उन का आंबोलन बहुत दिन पहले होना चाहिये था। इस के लिये यद्यपि मैं समझता हूँ कि संसार के इतिहास में इंग्लैंड ही एक ऐसा देश है जहां कि मजदूरों ने सब से पहले हड़ताल की और आन्दोलन शुरू किया, लेकिन हमारे देश में जहां कि इतने मजदूर और श्रमिक लोग रहते हैं उन को तो जरूर करनी चाहिये थी, लेकिन हमारे देश पर विदेशी शासकों का राज्य था, इसलिये उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान के मजदूरों और श्रमिकों की तरफ़ ध्यान नहीं दिया, उस वक्त जब हम गुलाम थे, तब तो इसे बर्दाश्त भी किया जा सकता था, लेकिन आज तो अपनी गवर्नमेंट है, इसलिये मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार को अब मजदूरों की हालत की तरफ़ ज़्यादा ध्यान देना चाहिये, नहीं तो उन के दिलों में भी एक असन्तोष इस किस्म का पैदा हो सकता है जो देश में एक गड़बड़ी भी मचा सकता है। लेकिन अफ़सोस के साथ मुझे यह कहना पड़ता है कि मैं देखता हूँ कि आज भी देहातों में गांव के गांव ऐसे हैं जहां के मजदूरों से, उन के लड़कों बच्चों और रिस्तेदारों से भी जबर्दस्ती काम लिया जाता है। हालत यह है कि आज जब वह पुलिस में कोई रिपोर्ट लिखाने जाते हैं, तो पुलिस उस पर कोई ध्यान नहीं देती। मैं तो आज श्रम मंत्री महोदय से ही नहीं बल्कि सरकार से प्रार्थना व अनुरोध करूंगा कि फ़ोर्सेड लेबर (forced labour) के जो नियम बनाये गये हैं उन को कागनेजेबुल आफ़ेन्स

(cognizable offence) करार दे कर फ़ोर्सेड लेबर को रोका जाय। कलकत्ता में भी जहां इतनी संख्या में डोक लेबरर्स (Dock labourers) काम करते हैं, उन पर अब भी ज़्यादा ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता, जहां तक उन की सर्विसेज (services) को रेगुलेट (regulate) करने का सवाल है, उस पर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता। मैं सरकार से भी इस विषय में अनुरोध करूंगा कि उन की सर्विसेज को रेगुलर बनाने के लिये सरकार को कोई ऐसा मेजर अख्यार करना चाहिये जिस पर वहां के अधिकारी ध्यान दें तथा उन को कैंजुएल लीव (casual leave) भी मिलनी चाहिये, इस पर अधिकारी ध्यान नहीं देते। इस तरह की और बहुत सी रक़रूटमेंट (Recruitment) वॉरर की शिकायतें मजदूरों को हैं। इसलिये मैं सरकार का ध्यान इन की तरफ़ भी आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। मैं ने इस रिपोर्ट में पढ़ा कि लेबर आफ़िसर्स, लेबर वेलफ़ेयर आफ़िसर्स और सिविलियन आफ़िसर्स (civilian Officers) जो चुने गये, तो उन में से देहात के कितने लेबर आफ़िसर्स चुने गये? मैं सरकार से यह भी अनुरोध के साथ कहता हूँ कि शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स में से भी आदमी चुने जाय ताकि उन को प्रोत्साहन मिले और यह लोग जा कर स्वयं अपनी समस्याओं को हल कर सकें।

जहां तक मजदूरों की समस्या का सवाल है, आज उनकी बहुत सी समस्याओं को हल करना शेष है, जैसे कि उन के रहने की उचित व्यवस्था और अभी हाल ही में प्रधान मंत्री पंडित नहरू ने जब कानपुर गये थे तो उन्होंने मजदूरों की उन गंदी बस्तियों को देखा कि वह वहां कंरी दयनीय और अस्वास्थ्यकर अवस्था में अपना जीवन बिता रहे हैं, उन के बाल बच्चे किस बरी दशा

[श्री गणपति राम]

में रह रहे हैं और मुझे यह कहते हुए प्रसन्नता होती है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने उनकी दशा को देख कर काफ़ी रुपया उन के गृह सुधार के लिये दिया। मैं सरकार से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि आज भी बहुत सी मिलों में चाहे छोटी हों और चाहे बड़ी हों मजदूरों के लिये घरों की उचित व्यवस्था नहीं है, उस की तरफ़ सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये और समुचित प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये। इस के अलावा जिन मजदूरों को अब भी डियरनेस अलाउन्स (Dearness allowance) नहीं मिलता है या अपर्याप्त रूप में मिलता है उन को दिलवाने की सरकार कृपा करे।

मुझे तो यह कहते हुए कुछ खेद होता है कि आज भी डाक मजदूरों को एक रुपया प्रति दिन के हिसाब से मजदूरी मिलती है। काटेन मिल्स में काम करने वालों की औसत मजदूरी भिन्न भिन्न शहरों में इस प्रकार है और आज भी बम्बई में एक मजदूर को ३० रुपया प्रति माह के हिसाब से मजदूरी मिलती है, अहमदाबाद में २८ रुपया, मद्रास में २६ रुपया, कानपुर में ३० रुपया और पश्चिमी बंगाल में २० रुपया २ आने मिलता है, हालांकि कुछ मिलों ने अपने यहां मजदूरों की वेजेज तथा डियरनेस अलाउन्स को बढ़ा दिया है। जैसे कि बम्बई में ५५ रुपये ६ आने अहमदाबाद में ६३ रुपये १३ आने, मद्रास में ४२ रुपये ९ आने, कानपुर में ५४ रुपये १३ आने कर दिये हैं, लेकिन पश्चिमी बंगाल ने अब तक ३० रुपये की रक्खा है यह जनवरी सन् १९५१ के स्टैटिस्टिक्स (statistics) में ने आप को बतलाये। मार्च १९५२ में बम्बई में ५६ रुपये ६ आने, अहमदाबाद में ६६ रुपये ८ आने मद्रास में ४४ रुपये ४

आने कानपुर में ५० रुपये ५ आने डियरनेस अलाउन्स रखा है। लेकिन वेस्ट बंगाल ने अभी तीस रुपया ही डियरनेस अलाउन्स अपने यहां रखा है इसी तरह अगर आप खानों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों की दशा पर ध्यान देंगे तो आप को मालूम होगा कि जनवरी १९५१ में झरिया के खान में काम करने वाले मजदूरों को ४ रुपये ९ आने ९ पाई प्रति सप्ताह मजदूरी मिलती थी और ओवर वेजेज (over wages) मिलाकर उन को हफ्ते भर में १२ रुपये १५ आने १० पाई मिलती थी। सन् १९५२ में उनकी अस्ली मजदूरी ४ रुपये ८ आने ५ पाई है और दूसरे ओवर वेजेज मिलाकर १२ रुपये १० आने १ पाई प्रति सप्ताह मिल रही है। वहीं हालत रानीगंज के मजदूरों की भी है। रानीगंज में १९५१ में ५ रुपये ९ आने ६ पाई अस्ली मजदूरी थी और ओवर वेजेज मिलाकर उन को ११ रुपये ११ आने मजदूरी मिला करती थी और सन् १९५२ में अस्ली मजदूरी कुछ बढ़ा कर ६ रुपया १ आना ६ पाई कर दी गई और अदर ओवर वेजेज (other over wages) मिलाकर ११ रुपये १२ आने १ पाई मजदूरी प्रति सप्ताह उन को पड़ती थी। यही मजदूरी आज तक उन को मिलती है जो कि शायद १२ आने प्रति दिन के हिसाब से ज्यादा नहीं पड़ती है। यह कितने दुःख और अफसोस की बात है कि इतनी कम तो उन को मजदूरी मिलती है। इस के अलावा उन के लिये घरों की उचित व्यवस्था नहीं है, शिक्षा की कोई समुचित व्यवस्था नहीं, उन की औख्तों के लिये काम की कोई उचित व्यवस्था नहीं और उन लोगों के आमोद प्रमोद का कोई माकूल इन्तज़ाम नहीं है। जहां तक मैं जानता हूं, और जैसा कि कुछ माननीय सदस्यों

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has taken more than 15 minutes.

श्री गणपति राम : बस थोड़ा समय और चाहता हूँ । कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid the hon. Member may not be able to finish. I will have to call the hon. Minister.

श्री गणपति राम : दो मिनट में मैं खत्म कर दूंगा ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : हर एक आदमी दो मिनट मांगता है, मैं क्या करूँ ?

श्री गणपति राम : मैं समझता हूँ माननीय मंत्री इस पर एतराज नहीं करेंगे । मैं केवल दो मिनट और लेना चाहता हूँ । मुझे यह कहना है कि आज भी देहातों में जैसी छुआ छूत की समस्या चल रही है वैसी ही हालत में ने अपनी आंखों से मिलों में देखी है । मिलों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों में भी छुआ छूत की समस्या बड़े जोरों पर चल रही है । अपने को उच्च जाति का कहने वाले मजदूर दूसरी छोटी जाति के कहे जानेवाले मजदूरों से खाने, पीने, उठने बैठने मिलने जुलने में छुआ छूत करते हैं । इस के लिये भी सरकार की ओर से ठोस कदम होना चाहिये । इसी तरह से उन के लिये सिकनेस रिलीफ (sickness relief) या और जो सुविधायें हैं उन का प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये । जो मजदूर काम करते समय बीमार पड़ जाते हैं या उन को कोई शारीरिक तकलीफ हो जाती है तो मिल मालिको को ऐसे आदेश होने चाहिये कि उन की मिल में काम करने वाले मजदूरों को इस के लिये पूरी सुविधा हो । उन मजदूरों के बाल बच्चों के

लिये ट्रेनिंग फ़ैसिलिटीज़ (training facilities) होनी चाहिये ताकि अच्छे से अच्छे श्रमिक पैदा हो सकें । साथ साथ उन की नौकरियों को परमानेंट करार दिया जाय न कि सिर्फ़ टैम्पोरेरी (temporary) रखा जाय । मैं रेलवे श्रमिकों के सम्बन्ध में भी आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ । जहाँ उन के लिये सरकार ने ग्रेन शाप्स (grain shops) खोली हैं, तथा उन के लिये फ़िक्स्ड अवसे (fixed hours) का इन्तज़ाम किया है, उन के लड़के बच्चों के लिये पढ़ने और कार्य देने की भी व्यवस्था करें ।

[English translation of the above Speech]

Shri Ganpati Ram (Jaunpur Distt.—East—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, I am glad to have got this opportunity of expressing my views and I thank you for it. I am also grateful to the Party Whip for having given me an opportunity to speak to-day.

There are dozens of kinds of labourers in India and their problems are variegated. Although in a way the problems of great many of the labourers are alike, yet in other ways they are different and it is imperative to solve them. Take, for instance the labourers who work in the mines. Whether they work in coal mines, or iron mines or gold, manganese and tin mines, they are a class by themselves. There are factory workers, may they work in cotton mills, silk mills or woollen mills. Similarly there are sugar mill labourers, tea field labourers, port dock labourers and railway workers. Then there are the agricultural labourers and those labourers who are engaged in small-scale industries. Besides these there are the sanitary labourers who work in the Municipalities and others who are engaged in leather industry or in the P.W.D.

None of the speakers has thrown any light on the problems of these labourers. Their problems certainly deserve to be attended to. Nearly 90 per cent. of the people in India live in the villages and nearly 70 per cent. of them are labourers, but the attention

[Shri Ganpati Ram]

paid to them by the Government or the progress made by them in the last few years does not give me as much pleasure as it ought to. I shall place some figures before you. Whereas in 1939 the number of labourers working per day in India was 1,626, 942, in 1949 their number was 2,433,966, and today their number has risen to 48 lakhs. But their problems have not been tackled on the same scale in which their number has increased. I think that problems of barely 5 per cent. of the labourers in India have been solved. The Government shall have to devote considerable attention to wards the solving of the problems of the rest of the labourers.

So far as cotton Mills are concerned, the number of labourers working in them per day in 1949 was 7,34,602 and the number of those who were registered was 8,03,038. In 1951 the number of labourers working per day was 7,14,479 and the number of those registered was 7,85,134. In January 1952 while the number of labourers registered was 8,06,748, the number of labourers working per day was 7,29,878. I am not satisfied with these figures, because the number of labourers working per day has not increased in the desired proportion. Government should adopt measures to see that mill-owners or employers do not tyrannize over them, and that their number increases day by day.

As regards the coal mines, while in 1951 the number of labourers working in them per day was 3,38,709, today in 1952 it is 3,49,430. Now that the country is independent and there is great need for coal and other minerals, the number of labourers engaged in the industry has not increased in the desired proportion.

We find that while Government have paid some attention to the welfare of mill labourers, it has not paid any attention to the welfare of the village labourers, who are also known by various other names like farm labour, agrarian labour or agricultural labour, and who have been oppressed through the centuries and have so far not been able to form a united organisation and get proper wages. We find that they do not get any relief in their period of recess. Their children are not paid adequate wages for the work done by them. Although forced labour is against the principles of the Constitution, they are still subjected to this labour. Government will have to pay attention to this matter, as the number of agrarian labourers working in the villages is very large. Govern-

ment have made many laws for the benefit of mill labourers. I am glad to say that they have issued the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance for their benefit, but still they do not get adequate relief. Either the mill-owners are not paying adequate attention or the Government themselves are slack in their actions.

In many mills, disputes still arise and a large number of labourers are dismissed. When the demands are legitimate, they should be re-instated in their jobs, but on many occasions this is not done. I would urge upon the Government that for resolving such disputes, either some arbitration machinery should be set up on behalf of the Government or some measure should be adopted for settling the disputes between the mill-owners and the labourers, so that the dismissal of labourers, who go on strike or indulge in any other similar activities may be prevented. Many friends have thrown light on the Minimum Wages Act. Although this Act was passed long ago, it has not been enforced in the villages so far and the people and labourers in the villages are not getting any advantage of this Act. On a perusal of the Report on the working of the Ministry of Labour, I have learnt that its implementation has been postponed till December 31, 1953. In my opinion it should have been enforced much earlier. I am sorry to submit that though there are vast numbers of labourers in India, the labour movement was not started earlier. In the history of the world, England was perhaps the first country where the labourers first went on strike and started agitation. The same example should have been followed in India also, where the number of labourers and working people is so large. But as India was ruled over by foreigners, these foreign rulers did not pay any attention to them. Then we were slaves and this thing had to be tolerated. But now we have our own Government, therefore, it is all the more imperative that our Government should pay greater attention to the welfare of labourers. Otherwise the discontent in their minds may become a cause for disturbances in the country. I have to submit with regret that in many villages the labourers, their children and their relatives are still subjected to forced labour. Things have come to such a pass that the police does not pay any attention when they go to lodge a report. I would urge not only the hon. Minister of Labour, but the Government as a whole to make such rules according to which

forced labour should be stopped by making it a cognizable offence. The number of dock labourers in Calcutta is very large, but little attention is paid towards regulating their services. I would urge the Government to take steps to see that the authorities do not disregard the question of making their services regular and granting them casual leave. The labourers have other grievances also relating to recruitment and other matters. From the Report it appears that the number of persons hailing from villages among the candidates selected for the posts of Labour Officers, Labour Welfare Officers and Civilian Officers is very small. I would suggest that some persons belonging to the scheduled castes should also be selected for these posts, so that they may be encouraged to solve their own problems.

Many other problems of labour like the housing problem remain to be solved. Recently the Prime Minister Pandit Nehru visited Kanpur and saw how the labourers and their children were living there in dirty slums in extremely wretched and unhygienic conditions. I am glad to say that the Prime Minister has donated a considerable amount for the betterment of their housing conditions. There are no proper arrangements for living accommodation of labourers working in the mills, big or small. Government should make satisfactory housing arrangements for them. Government should also see that dearness allowance is paid to those labourers who do not get this allowance as yet or get insufficient amount. It is a matter of regret that the wage of dock labourers is Rs. 1 per day. The current average wages of labourers working in cotton mills in different cities are as follows: Bombay: Rs. 30 per mensem, Ahmedabad: Rs. 28 per mensem, Madras: Rs. 26 per mensem, Kanpur: Rs. 30 per mensem, West Bengal: Rs. 20 As. 2 ner mensem. Some of the Mills have increased the wages and dearness allowance of labourers. For instance the dearness allowance has been increased to Rs. 55/6/- in Bombay, Rs. 63/13/- in Ahmedabad, Rs. 42/9/- in Madras and Rs. 54/13/- in Kanpur, but in West Bengal the amount is still Rs. 30/-. These are the figures for January 1951. The figures for March, 1952 are as follows: Bombay Rs. 56/6/-, Ahmedabad Rs. 66/8/-, Madras Rs. 44/4/-, Kanpur Rs. 40/5/-. But in West Bengal the amount of dearness allowance remains stationary at Rs. 30/-. Similarly in January 1951 the wages of labourers working in Jharia Coal Mines were Rs. 4/9/9 per week and after adding over-wages it comes to Rs. 12/15/10 per week. In 1952

their basic wages are Rs. 4/8/5 and with over-wages it comes to Rs. 12/10/1 per week. The labourers of Raniganj also sail in the same boat. In 1951, the basic wages of Raniganj labourers were Rs. 5/9/6 per week. After adding over-wages they got Rs. 11/11/- per week. In 1952 the basic wages were increased to Rs. 6/1/6 and including over-wages the amount comes to about Rs. 11/12/1 per week, i.e. not more than As. 12 per day. It is a matter of extreme regret. Besides the low wages paid to them, there are no proper arrangements for their houses, for their education, for the employment of their women and for their recreation.

.So far as I know and as some hon. Members.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has taken more than 15 minutes.

Shri Ganpati Ram: I want a few minutes more. Some hon. Members...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid the hon. Member may not be able to finish. I will have to call the hon. Minister.

Shri Ganpati Ram: I shall finish in two minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Everybody asks for two minutes more, what can I do?

Shri Ganpati Ram: I hope the hon. Minister will have no objection. I shall take only two minutes more. I have seen with my own eyes that untouchability is as much prevalent in the mills as it is in the villages. It is rampant on a large scale among the mill labourers. The labourers who claim to belong to higher castes treat the labourers supposed to belong to lower castes as untouchables in their daily life. Government should take bold steps in this direction. Similarly arrangements should be made for sickness relief and other facilities. The millowners should have strict instructions to provide all facilities to those labourers who fall ill or are injured while on duty. Training facilities should be provided for the children of the labourers. Their services should be made permanent. The railway workers also deserve attention. While Government have opened grain-shops for them and have made provision for fixed hours of work, these arrangements should also be made for the education and employment of their children.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I propose calling upon the hon. Minister to reply at 12-15 sharp. If Mr. Veeraswamy is willing to finish his speech exactly at

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

12-15, I am willing to allow him; otherwise, I propose calling upon the hon. Minister straightaway.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reservé—Sch. Castes): Sir, I am grateful to you for the opportunity you have given me to speak on this important problem of labour. I want to speak not from the capitalistic point of view, but from the point of view of the most active people, the Scheduled Castes and the backward classes. I come from Madras State and I was elected to the House of the People from Mayuram constituency consisting of 6 Taluqas where the agricultural labourers were tortured by the Government and the landlords. The Malabar Special Police attacked the people. They hunted the youths and shot many persons to death. The Scheduled Castes did not demand free distribution of land. They did not demand exorbitant wages. They only demanded just and living wages from the landlords.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I want to make one observation. Whenever very serious allegations are made against Government, the hon. Member concerned must have something to stand on and some authority to go by. Just now, the hon. Member was saying that young men were hunted by the Police and shot to death. Unless he has some authority,—some strong authority,—such allegations going forth from this House would appear in all the papers and would be widely read all over the country and a very bad impression would be created. These allegations may be true, but unless there is some foundation or authority which he can cite, they ought not to be made.

Shri Veeraswami: Sir, what I say is not untrue. It is a fact and it is known to everybody in this House.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Veeraswamy: I mean all hon. Members from Madras State know very well.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would like to know on what authority he is making these statements.

Shri Veeraswamy: Sir, I have seen with my own eyes young men being shot to death by the Malabar Special Police.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): On a point of order, Sir. Is it open for any hon. Member to criticise the State Government here?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I agree with the point of order. No act of the State Government ought to be criticised here, because the State Government is not represented here.

Shri Veeraswamy: I do think that the Central Government also must have known what was going on in Madras State.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is another matter.

Shri Veeraswamy: Sir, I know the conditions of labourers in the Golden Rock Workshop, in the Dalmia Cement Co., in Binny and Co., Madras and in the many textile mills in Coimbatore and Madurai. The majority of the labourers, whether industrial or agricultural, are Scheduled Caste people and they are most backward. The Scheduled Castes have been segregated and are made to live in cheries. They are daily wage-earners. They work in the fields from morn till night, but though they work hard under the sweat of their brow they do not enjoy the harvest they produce. They do not get a living wage, either from the landlord or from the factory-owner.

And how about the labourers' food? It is not sumptuous at all. It is deficient in nutrition. Can they think of energy-giving, or body-building, or protective foods like eggs, fruits, milk and so on? They would have seen milk when it is milked from the cow, but they would not have drunk it. They would have seen eggs, but not eaten them. They would have seen fruits, but not eaten them. All this is because the wages given to them are not at all sufficient. The clothes they wear are mere rags. The houses in which they live are extremely poor. Their surroundings and environments are unhygienic. Can they think of educating their children? Can they think of sending their children to Universities and Colleges? Can they dream of sending their children to foreign countries, as the high-caste rich Hindus and capitalists can do?

The Government have placed so many Acts like the Minimum Wages Act and the Employees' State Insurance Act on the Statute Book. But the Minimum Wages Act which was passed in 1948 has not yet been imple-

mented throughout India. It has been implemented so far as the Departments of the Central Government are concerned, but we do not know the progress made by the State Governments. The time-limit for the implementation of that Act was fixed up to the 31st December, 1953, but while minimum wages for agricultural labourers have been fixed in the Punjab, Delhi, Cutch and Ajmer, nothing has been done in the other States. I know that in Madras this Act has not been implemented. The only other place where it has been implemented is Patna district in Bihar.

Sir, take the Employees' State Insurance Act of 1948. It has been enforced only in Delhi and Kanpur and even that only from 24th February, 1952. It is said that it will be gradually enforced throughout the rest of India, but when and how they are going to do it, nobody knows.

In my State several tanneries have closed down and 50,000 workers have been thrown out of employment and as you know, the majority of the tannery workers are Scheduled Caste people. Therefore, they are the hardest hit by the closing down of the tanneries. What will they do for their food, clothing and other things? Let us just imagine the sufferings of the Scheduled Caste people in Madras State on account of the closing down of the tanneries. I was told this morning by a friend of mine who has come from Madras that some tanneries have been opened, but even those tanneries are not paying the wages regularly to the labourers.

The other thing that I want to say is that in the Cordite Factory at Aravankadu there are 1,500 workers. In 1914 a hill allowance, known by the name of 'local allowance', was given to the clerks. After many years it was extended to the Assistant Surgeons working in that factory—that is from 1943. In 1944 this allowance was further extended to all the employees. But, alas, it was withdrawn after four months. You know, Sir, that the hill stations are very chill and cold, and the people living there must provide themselves with warm clothing. The hill allowance is given just for this purpose. As a result of the withdrawal of this allowance, the people who are working in that factory at Aravankadu (Nilgiris), numbering about 1,500, have been suffering. Our Ministers have always been appealing to the people to work very hard for the growth of our nation and for the development of our country. I appeal to the Ministers and hon. Members on that side to consider

the conditions of the labourers. Unless the living conditions of labourers and workers are improved they cannot apply their minds to the work and thereby build the nation.

Shri V. V. Giri: I am very grateful to the hon. Members, representing the different sections of the House, on both sides, for the very illuminating speeches, helpful suggestions and healthy criticism they have made with respect to the labour policy of the Government. I can assure them as a Trade Union worker that whatever opinions I held during the last thirty-two years—in-between as an agitator, as an administrator—twice as a Minister in the Province and now as a Minister at the Centre—I still hold the same opinions and tomorrow when I cease to be a Minister—I assure you that I will hold the same opinions as I held thirty-two years ago. I have always held that if labour has to improve its position it must organize itself into strong, reasonable, democratic and well-organized Trade Unions. And I as a worker in the field have always insisted on Trade Unions putting forth their demands in a reasonable manner so that they may assure for themselves their fundamental rights and insist upon the employers recognizing them and their Unions and dealing with them as equals across the table. Whenever the employers have failed I have never kept quiet as a leader; I gave them enough time and opportunity to rectify matters, and if they failed I have never hesitated to declare direct action against employers, and in most cases I have done so successfully. I still hold the same view today, and I shall hold the same view till the end of my time.

If today, therefore, the complaint of the employers is that Trade Unions do not do their duty, that they pamper to the demands of the workers, that they are unreasonable in the things they put before the employer, I say that the employer and the employer alone, is responsible for such a state of things. Twenty years ago when we as Trade Union workers demanded legitimate recognition from them, legitimate right to meet them as equals across the table, they never respected our sentiments. They tried to seek help elsewhere and put down the Trade Union movement. So the employers must thank themselves if today they do not get the full benefit of trade unionism in India.

It is therefore a lesson to employers and workers and they must realize this hard fact, whether people like

[Shri V. V. Giri]

it or not, that both the workers and employers are partners in industry. I agree with my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram when he said that the workers are weaker partners. They may be weaker partners, but at the same time I hold that they are dominant partners in industry. They could secure that position of dominant partners provided they understand that they should organize themselves in a democratic manner, into constitutional Trade Unions and represent their demands and grievances in a reasonable way to the employers and the Government alike. That is the aspect to be borne in mind. I want my esteemed friends who are interested in the Trade Union movement to realize that in a democratic set-up today, there is no necessity to talk of direct action or to resort to acts of sabotage or anything of the kind. So long as they have organized Unions on a sound basis with sanctions behind their demands, I am absolutely certain that without recourse to any untoward action on their part they will be able to secure their reasonable grievances redressed.

I want to tell the employers that if they want to have peace in industry, if they want to have the benefit from their workers, if they want their loyalty towards the industry, they must know how to treat them. They must forget the old hackneyed principle of demand and supply. They must forget the idea that labour is a commodity. They must understand that without the help of the dominant partner the industry cannot run for a single day. If only they can realize these little, but very difficult, things I am absolutely certain that there will be peace in industry.

Speaking as Labour Minister of the Government of India I would like to tell both the partners in industry that they shall have my assistance, that they shall have the co-operation of the Government, provided they follow these principles. Then they will have my entire support. That is exactly the reason why in the past thirty-two years, both as an agitator and as a Minister of a Province, I have always held that internal settlement of disputes is better than external settlement imposed by a third party, be it Government or not. I do not want the intervention of Government. I want the parties to sit across the table, as equals, and as equally interested in the development of the industry, to settle matters. That is why I had always insisted in season and

out of season as a leader of the railway labour movement, in those times when we had to fight the British bureaucracy, that there should be a joint standing machinery at all levels, from the district level to the Railway Board and Railwaymen's Federation level and, if they do not come to an agreement, to have a tribunal for the settlement of the disputes. The credit goes to our esteemed leader, friend, and colleague, Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar, after all to implement the demand that I made 30 years ago to the bureaucratic Government at that time. I hope that aspect has now been fully understood and if only the railway workers take advantage of that machinery, there will certainly be peace in industry. There will be no necessity for 'direct action' and it will be good for all concerned. So also the same principles ought to be followed whether it is in private industry or in the public sector of the industry and my advice to everybody concerned is to have the same machinery as is now adopted in the railways. I shall insist on the development of the bipartite agreements and the tripartite agreements. I therefore welcome the idea of the Planning Commission who have proposed consultative committees in all industries, with representatives of workers and employers and an independent Chairman, to discuss from time to time the principles underlying the industry, whether it is with reference to the general working conditions, wage structure, profit-sharing, bonus or any other fundamental subject so that even the tribunals set up may have a clear idea as to what the respective parties want them to do. I may tell you straightaway, therefore, that I am for internal settlement of disputes, that I stand for a joint standing machinery in every industry at all levels, that I am for tripartite and bipartite agreements and if I may use the expression that seems to have become common, I am 'Enemy No. 1' to the courts, tribunals and the adjudication machinery of the Governments. I would like to avoid these courts and the adjudication machinery, which is a compulsory thing and which compels the parties to come together. I lay more emphasis on the parties themselves coming together. I am an optimist and I have found by experience that if both sides can be reasonable, they can adjust their differences. Both sides know how to meet as equals and any matter, however difficult it may be, can be easily settled. That has been my view. Even as a Minister when I felt that parties could not settle their differences there were occasions when I wanted to teach

my conciliation officers how to settle the dispute and I made the parties to come to me to the Secretariat and often got their disputes settled. I am absolutely certain, therefore, that if we can develop the idea of bipartite and tripartite agreements, there will certainly be peace in industry. I want to appeal to my esteemed friends who believe in Trade Union movement to organize the movement in a very democratic manner and try and see that the workers build sanctions behind them, so that their grievances may be redressed and peace in industry established. I want that agreements when they are entered into to be registered so that for a certain term that Union and that industry can go on without any further trouble. That is why I said that I believe more in agreements and less in legislation. I want to assure Dr. Lanka Sundaram that I believe in legislation for labour as much as he does. If there is agreement on matters with reference to wages, working conditions etc., bringing forth legislation is an easy matter. What is agreed upon between the parties is very easy to put into effect in the form of legislation without much rancour and bitterness because such a state already existed and you only register it through legislation in the land. That is what I meant when I said, I believe more in agreements and less in legislation. I do hope the spirit of it is understood and I assure my hon. friend that if it becomes necessary, we shall have legislation. In this connection, I congratulate my esteemed predecessor and my colleague, Shri Jagjivan Ram for bringing very beneficial legislation on the Statute Book and it shall be my endeavour to implement legislation wherever it has not been implemented.

As regards the Industrial Relations Bill and the Trade Union Bill, about which my hon. friends have referred, they have gone up to the stage where the Select Committee sat and presented its report but in order to prove my *bona fides* in the matter, I feel that there are still strong opinions for and against, on matters contained therein and I am therefore taking the opportunity of putting it before the various sections of the labour movement, employers and the public. I therefore desire that a questionnaire should be issued very soon, bearing in mind all the views of the workers, employers and the different sections of the labour movement even in the matter.....

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Is it a case of re-circulation or it is only a questionnaire to be answered?

Shri V. V. Giri: It is a questionnaire to be answered.

77 P.S.D.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: It will not be a re-circulation of the Bill.

Shri V. V. Giri: There is no question about it. Anyhow we have to bring a fresh Bill before this new Parliament. You may think in any way you like. The Bill has to come afresh after the questionnaire is answered and after consulting different views in the matter, and if necessary the leaders of the labour movement and the employers. The Government will decide about the way in which the Bill has to be presented, about the form and the number of sections etc. Even as regards the appellate tribunals, I had an occasion when I was in Madras to discuss matters with the employers and with the workers organizations and with the tribunal judges themselves and I have my own opinions in the matter. I assure you that that matter will be considered very carefully taking into consideration the views of the workers' organizations, who feel strongly about the removal of the appellate courts and also the views of the employers. We shall soon come to conclusions on that matter as well. I do not propose to go through details of the criticism offered on very many points. I would rather deal with fundamentals. Much criticism has been diverted towards the landless workers' conditions, towards agricultural labour, and the implementation of the Minimum Wages Act. I can assure the House that my predecessor did his very best to call the attention of the Provincial Governments and to see that the legislation is implemented by every Province at the earliest opportunity. I am continuing to do so. I want hon. Members to realize that this is a vast subject and a difficult matter, but difficulty should not come in our way to settle matters. We do hope the Provincial Government will take the time by the forelock and try to implement this Act. After all we must realize that the Central Government is not the Government that implements it. I can assure you that we are doing our very best to see that the Act is implemented. In this matter, I have an appeal to make to friends who are interested in the organization of workers in the villages. You must help them to build strong and democratic Trade Unions. When you do so, the Unions themselves will hurry up Governments, will go to the Labour Ministers, will go to the Cabinets and insist on the implementation of the Act. Therefore, not only a duty lies on me and on the Members on this side of the House who are interested in the workers in the villages; a duty lies on the gentlemen opposite also who are as sincere trade unionists

[Shri V. V. Giri]

as myself, to organise workers Unions in a sound way so that the conditions of the workers in the villages may also improve. Again, there is no use of mere implementation of this Minimum Wages Act. After all, an agricultural worker has only work from about 165 to 200 days in a year. Unless we secure for them subsidiary occupation by the establishment of cottage industries and the like and give them full employment, the effect of the implementation of the Minimum Wages Act will be nearly useless. My humble opinion in my individual capacity and also as Labour Minister is that in the community projects that are coming up, these things will be carefully looked into. These community projects may be made models where the agricultural workers may be able to secure for themselves full employment. If we succeed in this in parts, we may introduce such methods as will secure for the agricultural worker full employment. I do not wish to labour more on this aspect of the matter. It is absolutely necessary that there should be more co-operation in the matter of improving labour conditions in the villages. In a matter like this, co-operation and assistance from all sides of the House will be useful, especially on the part of those who are interested as trade unionists in this behalf.

An appeal was made to me about securing Trade Union unity. Even when there was a break of the Trade Union movement in 1929 at Nagpur, it took ten years to secure unity amongst the ranks. Afterwards the war came and again ideas changed. And, under the change of ideas, the Trade Union movement also broke up. There are no two opinions on this matter namely, unless there is unity amongst those who believe in full democratic Trade Union movement, and they come together with one voice and put forward their demand either before the employers or Governments, their voice will be a voice in the wilderness. That aspect of the question must be understood by all sections in the Trade Union movement. At least for the last nearly eight years, I have not belonged to any section of the movement. I am an independent trade unionist. In that capacity, during the last six years, I have been appealing to Trade Unions to come together and unite on a common platform on all matters. I do feel that there is some effect on the leaders of the Trade Union movement if I can rely,—certainly I can rely—on the statements and the views they have expressed to me in this behalf. None would be happier than me to see

a real democratic Trade Union movement working for the cause of workers, representing their difficulties and securing for the masses of this country their fundamental rights.

We are trying to see that the Employees' State Insurance Scheme, about which Mr. Veeraswamy spoke, is implemented as early as possible. In Kanpur and Delhi the scheme is working at the present moment. As soon as I assumed office, I went to Bombay, met the mill owners, met the workers and the Government of Bombay and I am very glad to tell you that by January, 1953, we will be able to introduce this scheme successfully in Bombay. Myself and the Director-General of this Institution had been to Bombay and I am glad to say that the mill owners of Bombay are seriously considering a proposal to erect a model hospital of not less than 300 beds at Bombay for the mill workers. The project is to be implemented soon with the aid approximately of 54 lakhs of rupees to be made available to the Mill Owners Association out of the donations to the Gandhi Memorial Fund. The construction of this hospital will relieve to a considerable extent the hardship of the working classes in Bombay in getting proper hospital treatment and the pressure on the hospital due to scarcity of beds will also be reduced. The Employees' State Insurance Act, under which medical care has to be provided to the factory employees, will be associated with this project. A Committee of six members has been set up to expedite the construction. It will consist of two representatives each of the Mill owners Association and the Bombay Government. The Mill Owners Association have already nominated two gentlemen on that Committee. The Director-General of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation will be one of the Members of the Committee which is going to expedite the planning and construction of this hospital. Similarly, the Punjab Government seems to be determined to introduce this scheme during its allotted time. I am absolutely certain that the other State Governments will also follow suit. I assure you that I shall be not merely Labour Minister of the Centre, I shall also be a propagandist on behalf of the workers to see that this scheme is not only implemented by the Governments but also to get the moral support of public opinion and the Employees' Organisations in this country.

I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the various legislations that have been passed during the last three years. I can assure you that if only labour can rightly organise itself, and the employers see the necessity of having beneficent social legislations, it will be my duty to persuade them to look at things from the right perspective on both sides and I am confident that, optimistic as I am, I would be able to get the legislations already passed duly implemented.

As regards future legislation, I want to give this assurance to the employers to the workers' organisations and to the public in this country that I shall take their full counsel and circulate the ideas of the Government to the fullest extent possible, and that without having complete discussion of all matters, no Bills would be introduced. But, I want to tell them that labour legislation is bound to be progressive, and labour legislation will have to be introduced from time to time.

I am very grateful to you, Sir, for the opportunity you have given me and I want to show that appreciation by finishing my speech before time. In fact I am finishing in half an hour. I do not think any good will come to me or to this House by my going into the details.

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

Shri Velayudhan: Hereafter, Ministers should be given only half an hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will consider each case separately.

The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced to Re. 1."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66, 67 and 122 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[As directed by Mr. Deputy-Speaker the Motions for Demands for Grants

which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P.P.]

DEMAND No. 63—MINISTRY OF LABOUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,29,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Labour'."

DEMAND No. 64—CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,95,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Chief Inspector of Mines'."

DEMAND No. 65—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,30,04,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour'."

DEMAND No. 66—EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES AND RESETTLEMENT

Labour'."

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,08,04,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Employment Exchanges and Re-settlement'."

DEMAND No. 67—CIVIL DEFENCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 83,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Civil Defence'."

DEMAND No. 122—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,09,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Labour'."

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Friday, the 20th June, 1952.