

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

werable for the fact that the arrest and manhandling of girls were done by male policemen.

3. Even after students had courted arrest, they were beaten up in police custody. A leg and an arm of Secretary, DUSU, have been fractured. President, DUSU, was beaten mercilessly till he became unconscious. President, ARSD College Students Union, was hit on his head with lathi causing grievous injury necessitating several stitches on his head.

While I do not approve students blocking the traffic and stoning the buses, from what I have stated, it is evident that the Police failed to apprehend the culprits and was brutal in using force indiscriminately against students who were naturally agitated over the murder of a fellow student. It should be a matter of concern for all of us that, of late, this is becoming a common pattern of the operation of law and order machinery.

I demand that all persons involved in the murderous attack on student Promod Kumar should be arrested immediately and a judicial inquiry should be instituted to ascertain the facts regarding the incidents leading to lathi charge by the police and to fix responsibility. All cases against students should be withdrawn forthwith.

(viii) PROTECTION OF FISHERMAN IN THE COASTAL BELT OF ORISSA.

*SHRI RASABEHARI BEHERA (Kalahandi): Orissa is famous in India and abroad for the delicious prawn available in the coastal water of the Puri sea and the Chilka lake. Fishing is the sole means of livelihood of thousands of fishermen residing in the coastal belt of Orissa. India exports huge quantities of Orissa prawn worth several crores of rupees to foreign countries every year. Steps are being taken to preserve this prawn. Quite a large number of ice factories and some other ancillary industries have been

set up near Chilka lake for the effective functioning of prawn trade. Thousands of fishermen have been directly involved in the prawn trade and fishing is their only source of income. Thousands of small fishermen from Andhra also earn their livelihood from fishing in these areas.

But the prawn trade has suffered a great setback for the last three years due to the interference of big fishermen who are equipped with trawlers and nets and carry on their vocation on a very large scale. Due to the indiscriminate fishing in the coastal area by the mechanised means, prawns are diminishing in quantity and are facing extinction. Besides, the basin of Puri sea near Puri is silting up very fast which poses danger to this species of fish.

The fishermen community in particular and people in general engaged in this trade will suffer further if steps are not taken to desilt the basin and promote the variety of prawn in the Puri sea. As the State Government and the Centre earn foreign exchange worth millions of rupees, steps should be taken to promote cultivation of prawn in this coastal area.

14-30 hrs.

LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

Clause 2—(Amendment of Section 48)—Contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up further clause by clause consideration of the Bill further to amend the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956.

Mr. Sunil Maitra had been on his legs.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA (Calcutta North East): Mr. Chairman, Sir, my amendment No. 17 to Clause 2 is significant. I have specifically given this amendment in view of the fact that despite the Supreme Court judgments

*The original speech was delivered in Oriya.

and orders, this Government is not coming forward to comply with those orders. Not only this. The Finance Minister had also made certain statements on behalf of the Government which obviously are also not correct.

I would like to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to what he said that day as I have to make certain comments on that.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): You can go ahead.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: While you were replying to the debate, Mr. Indrajit Gupta said "Shall I lay a copy of the order on the table?"

You said "Sir, he does not seem to have a copy of that order."

Then, Mr. Chairman commented "He is referring to that".

Then Mr. Venkataraman stated "Now, I will deal with it in my own way."

Then, on the 13th January, what the final and formal order of the court said is this:

"The learned Attorney-General who appeared on behalf of the Life Insurance Corporation of India has made a statement before us that the order passed by the court in its judgment dated November, 10, 1980, shall be complied with before 15th April, 1981."

Then, Mr. Venkataraman continued "Sir, this is the relevant portion of the order."

Now, he prefaces this quotation by stating "I will deal with it in my own way".

Then, on the 13th January what the final and formal order of the court says is this.

So, you say that the piece of paper that you read out to the House, you describe it as the final order, the final and formal order of the court.

The Finance Minister does not know that the paper that he read was nothing but a copy of the proceedings of the Supreme Court.

I am having the copy of the very same paper from which the Finance Minister read. This is the certified copy. With your permission, I would like to place it on the table of the House.

Now, if the Finance Minister characterises this record of proceedings of the Supreme Court, as final and formal order of the Supreme Court, then, on what basis and under what logic, did the Finance Minister the other day describe Mr. Gupta's similar piece of paper containing from the record of the proceedings of Supreme Court, dated 10-11-80, as not an order, not a formal order, of the Supreme Court? From the same record of proceedings of the Supreme Court, if the Finance Minister quotes something and says that it is a formal order of the Court, then it becomes a formal order of the court—simply because it is the Finance Minister who has quoted! And when the same thing is quoted by the Opposition, from the similar document, it is no longer a formal order because it is coming from the Opposition!

Sir, this is the "Record of Proceedings of the Supreme Court.... Civil Misc. Petition No. 15195/80 (CA 2275/78)....(b) RP No. 23-81..."

and so on and so forth.

"13-1-81. The matters were called on for hearing today.

"Hon. the Chief Justice

HON. MR. JUSTICE R. S. PATHAK

Hon. Mr. Justice A.D. Koshal..."

Then, this is the order:

[Shri Sunil Maitra]

"Upon hearing counsel, the Court passed the following order:—

"Learned Attorney General who appears on behalf of the Life Insurance Corporation of India has made a statement before us that the order passed by the Court in its judgment dated November 10, 1980, shall be complied with before April 15, 1981. We may add that this order will be naturally subject to the result of the review petition. Stay petition filed alongwith the review petition is rejected. Review petition be circulated to Court."

This is signed by the 'Court Master'. The other day when Shri Indrajit Gupta submitted a certified copy of similar order dated 10-11-80, the Finance Minister said that, if a document was signed by the Court Master—who, according to him, is nothing but a clerk—it was not an order. Here again the Finance Minister said something on the floor of the House which came from a document signed by the 'Court Master' who was described by the Finance Minister as nothing but a Clerk. When you quote from that, it becomes an order, and when Mr. Indrajit Gupta quotes from that, it is not an order! What is the logic? Therefore, Sir, I place* it on the Table of the House with your permission.

With these remarks, I conclude.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): Mr. Chairman, Sir, what is really pertinent for discussion in the House is the equity of the legislation before it. So far as the legality of it is concerned, it will be decided by the Supreme Court. I do not want to enter into an argument on the legality of the legislation. Successive speakers have held that it is not for the Parliament to decide on the legality of the legislation but it is for the courts to decide.

I wish only to clarify that what I have always insisted upon as a formal order is the order which says directing the Life Insurance Corporation to give effect to the terms of settlement of 1974 relating to bonus until superseded by a fresh settlement or industrial award or relevant legislation; that is the thing which is a final and formal order. Since it gives option to the Government either to have a second negotiation or an industrial adjudication or bring about a relevant legislation, the Government is well within its rights to bring the legislation. This is all I wanted to say. In fact, Mr. Indrajit Gupta mentioned about the order. I have got all the arguments, but they are to be used in the Supreme Court, they are not to be used here....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You do not want to give out the secrets.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I do not want to waste the time of this hon. House.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: What about your statement made on the floor of the House? (Interruptions)

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I have said what I wanted to say. I have nothing more to add. It is for you to draw whatever inference you want to.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): Discretion is the better part of valour.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: They think that they can provoke me, but unfortunately I have a very long experience in Legislature; I have over 25 years of experience in Legislature; therefore, I cannot be provoked.

I will deal with the equity part of it; this is more important. Whether it is legally right or not is not an important issue. Whether it is justified or not is the real issue and here again I want to mention that...

*The Speaker not having subsequently accorded the necessary permission, the document was not treated as laid on the Table.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): You cannot justify a thing which is illegal.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I can also quibble, but it will take time. I am going to confine myself only to the equity part of this. The Life Insurance Corporation employees are getting dearness allowance without a ceiling which is out of step with any other employee. Therefore, they have got to be brought under the broad parameters which are applicable to other employees.

The second point is that almost all the employees in the country are subject to the bonus law. To say that the LIC employees alone must be excepted, they should be exempt from the bonus law, they must get without any ceiling, is a proposition which, on the face of it, is inequitable. I say this because if the principle of equal pay for equal work is to be applicable to the lower category of employees, my submission is that it should be applicable equally to the higher category of employees; the people who are drawing higher salaries must also get equal pay for equal work, and some of the people should not have islands of high wage rates making it difficult and different for others and thereby leading to unrest and heart-burning amongst workers themselves. Fortunately for me, Sir, I am fully supported and fortified in this line of argument by no less a person than my esteemed friend, Mr. George Fernandes. I will read out what Mr. George Fernandes wrote in 1977 when he was sitting on this side, on these Benches....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): When you quote him, he always becomes your 'esteemed friend'.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: He has always been my esteemed friend. Ask him if he is not.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Do not quote me only so far as this article is concerned.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I will quote what suits me. You can quote what does not suit me.

This is what Mr. Fernandes wrote in the journal, *Mainstream*, 15th Annual Number, 1977, in which he said:

"Agitations are presently being conducted by the LIC and bank employees seeking...."

Mark these words.

"...still better wage terms."

These are Mr. Fernandes' words. He goes on to say:

"...An essential aspect of the formulation of a national wage policy is to accept the principle of equal pay for equal work."

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Is it Mr. George Fernandes or Mr. Lawrence Fernandes?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I will give the book to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has absolutely no doubt.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: "Though this is a proposition that is theoretically acceptable to everyone, the organised working class has, short of sloganising it, done pretty little to translate it into action and for obvious reasons. The result is there for all of us to see that even in the organised industrial sector, they have developed high-wage islands that have no relationship whatsoever to the wage pattern prevailing in the entire industry."

Now, there are other things also and I do not want to quote more. The point I am really seeking to make is this, that in respect of wages it is not only necessary that the people in the lower ranks should be brought to a uniformity on the basis of equal pay for equal work but people who are enjoying high-wage island pockets must also be brought within a comparative level with other wage-earners so that there is no bitterness,

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

there is no jealousy, there is no rancour and one does not lead to another wage-spiral from time to time.

I have explained that all the other employees are subject to a dearness allowance maximum and all the other employees, almost all except where some people have given up their rights to bonus, are subject to the bonus law. Why should and what right, the LIC employees alone have to be exempt from the operation of these laws and be entitled to a higher dearness allowance without a ceiling or to a bonus payment without a ceiling? ...

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: Bonus Act was not applicable to Life Insurance Corporation.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I am not going to reply to anything. I am only putting forward my case. You are only wasting your breath by your interruption.

Therefore, the government thought that in the interests of putting an end to the litigation which is going on, one appeal, another appeal, another case, revision petition, contempt application, review application and all sorts of indefinite and indeterminable cases and litigation, the government should set at rest all these things and have a legislation.

I would also like to ask one question, particularly, of my friend, Mr. George Fernandes and also Prof. Madhu Dandavate. To-day they are saying, 'Why are you interfering with a wage settlement which has been reached by collective bargaining, and all that. The previous government, that is, our own previous government did interfere with the wage settlement. It passed an enactment. That was challenged in the court. The Allahabad High Court set aside the notices. At that time it was the Janata government which was in power—in 1978.

रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) दोनों ने गलत किया। उन्होंने भी गलत किया और आपने भी।

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Both of them did? I will show even that is not correct.

Now, in 1978 when the Janata Party was in power and when the distinguished leaders of the Labour like my esteemed friend, Mr. George Fernandes and my good friend, Prof. Madhu Dandavate were in the Cabinet, why did they take it in appeal? Why did they not accept it? I know the reason. If you sit on this side of the House and have the responsibility for managing the finances of this country, you will have necessarily to see that there is some order. ...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: How does he know the Cabinet secrets, Sir?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Because I am a successor. Sir, I ask this question: if you are in a responsible position then, you know that it is not possible for certain sections of labour to get away with it and have all that they want. It was necessary for the Government, be it this Government now or the previous Government then, to see that some kind of uniformity is established in wage structure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whosoever wears the shoe. ...

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Knows where the shoe will pinch. (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: In 1974 you were in Government.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Agreed, we were the culprits and we were the villains and you were the angels. But why did not the angels immediately accept the position of the Allahabad High Court? Why did you go in appeal? Why did the angels leave this wretched legacy of carrying a baby which they begot?

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: That is the judgment of the Supreme Court. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: We want fools to rush in where the angels fear to tread.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): Why was the bonus not restored to the railways and the Government employees? It was only after a bitter struggle that it had been accepted that it is linked with productivity.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Nothing is an answer to this charge. If they say that they stand by the contract or if they want to save the sanctity of the contract, then they should have proved it when they were in office and when they had the opportunity. I see that they also followed this procedure which I am following. At that time, they had the option of going in appeal. Now, I have the option of going in for a legislation as observed by the Supreme Court. Therefore, Sir, all this argument on equity has absolutely no basis, whatsoever.

I would appeal to the Life Insurance Corporation employees that they must also fall in line with the other employees and should not try to be a superior Bolsheviki class by themselves. *(Interruptions)* They have become elite among the working-class and they have developed so much vested interests now like all other vested interests. Again they are losing the vested interests.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: This is humiliating. You are attacking the employees by using the words like bourgeoisie etc. When they are not in a position to reply to that.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, hard words break no bones.

SHRI AJOY BISWAS (Tripura West): What about breaking of bones of the monopolists?

4182 LS—12.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: The abuse is a language in which both sides can indulge. If you say shameful, I can say more shameful which is a worse term. But, I am not accustomed to it. As I said in the beginning, I went to the school which did not teach the vocabulary in which you are specialising. Mr. Chairman, I have only one more word to say that either on the basis of comparison with the other workers or on the basis of equity, whether the Life Insurance Corporation employees have a justifiable case or a presentable case for higher and superior treatment than that which is being given to the employees of similar categories in other services or in commercial services or not, has to be examined.

I cannot, therefore, accept any of the amendments moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri K. A. Rajan is not present. I shall now put the amendments moved by him—amendments No. 8 and 9—to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page,—

after line 2, insert—

“Provided that such terms and conditions shall not be unfavourable to the employees and agents as compared to the terms and conditions existing prior to January 31, 1981.” (8)

Page,—

for lines 5 to 30, substitute—

“(2A) All rules made under this section shall be subject to any judgement, decree or order of any court, tribunal or other authority and subject to the provision of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, or any other law or any other agreement, settlement, award or other instrument, for the time being in force.” (9)

[Mr. Chairman]

15 hrs.

Let the Lobbies be cleared. The Lobbies have been cleared.

Shall I put both the amendment together or one by one to vote now?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: We would like to shout twice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I will now put amendment No. 8 to Clause 2 to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 8 was put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put Amendment No. 9 to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 9 was put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put amendment, Nos. 13 and 14 to the vote of the House. Do you want division?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. Voice vote.

The Amendment, Nos. 13 and 14 were put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put amendments Nos. 16 and 17 to vote. *Amendments No. 16 and 17 were put and negatived.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put amendment No. 19 to vote.

The Amendment No. 19 was put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the question is:

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

Do you want division?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We want division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The lobbies have been cleared.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR (Gwalior): The lobbies have to be cleared

again. Before the vote is taken again we have to get the lobbies cleared again. This is to be done according to the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you insist I will do it again.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: It is the rule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the lobbies be cleared.

The lobbies have been cleared. Now, I will put the Clause to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 8

[15.09 hrs.]

AYES

Ankineedu, Shri M.
Ankineedu Prasad Rao, Shri P.
Arakal Shri Xavier
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Baleshwar Ram, Shri
Bansi Lal, Shri
Barrow, Shri A. E. T.
Behera, Shri Rasabehari
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhagwan Dev. Acharya
Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram
Bhatia, Shri R. L.
Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu
Bhole, Shri R. R.
Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh
Chakradhari Singh, Shri
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
Chavan, Shri S. B.
Chennupati, Shrimati Vidya
Chingwang Konyak, Shri
Chouhan, Shri Fatehbhan Singh
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Damor, Shri Somjibhai
*Dandavate, Shrimati Pramila
Dennis, Shri N.

*Wrongly voted for Ayes.

Desai, Shri B. V.
 Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
 Digvijay Singh, Shri
 Doongar Singh, Shri
 Dubey, Shri Ramnath
 Faleiro, Shri Eduardo
 Fernandes, Shri Oscar
 Gadgil, Shri V. N.
 Gehlot, Shri Ashok
 Gomango, Shri Girdhar
 Gounder, Shri A. Senapathi
 Gowda, Shri D. M. Putte
 Gulsher Ahmed, Shri
 Jai Narain Roat, Shri
 Jaideep Singh, Shri
 Jain, Shri Bhiku Ram
 Jain, Shri Nihal Singh
 *Jatiya, Shri Satyanarayan
 Jena, Shri Chintamani
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kamal Nath, Shri
 Kamla Kumari, Kumari
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
 Khan, Shri Arif Mohammad
 Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
 Kusuma Krishna Murthy, Shri
 Mahabir Prasad, Shri
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
 Mahala, Shri R. P.
 Makwana, Shri Narsinh
 Mallik, Shri Lakshman
 Mallikarjun, Shri
 Misra, Shri Nityananda
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ananda
 Gopal
 Muthu Kumaran, Shri R.
 Nagtha Rai, Shri
 Naidu, Shri P. Rajagopal
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Nandi Yellaiah, Shri
 Narayana, Shri K. S.
 Netam, Shri Arvind

Nikhra, Shri Rameshwar
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Pardhi, Shri Keshaorao
 Patel, Shri Ahmed Mohammed
 Patel, Shri Mohanbhai
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
 Patil, Shri Shivraj V.
 Pattabhi Rama Rao, Shri S. B. P.
 Poojary, Shri Janardhana
 Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram
 Pushpa Devi Singh, Kumari
 Ramulu, Shri H. G.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Rawat, Shri Harish Chandra Singh
 Reddy, Shri K. Brahmananda
 Rothuama, Dr. R.
 Sahi, Shrimati Krishna
 Sahu, Shri Shiv Prasad
 Saminuddin, Shri
 Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumari
 Shakyawar, Shri Nathuram
 Shamanna, Shri T. R.
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Shanmugam, Shri P.
 Sharma, Shri Chiranji Lal
 Sharma, Shri Nand Kishore
 Shastri, Shri Dharam Dass
 Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Singaravadiel, Shri S.
 Singh, Deo, Shri K. P.
 Solanki, Shri Babu Lal
 Sparrow, Shri R. S.
 Subba, Shri P. M.
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Dutt
 Tariq Anwar, Shri
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewary, Prof. K. K.
 Tiwari, Shri Narayan Datt
 Velu, Shri A. M.
 Venkataraman, Shri R.

Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Vijayaraghavan, Shri V. S.
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Girdhari Lal
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh
 Zail Singh, Shri
 Zainul Basher, Shri

NOES

Azmi, Dr. A. U.
 Balan, Shri A. K.
 Balanandan, Shri E.
 Basu, Shri Chitta
 Biswas, Shri Ajoy
 Chakraborty, Shri Satyasadhan
 Chaturbhuj, Shri
 Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin
 Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
 Das, Shri R. P.
 Fernandes, Shri George
 Ghosh, Shri Niren
 Giri, Shri Sudhir
 Goyal, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Harikesh Bahadur, Shri
 Hasda, Shri Matilal
 Jethmalani, Shri Ram
 Madhukar, Shri Kamla Mishra
 Maitra, Shri Sunil
 Mhalgi, Shri R. K.
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Misra, Shri Satyagopal
 Mukherjee, Shri Samar
 Multan Singh, Chaudhary
 Muzaaffar Hussain, Shri Syed
 Negi, Shri T. S.

Pandit, Dr. Vasant Kumar
 Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas
 Rajda, Shri Ratansinh
 Riyan, Shri Bajju Ban
 Roy, Pradhan, Shri Amar
 Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
 Sen, Shri Subodh
 *Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
 Verma, Shri Phool Chand

Verma, Shri R. L. P.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The result †† of the division is:

Ayes : 117

Noes : 40

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are no amendments to clause 3.

The question is:

"That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill".

The Lok Sabha divided:

AYES

Division No. 9]

[15.11 hrs.

Ankineedu, Shri M.
 Ankineedu Prasad Rao, Shri P.
 Arakal, Shri Xavier
 Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
 Baleshwar Ram, Shri
 Bansi Lal, Shri

*Wrongly voted for NOES.

††The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Sarvashri B. R. Nahata, H. R. Parmar, Subhash Yadav and P. C. Sethi;

NOES: Sarvashri Shibu Soren, Chandrapal Singh, Satyanarayan Jatiya and Shrimati Pramila Dandavate.

Barrow, Shri A. E. T.
 Behera, Shri Rasabehari
 Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
 Bhagwan Dev, Acharya
 Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram
 Bhatia, Shri R. L.
 Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu
 Bhole, Shri R. R.
 Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh
 Chakradhari Singh, Shri
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
 Chavan, Shri S. B.
 Chennupati, Shrimati Vidya
 Chingwang Konyak, Shri
 Chouhan, Shri Fatehbhan Singh
 Dalbir Singh, Shri
 Damor, Shri Somjibhai
 Dennis, Shri N.
 Desai, Shri B. V.
 Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
 Digvijay Singh, Shri
 Doongar Singh, Shri
 Dubey, Shri Ramnath
 Faleiro, Shri Eduardo
 Fernandes, Shri Oscar
 Gadgil, Shri V. N.
 Gehlot, Shri Ashok
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar
 Gounder, Shri A. Senapathi
 Gowda, Shri D. M. Putte
 Jai Narain Roat, Shri
 Jaldeep Singh, Shri
 Jain, Shri Bhiku Ram
 Jain, Shri Nihal Singh
 Jain, Shri Virbhi Chander
 Jena, Shri Chintamani
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kamal Nath, Shri
 Kamla Kumari, Kumari
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
 Khan, Shri Arif Mohammad
 Khan, Shri Zulfiqar Ali
 Krishna Pratap Singh, Shri
 Kusuma Krishna Murthy, Shri

Mahabir Prasad, Shri
 Mahala, Shri R. P.
 Makwana, Shri Narsinh
 Mallick, Shri Lakshman
 Mallikarjun, Shri
 Misra, Shri Nityananda
 Mohsin, Shri F. H.
 Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ananda Gopal
 Muthu Kumaran, Shri R.
 Nahata, Shri B. R.
 Naidu, Shri P. Rajagopal
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Nandi Yellaiah, Shri
 Narayana, Shri K. S.
 Netam, Shri Arvind
 Nikhra, Shri Rameshwar
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Pardhi, Shri Keshao Rao
 Parmar, Shri Hiralal R.
 Patel, Shri Ahmed Mohammed
 Patel, Shri Mohanbhai
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
 Patil, Shri Shivraj V.
 Pattabhi Rama Rao, Shri S. B. P.
 Poojary, Shri Janardhana
 Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram
 Pushpa Devi Singh, Kumari
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Rawat, Shri Harish Chandra Singh
 Reddy, Shri K. Brahmananda
 Rothuama, Dr. R.
 Sahi, Shrimati Krishna
 Sehu, Shri Shiv Prasad
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumari
 Shakyawar, Shri Nathuram
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Shanmugam, Shri P.
 Sharma, Shri Chiranjil Lal
 Sharma, Shri Nand Kishore
 Shastri, Shri Dharam Dass

Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Singaravadivel, Shri S.
 Singh Deo, Shri K. P.
 Solanki, Shri Babu Lal
 Sparrow, Shri R. S.
 Subba, Shri P. M.
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Dutt
 Tariq Anwar, Shri
 Tayeng, Shri Sobeng
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewary, Prof. K. K.
 Tiwari, Shri Narayan Datt
 Velu, Shri A. M.
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Vijayaraghavan, Shri V. S.
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Girdhari Lal
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh
 Yadav, Shri Subhash Chandra
 Zail Singh, Shri
 Zainul Basher, Shri

NOES

Azmi, Dr. A. U.
 Balan, Shri A. K.
 Balanandan, Shri E.
 Basu, Shri Chitta
 Biswas, Shri Ajoy
 Chakraborty, Shri Satyasadhan
 Chaturbhuj, Shri
 Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin
 Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
 Dandavate, Shrimati Pramila
 Das, Shri R. P.
 Fernandes, Shri George
 Ghosh, Shri Niren

Ghulam Mohammad, Shri
 Giri, Shri Sudhir
 Goyal, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Harikesh Bahadur, Shri
 Hasda, Shri Matilal
 Jatiya, Shri Satyanarayan
 Madhukar, Shri Kamla Mishra
 Maitra, Shri Sunil
 Mhalgi, Shri R. K.
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Misra, Shri Satyagopal
 Mukherjee, Shri Samar
 Muzaffar Hussain, Shri Syed
 Pandit, Dr. Vasant Kumar
 Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas
 Riyan, Shri Bajju Ban
 Roy Pradhan, Shri Amar
 Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
 Sen, Shri Subodh
 Sethi, Shri Arjun
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.
 Soren, Shri Shibu
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari

MR. CHAIRMAN: Subject to corrections, the result* of the Division is:

Ayes 116

Noes 37

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4—(Repeal and saving)

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI:
 beg to move:

Page 3,—

for lines 6 to 9, substitute—

“(2) Upon such repeal, anything done or any action taken under the principal Act as amended, shall cease to be of any

*The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Sarvashri Y. S. Mahajan, Saminuddin, H. G. Ramulu and K. B. S. Mani;

NOES: Sarvshri T. S. Negi, R. L. P. Verma and Phool Chand Verma

effect from the date of the promulgation of the Ordinance." (15)

समाप्ति महोदय, धारा 4(2) इस प्रकार है :—

“(2) इस निरसन के होते हुए भी उक्त अध्यादेश द्वारा यथा-संशोधित मूल अधिनियम के अधीन की गई कोई बात या कार्यवाही इस अधिनियम द्वारा यथा संशोधित मूल अधिनियम के अधीन की गई समझी जाएगी ।”

मैं अपने संशोधन के द्वारा चाहता हूं कि इसके स्थान पर ये शब्द रखे जायें :—

“(2) ऐसा निरसन होने पर यथा-संशोधित मूल अधिनियम के अधीन दी गई कोई बात या कार्यवाही अध्यादेश के प्रख्यापन की तारीख से प्रभावहीन हो जायेगी ।”

सरकार चाहती है कि अध्यादेश द्वारा संशोधित मूल अधिनियम के अधीन जो भी कार्यवाही की गई हो, इस अध्यादेश के निरसन के बाद, रिपील हो जाने के बाद, भी उसे वैध माना जाये । मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह बात इस धारा में न रहे । अगर इस अध्यादेश का निरसन हो जाता है, तो उसके द्वारा संशोधित मूल अधिनियम के अनुसार जो भी कार्यवाही की गई होगी, जो भी काम किया गया होगा, उसे सही माना जाये । उसे भी उतने समय से रद्द माना जाए । सरकार उसे जायज करार करना चाहती है और मैं उसे नाजायज करार करना चाहता हूँ । यही दोनों में अंतर है । मैं चाहूँगा कि सरकार इस

संशोधन को स्वीकार करे । और इस कानून के बनने के पहले जो भी कार्यवाही आपने की उसको रद्द करिए । उसको सही साबित करने की कोशिश आप मत कीजिए । यही मेरे संशोधन का आशय है ।

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Mr. Chairman, Shastriji's Amendment is contrary to the well-known principle of jurisprudence. In every legislation if it is set aside, we provide that whatever action has been taken earlier will be protected. And this is the Clause which says any action taken earlier will be protected. Therefore, being a negative amendment, I cannot accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I shall put Amendment No. 15 to Clause 4 to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 15 was put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is: “That Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.”

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 10]

[15.22 hrs.

AYES

Amarinder Singh, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri M.
Ankineedu Prasad Rao, Shri P.
Arakarl, Shri Xavier
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Bajpai, Dr. Rajendra Kumari
Baleshwar Ram, Shri
Bansi Lal, Shri
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhagwan Dev, Acharya
Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram
Bhatia, Shri R. L.
Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu
Bhole, Shri R. B.

Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh
 Chakradhari Singh, Shri
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
 Chavan, Shri S. B.
 Chennupati, Shrimati Vidya
 Chingwang Konyak, Shri
 Chouhan, Shri Fatehbhan Singh
 Dalbir Singh, Shri
 Dalbir Singh, Shri
 Damor, Shri Somjibhai
 Dennis, Shri N.
 Desai, Shri B. V.
 Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
 Digvijay Singh, Shri
 Dogra, Shri G. L.
 Doongar Singh, Shri
 Dubey, Shri Ramnath
 Gadgil, Shri V. N.
 Gehlot, Shri Ashok
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar
 Gounder, Shri A. Senapathi
 Gouzagin, Shri N.
 Gulsher Ahmed, Shri
 Jadeja, Shri Daulatsinhji
 Jai Narain Roat, Shri
 Jaideep Singh, Shri
 Jain, Shri Bhikhu Ram
 Jain, Shri Nihal Singh
 Jain, Shri Virdhi Chander
 Khandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kamal Nath, Shri
 Kamla Kumari, Kumari
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
 Khan, Shri Arif Mohammad
 Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
 Krishna Pratap Singh, Shri
 Kusuma Krishna Murthy, Shri
 Lakkappa, Shri K.
 Laskar, Shri Nihar Ranjan
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
 Mahala, Shri R. P.

Makwana, Shri Narain
 Mallik, Shri Lakshman
 Mallikarjun, Shri
 Misra, Shri Nityananda
 Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ananda Gopal
 Muthu Kumaran, Shri R.
 Naidu, Shri P. Rajagopal
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Nandi, Yellajiah, Shri
 Narayan, Shri K. S.
 Netam, Shri Arvind
 Nikhra, Shri Rameshwar
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
 Pardhi, Shri Kesharao
 Parmar, Shri Hiralal R.
 Patel, Shri Mohanbhai
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
 Patil, Shri Shivraj V.
 Pattabhi Rama Rao, Shri S. B. P.
 Poojari, Shri Janardhana
 Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram
 Pushpa Devi Singh, Kumari
 Ramulu, Shri H. G.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Rawat Shri Harish Chandra Singh
 Reddy, Shri K. Brahmananda
 Sahi, Shrimati Krishna
 Sahu, Shiv Prasad
 Saminuddin, Shri
 Sathe, Shri Vasant
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumar
 Shakyawar, Shri Nathuram
 *Shamanna, Shri T. R.
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Shanmugam, Shri P.
 Sharma, Shri Nand Kishore
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Shastri, Shri Dharam Dass
 Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
 Singh, Deo, Shri K. P.
 Solanki, Shri Babu Lal

Sonkar, Shri Kalpnath
 Sparrow, Shri R. S.
 Subba, Shri P. M.
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Dutt
 Tariq Anwar, Shri
 Tayeng, Shri Sobeng
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewary, Prof. K. K.
 Tiwari, Shri Narayan Datt
 Velu, Shri A. M.
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Vijayaraghavan, Shri V. S.
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Girdhari Lal
 Zail Singh, Shri
 Zainul Basher, Shri

NOES

Azmi, Dr. A. U.
 Balan, Shri A. K.
 Balanandan, Shri E.
 Basu, Shri Chitta
 Biswas, Shri Ajoy
 Chakraborty, Shri Satyasadhan
 Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin
 Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
 Das, Shri R. P.
 Fernandes, Shri George
 Ghosh, Shri Niren
 Ghulam Mohammad, Shri
 Giri, Shri Sudhir
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Harikesh Bahadur, Shri
 Hasda, Shri Matlilal
 Jaitya, Shri Satyanarayan
 Maitra, Shri Sunil
 Mhalgi, Shri R. K.

Misra, Shri Satyagopal
 Mukherjee, Shri Samar
 Multani Singh, Chaudhary
 Muzaffar Hussain, Shri Syed
 Negi, Shri T. S.
 Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas
 Rajda, Shri Ratansinh
 Riyan, Shri Baju Ban
 Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
 Sen, Shri Subodh
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.
 Soren, Shri Shibu
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
 Verma, Shri R. L. P.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The result†† of the division is: AYES: 116; NOES: 34.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1.—(Short title and Commencement)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now go on to Clause 1. Mr. Ramavatar Shastri, because Shri Somnath Chatterjee has left.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I beg to move:

"Page 1,—

for lines 10 and 11, substitute—

"(2) It shall come into force with effect from the date as may be agreed upon by and between the Corporation and Associations and Unions of the employees of the Corporation."
 (11).

मेरा संशोधन बहुत मामूली है लेकिन महत्वपूर्ण है। इस विधेयक की धारा 1 (2) में कहा गया है कि 21 जनवरी,

†† The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Sarvshri R. B. Behera, B. R. Nahata, Ahmed Mohammed Patel, and Mahabir Prasad;

NOES: Sarvshri Ram Jethamalani, Kamla Mishra Madhukar, T. R. Shamanna and Shrimati Pramila Dandavate.

[Shri Ramavatar Shastri]

1981 से यह प्रवृत्त हुआ समझा जायेगा। मेरा संशोधन है कि पंक्ति 9 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किया जाए :

"(2) यह उस तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगा जो निगम और निगम के कर्मचारियों के एसोसिएशनों और संघों द्वारा और उनके बीच तय पाई जाए।"

मेरा निवेदन बहुत स्पष्ट है तथा महत्वपूर्ण है। दोनों के बीच समझौता होकर तय हो और कलेक्टिव बार्गेनिंग (सामूहिक सौदेबाजी) की जो आप हत्या कर रहे हैं उसको फिर से बहाल किया जाए। पुनर्जीवित किया जाए और उसके बाद किस तारीख को इसे लागू करना चाहिए और किस तरीके से लागू करना चाहिए इसके बारे में जीवन बीमा निगम के कर्मचारियों और उनके संगठनों, जितने पांच संगठन हैं, सब से मिल-जुलकर और आपकी भी आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० शामिल है, पांचों को बैठक बुलाइए और उनके साथ विचार-विमर्श कीजिए कि इसको लागू किया जाए। विचार-विनिमय के बाद जो वहां तय हो, उसके मुताबिक आपको काम करना चाहिए। यहां 31 जनवरी, जिस दिन से आपने अध्यादेश जारी किया, उस दिन से आप चाहते हैं कि इस बात को छोड़ दीजिए। अभी भी समय है कि आप उनकी कटुता को कम कीजिए। उनके अन्दर जो सरकार की मजदूर विरोधी के खिलाफ दिलों में बगावत की भावना फैली है, उस भावना को थोड़ा कम कीजिए और अगर इस संशोधन को मान लेंगे तो थोड़ी बात इतनी जरूर होगी कि फिर एक टेबल पर बैठिएगा और तानाशाही की तरह जो आप चाहते हैं, वह नहीं कर पाइएगा।

अन्त में, मैं फिर माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि "द्वितीय अध्यादेश, दुरुस्त

आयद" वाले सिद्धांत के मुताबिक आप अभी भी सही रास्ते पर आ जाइए और हमारे इस संशोधन को मान लीजिए।

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I am not able to oblige him.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: It is not against jurisprudence.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: The amendment which Shastriji suggested just negatives the very legislation itself. It is not as if after the Allahabad High Court had given judgment, attempts were not made to come to some kind of a negotiated agreement or settlement. But I would like to ask Shastriji, as a labour leader whether he would advise his union to give up some of the rights which they have got. The position is that LIC has now got certain rights which are far in excess of other comparable workers and no negotiation was possible. That is why the Government has been driven to the necessity of legislating. Therefore, I am unable to accept the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I shall put amendment No. 11 moved by Shri Ramavatar Shastri to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 11 was put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Clause 1 the Enacting Formula, the Preamble, and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula, the Preamble and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

I have received a list of 15 Members who want to speak, of course, many of them are absent. (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: At least those who are present can speak. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Sunil Maitra. But you have already spoken. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: So far as I am concerned there is no end. (*Interruptions*). It is not difficult—sitting in this air conditioned aloofness—to deride, denigrate and abuse and vilify the employees of the Life Insurance Corporation of India. The Finance Minister had taken the opportunity to reply to the discussions we had today. While discussing it, the Finance Minister stated that the LIC employees are bourgeois. I do not know what he means by 'bourgeois'. Anyway, I am not going into that. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI R. VENKATARMAN: Here is a list (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: A bourgeois is a person who appropriates the surplus value created by the Labour Power of the worker... (*Interruptions*) LIC employees are not appropriating the surplus value created by others. They are setting their labour power... (*Interruptions*)

15.32 hrs.

SHRI GULSHER AHMED [in the Chair]

Very conveniently, the Finance Minister took only two things into consideration, the Dearness Allowance and the bonus of LIC employees but not the House Rent allowance that is paid to them. The Finance Minister said that the LIC employees have been brought on par with the Reserve Bank of India employees. He has not been briefed properly. The Reserve Bank employees are drawing House Rent Allowance at the rate of 12.5 per cent of their basic salary with a minimum of Rs. 60 and maximum of Rs. 150 per month. But the LIC employees are getting only 10 per cent of their basic salary with a maximum of Rs. 40/- per month.

As far as the medical expenses are concerned, in exchange of Rs. 2.50 per month, the Central Government

employees get full medical expenses for their entire family. But the LIC employees are getting only Rs. 100/- for the entire year. That is the medical assistance the LIC employees are getting and the Finance Minister has very conveniently referred to only the Dearness Allowance and bonus paid to them. He has not mentioned about House Rent Allowances and the medical expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I only want to draw the attention of the House to the hon. Finance Minister's statement that he was bringing the LIC employees in the matter of Dearness Allowance, at par with the Reserve Bank employees. And when confronted, he said that those whose pay is less than Rs. 1,099/- they are paid Rs. 15.80 as Dearness Allowance as in the case of the Reserve Bank employees. Therefore, where is the quarrel? Where is the difficulty? The difficulty is that the Finance Minister does not know—perhaps he has been wrongly briefed—that for the Reserve Bank employees the clerical grade used to be from Rs. 210 to Rs. 615 including a stagnation increment of Rs. 25/-. Now this grade has been revised from Rs. 400 to Rs. 1,170 including a stagnation increment of Rs. 50/-. That means, 90 per cent of the existing basic pay has been merged with their basic pay and they get more—ranging from Rs. 400 to Rs. 1,170/-. So far as the LIC employees are concerned, no merger has taken place. The basic pay has to be merged in the case of the LIC employees also and then only the DA of the Reserve Bank employees can be made applicable to them. The Finance Minister may please see his own statement in this House. The Dearness Allowance of the LIC employees should have been spelt out only when 90 per cent of their pay is merged. If it is so done, LIC employees ceiling of basic pay for Assistants should have been Rs. 1261/- and the minimum Rs. 332/-. That means, their DA should have been Rs. 18.95, as is being paid to the RBI employees. For stenographers, the minimum should have been

[Shri Sunil Maitra]

Rs. 399 and maximum Rs. 1347 and their DA should have been Rs. 20.55. Similarly, for Higher Grade Assistants their maximum should have been Rs. 1548.50 and they would have been paid Rs. 23.70. In the case of Superintendents, their maximum should have been Rs. 1757 and they would have been paid Rs. 25.30. But conveniently the Finance Minister forgot to mention that 90 per cent or, for that matter, even 1 per cent merger in the basic pay of LIC employees has not taken place. When he says it is a matter of equity, even in the matter of DA, for RBI employees you are paying Rs. 25.30 as ceiling whereas for LIC employees, you are only paying Rs. 15.30 as ceiling. Secondly, LIC employees have become bourgeois—that is what you say. Their grade is Rs. 175—585, a 22 years grade. For the last 33 years you have been ruling this country. If you take the base year as 1960-100, today the all India consumer price index should be round about Rs. 415. The cost of living is going up. Are the LIC employees responsible for it? You are responsible for it. Your economic policies are giving rise to inflation. Your policy of taxation, your policy of deficit financing, your policy of public borrowing, your policy of giving concessions to big bourgeois houses, is responsible for it. Tatas, Birlas and other big bourgeois houses are jacking up the prices and looting the people. Because of these things, the prices have gone up and you are bound to give DA. Again I am repeating the same argument. The fact that you are not paying the others cannot be the logic; because you are able to cheat and deprive the others, that cannot be the logic of your having absolute authority, logical authority, to go on cheating the LIC employees and depriving the LIC employees. Therefore, I submit that I oppose this Bill lock, stock and barrel and I shall go on opposing it, along with not only the 45,000 LIC employees but the entire working class, who are opposing it.

SHRI SUBODH SEN (Jalpaiguri):

Sir, I rise to oppose the Bill. When I read this Bill, I find that Government has sought for an enabling instrument to implement the theory that the ruling party has been enunciating since 1974. You will recall that since 1974, no less a person than the Prime Minister herself has said that the fruits of national development are being appropriated by the organised sector, implying that the organised sector must be struck down and implying that the peasantry should be set against the organised working class. Now this enabling instrument is being chiselled fast. First it will come upon the insurance employees. After that, by and by, it will strike down the other sectors of the organised working class. Let it be noted that the ruling party is not very consistent. In 1974, they enunciated that theory because there was a strike in our country. But only a few months back, when the peasantry came in the streets, then again another theory was doled out to us—the peasantry is waging a war against the nation; the peasantry is holding the nation to ransom! So, today the working class, tomorrow the peasantry. The crisis is growing and is deepening. They have themselves admitted in their *Economic survey* that inflation is now a world-wide phenomenon. India cannot escape from it. They are taking for granted that there will be increasing inflation, as a result of which there will be price rise, when people will come on the streets. Then, one by one, these enabling instruments will be sought for. So, I vehemently oppose this Bill.

My second point is this. Government is a continuing institution. This agreement, which was reached in 1974, was approved by the then Cabinet, particularly by the then Cabinet Minister in charge of Finance. If you repudiate and abrogate this agreement, it will be uncharitable not only to the employees but also to the then Finance Minister. What will be the faith in the Government for the people if a third or fourth Govern-

ment comes and abrogates the agreements entered into by the earlier Governments?

Thirdly, LIC is an autonomous institution. It is true that the Act gives ample powers to the Government to deal with it. But simply because they have the power, should they interfere? In the year 1974 when they approved of this agreement, certainly it was found viable and they did not think that it would ruin the economy of the country. So, it is very uncharitable for them now to come forward with this Bill to abrogate the agreement.

I take this as a preliminary step of the attack which will be waged against the workers. I oppose this Bill. I think the workers and the toiling section, including the peasantry, whom they are trying to put against the organised working class, will combine and fight this Bill outside the House.

SHRI AJOY BISWAS (Tripura West): Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill, which has been brought against the LIC employees, because it is anti-working class. Since this Bill is a clear intention of the Government to curb the trade union rights of the working class, the workers and employees of the entire country are concerned over the issue. Now that the Government have started with the LIC employees, I am sure that in future such a type of attempt will be made in the case of workers in other sectors also.

The Government are following policy in favour of the capitalists, which will lead to the total break down of the employer-employee relationship system in the country. Now the Government have come forward with a Bill, which will deprive the workers of the financial benefits which they were hitherto enjoying. But will the Finance Minister bring forward a Bill to reduce the profits of the capitalists and the monopolists? He will not do it, because he is re-

presenting them. In fact, it is for their benefit that he has brought forward this Bill. They are very happy with this Bill. Now in their own sector they will attack the workers and curb the benefits of the workers, taking a clue from the Government.

The employees and workers of this country are against this Bill. We know that the present ruling party is out and out anti-working class. So, not only the LIC employees, but the entire working class, including the Central and State Government employees will unite and fight outside Parliament to defeat your attempt to deprive the working classes of their rightful dues. I oppose the Bill.

श्री रोडलाल उसाव वर्मा (कोडरमा)

सभापति महोदय, मैं इस विधेयक का विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। सभापति जी, यह सरकार बराबर हरिजनों, श्रमिकों और मजदूरों की पक्षधर होने का स्वांग रचती रहती है। इस सरकार ने आज से 25 साल पहले मजदूरों के हित के लिए नियम बनाए और बराबर उनको व्यवहार में लाने के लिए उनका पक्ष लेती रही, वहीं सरकार आज जीवन बीमा कर्मचारियों के अधिकारों पर इस बिल के द्वारा कुठाराघात करने जा रही है। कर्मचारियों को वर्षों से जो कुछ अधिकार प्राप्त हुए थे, आपसी समझौते और न्यायालयों के निर्णयों के द्वारा उनको जो अधिकार हासिल हुए थे, उन सब अधिकारों को यह सरकार एक ही प्रहार के द्वारा समाप्त करने जा रही है जो श्रमिक हित में नहीं होगा। सरकार ने आशय रखा है कि बीमा धारकों और निगम के हित को ध्यान में रखते हुए कर्मचारियों का वेतन, बोनस और अन्य सुविधाएँ बहुत अधिक हैं लेकिन यह भी देखना चाहिए कि पिछले 5 वर्ष में निगम के कर्मचारियों ने कड़ी मेहनत कर के और पालिसी धारकों से संपर्क करके पालिसी धारकों की संख्या

[श्री रीतलाल प्रसाद वर्मा]

में काफ़ी वृद्धि की है और आय को 220 प्रतिशत बढ़ाया है। यह सारा श्रेय बड़े अधिकारियों को नहीं जाता, बल्कि उन सारे कर्मचारियों पर निर्भर करता है जिन्होंने अपने मनोयोग से बीमा-धारकों से संपर्क करके पालिसियों को बढ़ाया है। इस तरह से इन कर्मचारियों पर यह प्रहार प्रजातंत्र और मजदूरों के विरोध में है। यह बिल कतई लोकतांत्रिक नहीं कहा जा सकता। इस बिल से मैं समझता हूँ कि सारे देश में एक विद्रोह की भावना सुलगेगी, क्योंकि इसके द्वारा मजदूरों के सारे अधिकारों को समाप्त किया गया है।

समापति महोदय, अभी तक जब कभी भी कोई बात होती थी तो उसे आपत्ती समझौते के द्वारा सुलझा लिया जाता था और हड़ताल को टाल दिया जाता था, लेकिन अब तो जीवन बीमा कर्मचारियों के पास हड़ताल के अलावा और कोई चारा नहीं रह गया है। अब उनके पास एक मात्र हथियार हड़ताल ही कहा जा सकता है। ऐसी स्थिति में सारे देश में जीवन बीमा निगम के हजारों कर्मचारियों को हड़ताल के कगार पर लेकर खड़ा कर दिया गया है। इस बिल के द्वारा सभी कर्मचारियों को सरकार के प्रति अनस्था पैदा हो गई है। जो सरकार मजदूरों का दम भरती है, पेपरबाजी करती है, मजदूरों के हितों की रक्षा करने के बोल बजाती रहती है वही सरकार इस प्रकार के कानून के द्वारा श्रमिकों के अधिकारों का हनन करने जा रही है। यह उसकी कथनी और करनी के अन्तर का सबूत है। हाथी के दांत दिखाने के और, और खाने के कुछ और ही होते हैं। उसी तरह से सरकार का यह कदम भी है। व्यवहार में यह कानून मजदूर विरोधी है। इसलिए मैं इसका घोर विरोध करता हूँ।

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (Dum Dum):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is one of the most preposterous and bad Bills, a sort of fascist type of measure, that I have ever seen being introduced in the Parliament. This is not only anti-working class but also anti-national.

I have heard the Finance Minister saying that the LIC employees have become bourgeois. Perhaps, the Finance Minister thinks that Tatas and Birlas are workers and that Indian workers have become capitalists, the bourgeois class. He is in the service of those workers, Tatas and Birlas—they are not bourgeois; they are workers.

May I tell you, when it concerns Tatas and Birlas, etc., this Government and their Ministers simply crawl on their bellies before them. But when it comes to the working class, they become a mighty policemen, beating them down, and they think that a patriotic service has been rendered by them. With this Bill, I say, the Government has declared a war on the working class. That is what the Government has done. We have seen the real importance of it.

They are going back on all the promises as in the case of Bangalore based public sector employees. They are enacting a measure in order to bypass the Supreme Court and to negate its judgment. To the extent they have gone, it is an anti-national posture. Because to go against the people of the country is to become anti-national. To be simply in the service of big bourgeois class is also anti-national. The entire lot of them has become anti-national. This has become clear with the introduction of this Bill.

Not only this. When they say that Indian workers have become bourgeois, they are setting one section of the working class against another and their purpose is to create a division so that the working people of the town and the country side cannot

come together and march against them, the real exploiters. That is their whole purpose. To the extent they want to create a division amongst the working people and the Indian people in this country, it is a deliberate, diabolical policy that is being pursued by them.

They talk of raising the living standards of 50 per cent of the people living below the poverty line. There are 70 per cent of the people who are living below the poverty line. There are agricultural labourers. Their standard of living will never be raised. Instead, they will be pushed down below the poverty line. They will point out to them and say that it is an organised sector. They have fought for pretty long years to win some concessions from them. They want to snatch those concessions from them; they want to curtail them. They are living in misery. During the regime of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the assets of the ten capitalists went from Rs. 500 crores to more than Rs. 1,000 crores, in three years. That means their assets doubled.

Whenever the entire industry was in stagnation, that was falsely attributed to the poor services rendered by the workmen! I am sure that they will go on repeating the same charge in future also.

Let me make it clear that the trade union movement and the working class are being driven to the wall. We have no option but to accept the challenge and to fight it back. And naturally this fight will go on, with whatever means we have at our disposal. There will be no let or hindrance in this fight. Since it is a general war, everything is fair in war and love. We declare that we will fight it tooth and nail, inside and outside Parliament, through strikes, through demonstration and through every possible method and bring the urban and countryside together, in order to oust this Government from power. This Government has become a stumbling-block in the path of advance of the

Indian people. I, therefore, oppose this measure, lock, stock and barrel.

I know this Fascist Government will not retreat from the position. But, we will also not retreat from the position. There can never be any compromise between the authoritarian forces and the people. So, the war is on. We will fight this war. Whatever may be the consequences to be faced, we are prepared to face and we will face them and fight will continue.

श्री रामावतार शारङ्गी (पटना) :

सभापति जी, मैं इस विधेयक का जोरदार विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। इस विधेयक के जरिए सरकार ने द्विपक्षीय और त्रिपक्षीय समझौते के सिद्धान्त पर सब से करारी चोट की है। आश्चर्य की बात है कि जो सरकार द्विपक्षीय और त्रिपक्षीय समझौते की अब तक बराबर वकालत करती रही और मजदूर आन्दोलन में इन सिद्धान्तों को स्वीकार कर लिया तब सरकार स्वयं ही उस सिद्धान्त पर हमला कर रही है। अगर इसे तानाशाही प्रवृत्ति का द्योतक माना जाय तो क्या हर्ज होगा? इस बात को यह प्रमाणित करता है कि सरकार ने अपनी जो पुरानी कार्यवाही और नीति निर्वारित की स्वयं उस पर चोट कर रही है। हिन्दुस्तान में पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था को मजबूत करने के लिये।

सरकार की तरफ से तर्क दिया जाता है कि उनको बहुत तनख्वाह मिलती है, उनको हम नीचे लाना चाहते हैं क्योंकि हमारे देश में बहुत सारे ऐसे लोग हैं जिनको बहुत कम मिलता है। खेत मजदूर का नाम सरकार लेती है। किस ने आपको रोका कि खेत मजदूरों को कम से कम 5 रु० मिनिमम मजदूरी देने का जो हमारे बिहार में नियम है उसको आप ऊँचा कर के 10, 20 रु० ले जायें। कौन रोकता है? अगर कोई रोकता तो कह सकते थे कि विरोधी दल के लोग इसमें रुकावट डालते

[श्री रामावतार शास्त्री]

हैं। इसमें हम तो आपका साथ देंगे। ऐसा कानून लाइये। सरकार ने वादा भी किया है कि वह खेत-मजदूरों के लिए एक कानून लायेगी और पूरे हिन्दुस्तान के पैमाने पर उन के लिए कुछ न कुछ व्यवस्था की जायेगी, ताकि उनकी स्थिति में सुधार हो। लेकिन अभी तक वह ऐसा कानून नहीं ला पा रही है। कौन रोकता है उसे? वह ऐसा कानून लाये, हम उसका साथ देंगे। लेकिन वह तो लोगों में फूट पैदा करना चाहती है, उद्योग-धंधों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों और देहात में काम करने वाले मजदूरों के बीच विभेद पैदा करना चाहती है। ऐसा कर के वह गरीबों की हितैषी बनने का स्वांग रचना चाहती है, जो चलने वाला ही है।

16.00

किसी माननीय सदस्य ने ठीक ही कहा है कि सरकार मुनाफ़ाखोरों के खिलाफ़ उनके मुनाफ़े पर बंदिश लगाने के लिए, इजारेदारों, बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों और विदेशी चाय कंपनियों के मुनाफ़े पर बंदिश लगाने के लिए कानून क्यों नहीं लाती है। टाटा और बिड़ला बारह-बारह अरब रुपये के मालिक बन चुके हैं। क्या सरकार ने कभी उनके मुनाफ़े पर बंदिश लगाने की हिम्मत की है? उसकी हिम्मत उनके सामने खत्म हो जाती है। वह उनके सामने भीगी बिल्ली की तरह व्यवहार करती है और मजदूरों पर डंडा चलाती है।

मैं मुगलसराय से आ रहा हूँ। कल मुझे ख़बर मिली कि जो महिलाएँ यहाँ प्रदर्शन करने के लिए आ रही थीं, महंगाई के खिलाफ़ महिलाओं को रोजगार देने की मांग करने के लिए, दहेज प्रथा के खिलाफ़, उन पर होने वाले बलात्कार और अत्याचार के खिलाफ़, इस सरकार की वेशरम पुलिस ने मुगलसराय में उन पर बर्बर लाठी-चार्ज किया।

यह शरम की बात नहीं, तो और क्या है? सरकार लम्बी चौड़ी बातें करती है कि हम मजदूरों के हितैषी हैं। वह मजदूरों की हितैषी होने का सुबूत लाठी चला कर दे रही है।

सरकार इस तरह के रवैये को छोड़ दे। वह मजदूर संगठनों के साथ, मजदूर जमातों के साथ, समझौते और मुलह-सफ़ाई का व्यवहार करे। जिन सिद्धान्तों को उसने पहले स्वीकार किया है, वह उनका पालन करे। एल आई सी के मजदूरों के साथ उसने 1974 में बोनस देने का सिद्धान्त स्वीकार किया था। यह निर्णय समझौता-वार्ता के फलस्वरूप हुआ था। सरकार ने उन्हें कोई भीख नहीं दी थी, उनके प्रति कोई दया नहीं दिखाई थी। वं लड़ें थे—अपनी ताकत और संगठन के बल पर उन्होंने आन्दोलन किया था। सरकार ने उनकी मांग को सही समझा और उनको बोनस दिया। अब वह उसको छीनना चाहती है।

सरकार ने इस कानून के जरिये बिरनी के छत्ते पर पत्थर मारने की कोशिश की है। अगर बिरनी के छत्ते पर पत्थर मारा जाता है, तो बिरनी भा कर काटती है। मधुमक्खी भी वही करती है। अगर आप उसके छत्ते पर ईंट-पत्थर मारेगे, तो वह काटेगी आपको भंभोर लेगी, जिससे आपका बदन फूल जायेगा और आपको तकलीफ़ होगी। सरकार ने हिन्दुस्तान के संगठित और असंगठित दोनों मजदूरों को चुनौती दी है कि उसके लिए कानून और व्यवस्था का कोई मतलब नहीं है, बल्कि जो बड़ चाहेगी, जो उसकी नेता चाहेगी, जो उसका संगठन चाहेगा, वही होगा और बाकी लोगों की बात नहीं मानी जायेगी।

कहने के लिए यह जनतंत्र है, लेकिन इसमें यह कोई और तंत्र है, यह धन-तंत्र है,

जिसमें सारा काम पूंजीपतियों के स्वार्थ की रक्षा के लिए होता है। लेकिन अब मजदूर चुप रहने वाले नहीं हैं। उनमें बहुत अधिक गुस्सा है। उसका सुबूत यही है कि सरकार के पीछे चलने वाले मजदूर-आई एन टी यू सी के झण्डे के नीचे चलने वाले मजदूर—भी इस कानून का विरोध कर रहे हैं। एल आई सी के मजदूरों के प्रति सरकार ने जो नीति अपनाई है, वे उसका जोरदार तरीके से विरोध कर रहे हैं। सरकार को उनके गुस्से का भी सामना करना पड़ेगा। मैं मंत्री महोदय से फिर निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह दमन का, अपनी पुलिस और फ़ौज की शक्ति का इस्तेमाल न करें मजदूर आन्दोलन को कुचलने के लिए। मजदूर संगठित होंगे।

आखिर में एक बात और कह देना चाहता हूँ। आप कहते हैं कि खेत मजदूरों को बहुत कम मजदूरी मिलती है। जब हम लोग खेत मजदूर यूनियनों की तरफ से आन्दोलन करने जाते हैं, बिहार की बात मैं बता रहा हूँ कि पांच रुपये भी इन को नहीं मिलते, जब हम कहते हैं कि उन को मिलना चाहिए तो आपके कांग्रेस के बड़े-बड़े नेता और कार्यकर्ता विरोध करते हैं और कहते हैं कि देखो, यह मजदूरों का दल है, यह किसान-विरोधी है। उस समय आप कहाँ जाते हैं? उस समय आप को कहना चाहिए कि नहीं, शास्त्री जी या इन का दल या इस तरह के जो वामपक्षी विचारधारा के लोग हैं, किसान सभा के लोग हैं या मजदूर यूनियनों के लोग हैं, ये जो मांग करते हैं इन की मांग सही है? ऐसा क्यों नहीं कहते? लड़िए मिलजुल कर के। इसलिए विधेयक का डर मत दिखाइए। मजदूर समझ रहा है, आप की हिम्मत नहीं है। अगर आप की हिम्मत होती तो इस विधेयक पर राय जानने के लिए आप इस को प्रचारित

करते। उसी से आप को अन्दाज़ लग जाता कि हिन्दुस्तान का मजदूर वर्ग, हिन्दुस्तान का किसान बहुसंख्या में है, क्योंकि मैं अकेले नहीं बोल रहा हूँ, बहुसंख्यक जनता की भावनाओं को मुखरित कर रहा हूँ और आप के सामने रख रहा हूँ। बहुमत जनता आप के विरुद्ध जा चुकी है। अगर आप अभी भी नहीं माने तो फिर आप जहाँ जाने वाले हैं सात समुद्र में वहाँ आप को ढुंवा कर ही जनता छोड़ेगी।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का जोरदार विरोध करता हूँ।

श्री गिरधारी लाल ब्यास (भीलवाड़ा) : लाइफ इश्योरेंस कारपोरेशन अर्मेडमेंट बिल का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। माननीय शास्त्री जी जो बात अभी वर रहे थे उसके सम्बन्ध में कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान में चाहे सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लॉईज हों, पब्लिक सेक्टर एम्प्लॉईज हों या प्राइवेट सेक्टर में हों, कहीं भी हों, जितनी तनख्वाह इस लाइफ इश्योरेंस कारपोरेशन में मिलती है उतनी तनख्वाह किसी में भी नहीं मिलती। हमारी नीति है कि वेज पालिसी हमारी ऐसी हो जिस के अन्तर्गत जितना काम जो करे, उतनी तनख्वाह उस को मिले। तो जितना काम जो करता है जैसे एक क्लर्क स्टेट गवर्नमेंट में काम करता है, एक सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट में करता है, एक पब्लिक सेक्टर में काम करता है, इन तीनों को कितना मिलता है और लाइफ इश्योरेंस कारपोरेशन में काम करने वाले को कितना मिलता है? इस को देखा जाय। सब एक प्रकार के क्लर्क हैं, एक ही कैटेगरी में सब आते हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में अगर इन को ज्यादा पैसा दिया जाता है, ज्यादा बढ़ावा दिया जाता है तो निश्चित तरीके से वह एक भेदभाव की नीति होगी और वह भेदभाव की नीति हमारी सरकार नहीं अपनाना चाहती, इसलिए इस प्रकार

[श्री गिरधारी लाल व्यास]

बिल वह यहां लाई है। जो बिल इस पालिसी को लागू करने के लिए लाया गया है निश्चित तरीके से वह स्वागत योग्य है।

दूसरा निवेदन मैं करना चाहता हूँ— इंडस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट्स ऐक्ट में वर्कर की डेफिनीशन में कौन आता है? कौन वर्कमैन है? इस का उस में प्रावधान है कि कितना पैसा पाने वाले को वर्कर माना जाता है। उस डेफिनीशन को अगर आप पढ़ें तो निश्चित तरीके से आप को अन्दाज हो जायगा कि किस को आप वर्कमैन मानते हैं और उस को किस प्रकार का लाभ मिलना चाहिए। इससे स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि वर्कमैन की डेफिनीशन के आधार पर इन सारी नीतियों को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए इस प्रकार का बिल यहां पर हम ने प्रस्तुत किया है। निश्चित तरीके से यह हमारी नीतियों के जो कांग्रेस की सरकार ने लेबर के बारे में अपनाई है उस के अनुकूल है। जिस प्रकार से मजदूरों को आगे बढ़ाने की नीति कांग्रेस की सदैव से ही रही है उसी के अनुरूप यह विधेयक भी है और निश्चित तरीके से उन वर्कमैन को जितना लाभ हमारे कानूनों से मिलना चाहिए वह देने का प्रयत्न सदैव हमारी सरकार ने किया है। यह जो कहते हैं कि बहुसंख्यक हम हैं यह गलत है। अगर आप बहुसंख्यक हैं तो हम यहां पर कैसे बैठे हुए हैं? हमारा तो यहां से पत्ता कट जाना चाहिए था। शास्त्री जी बहुसंख्यक नहीं हैं। उन के पास तो थोड़े से लोग हैं जिन के आधार पर वह बात करना चाहते हैं और वह ह्वाइट कालर लोग हैं। उन ह्वाइट कालर लोगों को हिमायत कर के वह करोड़ों करोड़ गरीब आदमियों के साथ अन्याय और अत्याचार करने में लगे हैं। इस प्रकार की नीति हिन्दुस्तान में निश्चित तरीके से नहीं चल सकती। हमारे फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब

ने सी पी एम के भाइयों को बिल्कुल ठीक कहा कि ये बुर्जुग लोग हैं, ये उन लोगों का समर्थन करते हैं जो लोग आज संगठित हो कर इस देश के अन्दर खराब वातावरण बनाने की योजना बना रहे हैं। पब्लिक सेक्टर के लोगों को बरगला कर इस सरकार के खिलाफ विद्रोह करना चाहते हैं। ज्यादा तनख्वाह पाने वाले लोगों को संगठित कर के इस सरकार के खिलाफ ये काम करना चाहते हैं। जहां इन की सरकार है वेस्ट बंगाल में वहां तो जोतेदारों को निकाल रहे हैं। उन के साथ किस प्रकार का अन्याय हो रहा है? जमीनें छीनी जा रही हैं, अन्याय और अत्याचार किया जा रहा है वेस्ट बंगाल के अन्दर और ये आज उन लोगों की पैरवी कर रहे हैं। यह पैरवी करते समय उन को ध्यान में रखना चाहिए कि उन की खुद की स्टेट में जहां वे सरकार चला रहे हैं वहां गरीब मजदूरों, गरीब क्राश्टकारों और छोटे छोटे लोगों को ऊंचा उठाने के लिए किस प्रकार की व्यवस्था बना रहे हैं? यह सही है कि आज माक्सिस्ट कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग इस देश में गन्दा वातावरण बनाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। पहले भी आपने देखा है कि कोयले की खानों में क्या हो रहा है? किस प्रकार की अव्यवस्था वहां पर आई हुई है। माक्सिस्ट कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग वहां से 50 लाख टन कोयला स्मगल करके विदेशों को भेज रहे हैं। इस प्रकार की नीति इनके द्वारा अपनाई जा रही है। यहां पर ये कहते हैं कि इस व्यवस्था को मजबूत बनाना चाहते हैं लेकिन इनकी नीतियों से बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो जायेगा कि किस तरीके से ये इस देश में काम करना चाहते हैं? इनकी कथनी में कुछ है और इनकी करनी में कुछ और है। यहां पर ये कुछ और कहते हैं और बाहर कुछ और कहते हैं। इस प्रकार की नीतियां अपना कर ये लोग निश्चित तौर से इस देश को आगे बढ़ाने में मदद नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिए

मैं इन भाइयों से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इनकी कथनी और करनी में जो अन्तर है उसको ये दूर करें। यदि आप लोग मजदूरों का भला करना चाहते हैं, किसानों का भला करना चाहते हैं और गरीबों का भला करना चाहते हैं तो आप उन नीतियों को अपना समर्थन दें जो कि हमारी सरकार बराबर मजदूरों को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए अपनाती रही है, किसानों और गरीबों को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए अपनाती रही है।

शास्त्री जी, आप कहते हैं कि हमारी नता, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी तानाशाह हैं लेकिन वे तानाशाह नहीं हैं बल्कि वे प्रजातंत्र में पूरा विश्वास रखने वाली हैं। उन्होंने प्रजातन्त्र को मजबूत बनाने के लिए सदैव अपनी आस्था व्यक्त की है। इस देश को ऊपर उठाने में जितना काम उन्होंने किया है उतना और किसी ने भी नहीं किया है। इस देश की सारी व्यवस्थाओं को ठीक तरीके से चलाने के लिए जितना काम उन्होंने किया है उतना अन्य कोई भी नहीं कर सकता है। इसलिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उन नीतियों और कार्यक्रमों के आधार पर हम इस बात को सोचना चाहिए कि आज लाइफ इंश्योरेंस के कर्मचारियों को क्या मिल रहा है और दूसरों को क्या मिल रहा है? लाइफ इंश्योरेंस कॉर्पोरेशन के कर्मचारियों को कितना बोनस और डी.ए. मिल रहा है और दूसरों को कितना मिल रहा है? दोनों को देख कर हमें समन्वय स्थापित करना पड़ेगा। अगर आज इसकी ठीक नहीं किया जायेगा तो इन लोगों ने आज लाइफ इंश्योरेंस वालों को बहकाया है, कल को रिजर्व बैंक वालों को बहकायेंगे, फिर पब्लिक सेक्टर अण्डरटेकिंग वालों को बहकायेंगे और उसके बाद गवर्नमेन्ट सर्वेन्ट्स को बहकायेंगे। इस प्रकार से इस देश की व्यवस्था नहीं चल सकेगी।

हमारे कम्युनिस्ट साथियों ने पीछे जनता पार्टी का समर्थन किया था लेकिन मैं नहीं जानता उन्होंने मजदूरों और किसानों के हित में कौन सा काम किया? ये केवल उन लोगों के पिछलग्गू बनकर रह गए। इन्होंने भी इस देश की व्यवस्थाओं को बिगाड़ने में कोई कोर-करसर बाकी नहीं रखी। तीन साल के शासन में निश्चित तौर से इस देश को बर्बाद किया गया और आज भी ये बर्बाद करना चाहते हैं। फरनाण्डिस साहब यहां पर बैठे हैं, इन्होंने 1974 से बराबर इस देश को बर्बाद करने का काम किया और जब सरकार में आए तो सीमेन्ट का दाम बढ़ाया, उसमें मिट्टी मिलाई और मल्टीनेशनल्स को प्रोत्साहन दिया। जनता पार्टी के शासन में इन्होंने देश को बर्बाद कर दिया, इस देश को रसातल में पहुंचा दिया। यह तो श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी का नेतृत्व और उनकी नीतियां हैं जिन्होंने इस देश को जहनुम में जाने से बचाया और अब मजबूती के साथ इस देश को आगे बढ़ा रही हैं। उन्होंने इन्फ्लेशन को रोका है और महंगाई को रोकने का प्रयत्न कर रही हैं। हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर की सूझ-बूझ से ऐसे कार्यक्रम बनाए जा रहे हैं जिनसे देश को शक्ति मिलेगी। इसीलिए मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill. For the last several days we have been dealing with this issue and debating it. I was seeing the Finance Minister, sitting in front of me, fondling the old annual number of Main Stream, and I also say him very seriously studying it. I did not know that all that he was studying was just one article written by me—I thought he was doing little more than that—and that too, not the entire article but just a couple of sentences from that article. I would, however, like the Finance Minister to know that the views that appeared in the article of Mainstream—the Annual Number 1977—are not the views that

[Shri George Fernandes]

I held as a member of the Government. They are the views that I have held all through my trade union life and if the hon. Minister would care to read one other article which I wrote after May Day 1980 and it has appeared in a magazine called Sunday published from Calcutta in July last year, he would find that my views are the same.

I have not discussed the wage structure of any particular category of employees. I have been an advocate of a national wage policy all through my trade union life and it is now about thirty-two years. Over these years we have fought many a battle, one of which was cited by an hon. Member who makes with his noise all that lacks in arguments and just everything else. That was the 1974 strike of the railwaymen. My hon. friend sees in that an attempt to create chaos in the country. It is not an original statement that you are making. Others have made it before you. But the fact is that in 1974 the strike was on this very issue of national wage policy. The railwaymen were demanding parity in wages with other sections of public employees. There is a strike going on in Bagalore just now. One hundred twenty thousand workers are involved in that strike in Bangalore, Nasik, Naini, Lucknow, Hyderabad and elsewhere in the country. They have withstood for the last 74 days every kind of assault on them — physical and other tactics — which no civilised Government should be use.

I wish to refer in this House the use of barbed wire round the Chiklal Bagh ground in Bangalore on the 5th of this month to prevent a meeting of the workers. The police, the PWD and contract labour spend the whole night to surround it with barbed wire—ten feet high barbed wire—to prevent the workers from assembling for a meeting.

Sir, this morning this House was to witness a poster and hand bills which are now telling the Malaylees and the

Kerala people and the Tamil people—that includes my esteemed friend, the Finance Minister, also because he comes from Tamil Nadu and there in Karnataka there is a wing of the ruling party which says 'throw out Malaylees and the Tamilians. If you do not do it within seven days, than they will starve you of water, electricity and rations.' (Interruptions).

We shall be discussing separately. The hon. Member may keep back his fire because he will get a chance most probably tomorrow to counter it with evidence. But today I am raising it in the House with evidence. Sir, the only point that I am making is that there is a struggle going on and let me tell the hon. Members that there is something else that they tried to do. Weeks ago a Minister of the Government was sent down to Bangalore, the Minister of Health, Shri Shankaranand. He spent two days in Bangalore calling together all the Harijan workers and telling them this is an attack on the public sector and so on and so forth and those workers were asked to go back to work. They refused to go back. Another effort was made to tell the Brahmin workers that they must protect the leader and, therefore, they must go back to work. Nothing works, Mr. Shankaranand! Neither Brahmin slogan nor Harijan slogan works. And now you are back to one of the lowest of slogans you could possibly, coin, that of Malayalee versus Karnataka; Tamilian versus Karnataka. But we will deal with it separately. The point I am making is that the struggle for parity in wages is something for which people like me have always fought. The Finance Minister pointed out that Allahabad High Court has given a judgement and he said, 'My esteemed friend Mr. George Fernandes was a member of the Government; so also Prof. Madhu Dandavate'. I would like my esteemed friend the Finance Minister to know this, that some of us opposed the idea of going in appeal to the

Supreme Court. I know I have taken an oath and I am assuming that even when I am in opposition I am bound by that oath. And that is why it is very difficult very often to discuss a lot of things. But let me make this point that some of us opposed it. I lost here as I lost on many other things and my Government lost on this issue also. But I would like the Finance Minister, if he wants to quote me, not to quote me only on one article in the Mainstream but to quote me on a number of other articles on issues on which I kept on speaking in this House and also writing outside and now that I know that the Hon. Finance Minister reads the Mainstream and reads it with such diligence, maybe, some of us could write a little more in the Mainstream so that we may help the Finance Minister assimilate some of the ideas for which we have been campaigning in this country. Will the Finance Minister accept my idea of abandoning the 700-crore fraud on the Indian people in the name of Asian Games? (*Interruption*). Why not? After all, if George Fernandes has given an idea as to how the national wage policy should be, and if those ideas inspire the Finance Minister, why should not George Fernandes's idea on 700-crore of money going into the drain in an extravaganza which has no relevance to the people of this country also not inspire him? Will the Finance Minister listen to George Fernandes on the Black Money Bonds when the Bill comes up next week or when it is put on the list? I said that we are opposed to this Bill. I said that it is an invitation to black money. Will he accept my views on that? Will he accept my views on take over of large number of large-sized private sector undertakings? So, Sir, the main point that I am trying to make out is that there are wider issues involved. Our opposition to this Bill came on a variety of grounds; I shall not go back to them again. But take the Statement of Objects and Reasons which the Finance Minister has enumerated

in the Bill. What has he said? He said and I quote:

"In order to control the cost of administration in the interest of the Life Insurance Corporation of India and its policyholders whose premium income the Corporation holds as a Trustee, it became necessary for Government to vest itself with powers to determine the terms and conditions of service of the employees and agents and streamline the salary structure."

Now, I would like to ask the Finance Minister that if this is the primary object with which he came forward with this Bill, why is he deciding now to split the LIC into 5 units? Is that also to reduce the expense ratio, the cost structure and so on and so forth? Or is it to provide for 5 Chairman instead of one Chairman? To provide instead of one M.D., 5 M.Ds? Instead of one Board of 10 and 2 Joint Secretaries (who incidentally get less than the LIC employees but who would continue to enjoy being Joint Secretaries rather than become LIC clerks by using some of the influence which otherwise they spend along in a very big way); instead of having two or three in One Board, you want to have 10 of them on 5 boards? Instead of having 10 member Board of Directors you want to provide for 50,—all of your own people? (*Interruptions*) It is very important to educate some of you, particularly when we have a young man like you and an enthusiastic man like you who is ever willing to learn even in this age. It is very important that we raise this issue again today because I want the Finance Minister to remember that if we are opposing this Bill today it is not because we support anything that is irrational; we are opposing it because the grounds which the Minister has come forward which are not tenable. I would now go back to the point he made about Mr. Fernandes

[Shri George Fernandes]

and Prof. Madhu Dandavate being in the Cabinet which went in appeal. We were fair, but you may charge us that we had gone on appeal. But we did something that was legal and we went on appeal to the Supreme Court. What you have done is that you try to introduce through the back-door an Ordinance with which you are now trying to do away with all that the workers have achieved over 20 years through collective bargaining. Are you trying to equate your Act with this Ordinance which the Government is going against an appeal, against the judgment of the Court? Some of us did not support that idea. But can you equate this too? And yet I find the Finance Minister today having no other argument, having nothing else to fall back upon... (Interruptions) My colleague Prof. Dandavate was quoted as saying that he was quoting the Bible when he was reading the main stream of article.... (Interruptions) I felt like saying that the devil is... (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: It was wrongly quoted.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: If at all sometimes devil is friendly, it becomes a problem... (Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Here it was a saint quoting from a very bad scripture....

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Now, we are in a situation where the Government have really thrown a challenge. This is a challenge which we are seeing everywhere and I am sure the hon. Member from Rampur Constituency will not take me a miss when I say that we were facing it in Modi Nagar, we were facing it in Bangalore public sector undertakings, we were facing it in a large number of sectors where the workers are being denied a fair deal. You are using all the powers that you possess today to deny them

of even what they have. Many of us have criticised this Bill that it is not only a wage freeze Bill but you are moving in the direction of wage cut, to which you have taken the first step by bringing this Bill forward in this House. You may use all the powers that you have to pass this Bill. But let me warn you that it is not going to work. It did not work earlier and it will not work now. Last time, you did similar things. Don't forget that. I do not want to go and refer to the ancient history. I only want to go back to 3 or 4 years during which period you brought forward the Emergency Bill and then you tried to do away the various concessions which the workers had secured after several years of struggle and you know the consequence. Today you are doing it without the Emergency or may be having created a situation of challenging the working class in this country, you would than think that may be conditions could be created where you can once again talk in terms of Emergency. It is very difficult to know their minds because very often when they say 'No', it means 'Yes' and when they say 'Yes' it means 'No'. It is very difficult to know what is going on in their minds.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Especially when the ladies any 'No'.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ladies are sometimes kind and soft-hearted.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: So, if the Government has any such ideas that they will beat the workers down and as the hon. Members has just now pointed out about the poor and rural people and so on and so forth and I know a large number of hon. Members on the ruling party side are deeply concerned about the poor and the rural and you approached some of them the other day. Now, the expenses that have been incurred, work out to anywhere between one hundred crores

and two hundred crores of rupees. It was nice to see, it was nice to know that in your disposition the poor of this country can afford Rs. 100 crores to Rs. 200 crores to come to Delhi just for a day. It is good to hear that, it is good to read that, it is good to know that. But if you think that you are now going to create a situation where you are going to bring about a division between urban and the rural, between the workers and the peasants, you are making a mistake on that (*Interruptions*). We never made that mistake. Of course, we made a number of mistakes, not a mistake of that nature... (*Interruptions*) because we are aware of the fact that the workers of the country are the children of the farmers. I want to warn this Government. This is a very major piece of legislation which they are now going to enact. It will be passed, they have the majority with which they can pass it. We are aware of that. But since they are now on the threshold of enacting this major piece of legislation and in the process, throwing a challenge to the working people of this country, let me tell the Finance Minister, let me tell the Government that we take your challenge, that we accept your challenge and though we shall have lost the fight within another five minutes from now, but we shall take this fight outside this House and we shall meet you anywhere and every where on any terms that you may decide and we shall finally win this war.

With these words, I oppose this Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Mr. Madhukar, I could not call your name because the time is running very short.

Now, the Minister.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, very early in my legal career,

I had read a little anecdote and that is that if your case is weak, you abuse the opposition attorney.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Abuse or annoy the attorney?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: That is also used, but 'abuse the opposite attorney', is the British version of it.

The amount of abuse that I have heard makes me sure that the case is weak.

So far as the Bill itself is concerned, it is very simple. The present wage structure in the LIC is irrational and on that there can be no two opinions. And what the Government has done is only to bring it on par with some of the best that we have. To say that Government have done something which has taken away the right of collective bargaining is to indulge in exaggeration out of proportion to what has happened. Sometimes, as you know, exaggerations lose the case. If you exaggerate too much, people do not even understand what the substance is in that. No power has been taken, no law has been enacted saying that there is no direct negotiations even now possible between the LIC and the workers. What we have said is that in view of a long pending dispute which has gone from court to court and involved interminable proceedings, Government have taken powers to notify the ceiling rate of dearness allowance and the application of the bonus law to them. Therefore, to infer from this that the collective bargaining right has been taken away and there is an attack on the entire working class, there is a battle, war cry raised against it and all that, is to whip up an emotion which is not warranted by the circumstances.

A number of irrelevant things have been said and I find myself in a

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

difficulty. Normally, I do not reply to things which are not relevant, but in some of these cases if they go unchallenged, it may mean that we have accepted them. Shri Fernandes particularly said that there were some attempts made by the various people in the Government to split the workers. I very firmly deny that charge. The workers themselves have been coming and meeting different Ministers and they have been trying to request them to intervene and bring about some kind of settlement. To say that the Ministers have gone about creating differences between Harijans and non-Harijans, or Tamilians and others is totally unwarranted in the circumstances.

Certain notice or some poster has been displayed in the House. Nobody knows who issued it and yet you assume that it has been issued by the ruling party or the Government and then you go on attacking as if it had been established that it has been issued by the Government or anybody in charge of the Government, or anybody connected with the Government.

Now, if you assume the thing to be proved, then how do we deny it, how do we counteract it? I thought there is something like logic, something like proof. And when you make certain allegations, they have got to be proved. But you produce something and say this is something produced, therefore, the Government are now trying to split the workers into regional and linguistic groups and so on is a statement which, at any rate on the present showing, is unfounded. We do not know unless something more positive is produced as to the man who propounded it, as to the man who got it published. It is really not possible for anybody to immediately levy a charge against the Government as such or against

Members of the Government as being guilty of this.

Mr. Fernandes particularly wanted me to tell him whether I would follow him in several other things. Well, it should have been obvious to him that I don't. Well, if we had followed him, we would have been in the same place; the very fact that you are opposite and we are not, proves what I say.

But what I quoted was what Mr. Fernandes himself enunciated a basic Labour Policy that there are high wage islands and he specifically mentioned LIC and Banks and he said that they are asking for more which, in his opinion, is not justified. I said, when Mr. Fernandes himself had satisfied that it is not justified, how does he now go and support the case when I tried to bring out uniformity.

16.38 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Only one minute Sir. If he reads that entire paragraph, he will find that I have, in fact, used the term that they are very justifiable asking for more.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Shall I read it?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:

"Agitations are presently being conducted by the LIC and Bank employees seeking still better"

mark the word 'still better' "wage terms".

And when you come to this....

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Read the whole paragraph.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: The paragraph says:

"Cement workers are threatening nationwide strike then, if they are not given a 50 per cent hike in their total emoluments."

In fact you are supporting what I am saying.

"In Haryana, Tamilnadu and Maharashtra industrial production has come to a halt in several industrial belts. The impression that with the CDS and the Bonus question settled, there would be a thaw in wage demands has been belied. As their wage contracts expire, workers quite justifiably are seeking fresh negotiations on new demands."

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I said they are justified in seeking it.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: No, you say, 'they are asking still more.' These are exactly the words.

If the LIC and the Bank employees are seeking still higher wages that means they are getting high wages that they are not entitled to.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: In the absence of a National Wage Policy all these things may quite justifiably take place.

That is what I said.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I will read that also.

"An essential aspect of the formulation of a National Wage Policy is to accept the principle of equal pay for equal work. Though this is a preposition that is theoretically acceptable to everyone, the organised working class has, short of sloganising it, done pretty little to translate it into action for obvious reasons. The result is there for all to see. Even in the organised industrial sector there have developed high wage islands that have no relationship whatsoever, to the wage pattern prevailing in the entire industry."

And he goes on to say:

"But the minimum wage of the unskilled workers in the Khadi and Village Industries Commission where the files get pushed is over Rs. 300 per month."

"And, as trade unionists we are keen on getting bonus for the employees of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission, while the Khadi worker's claim for a better deal will never figure in our thinking."

The whole tenor of this article is this. *(Interruptions)* If you say that I have read wrong, I am sorry.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is the date of this?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: 1977. *(Interruptions)* It is all right. It adds to my knowledge. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We were discussing the national wage policy. It is not only pre-1977 or 1977. I am prepared to read articles of 1980 and 1981 also for the Minister.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He could not have written a better article in 1977.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: The whole tenor of the article is this. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA (Bombay North): That justifies his position.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: He justified himself on that word. The tenor of the whole article is that. *(Interruptions)* It is all right; but based on what? It is based on the feeling that some high wage islands are existing there, while the Khadi and village workers are getting very much less—for whom the trade unions does not shed a tear—and while we are going on asking for payment of wages and bonus for the worker—who is a Clerk or an employee in the Khadi Commission. *(Interruptions)*

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

This is what he has stated. This is the position.

I do not want to go into an elaborate argument. I only wanted to say that the position, as stated by Shri Fernandes himself, is that in our country we have, rightly or wrongly, intentionally or unintentionally, developed certain high wage island pockets; and it requires to be set right. And this is what we have done.

Fernandes again said: "We filed an appeal. It is different from bringing in a legislation." I can read for him what the courts said. If he thought that the High Court's decision which upheld the worker's right saying that the agreement prevailed over the Ordinance which was passed by the present Government in its earlier term of office; what does the Supreme Court say here? "This agreement will be valid until it is set aside by a fresh agreement, adjudication or legislation"; and we have done this piece of legislation. Therefore, if you say that you were people who were sworn to the sanctity of the collective bargaining agreement, then you should not have gone in appeal, and should have conceded the collective bargaining agreement.

Mr. Fernandes said something on which I don't want to comment. He said that he differed. But you know the Cabinet practice, Parliamentary practice is that if a man differs.... (Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, he has quoted Fernandes so much. Fernandes should be laid on the Table of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is very near the Table of the House.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: He said that he differed and also included Prof. Dandavate when he was not there—that both of them differed. The common parliamentary practice is that if they differed, they should have resigned. And if they did not resign, it means that they did not differ.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Like Mr. V. V. Giri.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Are we permitted to resign with retrospective effect?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, I concede him the right, because he concedes me the right—that I can do retrospective legislation.

I don't want to take more time. Honestly, I say that this will not bring about all this kind of fears and apprehensions which are being expressed. The relationship between the LIC and the staff will settle down on the basis of this legislation; and the legislation having ensured for them the dearness allowance at the rate... (Interruptions) and the bonus law being made applicable, they will be able to negotiate, and arrive at a settlement between them. I thank the House for the elaborate discussion and also for very valuable suggestions made from time to time. I hope the House will accept the motion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 11)

AYES

(16.49 hrs.)

Abbasi, Shri Kazi Jalil
Ankineedu, Shri M.
Ankineedu Prasad Rao, Shri P.
Arakal, Shri Xavier
Baithe, Shri D. L.
Bajpai, Dr. Rajendra Kumari
Baleshwar Ram, Shri
Bansj Lal, Shri
Barway, Shri J. C.
Behera, Shri Rasabehari
Bhagwan Dev, Acharya
Bhatia, Shri R. L.
Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu
Bhole, Shri R. R.
Bhuria, Shri Dildeep Singh
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
Chavan, Shri S. B.
Chennupati, Shrimati Vidya
Chingwang Konyak, Shri

Choudhari, Shrimati Usha Prakash
 Chouhan, Shri Fatehbhan Singh
 Daga, Shri Mool Chand
 Daibir Singh, Shri
 Dalbir Singh, Shri
 Damor, Shri Somjibhai
 Dennis, Shri N.
 Dev, Shri Santosh Mohan
 Dogra, Shri G. L.
 Dubey, Shri Ramnath
 Faleiro, Shri Eduardo
 Fernandes, Shri Oscar
 Gadgil, Shri V. N.
 Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh
 Gehlot, Shri Ashok
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar
 Gounder, Shri A. Senapathi
 Gulsher Ahmed, Shri
 Jadeja, Shri Daulatsinhji
 Jai Narain Roat, Shri
 Jaideep Singh, Shri
 Jain, Shri Bhiku Ram
 Jain, Shri Nihal Singh
 Jain, Shri Virbhi Chander
 Jena, Shri Chintamani
 Jitendra Prasad, Shri
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kamal Nath, Shri
 Kamla Kumari, Kumari
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
 Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
 Kochak, Shri Ghulam Rasool
 Kosalram, Shri K. T.
 Kuchan, Shri Gangadhar S.
 Kusuma Krishna Murthy, Shri
 Lakkappa, Shri K.
 Laskar, Shri Nihar Rajan
 Mahabir Prasad, Shri
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
 Mahala, Shri R. P.
 Mahendra Prasad, Shri
 Mallanna, Shri K.
 Mallick, Shri Lakshman
 Misra, Shri Haripatha
 Misra, Shri Nityananda
 Mohanty, Shri Brajamohan
 Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ananda Gopal
 Muthu Kumaran, Shri R.
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Narayana, Shri K. S.
 Netam, Shri Arvind
 Nikhra, Shri Rameshwar
 Odiedra, Shri Maldevji M.
 Panday, Shri Kedar

Pardhi, Shri Kesharao
 Parmar, Shri Hiralal R.
 Patil, Shri A. T.
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
 Patil, Shri Uttamrao
 Pattabhi Rama Rao, Shri S. B. P.
 Poojary, Shri Janardhana
 Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram
 Pushpa Devi Singh, Kumari
 Raju, Shri P. V. G.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Reddy, Shri K. Brahmananda
 Sahi, Shrimati Krishna
 Saminuddin, Shri
 Sangma, Shri P. A.
 Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumari
 *Shamanna, Shri T. R.
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Shanmugam, Shri P.
 Sharma, Shri Chiranjil Lal
 Sharma, Shri Nand Kishore
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Shastri, Shri Dharam Dass
 Shastri, Shri Hari Krishna
 Shingda, Shri D. B.
 Singh Deo, Shri K. P.
 Solanki, Shri Babu Lal
 Sparrow, Shri R. S.
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishna Dutt
 Sunder Singh, Shri
 Suryawanshi, Shri Narsing
 Tayeng, Shri Sobeng
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewary, Prof. K. K.
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Venkatasubbalah, Shri P.
 Vijayaraghavan, Shri V. S.
 Virbhadr Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Giridhari Lal
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh
 Zail Singh, Shri

Zainul Basher, Shri

NOES

Balanandan, Shri E.

Basu, Shri Chitta

Biswas, Shri Ajoy

Chakraborty, Shri Satyasadhan

Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin

Dandavate, Prof. Madhu

Dandavate, Shrimati Pramila

Das, Shri R. P.

Fernandes, Shri George

Ghosh, Shri Niren

Giri, Shri Sudhir

Gupta, Shri Indrajit

Hasda, Shri Matilal

Jatiya, Shri Satyanarayan

Madhukar, Shri Kamla Mishra

Maitra, Shri Sunil

Mhalgi, Shri R. K.

Misra, Shri Satyagopal

Mukherjee, Shri Samar

Negi, Shri T. S.

Pandit, Dr. Vasant Kumar

Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas

Rajda, Shri Ratansinh

Riyan, Shri Baju Ban

Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar

Sen, Shri Sunil

Shastri, Shri Ramavatar

Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.

Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari

Varma, Shri Ravindra

Verma, Shri Phool Chand

Verma, Shri R. L. P.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Subject to correction, the result †† of the division is:

AYES: 116: NOES: 32.

The motion was adopted

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Bill is passed.

(Interruptions)

(At this stage, some hon. Members left the House.)

16.51 hrs.

GENERAL BUDGET, 1981-82—GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We shall now take up the general discussion on the General Budget.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Mukundapuram): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir. There have been broadly two reactions to the Budget among the hon. Members of this House and the people at large. Amongst some there has been a sense of jubilation about the concessions provided in the form of the exemptions and reductions to the middle classes which has been made out to be an essential feature of this year's Budget. Among others there has been a sense of scepticism about the Government's economic policy in general and the Budget in particular—heightened by the Bearer Bonds Scheme the explicit and implicit concessions to the corporate sector and the huge deficits in the Budgets of last year and this year and increasing reliance on foreign capital that has come to characterise our path of development. It is on the basis of this scepticism and the implications thereof that I intend to draw the attention of the Members of this House and the Finance Minister himself.

The Finance Minister has in his speech referred to a transition from a period of "crisis management" to one of growth as forming the background of the budget that he has presented. However, as a prelude to my comments

††The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Sarvshri Laxman Karma, P. Rajagopal Naidu, Charanjit Singh,

NOSE: Sarvshri A. K. Balan and T. R. Shamanna.