

taking. Only then the House will feel re-assured that the Prime Minister's security is taken proper care of.

MR. SPEAKER: We take up legislative business.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: My point of order is, yesterday I had given Calling Attention notice regarding Peking broadcast. I saw on the notice board that three other Calling Attentions were admitted and my Calling Attention was put for to-day. To-day I found it missing. According to Rule 5 it will lapse if it does not come to-day. May I know the fate of this Calling Attention.

MR. SPEAKER: After the Calling Attention was balloted, the Minister of External Affairs informed me that he has to go along with the Prime Minister to Nepal and the question being a very important question he wanted personally to answer the question. Therefore I have listed that question for Monday.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): I had sought your permission to raise the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: To-day I have given five.

श्री विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने नया रूल यह बनाया है कि जिस दिन आप एडमिट करेंगे, उसी दिन जितने मनाम होंगे, उन में से आप इन्क्लूड क रगे, उस का रिप्लाय कब होगा, रह बाद की बात है। इसलिए जो नाम एडमिट हुए हैं उनमें नया नाम नहीं जुड़ सकता है।

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. As it is it will come on Monday. All the 377 statements will be allowed (including yours). Not to-day. I selected, five.

MHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Just a minute.

MR. SPEAKER: Our minutes are very long minutes. We take up further consideration of the Bill. Shri Ravindra Verma.

(Interruptions)\*\*

MR. SPEAKER: Please, don't record.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please don't record.

Now we take up further consideration of the Bill. Shri Ravindra Varma.

12.33 h.rs.

PAYMENT OF BONUS (AMENDMENT BILL)—contd.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-TARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): When the House passed on to other business on Wednesday I was referring to the concept of the bonus and the relation between the concept of the bonus and the coverage that the Act provides. I tried to point out that in spite of the fact that amendments to the Act earlier had empowered the State Governments i.e. the appropriate Governments to extend the coverage of the Act to establishments and undertakings employing less than 20 but not less than 10, the coverage had not been extended and I ask my hon. friends here to think about the reasons why in spite of legislation that enabled this possibility, the application of the Act was not extended. It is primarily because, as was pointed out the other day, there is a close connection between the extension of the coverage of the Act and the impact that this extension will have on the economic viability of undertakings. Sir, my hon. friend Shri Stepher to whom I have referred again and again said the other day that the concept of a deferred wage arises because of two factors, and I am entirely in agreement with him.

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

[SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO in the chair]

First of all he said that the reason why we in this country think of, and demand, bonus as a deferred wage is the fact that wages in this country are very low. There is a relationship between the concept of a deferred wage and the reality of low wages. He, therefore, very rightly pointed out the other day that the question of a minimum wage, the question of a fair wage, the question of the level of wages, all these questions are relevant to and related to the concept of a deferred wage.

He also said—I agree with him again—that, unfortunately, in this country there is a gap between income and expenditure, especially, in the lower rungs of society. It therefore, transpires that the immediate consumption needs of essential commodities are paramount. Therefore, the wage-earner is not in a position to save and meet the expenditure that sometimes he has to incur all of a sudden. So, he pointed out to the fact that it sometimes becomes necessary to cushion the availability of income to the wage-earner, and to see that such contingencies as festivals and other things are met.

Now, Sir in regard to both these points, I am in agreement with him. When you say that the bonus is a deferred wage, it gets linked with the whole question of level of wages, the prices that prevail and the incomes that are permissible. Therefore, I would beg to submit that these conclusions are only based on the premises which my hon. friend put forward, with which I myself agree.

Therefore, it is entirely logical for the Janata Party to hold, and for this Government to hold, that the question of bonus as a deferred wage, the concept of bonus as a deferred wage, is linked with the general questions of the level of wages, fair wage, minimum wage and the questions of prices

and incomes that are all inter-related. Nobody can deny that these are inter-related questions. That is what we have said that our attitude to these questions is dependent on our overall policy as far as incomes, wages and prices are concerned.

There is nothing which can be described as illogical in holding that these two are connected. Now, a question was raised about the duration for which we are introducing the statutory minimum bonus of 8.33 per cent. As my hon. friends on the other side and this side said the other day, it is true that in the past too, from 1971 onwards, when the bonus was increased from 4 per cent to 8.33 per cent, it was through Ordinances and subsequent acts which were annual. It was open to the then Government too to bring forward a legislation which would have made this a permanent feature. I am sure my hon. friend, Shri Stephen would have moved amendments and must have made such demands at that time too. His point was that this should become a permanent feature. I can understand his anxiety in this regard. The fact remains that, in the past too, legislation on this question had been brought from year to year. In our case, as I tried to submit earlier, there is a logical relationship between our stand on the wages and the fact that we are bringing forward this Bill for one year; our attitude to the question is dependent on our overall policy on wages, incomes and prices.

Now, Sir, it was open to the then Government to extend it and to put it in the statute book for all times. They had all the powers that they wanted. There was no dearth of powers. I am sure nobody will argue that there was dearth of powers. The limitless powers which the Government enjoyed during the emergency were not used to put such a legislation on the statute book; but these limitless powers were used to put the hands of the clock back, and not for-

ward. This is unfortunately a fact with which my hon. friend will also agree.

Then I come to 34 (3) which was referred to. My good friend, Shri Saugata Roy, who is a very well informed Member and who makes very intelligent and effective contributions to the deliberations of the House unfortunately slipped up on this question. I am sorry my young friend is not here at this moment. But he said that we are trying to take away 34(3) from the Act. This is totally incorrect, and I am sure he would not have made this statement if he had taken pains to look at the Bill that we have brought before the House. There must have been a terrible slip up. Otherwise, a man like my hon. friend, Shri Saugata Roy, would not have said what he said, because, facts are quite to the contrary. 34(3) was removed from the Act during the Emergency by my hon. friends sitting opposite. Now, what we are trying to do is not to remove this. Today, it does not exist in the Act as it stands. This Bill has been brought forward to put this clause back; it was removed earlier. Therefore, I am sorry that on the basis of a gross misunderstanding my hon. friends should have accused us of trying to remove this provision.

It was stated that this clause introduces some new features. It is true that there are two provisos that we have put in in this Bill. One relates to the need to secure prior approval from the appropriate government and the other relates to 8.33 and the allocable surplus. Unless there is an allocable surplus, bonus cannot be more than 8.33 per cent. I should like to ask this House; is it better not to have section 34(3) at all, and continue the situation as it existed during the emergency, or is it better to reinstate the clause with certain safeguards which were demanded all the time by my hon. friends including my hon. friend Stephen. I do not think that it would be possible for me to pre-

sent the case for this proviso better than in the words of my distinguished friend Mr. Stephen. I refer to him because he is a man of enormous experience in the field of trade union activity, and I respect him for that. He therefore knows what flaws are there, and how certain provisos are pregnant with the possibility of abuse. I should like, not for banter, but because I think those are the best ways of formulating the arguments to quote what my hon. friend Mr. Stephen has said. Here I must say that 34 (3) talks of bilateral agreement on the basis of some formula, negotiated formula other than the formula of the 8.33 minimum bonus. Emphasis is on the necessity to agree on a formula, emphasis is not on agreement or on the necessity to agree, on a figure. With characteristic eloquence my hon. friend Mr. Stephen said:

“Legislation provided for agreements outside formula. What was the result? Minimum bonus was conceded. It is a ten year old concept now. Has any intelligible or intelligent productivity bonus formula been evolved in the course of ten years? I am not talking about a few institutions where there are production and productivity bonus formulae. In a large number of institutions such a formula has not been evolved. No trade union has ever tried to evolve a formula that way. A thing that should have been evolved has not been evolved.... There were areas, public sector areas where large amounts were being paid, private sector areas where large amounts were being paid....”

“At whose cost”? Asks Mr. Stephen.

“At whose cost? Even if the surplus warranted a payment of only 10 per cent, if an agreement is evolved between the management and labour for payment of thirty per cent, at whose cost is this being done?”

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that income-tax is being taken out. It is at that cost it is being done...."

I do not want to quote too much lest he may say that I am quoting scriptures. He goes on to say:

"The bonus review committee collected details and the details show that 80 per cent of the cases are those in which this particular provision was taken advantage of and bonus was being paid at a level far higher than warranted by this formula or by the appellate tribunal formula."

I am tempted to quote because this is the best way of formulating the arguments in favour of the proviso. Then he went on to say, "As a trade union worker—which he is—"myself and Shri Banerjee were very keen to get freedom to workers to have an agreement at higher levels. But as a Parliamentarian"—he is a distinguished Parliamentarian even as he is a distinguished trade union worker—"and as a representative of the people, we will have to look at the other side also."

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): He will be your potential friend.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: He has been my friend always. I do not disown him today. I hope he does not disown me.

If freedom is to be given, then why should we have the Statutory provision? Then the whole thing can be left at that stage. As I said earlier, I am not quoting this to confront Mr. Stephen with his past not at all. If he thinks so, I will be sorry, because it is not my intention to do so. But I want to point out, how even a trade union leader of his eminence and a distinguished Parliamentarian of his eminence thinks of the logic behind certain provisos of the kind in 34 (3) that a formula is necessary. Often

times it happens that a figure is agreed upon, and no formula is evolved and if that is the case, who should look at the question whether there is a formula or it is only a figure. It can only be the Government. My friend Mr. Stephen again says— I do not want to quote him at length—"as a trade union leader, I have signed many agreements which are one line agreements." I am sure the other friends here also have the same experience, agreement on one line in which you say something about a certain figure. What is the basis of this agreement? It need not be always negotiations and examination of account books and what not? It can be pressure. I am not raising the question whether this pressure is legitimate or otherwise. But the purpose of the legislation to see that this is done on the basis of a formula which is different is not achieved if there is not some possibility, some contrivance, some way of examining whether there is an alternative formula or it is only a figure arrived at as a result of pressure, if not collective bargaining.

Therefore, the reason why we have introduced this proviso is very clear, and as Mr. Stephen himself said, we have to look at it here from the point of view of Members of Parliament who have to protect not only the rights of workers— of course, we have to protect the rights of workers, we have to protect the interests of the workers and ensure that they get a legitimate share of the profits, they get a wage consistent with their requirements— we have to protect all these things— but as Members of Parliament, we cannot ignore the interests of other sections of the society as well. We are sitting here as Members of Parliament who have to protect the interests of all sections not only of workers, but of other sections also to hold the balance and this can be done only by this hon. House. Therefore, it is being said that there must be a provision which enables the Government to look at agreements, and

examine and scrutinize whether there are alternative formulae or alternative means are used to by-pass a formula.

There was a reference to the increase in quantum, in an amendment or in a speech made from this side. This is not new either. This has been partly answered by what I said earlier. I think, it was Mr. Mahesh Desai—I hope, Mr. Stephen will correct me if I am wrong—who demanded 15 per cent bonus. It is not a new idea that the quantum must be increased. But, Sir, the arguments that I have put forth before the House are arguments that answer the demand about the increase in the quantum.

Now I come to investment allowance. Again it was made to look as though it was something new which was being conceded to the capitalists by the Janata Government. This is most unfortunate. I think it is because the question has not been properly studied. My distinguished and hon. friend, comrade, Ahalya Rangnekar also made this point. Unfortunately, she is not here at the moment. The House knows that even from 1965, the development rebate was deductible as a prior charge in the computation of the allocable surplus. In the Finance Act of 1976, the development rebate was done away with, and in its place the investment allowance has been introduced. All that we have tried to do in this Bill is to up-date the clause. Since there is no development rebate and its place has been taken by the investment allowance, we are putting in the words 'investment allowance'.

Scrutiny of profit and loss account is a very important point which has been referred to by Mr. Stephen, Mr. Saugata Roy, Mr. Chitta Basu, who mounts a constant vigil on everything that concerns workers and bonus—and many others on this side. Dr. Swamy, my distinguished friend who crosses swords with many—I can't yet refer to him as a veteran of many wars—has also referred to this. This criticism is based on a misunderstanding

of the situation. Mr. Stephen was a little clearer than some others who were ambiguous. It is not that the Act as it stands today guarantees this right to the workers to inspect the profit and loss account and challenge the propriety of the entries. It is not that such a provision exists in the law today and we are trying to take it away. Mr. Stephen said that a declaration was made by the then government about two things, firstly that there will be a minimum bonus of Rs. 100 if there was a profit irrespective of allocable surplus, and secondly, that workers will have the right to challenge the propriety of entries in the profit and loss account. These were two announcements made by the then government on 17th January, 1977, a day or two before the elections were announced. It was a declaration of intention by the then government. Could the government not have acted on it? Did they not have the power? How many ordinances were promulgated! Could they not have promulgated another ordinance for this? They did not do so. Therefore, to give the impression to the House that the previous government had given some rights to the workers which the Janata Government is trying to take away now is highly misleading. Mr. Stephen did not say so; but he said that on 17th January they made the declaration, and they had no time afterwards. Whether there was no time or whether there was no intention, I do not want to go further into it except to say that it is a fact that this proposal was made but was sent back from quarters higher up or whatever they were described as at that time.

Some points were raised about industrial unrest. I do not think I should take the time of the House to deal with this, because we have discussed this question during Question Hour and on many other occasions. There is no doubt that there is industrial unrest in the country. One does not deny it. As I have said many times, the government is trying to

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

deal with this situation firstly by removing irritants, and secondly by streamlining the machinery for settlement of disputes. We are all well aware of the many lacunae in the existing legislation. We hope it will be possible for us to bring forward legislation to remove them on the basis of the consensus that we have identified as a result of the discussions that we have had in the tripartite conference and the tripartite committee. I would not like to say more on this.

Sir, the debate on the motion for consideration has shown that there is considerable agreement, almost unanimity in this House as far as the restoration of the 8.33 per cent bonus is concerned. There is no dispute on that and that is the main objective of the Bill. On coverage too I would like to submit to the House that the banking companies and the Industrial Reconstruction Corporation which were taken out from the coverage of the Act through the amendments that were made in 1975 is being restored. So, the House can very well see that the primary objective of this Bill is to restore the position that existed before the Emergency and the Act that was passed during the Emergency.

Sir, I agree that the Bill as we have introduced now does not deal with all the points that the hon. Members on this side and on that side of the House have raised regarding conditions of workers or their demnads. I do not claim on behalf of the Government that this is a comprehensive Bill which deals with every aspect of the situation. I do not claim so. But I would like to say one thing. Even if the Bill does not go as far as many hon. Members want the Bill to go, if the hon. Members feel that this Bill is a welcome measure, in that it restores the 8.33 per cent bonus, I would suggest to the House that this is a Bill which should receive the support of the House.

Often times there is a choice between half a loaf and no loaf at all. It can very well be that in many situations that we face, we do not get every thing that we want. I will not for one moment say that many of the demands that have been made or many of the suggestions that have been made should not be considered. I am not even saying on second consideration, that Government will not accept many of those things if not today, at another time. I am not saying it. But inasmuch as this Bill tries to restore the 8.33 per cent bonus and the coverage that existed before the amendments were introduced in 1975 I would unhesitatingly recommend this Bill for the acceptance of the House and, therefore, I hope that the hon. House will accept the Bill that has been introduced by me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is

"That the Bill further to amend the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: After the lunch hour we will take up amendments. The House stands adjourned for lunch till 2 p.m.

12.58 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.*

*The Lok Sabha reassembled after Lunch at eight minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.*

[SHRI M.SATYANARAYAN RAO *in the chair*]

#### PAYMENT OF BONUS (AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We take up clause by clause consideration.

Clause 2— (Act 21 of 1975 to have the modified effect for a particular period)

**SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER** (Durgapur): I beg to move:

Page 1 line 16—

for "1976" substitute "1974" (5)

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN** (Idukki): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 16,—

for "1976"

substitute—

"1974 and in respect of every subsequent accounting year" (19)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is, if I may say so, the most vital clause in this Bill. There are two aspects in the Bill— (1) what are the provisions that the Bill seeks to incorporate and (2) for what period. With respect to the proposals, they are broadly welcomed subject to this that something must be added and something must be deleted. But the controversy or, if I may say so, the agony from the side of the workers is that this has been mischievously, deceitfully limited to one year, nevertheless, giving an impression that some revolutionary step has taken place. The Act as it was, provided for 4 per cent bonus irrespective of profit and loss. From 1977 onwards it provided for 8.33 per cent bonus irrespective of profit and loss. When the amendment ordinance came during the emergency period, this got sub-divided into two—one is that for the year 1974 4 per cent bonus would continue irrespective of profit and loss and for the subsequent years 4 per cent or Rs. 100 only would be there if there was available surplus. What is to be done with that is the question. The Janata Party had given a promise to the people that this—if you call it a mischief that was done by that ordinance—would be rectified. I do not want to go into deferred wage and all that. Even formerly as the Act was, it was not the position that there was no deferred wage. No, it was not deferred wage. It is only an advance payment of wages to be adjusted against the profit that may come up

in the subsequent years subject to a limitation of period within which if the adjustment does not take place, that will get time, barred and cannot be recovered. It was not a deferred wage at all. That is why the captain said 'payment of bonus and matters connected therewith' without spelling out whether it was on profit basis or productivity basis or deferred wage basis. My speech was elaborately quoted by my friend, making it appear that I said something very very absurd. He said that I am capable of making an illogical thing appear logical and a logical thing appear illogical. And the ordinance, according to him, is not a good thing. After going through the speech he might have felt that I was making a logical thing in a presentable thing. The portion you spoke, therefore, obviously is not fully reflective of my speech. That is what I want to say and nothing more than that.

Now, the specified question is, the emergency ordinance stated that for the period 1974 the workers would get only 4 per cent whereas in the previous years they got 8.33 per cent, whether you are prepared to give 8.33 per cent for that year. I may tell him for information that there are disputes pending, large number of them, even today with respect to the period 1974

I have got on my hand a dispute pending about it. HMT's dispute is still there. I can quote a number of industrial establishments where bonus disputes for the year 1974-75 remained unsettled. Are you prepared to give 8.33 per cent for that year? Then, for the next year, you have not given anything at all. For the next year, you have not given even 4 per cent. You will kindly understand that. It is blank. For the period 1976-77, you have given 8.33 per cent. Now, let us not forget this fact that for that interim period, it is cipher, minus; not I per cent. That is the position. You forget about 8.33 per cent. It is blank. Therefore, the question is whether for the entire period, for these two years, you are prepared to give 8.33 per cent; if not,

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

why not? On the basis of the commitment made by the Janata Party, do not quote our position and all that.

We took certain decisions; we argued about it; we thought that it was necessary to contain inflation; we made certain provisions and with those provisions we went to the people. You went to the people saying that these provisions were wrong. You got votes from the people and came to power. Now do not quote us because people decried that the position we took was wrong and we took certain measures which did not receive any acceptance. If you quote us, then it is absolutely illegal. We had been defeated; we had been taken to task; we went to the bar of the people; we had been convicted; we had been thrown out of power. Now, we are here. You told the people that those measures were wrong; those measures would be rectified. You were voted back to power. Do not quote that we took certain decisions which the people rejected and try to justify yourself. This is not proper; this is absolutely wrong; this is most hypocritical.

Now, therefore, Sir, the theoretical aspect apart, this is a matter on which there can be no budging at all. 8.33 per cent is clear, specific and categorical. This specific, clear and categorical commitment had been given throughout to the people. This was accepted in principle that 8.33 per cent will be given for this particular year, leaving the previous year completely blank and the year before that and the year coming forward making completely blank; not even 4 per cent; the Ordinance remaining as it is for the succeeding years. This is the picture which is emerging. This position cannot be accepted. It was mentioned that there was a connection between the wage and the bonus. Therefore, it will depend on the way the argument you are developing. If that is the argument, that argument is very dangerous and the working class will have to take notice of that.

I quote my speech which of course is correctly put forth like this. "There is a connection between bonus and the wage. It is only to link up, to bridge the difference between the actual expenditure and the wage that deferred wage and the minimum bonus is contemplated." Therefore, unless we determine what is going to be the wage policy, there can be no decision, as far as this is concerned, on a permanent basis. Therefore, the argument that is developing is that if they are going to get a proper wage, then this is not forth coming. They will get it if the wages are going to be low. We are going to give them 3.33 per cent subject to one condition that the wages are to be done away with.

Now the Bhoothlingam Commission is going into the wage matter. They will get either good wage or bonus. If their wages are fairly good, they are not going to get this bonus. They will get this bonus provided the wages are low and there is sufficient assurance from the Bhoothlingam Commission that the wages will be fixed sufficiently low. If this is going to be the linkage, this is the principle against which a voice of protest has to be raised here and now. Therefore, irrespective of all that, on the same basis of profit being the minimum, irrespective of profit and loss, on that, there can be no going back. We went back on that. Now, you are not only going to go back to that, but you do not have the courage to say that for the coming year at least four per cent will be paid. You are not prepared to say that. Forget about 8.33 per cent. Even 4 per cent, you are not prepared to say. If this Amendment says 'restoration of *status quo ante*', if that is the position, then from 1974 onwards, 8.33 per cent bonus must come. Whatever has been incorporated must come in a permanent form. I do not know why this must be limited only to one year, why all these amendments which you are proposing should be limited to only one year. Some of my friends have moved amendments. I want to men-



tion this to them. They have moved amendments like 'substitute 1975 to 1976' or 'substitute 1974 to 1976'. That is not enough, because the word here is 'year'. The word in the principal clause is not 'years'; it is 'year'. If you say 'substitute 1975' means the year 1975-76. There it stops. Then 1976-77 goes. That is why, I propose that the amendment must be "for the year 1974-75 and for every subsequent accounting year". This is an amendment which I seek to press, on which there can be no compromise, no budgeting at all. And if the Government flatters, that will be committing a breach of faith with the people on a very vital matter. On the basis of this we went to the polls, as a matter of controversy; you charged us, you accused us, as anti-working class on the basis of this, what you called, Black Act, and you got the benefit of it. Now, be true to the promise you made and not quote the arguments which we made and which people have rejected. Therefore, on that basis, I press my amendment.

**SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA:** I have listened to my distinguished friend, Mr. Stephen, with great interest and respect. I do not want to spend much time of the House dealing with the many aspects of the matter that he himself raised earlier to which I have given answer from this side.

I would, however, like to say once more that it will be totally wrong; and if Mr. Stephen had not done that and some one else had done that, I would say 'malicious'—to interpret this Bill to mean that, for subsequent years, Government has no policy regarding bonus. I am sure that he would not like to make such a charge because, as I pointed out in the course of my reply at the stage of consideration, in the past too such amendments have been made for a year. He said that in 1975-76 when the amendment was made, there were two parts to the amendment: one relating to 1974 and the other relating to 1975-76. I do not think, at this stage, it is necessary for me to take the House into the details of this discussion.

The main points that he made were two: one, that for the interim period there is no provision for the payment of bonus in this Bill as it is before the House; and the other, that there is no promise for the future. I shall therefore, briefly deal with these two points.

Firstly, as far as the interim period is concerned, I wish to state in all humility and seriousness that the responsibility for the interim period lies there, and not on this side of the House. If the bonus which was 8.33 per cent evaporated into zero, the responsibility for that squarely rests there, and as Mr. Stephen said, the electorate itself understands it, and has given its verdict.

As far as the question of making it retrospectively effective is concerned, I am sure the House will seriously consider whether liabilities on people can be retrospectively imposed. Liabilities can be imposed on people only prospectively, for the future. But if one says today that, for the period 1974-75 and 1975-76, for which some others were responsible, retrospectively the managements or undertakings have to bear responsibility, it will be imposing a liability retrospectively, and that is not something which can be argued for.

Now, coming to the second part of the criticism about the future, as I began by saying, it would be totally wrong to conclude from this Bill that our attitude, as far as bonus is concerned is limited to one year. That is not the case: but as I tried to explain with the ability at my command—which is far less than that of the hon. Member opposite—the question is linked with the whole question of minimum wage and living wage. To say this does not mean that there will be no bonus in future—but whether there will be bonus or not and what the quantum will be are things which are all dependent on the question of minimum wages and living wage. An examination of this has to go on.

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

I do not want to say much more than contradict and repudiate the suggestion made by the hon. Member that even by implication the Bill says that there is a full-stop after the accounting year 1976-77; there is no such full-stop. The position is that the question has to be considered, even as it was considered in the earlier instances, and there would also be the over-all perspective to be considered. As he has said, the Janata Government has received the mandate of the people. That mandate is in the light of the over-all perspective. Therefore, we want to have the over-all perspective clearly on our view and place it before the people of this country and then take a decision. This does not preclude the continuance of what has been provided in the Bill, but it certainly means it has to be considered in the light of the over-all perspective, which has to be cleared. I therefore oppose the hon. Member's amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put amendment No. 5 to the vote of the House.

The Amendment No. 5. was put and negatived:

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put amendment No. 19 of Mr. Stephen to clause 2 to vote. The question is:

Page 1, line 16,—

for "1976"

substitute—

"1974 and in respect of every subsequent accounting year" (19).

*The Lok Sabha divided:*

Division No. 5] [14.31 hrs.

AYES

Alluri, Shri Subhash Chandra Bose

Chandrappan, Shri C. K.

Chandre Gowda, Shri D. B.

Chettri, Shri K. B.

Damani, Shri S. R.

Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas

Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb

Haren Bhumji, Shri

Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.

Kadam, Shri B. P.

Kosalram, Shri K. T.

Kunhambu, Shri K.

Lakkappa, Shri K.

Laskar, Shri Nihar

Patil, Shri S. B.

Pullaiah, Shri Darur

Rao, Shri Jalagam Kondala

Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal

Seyid Muhammad, Dr. V. A.

Stephen, Shri C. M.

Venkataraman, Shri R.

NOES

Ahmed, Shri Halimuddin

Amat, Shri D.

Amin, Prof. R. K.

Ananthan, Shri Kumari

Bal, Shri Pradyumna

Barakataki, Shrimati Renuka Devi

Berwa, Shri Ram Kanwar

Chandra Shekhar, Shri

Chaudhary, Shri Motibhai R.

Chaudhry, Shri Ishwar

Chavda, Shri K. S.

Chhetri, Shri Chhatra Bahadur

Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh

Chunder, Dr., Pratap Chandra

Dhara, Shri Sushil Kumar

Dharia, Shri Mohan

Dutt, Shri Asoke Krishna

Gattani, Shri R. D.

Gore, Shrimati Mrinal

Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal

Harikesh Bahadur, Shri

Jain, Shri Kacharulal Hemraj

Jain, Shri Kalyan

Jain, Shri Nirmal Chandra

Kailash Prakash, Shri

Kamble, Shri B. C.

Kar, Shri Sarat

Kaushik, Shri Purushottam

Kureel, Shri Jwala Prasad

Mahala, Shri K. L.

Maiti, Kumari Abha

Mathur, Shri Jagdish Prasad

Mehta, Shri Prasannbhai

Mohd. Hayat Ali, Shri

Mondal, Dr. Bijoy

Nathu Singh, Shri

Nathwani, Shri Narendra P.

Nayak, Shri Laxmi Narain

Negi, Shri T. S.

Pandey, Shri Ambika Prasad

Paraste, Shri Dalpat Singh

Parmar, Shri Natwarlal B.

Patel, Shri Dharmasinbhai

Patel, Km. Maniben Vallebhai

Patnaik, Shri Biju

Raghavji, Shri

Rai, Shri Gauri Shankar

Raj Keshar Singh, Shri

\*Rajan, Shri K. A.

Ram Kinwar, Shri

Ramachandran, Shri P.

Ramji Singh, Dr.

Ranjit Singh, Shri

Rathor, Dr. Bhagwan Dass

Rodrigues, Shri Rudolph

Sahoo, Shri Ainthu

Sai, Shri Larang

Sai, Shri Narhari Prasad Sukhdeo

Saini, Shri Manohar Lal

Sarkar, Shri S. K.

Satya Deo Singh, Shri

Shakya, Shri Daya Ram

Shastri, Shri Y. P.

Sheo Narain, Shri

Sikander Bhakht, Shri

Singh, Dr. B. N.

Sinha, Shri C. M.

Sinha, Shri Purna

Somani, Shri S. S.

Tiwari, Shri Brij Bhushan

Tripathi, Shri Ram Prakash

Tyagi, Shri Om Prakash

Varma, Shri Ravindra

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Yadav, Shri Ramji Lal

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Yadav, Shri Vinayak Prasad

Clause 6—(Amendment of section 6)

Yadava, Shri Roop Nath Singh

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment by Mr. K. Ramamurthy. But he is not here.

Yadvendra Dutt, Shri

Mr. K. C. Halder,

Yuvraj, Shri

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Durgapur): I beg to move:

MR. CHAIRMAN: The result of the division is: <sup>+</sup> Ayes—21; Noes—78.

Page 2,—

*The motion was negatived.*

omit lines 18 to 20. (6)

THE MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT): What is all this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Prasannbhai Mehta—he is not here. Shri Stephen.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You should be unhappy at least.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: This is about the investment allowance. My friends have said that there was development rebate and that this investment allowance has taken its place. I just want to point out one subtle difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put clause 2 to vote. The question is:

“That clause 2 stand part of the Bill.”

Development rebate has been allowed to be deducted on the principle that for purposes of future development and conservation for future expansion and rehabilitation, the amount that is allowed must be deducted from the gross profits. That is the understanding of the principle. Here it is different. Investment allowance is not based on that principle. Investment allowance is not based on the principle of conservation of some amount for future purposes of facilitating future rehabilitation. More than that, it is for the purposes of giving an incentive for investment. That should not be a charge. The principles are entirely different.

*The motion was adopted.*

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: To the extent possible, ‘Aye’.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now Clause 4, Shri Prasannbhai Mehta—are you moving your amendment?

SHRI PRASANNBHAI MEHTA (Bhavnagar): I am not moving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That clause 4 stand part of the Bill.”

I do not want to prolong my speech. The comparison does not stand. Therefore, merely because development re-

*The motion was adopted.*

\*The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Sarvshri Nanasahib Bonde, Ajit Singh Dabhi and K. A. Rajan;

NOES: Sarvashri Surjit Singh Barnala, S. S. Das, Shyamlal Dhurve, Ram Murti, Rudra Sen Chaudhury, M. A. Hannan Alhaj, Ram Lal Rahl and Padmacharan Samantasinhera.

bate was permitted to be deducted which is basically on an understandable principle, to say that investment allowance which is in the nature of an incentive for investment purposes and should be deducted from the gross profits depriving the workers of bonus is an absolutely un-understandable principle. Hence my amendment.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I only wish to say that the hon. Member is well aware of the role Investment Allowance plays in the development of industry which is not far different from what was the purpose of the development rebate. In fact the development rebate was allowed at 40 per cent for ships and at rates varying from 15 to 35 per cent for plant and machinery. In the case of Investment Allowance it is far below that rate and it will be largely at a uniform rate of 25 per cent. Therefore, I do not think that the House should accept the amendment moved by Shri Stephen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put Amendment No. 6 moved by Shri Krishna Chandra Halder to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 6 was put and negatived.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 6 was added to the Bill.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we take up clause 7. Shri Prasannbhai Mehta, are you moving the amendment?

SHRI PRASANNBHAI MEHTA: I am not moving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 7 was added to the Bill.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we take up Clause 8. Shri D. D. Desai is not here.

*Clause 8—(Amendment of section 10)*

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 34,—

for "one hundred" substitute  
"two hundred" (33)

Page 2,—

after line 40, insert—

"Provided further that for the purpose of payment under this sub-section, the provisions of section 32 shall not be applicable." (34)

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I beg to move:

Page 2, lines 30 and 31,—

for "Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1)"

substitute—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) regarding the payment of minimum bonus, but subject to the other provisions of this Act" (54)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I move my amendment and I rise to oppose the amendment of Shri Ravindra Varma.

I am making these explanations for the benefit of the trade union friends on the other side who have been very very vocal on behalf of the Railway workers, Posts and Telegraphs workers, departmental workers and all the four of them.

My amendment says for the purpose of payment of minimum bonus these sections should also be made eligible. I said Section 32 of the Act should not apply for the purpose of payment of minimum bonus. Section 32 spells out different categories of

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

workers who will not be eligible for the bonus under the Act—departmental workers and all of them.

The question is my friends on the other side and this side and who have been presenting petitions before Parliament for the payment of bonus, who had been guiding the rally and carrying on the agitation very proudly over-throwing 85 trains in a short period, that was the claim that was made and all that, whether they would come forward in a convention of the trade union conscience and I would say—minimum bonus at least must be paid to these people. This is all the purpose of this amendment.

Now, the purpose is self-explanatory. I do not want to carry on my speech about it. The purport is that those who have been arguing for this, let them not commit the sin of voting against their conscience now.

Regarding Shri Varma's amendment, I am sorry that he had a very belated awareness of some danger somewhere lurking as if nothing has happened if the amendment is moved:

“Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) regarding the payment of minimum bonus, but subject to the other provisions of this Act.....”

What for is the provision 'subject to the other provisions of this Act' as far as minimum bonus is concerned? This notional minimum of Rs. 750 was not applicable as far as that is concerned.

All those provisions become applicable now which were not in the previous Act—not even in the emergency Act. This provision was not even there in the previous Act. Now an improvement is brought about. Our emergency law which was brought in took away some rights. They said they are restoring that now in the process of amending the previous Act

and saying that, for the purpose of minimum bonus, that will be 'subject to the provisions of this Act' including the provision of notional salary of Rs. 750/- and upwards and all that.

I would like the Minister to explain why this particular provision became necessary and why could he not leave it at that? Why this amendment has become suddenly necessary? Which heaven is going to fall if this amendment is not going to come in this section of the Act? Which section of the Act do you want to apply to the payment of the minimum wages? My understanding of the situation as I have explained is this—if I am wrong, kindly correct me and if I am right, kindly agree with me on the amendment and leave the matter at that. Therefore, I press my amendment and I oppose the amendment brought forward by Shri Varma.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Sir, I think we are repeating and restating our positions in this regard again and again because, at the stage of general discussion, this matter was brought up by the hon. Member and other Members who spoke in support of his position. I have elaborately answered this question. Sir, I do not want the impression to go around—the impression that my hon. friend wants to create—that there is opposition here to the consideration of equality of benefits to various employees in various undertakings. He pointedly referred to the fact that some hon. Members have presented petitions on behalf of the railway employees and made reference to the employees in other undertakings as well. He is very well aware that even in the case of non-competitive undertakings in the public sector, though the Act does not apply to them, an *ex-gratia* payment is made on the basis of the same formula as is mentioned in the Act.

If, in this Bill there is no provision for the expansion of coverage to other areas, the hon. Member referred to that, the reasons for that have been

stated by me earlier to the House. The expansion of coverage is related to the whole question of the concept and quantum and the effect on the economy; it is not that anything is ruled out. But at this point, our limited purpose is to restore the coverage that existed earlier and not to expand it. This does not mean that we are making any statement about the possibility of considering expansion of benefits, equivalent benefits, in one form or another to the employees of the other undertakings. But, as I stated earlier in this House, the limited purpose of this Bill that we have introduced is to restore the coverage that existed and undo the damage that was done by the other side when they were here.

I, therefore, oppose Mr. Stephen's amendment. About my own amendment, the hon. Member has raised some questions. I would like to say in all sincerity that there is no effort at all to take away anything or jeopardise anything. The present wording of Sec. 10(2) (A) which was inserted by the Ordinance and which now figures in the Bill in clause 8 may create an impression that a minimum bonus will be payable even by units which are newly set up for which Sec. 16 of the Act makes a special provision. The section of the Act to which he has made a reference is sec. 12 which is an old section which has been there from 1965. That is all.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: The old Act says: "Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) but subject to provisions of sections 8 and 13, every employee shall be bound by....." You can go back to that. After saying 'subject to all the other sections' you cannot now say that section 16 alone will apply. Section 12 spoke on notional bonus and that section was made subject to the provisions of sections 8 and 13, whereas you are making all the sections applicable to this.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I have already explained that nothing that is stated here militates against the

position that exists. The amendment has been proposed because it has been pointed out that there may be ambiguity about application of other sections including section 16.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Why not spell out that particular section? Why say 'subject to other provisions of this Act?'

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put Amendments 33 and 34 of Shri C. M. Stephen to the vote of the House.

*Amendments Nos. 33 and 34 were put and negatived.*

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: We introduced this amendment only because we had a feeling that section 16 may come into jeopardy. It is not our intention as I said earlier to change the other existing sections or do any other thing of that sort.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Law is law and your intention is irrelevant.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Subject to other provisions of the Act, means that section 16 is included.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put Government Amendment No. 54 to the vote of the House. The question is:

Page 2, lines 30 and 31.—

for "Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1)"

substitute — "Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) regarding the payment of minimum bonus, but subject to the other provisions of this Act" (54)

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 8, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

Clause 8, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 9 to 12 were added to the Bill.

Clause 13—(Insertion of new section 24)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We take up clause 13. There is an amendment No. 21 by Shri C. M. Stephen.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I move my amendment No. 21.

Page 3,—

after line 24, insert—

“(3) Where any dispute of the nature specified in section 22 between an employer and its employees, other than those covered by sub-section (1), has been referred to the authority under that section it shall be competent for the authority, notwithstanding anything in sections 23 and 25, to determine (a) whether any entry is truly and correctly made in or omitted from the accounts and (b) whether any item shown as an item of expenditure in the accounts was incurred in the interest of the business.” (21)

It is a very material and vital amendment. When I spoke at the introduction stage, I referred to the scrutiny of accounts and the right of tribunal to question the entry as an expenditure and the right of the tribunal to appoint an auditor to examine the audited balance sheet. These were rights conceded by government notifications by the previous government, with a promise that legislative measures would be brought forward later on. After that the House was dissolved and we went to the polls.

It is a right, which after prolonged struggle and memorandums and all that, the workers practically got promised to them. But the present position is, the audited Profit & Loss Account cannot be reopened at all. A stage has

come where the Government has to agree to bring in a legislation to undo this wrong thing. Because once you say that the workers get bonus only as a part of the profits, then they are entitled to know what the profit is, where the profit is, and whether mis-entries have been made and this account will have to be reopened. This is a demand which the trade unions have been pressing forward. My amendment seeks only to incorporate this. A promise was given, the Government issued notification with a definite promise that a legislation is being brought about for this purpose. I hope my hon. friend will have no objection, the Government will have no objection. No finance is involved. It is only the right of the workers to go into the Profit & Loss Account. We know how most of the Profit & Loss Accounts are drawn up. Therefore, it will have to be examined by the workers, which they are entitled to. I hope my friend will accept at least this amendment so that the promise given to the workers is incorporated in the Bill.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Sir, this too, I would like to submit, is a matter that we discussed at the consideration stage of the Bill. I do not, therefore, want to take much time of the House in dealing with the arguments of my distinguished friend, Mr. Stephen. As I pointed out at that time, there was no legislation introduced of this kind. But that does not mean that it cannot be done. The question is, whether it is to be done in this Bill. He said that workers must have the right to question not only the accuracy of the Profit & Loss Account, but also the propriety of entries in the Profit & Loss Account. This is a matter which has been engaging the attention of the Government—the previous Government as well as this Government—and there is much to be said in favour of making a provision of this kind somewhere. But whether it is to be done in this Bill, in what form it is to be done is another question. I might say, Sir, to the House that in fact this



question has been discussed in the Tripartite Committee on Comprehensive Legislation. There too, this matter was brought up, and the whole comprehensive question of access to information for trade union workers and workers, and the necessity to provide for ensuring that profit and loss accounts are not manipulated by the management and to provide opportunities for the workers to examine it, was examined at length in the Committee on Comprehensive Legislation and I can say that some proposals in this regard are likely to find their place in the comprehensive Legislation as well as in other things that the Government has in view. Therefore, I do not think, it will be appropriate for us to introduce a clause of this kind in this Bill and I can tell my hon. Friend that we are quite conscious of the need for a provision of this kind to ensure that there is full satisfaction, that there is no impropriety committed in the computation of the Profit & Loss Account and we shall certainly bear in mind the views that he has expressed in coming to conclusion in this regard. I would submit that it is not necessary to press for an amendment of this kind in this Bill at this stage. I would, therefore, request him to withdraw the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you pressing the amendment?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: In view of the definite promise given by the Minister, I seek the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

*Amendment No. 21 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 13 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 14 was added to the Bill.*

**Clause 15— (Amendment of section 31A)**

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I beg to move:

Page 3, for lines 33 to 36, substitute—

'15. In section 31A of the principal Act, for the existing proviso, the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:—' (22).

It is not a controversial amendment. Now they are putting a proviso which is acceptable. But I am seeking that the mischief that we did may be undone. I quarrelled as best as I could but failed at that time and I am again quarrelling. For productivity bonus agreement, to fix a ceiling is absurd. That ceiling must go. While it must be ensured that the minimum must be there, the ceiling must go.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I am sorry I cannot reciprocate his gesture by agreeing with him in this case. All of us hope that the sky is the ceiling if there is any ceiling. But I am afraid that incentive to productivity is connected with both bonus and profits. One cannot take on stand in one case and another in another case. I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put amendment No. 22 to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 22 was put and negatived.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 15 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 15 was added to the Bill.*

**Clause 16— (Amendment of section 32).**

SHRI K. A. RAJAN (Trichur): I shall move my amendment No. 29 but

[Shri K. A. Rajan]

I do not want to speak on it. I beg to move:

"Page 3 and 4, for clause 16, substitute—

"16. Section 32 of the principal Act shall be omitted." (29)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I now put amendment No. 29 to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 29 was put and negatived.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 16 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 16 was added to the Bill.*

Clause 17—(Substitution of new sections for section 34).

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: I beg to move:

Page 4, omit lines 11 to 13. (7)

Page 4, omit lines 18 to 27. (8)

SHRI K. A. RAJAN: I beg to move:

Page 4, after line 27, insert—

"Provided also that such employees as have entered into any agreement with their employers prior to the commencement of the Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Act, 1977, shall be paid bonus on the terms of such agreements." (16)

SHRI K. T. KOSALRAM (Tiruchendur): I beg to move:

Page 4, after line 27, insert—

"Provided also that such employees as have entered into an agreement with their employers

prior to the commencement of the Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Act, 1977 shall be paid bonus on the terms of such agreements." (9)

15 hrs.

\*As Shri Ravindra Varma knows Tamil well, I would speak in Tamil on my amendment. I am already explained the implications of my amendment to him. In the implementation of agreement arrived at between the employers and the employees about the quantum of bonus the Government does not incur any expenditure. In my home town, one factory has entered into an agreement with the workers on payment of 20 per cent of bonus and this would be in force till 1980. Sir, 20 per cent bonus is given on the earning of 2.5 crores, 3 crores or 4 crores per annum. With their business acumen and with their inventive institution, they could anticipate the provisions of the Payment of Bonus Ordinance. In this year's balance-sheet they have not shown any allocable surplus. The workers have been made the victims of their greed. As a representative of the Janata, Shri Ravindra Varma should not betray the claims of workers by backing the capitalists.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Sir, let the House decide to extend the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to take up non-official business now. I think within ten minutes we will finish this business.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: Mr. Chairman, my point is that instead of fixing five or ten minutes for this, let the House agree that we pass this Bill today and whatever time is taken for this now may be added to the time for Private Members' business afterwards.

---

\*The Original speech was delivered in Tamil.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The difficulty is that there are some Members who want to speak. So, I think it is better to postpone it. We will take up the non-official business now and we will continue it later on.

15.02 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

NINTH REPORT

SHRI RAJSHEKHAR KOLUR (Raichur): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Ninth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 7th December, 1977."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Ninth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 7th December, 1977."

*The motion was adopted.*

15.03 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: PARITY BETWEEN PRODUCTION AND PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS—contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will now take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Arjun Singh Bhadoria on the 24th November, 1977:—

"This House is of opinion that farmers and poor people of the country have been utterly neglected during the last 30 years and the then Government failed to keep a balance between the agricultural and industrial production. While on the one hand, there was constant

decline in agricultural production and prices, on the other, the prices of industrial products constantly increased due to fictitious expenditure.

This House, therefore, resolves that with a view to maintain parity between the production and prices of agricultural and industrial products, necessary steps be taken to ensure that:—

(i) there should not be an increase of more than 10 paise per Kg. in the prices of any foodgrains during the interval between the two successive crops;

(ii) the sale-price of any essential goods manufactured in a factory should not in any case be more than one and a half times of its cost of production;

(iii) the farmer should get reasonable price for his foodgrains and other agricultural products which should meet his cost of production as well as the cost of living;

(iv) the profits of big businessmen and big agricultural farmers are curbed;

(v) ceiling on income in the private sector and Government services is imposed;

(vi) taxes such as Octroi, Sales Tax, etc. levied on essential goods are reduced; and

(vii) price policy is made effective through a four-tier and autonomous system based on socialism."

Shri Arjun Singh Bhadoria may now continue his speech. He is absent.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) :  
 सभापति जी, भदौरिया जी का जो प्रस्ताव है, मैं सिद्धान्ततः उससे पूर्णतः सहमत हूँ और इसके लिये उन्हें बढ़ाई देना चाहता हूँ। इस प्रस्ताव में जो भावनार्ये व्यक्त की गई हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि केवल वे भावनार्ये इस तरफ