

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री कठाय को कम से कम आज तो पूरी तरह साइजेंट रहना चाहिए ।

I would say it is not a question of a point of order or rules. We have, unnecessarily lost about 45 minutes. This Bill is also to go to the Joint Committee.

Shri Nambar: There is no hurry.

Mr. Speaker: Why not we sit an hour more? There will be no difficulty at all.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a question of 'No'. Those who are not prepared to sit may go. Now, Mr. Sondhi will begin and we will have this up to 5 P.M. Then, we will take up the other Bill.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: It is already 3-45 P.M. time will not be enough.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot help it. I have called Mr. Sondhi.

15.45 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF THE
DEARNESS ALLOWANCE
COMMISSION

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Dearness Allowance Commission on the question of the grant of Dearness Allowance to Central Government employees in future, laid on the Table of the House on the 6th June, 1967."

I submit that this subject assumes a special importance today, and in requesting the House to consider this question, I am aware that there is pending a decision of the All India Railwaymen's Federation and of other Government Employees Associations to go on strike, on a full day strike, on the 11th September. **Mr. Speaker,** I feel that this House will agree that this is the most grave matter that, if this strike takes place, valuable

resources will be lost to this nation which it can ill-afford at this juncture. But I wish to submit that the strike is not directed against the public; it is not directed against the public interest. I would submit that in Delhi itself this strike, if it takes place, will be supported by the public. An important journal of opinion has urged the Opposition members the other day to realise their responsibility for maintaining harmonious relations between the Government and their employees. We, on the Opposition, are fully mindful of this responsibility and it is in keeping with this responsibility that we feel that the Government should trust their employees. Trust begets trust. We certainly champion their cause, not because they are government employees, but because they are the people who are engaged in the work of nation-building; they are the people who represent, by and large, the enlightened section of our society, and all that this section of our society wants is a reasonable degree of comfort in order to engage themselves in nation-building activities. This enlightened section of our society, if properly looked after, spells hope for India, the India of our dreams, but if they are made to feel that their interests have been ignored, then they will feel frustrated and out of that frustration will arise consequences which will be most unfortunate for our country.

The hon. Finance Minister and Deputy Prime Minister is known to have in his mind a certain type of calculations, in which there is, as it were, a process of unlimited addition: Rs. 30 crores for the Central Government employees plus Rs. 32 crores for the States plus Rs. 11 crores for public sector corporations plus Rs. 14 crores for municipal sector, coming to a total of Rs. 87 crores, and then multiply it by two, because it is felt that another slab rise will take place, making a total of Rs. 175 crores.

I submit that this is the version of a rather discredited theory in international politics, the theory of Domino Effect. Mr. Mc Namara has been thinking of South-East Asia in terms of Domino Effect, one thing giving rise to a failure and further failure and so on. The hon. Minister, in

his thinking on the Gajendragadkar Commission's Report, seems to have fallen a prey to this sort of panic thinking that one thing will lead to another and then to the final disaster. I submit....

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri K. C. Pant).

Another slab is also due. It is not something in future.

An hon. Member: He can reply later.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: I would submit that one of his professors in office, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, gave assurances galore, and, in fact, I would say that the Resolution of the Ministry of Finance itself refers to the fact that the matter was referred to the Commission for impartial settlement. These are words to be noted. The employees expected a certain impartiality in settlement. That was the whole purpose of referring the matter to the Gajendragadkar Commission. What do we get from the Commission? We get perhaps one recommendation which seems at least to spell hope. That is, that after the expiry of two years or when the price reaches a certain figure, revision of the pay scales is recommended and Government are advised to give interim relief. This proposal may be considered as a positive aspect of the otherwise gloomy and uncreative situation.

But what are the substantive recommendations? They consider the range from Rs. 70 to Rs. 575 and they think in terms of these 10 point rises which the hon. Minister referred to. But may I ask what is the subsistence level and the upper limit of vulnerability? Can anybody deny that the upper limit of vulnerability is actually not what the Commission agree to, but in fact much above it? Rs. 750 do not mean much as far as vulnerability goes. And then what is the lowest rung? Can anybody deny that Rs. 300 is in fact the lowest rung today in places like Delhi?

Therefore, I would say that the refusal of the hon. Minister to consider, as it

were, sympathetically whatever recommendations have been made by the Gajendragadkar Commission is, in fact, a refusal to mitigate the hardships being faced by a very important section of the population, a section of the population which is engaged in the work of national construction.

In fact, we are not even left with a definition of 'dearness allowance' in the manner in which thinking has proceeded in Government so far. It was supposed to be a device to protect the real income of wage earners and salaried employees from the effects of rise in prices. But whatever Justice there was in this definition is also sought to be taken away. In fact, the Gajendragadkar Commission themselves say that 'the rates of dearness allowance sanctioned in 1965 were regarded as inadequate by employees and they demanded revision or arbitration'. Government seem to have suffered a lapse of memory. They seem to forget that we in this House are aware of certain principles, certain definitions, certain norms of conduct. Instead, a very dubious argument is raised of rising to help the country and making sacrifices. Indeed, sacrifices should be made.

The other day in a very, I would say almost frivolous way—I use this word regretfully but deliberately—it was said that dearness allowance payment would cost the exchequer several hundred crores of rupees and it would contribute to price risk. I would challenge the Minister to ask an independent body like the Institute of Economic Growth to investigate the money flow involved in dearness allowance. I would submit that when the last slab of dearness allowance was given in December 1966, there was in fact no perceptible rise in the price spiral. I would submit that the delay in giving DA, not giving what the people were fully entitled to, has not resulted in any price policy success. There has been no holding of the price line by not giving DA.

Therefore, they should think of what lies behind this dearness allowance. It is not always useful to think in terms of macro-economic concepts, taking these magnitudes, what lies behind the dearness allowance which the employee gets is only

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

a chance to invest in the education of his children.

In other words, it is investment in man which the Finance Minister seeks to deny us by this measure.

He talks of economies, and I think that in considering the Gajendragadkar Commission's report, he was concerned with economy above all; and he is known to be an economic expert amongst the statesmen in the world. Therefore, is it difficult to expect him to think in terms of real economies, not superficial economy in terms of retrenchment but economy in giving up hare-brained schemes and wasteful schemes and schemes like the revolving tower on the Ashoka Hotel?

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): And also Bokaro.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should be very brief and he should give some time for Members from the other parties also.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: He expects a good monsoon, and we not only expect a good monsoon but we pray for a good monsoon also. And we hope, therefore, that in our country where the price structure depends upon food, since a good monsoon is expected, if they take other commensurate steps, there is no reason why for the sake of maintaining the price-line, they should bring so much human suffering on the white-collared employees and the other Government employees. This very negation of the definition of dearness allowance is something that we on this side of the House will never allow.

He has been known to ask for savings and greater savings. May I assure you and assure him through you, Sir, that we the Bharatiya Jan Sangh would like to do everything to foster public savings but not under threat, not under duress? Let him give the dearness allowance. Then we shall go to the Government employees and ask them to subscribe to public savings in as large-hearted and full-hearted a manner as he would wish us to do. But let him feel the pulse of the nation. Let him feel the pulse of the people. Principles, I submit, should not be sacrificed

in an emergency. Promises have been given by successive Finance Ministers. These should not be thrown away. This domino theory of dearness allowance must be discredited because it depends upon certain archaic economic ideas.

What about the effect, on efficiency, of denying people their right to a subsistence level of living? Why has there been a rise in defence expenditure? Why the closure of the Suez Canal which has harmed us so much? Why our isolation from the European Common Market? Why our incrustation in the Commonwealth, a defunct organisation? Why should all these sins of Government be visited upon Government employees? What of the ideal employer-thesis that Government should be the ideal employer?

Therefore, I submit that hundred per cent neutralisation is justified. If there are any shortages, these are man-made shortages. Our country has been endowed by God with all those requirements of good living. Therefore, the question is about the capacity to bear and the capacity to pay.

I submit that Government have the capacity to pay the amount in cash and I submit that the Government employees do not have the capacity to bear price rise.

Finally, I would say, and I say it in all humility, that for a person who belongs to the Gandhian tradition, it ill behoves him to wail about the state of the economy. Gandhiji never used to wail; he never used to despair; he used to work for economic salvation.

We in the Jan Sangh want an efficient Centre. That does not mean overburdening the Centre. I would say that let the resources be given to the States. Let them have more resources, but let the Centre keep a decisive and strategic control to themselves to advance the perpetual endurance of our sacred Union, our Bharatavarsha. But the Finance Minister when he looks into this problem seems to feel that he is carrying the whole burden on his shoulders, and he is, if I could use a jargon of modern political science, suffering from what I would call inflammation and communication overload. He

thinks the whole burden is on his shoulders.

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Member leave something for others also to say. He is taking so much time.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: I shall conclude in a minute.

When he was meditating on the Gajendragadkar Commission's report, some of us thought that he was like a pearl-diver who had gone deep into the sea to bring out some valuable pearl which we could then show to all the Government employees. I am disappointed and my final feeling is that let him not follow the example of that rather ill-fated European character Don Quixote who used to tilt at windmills. It is not Government employees who should be squeezed. The chances of getting what he wants for this country, real economic progress, are bright provided enough judgment and a certain honesty of purpose are brought to bear in public life.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Dearness Allowance Commission on the question of the grant of Dearness Allowance to Central Government employees in future, laid on the Table of the House on the 6th June, 1967."

One hour we have got. I would request friends on both sides.....

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): How do you reach the conclusion of one hour?

16 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: Forty minutes you wasted, I do not know.

Some hon. Members: No.

Shri Nath Pal: Full two hours and more.

Mr. Speaker: I will call the Minister at 5 O' Clock, and then each one of them I will allow five or six minutes.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): We know the views of the Finance Minister. We have been discussing with him for the last few days.

Mr. Speaker: Then, why do you waste the time?

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay Central South): A continuous debate on this question has been going on. The political-party leaders had an interview with the Finance Minister, and yesterday, speaking on another resolution, the Minister of State also had some arguments against our demand for cash payment of dearness allowance. Therefore, nothing much new remains to be added, no doubt, but then some points have got to be restated, so that the viewpoint of the workers may not go unrepresented or misrepresented.

16.02 hrs.

[SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK *in the Chair*]

During our talk with the Finance Minister, i.e. the Deputy Prime Minister, the whole question was pivoted on a single point, that, as he claims, if Rs. 175 crores equivalent to 20 points rise in the dearness allowance in the cost of living were paid to the Government employees, pumping Rs. 175 crores into the system would start a rise in prices, and then that rise would again demand a rise in dearness allowance and therefore the cycle cannot be checked.

Therefore, he starts with wages. We started with prices. He said: you give me one year, do not ask for this, and I will try to hold the price line. He is not confident about it. He said: if I fail, then you start the demand again, or I will go away. What is the satisfaction to Government employees after having been starved for one year of Rs. 175 crores, if the Finance Minister walks away saying he is a failure. So, that is not the pleasure that we want.

He starts with wages; we, in theory, start with prices, and this is a perpetual quarrel going on in the world of theory, in the world of economists, in this country.

[Shri S. A. Dange]

and every where. All the economists of the bourgeois or capitalist class, trace the rise in prices to a rise in wages, and all the economists and theoreticians of the democratic movement, the workers and the people say that the prices are not made by wages. And in this I am not alone as a sort of communist party speaker only. The leader of the British TUC denounced the freezing of wages by denying the correctness of the theory that a wage freeze would freeze prices. Mr. Reuther, the American leader of trade unions, who is very well-known and who supports all the American efforts at killings in Viet Nam, even he rejected the theory of wage freeze.

Therefore, this theory, which is discredited everywhere, which has nowhere proved correct, is now being taken up by the Finance Minister in this country because he chooses to follow outmoded theories of capitalism and does not see that in this country, in order to build a democratic India, a socialist India, this theory should not be held invalid.

So, our appeal to him was this. For the last six months the Government employees have not got their dearness allowance increase. Then, why were prices rising? Who was then making the rise in prices? Those who control the wage goods are responsible for the rise in prices. Who are controlling the wage goods? Open the report of the monopoly commission. The whole pharmaceutical industry in certain essential medicines is controlled by two firms and they dictated the prices. The prices in textiles are controlled by a single federation. It may have 400 mills but they dictate the prices and the government who gives them price increases as they did last time who have got bank advances to hoard food are the people who are responsible for rise in the price of foodgrains. Therefore, these are the people who are to be taken possession of first and cured of their habit of mobilising profit, if they could be cured at all. If they could not be cured, they should be "frozen" completely, either under the Preventive Detention Act or any other Act and then he can ask us whether we want a wage rise or not. That is the way to

control prices, instead of starving wage-earners. This argument has not impressed him and he says: believe in me and allow me not to pump Rs. 175 crores into the economy. What does it mean? It means that the prices will continue to rise and with the existing demands, an additional Rs. 175 crores is put into the pockets of the traders and the manufacturers and they are given super profits of Rs. 175 crores for the next one year until the Finance Minister is convinced that we were right and he was wrong. That is one method of giving Rs. 175 crores of super profits. When he does that all the manufacturers in the country are going to do the same thing; he wants them also to have a wage freeze or a wage cut to be carried out. That means again that this government is not only doing this to save governmental treasuries but is doing this in order to give extra profits to the already profiteering interests in this country. That is another effect it will have.

The third point is this. Let me quote for your reference the study of prices made by the Reserve Bank of India, economic division. In this country the cost-push theory of price is not valid; prices have risen primarily because of the demand for food and the food prices have gone up. Therefore wage demand arises out of this rise in prices. It says: "Thus there has been a price induced wage spiral in India in recent years." It is not the view of a communist; it is the economic division of the Reserve Bank.

If he wants to avoid pumping into the economy more money, why has he given Rs. 268 crores deficit financing to be absorbed in the monetary system of the country from April to July as had been exposed by the Economic Times? He has tried to answer it but it has been a hopeless attempt and nothing has been answered. On the one side in order to enable manufacturers to earn profits, Rs. 268 crores of deficit financing is permitted. Not only that. If this rise is not given and if there is action on the part of workers and if there is a general strike, already the Bill is coming in order to put more security force into the

system in order to keep down the workers in the public sector. The charge of this force is going to be Rs. 11 crores as stated here. This security force in three instalments of seven battalions each is going to cost every year about Rs. 4 crores. To stop the public sector workers from demanding Rs. 11 crores the government is prepared to spend Rs. 4 crores on the security force, in order to beat them down. But they are not going to save the Balance of Rs. 7 crores; they are going to lose more crores. That only shows the way in which the policy is being carried out on behalf of the government.

The last point is this. Shri K. C. Pant advanced some arguments yesterday.

He said that the majority of the Ministers coming from the non-Congress States have agreed to it. And he read out the names of the parties who were in the Government, one party being my party. Yes. The majority of non-Congress Chief Ministers are not necessarily Ministers who do not subscribe to the Congress Minister's theory of finance. We are not responsible for that theory. If those Chief Ministers oppose a wage increase, we will oppose the Chief Ministers where we have the power; and we will throw them out. On this question there will be no compromise.

Secondly, there are now seven Congress Ministries and to make them a majority—three or four of those States like some of those where we are not in a majority, where we are not in force,—there, you can have the majority, of the Chief Ministers to support your line. The Kerala Ministry has not supported it. The Cabinet in West Bengal is not supporting it. The Bihar Cabinet is not supporting it. The hon. Minister here quoted that the Bihar Cabinet gave a deferred payment. Bihar is in famine. Declare famine throughout the country, and then come forward and say, "Please have deferred payment." (Interruption). If you are so bankrupt or famine-stricken, you can declare it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri S. A. Dange: Therefore, the point is this. Merely scoring a debating point,

as he was doing yesterday, is no use. Because this is a problem of six million workers; their problem of livelihood. Government has money; it has already increased the taxation. It is already pumping deficit financing. If he frightens me with the prospect of deficit financing, well, deficit financing by itself is not responsible for price rise. That also is a wrong economic theory. I would say, "all right: put in Rs. 175 crores as additional deficit financing to the Rs. 268 crores which has already been done and give me my DA increase." Even in spite of it, the prices can be held, because the prices are made by the bank advances to feed your monopoly houses who get the advance and it is these 75 monopoly companies who are controlling the price and are dictating things to this country. Therefore, freeze the prices first and take over the banks. He will say, "I have heard you saying that so many times." Well, he will hear the same thing again and again because you are also saying the same thing again and again. (Interruption). Therefore, take over the banks and you will be able to solve the problem of prices. Smash in some of those monopolists who are controlling the basic goods. You will be able to hold the prices.

I can understand and I can accept the statement that you want to hold the price line. Please then take the correct measures and not hit the wage-earner and the wages of the workers. So, in the end, I will appeal to him again: if this appeal falls on deaf ears, then, the Government employees' organisations are taking the decision, and we in the central organisation have taken the decision that we are going to carry out a general strike on 11th September or on any date that is accepted by all, in order to register our protest against the policy of the Government which is hitting the working class in this country.

श्री आर्ज फरनेग्जीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : दो दिन वित्त मंत्री से सदन के कई सदस्यों ने और सरकारी कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों ने महंगाई भत्ते के बारे में बातचीत चलाई है। लेकिन कोई भी ठोस उत्तर वित्त मंत्री जी से नहीं मिल पाया है। सिर्फ इतनी ही उन्होंने कहा है कि महंगाई भत्ता इस वक़्त वह नहीं

[श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज]

सकते हैं। एक बड़ी झूठ बात भी फैलाने का प्रयास इस वक्त मुल्क में हो रहा है। यह कहा जा रहा है कि अगर सरकार ने महंगाई भत्ता दे दिया तो 175 करोड़ रुपया सरकार को तत्काल देना पड़ेगा। मैं सब से पहले इस बात की सफाई कर देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन द्वारा रिपोर्ट किया गया महंगाई भत्ता, जोकि असल में हमें श्री सरकारी कर्मचारियों को मंजूर नहीं है क्योंकि दास कमिशन ने जो महंगाई भत्ता देने की बात कही थी उसमें कुछ कटौती करने का काम गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन ने किया है, देने की बात मान ली जाये तो केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों को जिनकी सीधे जिम्मेदारो वित्त मंत्री पर है सिर्फ साठ करोड़ रुपया उन्हें देना पड़ेगा, 175 करोड़ नहीं। राज्य सरकारों के कर्मचारियों के बारे में वित्त मंत्री को नहीं बोलना चाहिये, न ही स्थानीय स्वराज्य संस्थाओं के कर्मचारियों के बारे में अथवा पब्लिक सैक्टर अंडरटेकिंग के कर्मचारियों के बारे में। इस बात को मैं मानता हूँ कि उन्हें भी महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ाना पड़ेगा इस रिपोर्ट के अनुसार अगर केन्द्रीय सरकार इसको मान लेती है। लेकिन मेरा निवेदन है वित्त मंत्री से कि कोई भी ऐसी बात वह न फैलाये जिससे मुल्क के लोगों में गलतफहमी पैदा हो और लोग ऐसा समझें कि करीब दो सौ करोड़ के नये टैक्स इस साल हमारे अर्थ मंत्री ने लगाने का फैसला किया है और इतनी राशि वह भारत के लोगों की जेबों में से निकालने वाले हैं और निकाल कर सरकारी कर्मचारियों को देने वाले हैं।

एक दूसरा झूठ भी फैलाया जाता है। यह कहा जाता है कि महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ने से चीजों के दाम बढ़ जायेंगे। मैं इस पर अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। एक ही बात उनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के कई सूबों ने और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने रेलवे बत्तालगा के साथ मिल कर हिन्दुस्तान के

लोगों की जेबों से नये करों के द्वारा जो पैसा लेने का फैसला किया है उसकी कुल रकम कम से कम दो सौ करोड़ हो जाती है। नये टैक्स लगा कर दो सौ करोड़ लेने की बात जब चलती है तो इसका एक ही मतलब होता है कि चीजों के दाम भी उसी परिमाण में बढ़ जायें और वे बढ़ जाते हैं।

जो आपका बजट आया है और जो रेलवे का बजट आया है इस साल उनकी वजह से हिन्दुस्तान में हर एक चीज के दाम, जीवनोपयोगी वस्तुओं के दाम, जीवन के लिए आवश्यक वस्तुओं के दाम दस से पंद्रह प्रतिशत बढ़ गये हैं। आज आप खड़े हो कर साठ करोड़ रुपये वाली बात कहने हैं। लेकिन आप यह देखें कि यह कमिशन हमारा बनाया हुआ नहीं है, आपका ही बनाया हुआ है। मैं आपका याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आप शायद तब वित्त मंत्री नहीं थे जब यह कमिशन बना था। इसलिए मैं आपको खास तौर पर यह बात याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन की रिपोर्ट के 73 नम्बर पन्ने पर जो लिखा हुआ है, उसको आप देखें। उसमें लिखा हुआ है :

“Government had announced its intention that if the employees are dissatisfied with the extent of neutralisation of the rise in the price index effected by the grant of DA, the Government would refer the matter for impartial settlement.”

यह सरकार का प्रस्ताव है। आगे जा कर गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन के हाथ में जो जिम्मेदारी देने में आई है, वहाँ यह बात लिखी हुई है :

“...to recommend at what rates and from what date the revised DA should be granted to the said employees.”

आपने उस कमिशन से कहा था कि दामों को रोकने में आप असफल हुए हैं आपकी सरकार असफल हुई है और इस

आपकी असफलता के कारण गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन को बनाने का आपने फैसला किया, आपको यह फैसला लेना पड़ा और उस कमिशन से आपने कहा था कि बताओ कि कितना महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ना चाहिये और कौन सी तारीख से बढ़ना चाहिये। उन्होंने अपनी सिफारिशों स्पष्ट और साफ तौर पर दी हैं और इसमें कोई वाद-विवाद की गुंजाइश नहीं है।

16.18 hrs.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair.]

परसों जब हम वित्त मंत्री से मिले थे तब बातचीत के दौरान मैंने उनसे कहा था कि गजेन्द्रगडकर की जो रिपोर्टें डेशन है यह कोई नैगोशिएबल प्रस्ताव नहीं है, इस पर बहस नहीं हो सकती है। यह जो रिपोर्ट है इसको आप मान लीजिये। अगर सरकार की जबान की कोई कीमत है तो फिर आपका यह फर्ज है कि रिपोर्ट को पूरे तौर पर आप तत्काल मानें और इसको अमल में लायें। मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि कर्मचारियों में कई लोग हैं जिनको यह जो रिपोर्टें डेशन है यह पसन्द नहीं है। लेकिन अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस कमिशन की सिफारिशों को न मानते हुए मूलक में जो वातावरण है उसकी बात कर दी जाती है और हमें समझाया बुझाया जाने लगता है। लेकिन आप देखें कि आज होयहां एक विधेयक के बारे में अभी काफ़ी शोरगुल हुआ है। सेंट्रल इंडस्ट्रियल सिक्योरिटी फोर्स बिल जो आया है, जो एक नई पुलिस फोर्स आप बनाने जा रहे हैं और जिस पर आप सालाना दो करोड़ रुपया पब्लिक सैक्टर अडॉप्टेडिंग की मदद करने के लिए खर्च करने जा रहे हैं, वहां पर पैसा बरबाद करने के लिए तो आपके पास है लेकिन यहां पर आप जो करने के लिए बचनबद्ध हैं, वह करने को तैयार नहीं हैं। अभी रोड रोलज का मसला आया था। यहां पर आपके रिश्तेदार लोग थे, कोई सम्बन्ध उन लोगों से

था इसलिए आप ने एक करोड़ 85 लाख रुपया बरबाद करने का फैसला कर लिया लेकिन जब महंगाई भत्ते का सवाल आता है तो आकर आप वताते हैं कि पैसे की तकलीफ है। अगर पैसे की तकलीफ भी हो, तो गजेन्द्रगडकर कमिशन की रपट में मंत्रियों और सरकारी प्रशासन के खर्च में आस्टैरिटी के सम्बन्ध में सलाह दी गई है। वह सलाह ठीक हो या शलत, लेकिन उसमें कहा गया है कि आस्टैरिटी के बारे में हमारे सामने कई सुझाव आये हैं कि मंत्रियों और प्रशासन के खर्च में कैसे बचत की जाये।

"It has been urged before us that the Government of India and the State Governments must set a pattern of austerity in the conduct of the Ministers and in the general manner of administration."

अगर कहीं से आस्टैरिटी की शुरुआत करनी है, तो मंत्रि-मंडल और सरकार से शुरुआत करनी चाहिए, मंत्रियों आदि के व्यक्तिगत जीवन से करनी चाहिए। जिस मुल्क की म्यूनिसिपल कर्मचारी, रास्ते पर झाड़ू मारने वाली औरत, साल में एक साड़ी भी खरीदने की ताकत नहीं रखती है, उस मुल्क के मंत्रि-मंडल में दिन में तीन बार साड़ियां बदलने का तरीका चलता है। और फिर हमें कहा जाता है, देश को कहा जाता है कि आस्टैरिटी होना चाहिए। जिन लोगों में अपने व्यक्तिगत जीवन में आस्टैरिटी लागू करने की—सिर्फ दिखावे के लिए नहीं, बल्कि अमल में—न तो कुब्वत है और न ईमानदारी, उनको आस्टैरिटी के बारे में बात करने का कोई नैतिक या कानूनी अधिकार नहीं है।

मैं मन्त्रता के साथ वित्त मंत्री से कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेहरबानी कर के वह इस झगड़े को न बढ़ायें। 11 सितम्बर की तारीख केन्द्रीय सरकारी कर्मचारियों की अस्ट्राइक के लिये तय हुई है। जब परसों हमारे एक साथी

[श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज]

ने वित्त मंत्री से कहा कि अगर वह बेज फीज की बात करते हैं—श्रीर जो कुछ वह कर रहे हैं, वह बेज फीज ही है—तो वर्क फीज भी हो सकता है, तो उन्होंने कहा कि हम डीफीज भी कर सकते हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि उनके पास शक्ति है, क्योंकि उनकी बगल में गृह मंत्री बैठे हैं।

इस सम्बन्ध में बांड्ज की बात कही जाती है, डेफ्रैंड पेमेंट की बात कही जाती है—कहा जाता है कि साल के बाद पैसा ले लो और तब तक उस पैसे को हमारे पास रखो। मैं मांग करना चाहता हूँ, जिस को श्री मधु लिमये ने गजेन्द्रगडकर कमीशन की रपट घाने पर पेश किया था, कि सरकार ने फ़रवरी से वह पैसा देना है और ग़रीब सरकारी कर्मचारियों का वह पैसा फ़रवरी से सरकार के पास पड़ा है, इसलिए वह पैसा ब्याज के साथ सरकारी कर्मचारियों को देना चाहिए।

मैं साफ़ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर घाने वाले तीस दिन के अन्दर इस रपट को सौ फ़ीसदी मान कर महंगाई भत्ते का यह पैसा न देकर, सरकारी कर्मचारियों के इस आन्दोलन को ठुकराने और मिटाने का प्रयास किया गया, तो सरकार और मंत्री महोदय यह याद रखें कि वे सरकारी कर्मचारियों को नहीं पीट सकेंगे। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि 11 सितम्बर के आन्दोलन से इस सरकार को मिट्टी में मिलाने का काम हो जाये। वह हम लोगों को इस परेशानी में नडालें।

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, let us try to see what exactly the issue is, what is the Government's attitude to it is and where we are disagreeing with it. It will help the debate if we try to clarify the issue.

In the beginning, Sir, I should like to say that when we met Shri Morarji Desai we had a delightful satisfaction. I think a little exile from office has done some good. There was unusual warmth and cordiality in his talks; the old habit of

obstinacy dying hard. He often mistakes obstinacy for tenacity of reasoning. Barring this, there was some very cordial and frank discussion between us. He was very lavish in offering sympathy but very stingy and miserly when coming to implement that sympathy in cash. He was offering a plateful of sympathy, a dishful of sympathy. Unfortunately for us who were invited to that repast there was a little difficulty in partaking in that plateful of sympathy because that plate was covered with an iron cast napkin which he kept on reciting.

Briefly, the issue is like this. The Gajendragadkar Commission states the issue like this:

"We have thought it necessary to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that we have been oppressed by the apprehension that the problem of rising prices may pose a very serious danger to the whole of our national economy, unless it is tackled effectively, comprehensively and without delay."

Then the Commission says:

"We have already mentioned that the living cost index has been registering rapid rise almost from month to month. In fact, whereas it took 8 months for the 12 months average to rise by 10 points, the next rise of the same magnitude was witnessed in six months."

Now the Commission says:

"We, therefore, recommend that automatic adjustment in future in the manner indicated by us in the Table in Paragraph B...."

Here comes a point of dispute between the Finance Minister and the representatives of the Government employees.

"After examining all the considerations involved, we are unable to recommend any alternative form of assistance....."

I am sure Shri Morarji Desai has read this part of the recommendation but for

the benefit of the other members, who might not have had the time to read it, I am emphasising and reiterating this para:

"...any alternative form of assistance which might be given to ensure real benefit to Government employees without necessarily increasing inflationary pressures on the economy."

Shri Gajendragadkar is very clear in his mind as to his recommendations. He has categorically rejected the possibility of what is due to the government employees being imposed on them in some form of deferred payment, as the Finance Minister obdurately and tenaciously has been trying to hold.

What is the malaise that has given cause to this kind of attempt? May I invite your attention to some recent studies done in this matter. Shri Morarji Desai and some of his colleagues in the Congress Government are never tired of telling this House, though he used sometimes to champion the cause of the underdog years ago, that inflation is inevitable since we are committed to development and growth. This is a fallacious theory which the experience of other countries has now blown to pieces. May I read from *Inflation and Growth*, in which it has been pointed out :

"The available statistical evidence suggests that rising prices discourage economic development and rapid inflation seriously inhibits growth."

Here, may I remind Shri Morarji Desai of what he has himself stated earlier? Perhaps he has forgotten that.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I have never forgotten what I said.

Shri Nath Pal: May I point out that in 1958 you said, you defended the position in these words in this House? Sir, this time should not be included in the time allotted to me; this is grace time—Sir, you must be fair to me.

Two points were made by him when he was the custodian of the finance portfolio. One was that price rise in India is negligible compared with other countries and,

secondly, that a certain price rise is inevitable.

Shri Morarji Desai: That is all right. It is not inflation.

Shri Nath Pal: There is a semantic difference. What he calls continuous rise in prices is technologically and technically called inflation; of course, there is semantic difference. I am glad that he is agreeing that he has made this statement.

I am just showing the fallaciousness of this argument. During these two years the annual average weekly index of wholesale prices rose by only 2.4 per cent per week. In the fourth page, emphasising the last three years of the Third Plan, the rise in prices was of the order of 29 per cent. The rate of price rise has continued till 1966-67.

If there is continued inflation in this country, who is responsible for it? Certainly, you will agree with me if I suggest, that it is not the government employees, that it is not the fixed wage income group, it is not the agricultural labour, it is not the school teacher, it is not those who come in the lowest income bracket, it is not these people who are responsible for continued inflation in this country. The responsibility for this has to be borne by those who are occupying the Treasury Benches. The mistake is theirs, but the penalty is to be paid by somebody else; that seems to be the sense of justice of Shri Morarji Desai!

Shri Desai, during his reply to the Finance Ministry's demands in this year's budget discussion, made a tall claim when it was brought to his notice that during the past years the real income of the lowest income brackets had declined; he, with his usual tenacity, rejected it. I wish he had brought to bear a little more of logic, facts and data, rather than cling tenaciously to his prejudices and pretend that they are arguments. I am reading from a recent study of Mr. R. K. Amin. Who are the people whom Mr. Morarji Desai is going to penalise? This is very simple. He says, "There is inflation. I know something is due to you accord-

[Shri Nath Pai]

ing to Justice Gajendragadkar. I am prepared to give it to you. But I am not prepared to give it to you in the form in which you are entitled as per the Commission's Report. I am going to give it to you by way of deferred payment." Why? The reply is, "If I give you in cash, the inflationary pressures will be increased and accelerated."

I am asking a very simple question: Who is responsible for this inflation? Is it the Government employee? Is it the man with fixed income? Why are you trying to penalise him for the sins committed by the Government? The whole trouble arises because of the failure of this Government on the economic front. For this failure of the Congress Government, who is to pay the penalty, who is to bear the burden? It is those who are less qualified to bear the burden. It is precisely the victim of this who is made to pay the penalty. If Mr. Morarjibhai Desai and the Congress Government come forward with proposal so that those who have benefited from the inflationary economic policies of the Government were made to pay the penalty, we can understand that and we can cooperate with the Government. It is precisely those who have paid through their nose due to the inflationary policies of the Government that are being called upon to pay the penalty by being asked to take what is due to them not in terms of cash, in terms of bonds and defence certificates.

There are patent inequities about the suggestion of the Finance Minister. He will make much about it and, I think—he is really more eloquent these days—he will tell us, "I sympathise. I understand, my heart goes as much as that of anybody else to the poor employee. But what shall I do?"

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may try to conclude now.

Shri Nath Pai: May I quote this?

"The First and Second Agricultural Labour Enquiries conducted in 1950-51 and 1956-57 respectively indicate that in 1956-57 as compared to 1950-51 agricultural labourers had fewer days of work, lower real wages per day, heavier burden on debt per

household, larger number of households in debt and bigger deficit in the household budget."

This is the lowest income group in this country. I will ask Mr. Morarji Desai only one thing. Who is paying the penalty for inflationary economic policies followed not only by him but by the Government as a whole. Actually, when he was made to resign under the so-called Kamaraj Plan, he was about to make a new departure and, with his characteristic courage, he was about to accept mistakes and was to make a new departure. He was given a chance. I do not hold him entirely responsible for all this. But it is his lion's share in this. Then, this what I quote:

"It is certain that the poor were worse off in 1966-67 compared to 1961. Per capita income in 1961 and in 1966 was almost the same Rs. 325 at 1960-61 prices. During this period, conditions in agriculture deteriorated considerably....."

The per capita output in agriculture in 1965-66 and 1966-67 was the same. That is the lowest for that period.

I want to conclude by pointing out one or two things to Mr. Morarji Desai. He has indulged in a very strange play with some figures. What he owes to the Central Government employees is Rs. 60 crores. In order to frighten us, he says, "If I give you this much, I must think of what State Governments are going to pay. What about the public sector undertakings employees? What about the State Government employees?" And he has given a huge figure. Certainly, he has become the Christmas Father of all the employees in the country. He has taken the burden on his shoulders. I concede to him as the Finance Minister of the Union Government that he should think of the economy as a whole.

There, he does not answer our question. If you want to check inflationary pressures in any way, where do you want to make a beginning? Is it with those who are less qualified to bear the burden, who are most oppressed by the burden, who are most vulnerable or those who have taken the benefit out of the inflationary policies of

the Government? I think, he is making a beginning in the wrong way. I must tell him that we are not at all convinced by what we heard from him. In the first place, I must tell him, this is not something that the Central Government employees demand. It is the Government of India which appointed the Gajendra-gadkar Commission to look into it. He has not given to them what they were entitled to and what they asked for. He is giving only 90 per cent neutralisation and Mr. Morarji Desai is even denying that. I know his anxiety for the economy as a whole. I think he is making a beginning in the wrong way. Exactly seven years ago, when there was a similar occasion, when this was discussed, you, Sir, participated in that and you told us as to who was responsible for the step taken by the Government employees.

History has a very bad way of repeating itself, but we wise try to learn some lessons from history. Mr. Morarji Desai was the Finance Minister in that year when the Government of India employees, for the first time in the history of a free country, resorted to a strike. That strike was crushed with an iron hand and that was the only victory that the Government of India had won since Independence, that is, it had beaten down the half-starving employees who had been kept on a subsistence level by the Government. Mr. Pant admitted that 21,000 employees were arrested, 45,000 were suspended, and he came here to this House gloating over the spurious victory of theirs.

I have to quote something from a confidential letter of the then Prime Minister. This will be my appeal to Mr. Morarji Desai, the so-called steel man: let no strength be displayed before the half-clad and half-starving government employees. That steel, if at all it is there, has to be displayed in some other sphere.

Then let us not forget this: it will not be helpful to hold the irresponsibility of the trade union leaders as the cause of the strike. Nobody wants a strike; the government employees want it least. But you drive them, you force them, you do not give them any other alternative: you close every door and when they resort to

the only weapon they have, then you hold them responsible as the people who are jeopardising the security and the economy of the country. The nation will not accept this plea; the fallacy of the plea has already been exploded.

Before I sit down, I should read what in a confidential letter, the then Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had to warn his colleagues:

"We have thus far not evolved any adequate machinery for the rapid settlement of disputes of this type. The Government's way of dealing with such matters is a leisurely way, and months and even years pass sometimes before we come to grips with the problem; a problem which perhaps could have been solved with greater ease, becomes more difficult. Frustration takes place and passions are aroused, and these lead to a conflict which is ultimately good for no one".

I want to plead with the Minister: let us not strike a false posture, let us see who is bearing the burden and let us try to relieve the burden, at least from the shoulders which have carried it too long and too patiently. It is the last straw that breaks the burden of the camel and he know who is the camel and how patient they were in this case. I hope that Mr. Morarji Desai will discard the false posture of strength and will come out in a real conciliatory manner. The real strength—it is no weakness—in a really good man of strength is to see the truth, even though it is a little late to see the truth sometimes.

श्री कृष्णी नाथ पांडे (पदरीवा) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्राज्ञ की जो परिस्थिति है वैसे मैं बहुत इसके लिए उत्साहित नहीं था कि इस विषय पर बोलूँ पर दोस्तीना भी बहुत आवश्यक है इसलिए कि एक बहुत सिद्धांत का प्रश्न भी इस में आया है और मैं माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी के ध्यान में यह चीज जाना चाहता हूँ। इस गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के दो भाग हैं। एक वह भाग है जिसमें उन्होंने एक रिपोर्ट की है कि इतना

[श्री काशी नाथ पांडे]

गवर्नमेंट के कर्मचारियों के लिए देना चाहिए। अब यह जरूर है कि जो भी उन की सिफारिश है उस से एक धनराशि का प्रश्न सामने आता है। गवर्नमेंट को तरकीब निकालनी है कि कैसे वह रुपया लाये और उन को दे? यह दूसरी चीज है जिस का इंतजाम वित्त मंत्री जी को करना है। पर एक चीज मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ जो सिद्धांत का प्रश्न इस में है वह यह है कि जब गवर्नमेंट को कोई कठिनाई होती है या दो पार्टियों में झगड़े होते हैं और भ्रक्सर यह झगड़े होते हैं क्योंकि गवर्नमेंट सब से बड़ी एम्प्लायर है चाहे वह गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लायी डाइरेक्ट हों जिन की तनख्वाह टैक्स से आती है या स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की फॅक्टरीज में काम करते हों, जब कभी भी इस तरह की बातों को लेकर झगड़ा होता है तो आप उसे जज के सुपुर्द करते हैं और जब जज का कोई फैसला हो, जैसे इस चीज को आप ने गजेन्द्र गडकर जैसे जज के सुपुर्द किया जिन का हिन्दुस्तान में एक स्थान है और मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि उन जैसे जज ने इस विषय पर अपना मस्तिष्क न लगाया होगा, यह बात दूसरी है कि आज वह बाहर हैं लेकिन एक दिन वह सुप्रीम कोर्ट के चीफ जस्टिस रहे हैं, जो उन्होंने रिपोर्ट दी है, अगर गवर्नमेंट ने उस में कोई तरमीम करने की कोशिश की तो दूसरी बार अगर आप ने किसी जज के सुपुर्द यह बाल की तो आप की इस बात का विश्वास किसी को नहीं होगा। मैं मन्त्र शब्दों में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब आप ने एक चीज पहले से सिद्धांतरूप में स्वीकार कर ली है और एक जज के सुपुर्द आप ने जिस चीज को किया है, तो उन्होंने जो सिफारिश की है उस सिद्धांत को मान लीजिए।

मैं आप की कठिनाई को समझता हूँ, लेकिन यह जो साइकिल है उस को आप को एक दिन तो फेंस ही करना पड़ेगा क्योंकि हम कह सकते हैं आप रुपया दे दीजिये। लेकिन रुपया देना आप को है। हम तो केवल बतला

सकते हैं कि रुपया आप को देना चाहिये। मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ, जैसा कि मैं समझता हूँ, कि जितनी धनराशि बढ़ती है, सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लायीज को जितना पैसा मिलता है, निश्चय ही उस का प्रभाव स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के एम्प्लायीज पर पड़ता है। वह पड़े बिना रह नहीं सकता। जब भी पे कमीशन की सिफारिश हुई है तब पब्लिक ग्रन्डरटेकिंग्स में, जहां बेज बोर्ड नहीं बने हैं, इस चीज का फायदा लोगों को मिला है। हम ऐसा नहीं कह सकते कि पब्लिक ग्रन्डरटेकिंग्स में जो कर्मचारी काम करते हैं, वह इस का फायदा नहीं उठावेंगे। जैसा कहा जा रहा है, हो सकता है कि 60 करोड़ की धनराशि की ही जरूरत हो। लेकिन इसके लिये 60 करोड़ की धन राशि कहां से आयेगी। इस को ढूँढना आप को है। हो सकता है कि आप टैक्स लगा कर यह रुपया दे दें। लेकिन आज देश और टैक्स के लिये तैयार नहीं है। तब यह रुपया कहां से आयेगा ?

जो एक लम्बी चीज आप प्राविडेंट फंड में दे रहे हैं उस के संबंध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्राविडेंट फंड एक ऐसी चीज है जिस से अगर रुपया उधार लिया जाये तो उस के लिये रूल्स बने हैं। उस से आदमी बिल्डिंग के लिये रुपया उधार ले सकता है, लेकिन अगर कोई और काम हो तो प्राविडेंट फंड से रुपया उधार नहीं लिया जा सकता। इसी लिये अगर आप डेफेंड पेमेंट करना चाहते हैं, बाण्ड्स को शकल में मले हो उस को कोजिये, लेकिन कम से कम आधा पैसा जरूर दे दीजिये।

श्री नाथ पांडे : नहीं, नहीं। (व्यवधान)

श्री काशी नाथ पांडे : मैं यह नहीं कहता कि बनर्जी साहब कहते हैं। यह तो काशी नाथ पांडे कह रहा है। उसको आप सुनिये। बनर्जी साहब अपनी जगह वहां पर बैठे हैं और मैं यहां बैठा हुआ हूँ। मैं अपना विचार

रख रहा हूँ। मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ : (ब्यवधान) आप को समझना ही नहीं है, इस लिये जो चाहे कह डालिये। सब ठीक है। मैं एक चीज कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कर्मचारियों को बांड की ही शकल में देना है तो वह चीज ऐसी होनी चाहिये कि वह दो या चार साल में जब भी लेना चाहें उस को ले सकें किसी भी काम के लिये। बच्चों को शिक्षा के लिये प्राविडेंट फंड से रुपया नहीं मिल सकता। उस में बहुत सी और भी रुकावटें हैं। इस लिये इस का दूसरा कोई फंड बनाइये और कम से कम आधा पैसे कर्मचारियों को जरूर दे दिया जाये। यह मेरा सुझाव है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, Shri S. M. Banerjee. He should take just five minutes and be very brief.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi (Cuddalore): How can you neglect our party? We must also be given some time.

16.44 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जितनी बहस हम वित्त मंत्री जो से कर चुके हैं उस का एक ही निष्कर्ष निकलता है कि वह कहते हैं कि उन्हें 175 करोड़ रुपये की जरूरत है और हिन्दुस्तान के पास वह पैसा है नहीं। मैं एक चीज कहना चाहता हूँ कि पहले से ही यह इरादा था हमारी सरकार का या हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी का कि यह पैसा देना नहीं चाहिये, क्योंकि रेलवे मंत्रालय ने अपने बजट में डो० ए० के लिये, महंगाई के लिये पैसा दिया, लेकिन आप ने.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should be very short. Shri S. A. Dange has already spoken on behalf of his party.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have been pleading with you to give me some time. Today is the last day of this session.

Mr. Speaker: If two or three Members are going to speak from every party, then we shall not be able to complete the debate.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Even if you are harsh to me, I would submit that you may remember that.....

Mr. Speaker: I am not harsh at all.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I know, Sir, that you have been very kind to us. You are like a coconut, hard on the surface but very soft inside.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): What is this? The Speaker is being compared with a coconut?

Mr. Speaker: Now, let Shri S. M. Banerjee continue his speech. Let him not waste any more time.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would not take more than six to seven minutes.

मैं कह रहा था कि आज हमारे सामने जो मसला है वह 175 करोड़ ६० का नहीं है। जब वित्त मंत्री जी ने साफ तरीके से मुख्य मंत्रियों को कह दिया है कि सूबे की सरकार के कर्मचारियों के लिये कोई पैसा वह देने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, दूसरी म्यूनिसिपैलिटीज और लोकल बाडीज के जो एम्प्लायीज हैं उन के लिये भी उन्होंने कहा है कि नहीं है, तब हमारे सामने सबाल सिर्फ 60 करोड़ रुपये का रह जाता है।

अगर आप हमारे 22 लाख सरकारी कर्मचारियों की बेजेज को देखें तो वह 1947 से भी नीचे गिर चुकी है। सरकार ने जब 1952 में यह सोचा कि महंगाई तो कम होनी नहीं है, जैसा कि पहले पे कमीशन का कयास था और वह सोचता था कि 165 से ले कर 175 या 200 के ऊपर वह सीमित हो जायेगी, तब उन्होंने समझा कि यह महंगाई भत्ता महंगाई भत्ता नहीं है, बल्कि तनख्वाह का एक हिस्सा है। उन्होंने 1952 में एक

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

कमेटी का निर्माण किया जिस का नाम गाडगिल कमेटी था।

गाडगिल कमेटी ने कहा कि :

"This question of treating as part of pay a portion of the dearness allowance now granted to the Central Government employees has been engaging the attention of the Government of India for some time. The Government of India have now decided to set up a committee consisting of non-officials and officials to conduct an investigation into these matters and make recommendations to Government on this subject."

1952 में जो हमारे वित्त मंत्री थे उन्होंने समझा कि उस को तन्ख्वाह में जोड़ देना चाहिये। मैं कहता हूँ कि आप आज गाडगिल कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को भूल जाइये। गजेन्द्र गडकर कमिशन ने भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में केवल 90 परसेंट न्युट्रलाइजेशन दिया है, और वह भी 70 रु० से ले कर 109 रु० तक है। हम लोग चाहते थे कि 600 रु० या कम से कम 450 रु० तक सेंट पर सेंट न्युट्रलाइजेशन हो। जिन लोगों को 600-700 रु० मिलता है वह भी मध्यम श्रेणी के आदमी हैं। यह सही है कि उन को भी मिलना चाहिये। लेकिन आप इस को भूल जाइये, हमारी जो बेसिक डिमांड है कि सेंट पर सेंट न्युट्रलाइजेशन होना चाहिये, वह भी अगर आप नहीं कर सकते, तो गजेन्द्र गडकर कमिशन को रिपोर्ट के अनुसार 185 और 195 के आधार पर जो महंगाई भत्ता हम को मिलता है, वह तो मिलना चाहिये।

आज मेरे लायक दोस्त जार्ज फरनेंडीज ने, श्री डांगे ने और दूसरे लोगों ने कहा है कि 11 सितम्बर को हड़ताल होने वाली है। यह हड़ताल इस लिये नहीं है कि हम सरकार को उलट दें। यह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट तो खुद ही बिजान्क करती जा रही है धीरे धीरे और मैं समझता हूँ कि वह अपने आप बिजान्क

हो जायेगी क्योंकि चारों तरफ से इस के झुक् पौर कह चुके हैं। इसलिये आज इसका मतला नहीं है। लेकिन आज सरकारी कर्मचारियों की हालत क्या है? 22 लाख कर्मचारियों में से 14 लाख कर्मचारी ऐसे हैं जिन की तनख्वाह 100 रु० से कम आज भी है। ऐसे वक्त में अगर वह चाहते हैं कि उन का पैसा रोका जाय, उन को नकद पैसा न मिले, तो घटना होगा। हमारी लड़ाई भाई भाई की लड़ाई है। हमारे वित्त मंत्री जो हैं उन से हमारा महाभारत की लड़ाई है। हमको पांच गांव चाहिये। हमें चाहिये रोटी, रोजी, कपड़ा, मकान और अस्पताल। यह पांच गांव अगर फर्मचारियों को नहीं मिले तो मैं बतला दूँ कि महाभारत कुरुक्षेत्र के मैदान में न हो कर दिल्ली, बम्बई, कानपुर के मैदानों में आज के दुर्योधन से जरूर होगी, कौरव राज्य से लड़ाई जरूर होगी।

इसलिये मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि वह मेहरबानी कर के दुबारा सोचें। हमारे दरवाजे खुले हुए हैं। अगर पैसे की बात है तो हम सोचेंगे कि पैसा कहां से मिले। उन्होंने कहा कि 31 मार्च, 1968 तक हम को मौका दीजिये। बी आर प्रामिजिग उस के बाद हम आप के पास नहीं आयेगे। लेकिन जहां तक गवर्नमेंट की प्रामिज की बात है, उसके लिये कुछ लोगों ने कहना शुरू कर दिया है कि :

"Government of promises, government by promises and government for promises."

प्रामिज के सिवा उस के पास और कुछ नहीं है। मैं श्री भारारजी देसाई की स्टेटफार्बडनेस और प्राम्नेस को ऐडमायर करता हूँ। मैं उन से एन्वी करता हूँ। कभी कभी मुझ में भी उन की एरोगेन्स होती है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस मामले को हल करें, उन की पूरी कॅबिनेट हल करे। अगर आज उन को वपया नहीं मिलता है तो 11 सितम्बर की हड़ताल इसलिये नहीं

होगी कि वह सरकार को उलटना चाहते हैं। वह इस लिये होगी कि वह जीना चाहते हैं, फाकेकशी से बचना चाहते हैं, अपने बच्चों को सुस्कराहट को कायम रखना चाहते हैं। इस लिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बहुत बहस हम कर चुके हैं। आज वह डिक्लेयर करें कि वह कौश देने के लिये राजी हैं ताकि हम खुशी से जा कर सरकारी कर्म-चारियों से कह सकें कि उन की मांग मंजूर हुई है।

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Even Mr. Dandekar has not spoken?

Shri Namblar: I am a co-signatory to the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I know, that is exactly where we get into trouble. One party gets two spokesmen.

श्री तुलम चन्ड कछशा (उज्जैन):
पांच मिनट मुझे भा क्या आप देंगे ?

Mr. Speaker: If I give a chance even to one from each party, it will go on for another two hours. I will call one or two speakers.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta (Delhi Sadar):
One or two minutes for questions.

Shri N. Dandekar (Jamnagar): I think this is one of those situation where, almost there seems to be 'right' on both sides.

The case for increase in dearness allowances has been carefully studied and ably reported in the Commission's report. I would not like to add anything to it. It is perfectly obvious that there has been a steady rise in the cost of living, and that the employees affected, whether you stop at Rs. 350 or Rs. 500 or whatever figure, are of a category who can least bear the burden of rising prices. And it is not as if the Commission has made any very generous recommendations, except at the very lowest rung, where also there is only

90 per cent neutralisation. I do not think one can characterise the report of the Commission as over-generous. So the case, as far as the Central Government employees are concerned, is pretty clear and beyond doubt.

On the other hand, one cannot ignore the impact of this upon public finances regardless of whether the money is going to come from the Central Government, State Government, public sector enterprises or whatever else. But it is not merely a question of a bill that aggregates Rs. 170 crores. It is also a question of the impact of this Rs. 170 crores additional expenditure by the persons to whom the additional Dearness Allowance would be given, upon the economy in general, and in particular upon the economy. And here I am very much in sympathy with the point of view which the cost of living part of the Finance Minister has on this, that if this goes on, it would start a spiral, a new spiral would be set in motion, which is going to make increasingly difficult any question of price control.

Nevertheless, I almost feel like saying at this point: the Government have made their bed, let them sleep in it, let them stew in their own juice, because this is the direct consequence of 15 or 20 years of reckless planning that has been going on. We on our side, and many, I know, on the Congress side, though they have not given expression to it publicly, have over and over again emphasized the extravagant character of planning, the extravagant expenditure of Government involved in terms of so much investment expenditure as well as consumption expenditure, the extraordinary degree of deficit financing and so on. All of which is well known.

Shri Ranga: Even now it is going on.

Shri N. Dandekar: We warned them over and over again. I certainly have done so in the last three years when I have had the honour of being in the House; and my colleagues have done so over a longer period. Over and over again

[Shri N. Dandeker]

we have said this to the Government that they were heading for disaster in terms of inflation, in terms of a general rise in prices in terms of rise in the cost of living, and that there will come a time when inflation will overtake all your plans and policies like the plans and policies of mice and men. And it has happened.

As I said, I almost feel like saying let the Government stew in their juice. But to be one sided in this issue would not be proper. However, I do ask myself this what have the Government done in this very year to restrain the rise in prices? The Railway Minister added to costs by increasing railway fares and freights, and the Finance Minister countered by increasing the petrol taxes and diesel taxes, so that the cost of transport all over, whether by road or rail, would increase. Then, he added a lot of indirect and direct taxes, the total impact of which in terms of general level of prices and cost of living is already known.

So, has this Government done anything in terms of its taxation policy that would arrest the rise in prices? Has this Government done anything in terms of restraining extravagant expenditure,—consumption expenditure as well as the so-called but phoney investment expenditure—that would restrain prices? If not, are they entitled to come over and say to their employees: you are the only people who must suffer the consequences of all this, and therefore please do not ask for this dearness allowance, because additional dearness allowances at this juncture will admittedly add to the rising cost spiral?

I do not think that in this sort of a situation it is possible justly and legitimately to deny the relief that is asked for. But the question does arise, from the point of view of the national economy which it is the business of the Finance Minister to consider: in what form should this dearness allowance for neutralisation of rise in the cost of living to the extent recommended by the commission be given? Here I support very much what Mr. Kashinath Pandey said a little while ago. I think a certain amount of it should undoubtedly be frozen by way of provident fund or some other form of saving

of that kind so that although they get a recompense for the rising cost of living, they put in a certain amount of the increase in dearness allowance into savings of that kind. But I also agree that it is not enough to do that. I am clearly of the opinion that a part of the allowances should also be given in cash.

Finally, Sir, I would say a few words about the threatened strike. I think that there are hardly any circumstances whatever in which a strike by public servants can ever be justified.

An hon. Member: It is the old I.C.S. which is speaking.

Shri N. Dandeker: I would put it at that extreme level. A strike by public servants is a strike against the community and against the entire economic structure; it is a strike against all that everybody wants in terms of further development of the country, in terms of further production, in terms of anything that one would care to mention in the present circumstances of recession... (*Interruptions*). I have therefore no hesitation whatever in saying that, on the one hand, the case for dearness allowance cannot be denied and, on the other, the government has a case about the consequences of giving this dearness allowance wholly in cash and their case too cannot be denied. There is necessity therefore to pay the dearness allowance partly in the form in which it cannot be spent and partly in a form in which it can be spent. But, finally, I cannot justify on any ground any strike, and the heavy "padding", that the all-India strike in all kinds of public activity is not intended for this or that but merely as some kind of a token demonstration of their resentment, cannot be accepted. No, Sir, a strike by public servants can under no circumstances be regarded as just and legitimate.

Mr. Speaker: I find some hon. members rising. I said I would call the Minister at 5 O'Clock and I can extend the time by 5 or 10 minutes. Even then, some parties have not spoken; the D.M.K. has not spoken. Some congressmen also want to speak.

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : घ्रापने कहा था कि पांच बजे दूसरी चीज लेंगे। पांच बज गए हैं, इसको अब घ्राप खत्म करें और उसको लें।

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, he cannot raise the point of quorum now. Therefore, I would suggest a via media. Instead of making speeches, you may put questions before the Finance Minister replies, not afterwards.

Shri Nambar: Five minutes each.

Mr. Speaker: Instead of making speeches about poverty and all that which is all very well known, they may put questions. They may each take two minutes. The question type of thing is what I suggest instead of making speeches about the cost of living and all that which had been said already. The other alternative is to allow one or two speeches and then I will call the Finance Minister.

Shri Nambar: Five minutes each.

Mr. Speaker: Even five minutes each, it will take another two hours. There are parties which have not spoken.

श्री कंडर लाल गुप्त : डी० एम० के० और लैफ्ट कम्युनिस्ट पार्टीज ही बची हैं।

Mr. Speaker: There are not only two parties, the D.M.K. and the CPI-Marxists. Gani Dhar is here.

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): Four or five from the Congress side also.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Radhir Singh's name is not here from the Congress side.

Every day, Mr. Randhir Singh's name is there. He sends slips for everything.

17 hrs.

Shri Randhir Singh: Sir, I am not speaking on this.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, the Railway Minister is to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker: After this, that will be made. (Interruption).

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I am calling Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji. I want to be fair to every party and everybody. It is not a question of calling only one or two from that side and avoiding the other party on this side. Yes, Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji (Howrah): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a subject which is really of great importance. (Interruption) I hope I will get at least five minutes, Sir. While I fully sympathise with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Members on the other side, I want to say that the Members on this side also yield to none in their sympathy for the Government employees either at the Centre or in the States. I was surprised that the hon. Member on the other side, while speaking in this air-conditioned chamber, forgot to mention the State Government employees—millions of them. The State Government employees are also equally suffering; they are just like the Central Government employees; similar is the case of the servants of the local bodies, and also the servants under the various public undertakings. I was surprised that Shri Nath Pai forgot them altogether and requested our Deputy Prime Minister also to forget them altogether. It is not possible.

I will just read out to you from the Gajendragadkar Commission's report, to show you how they themselves pointed out and pleaded also for those serving in the States and in the public undertakings; they could not find any way out of it although they have commended a certain dearness allowance. I crave your indulgence to read out just one sentence from that report. They have said:

"That is why we wish to emphasise the fact that even while we are making our recommendations in regard to the payment of dearness allowance in future we are quite clear that unless the menace of rising prices is effectively controlled, within a reasonably short time, our recommendations would become obsolete."

[Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji]

I am one of those who plead for a dearness allowance, and not only for the dearness allowance but for a need-based salary in a socialist State. It would be a travesty of truth if anybody comes here and says that our Deputy Prime Minister is trying to shirk the responsibility in respect of implementing the Gajendragadkar Commission's report. That is not so. What he has been saying before is that the price rise should be checked first and then the question of dearness allowance could be taken up. I had a talk with some of the Central Government employees only the other day. I told them point-blank, "Do you believe that an increase of Rs. 10 or Rs. 15 in their present dearness allowance, and thus, in their total emoluments, will solve your problems?" They replied, "No. It cannot solve the problems." (*Interruption*). I am with them; I plead for them and I say that they should get relief and they should get something, the money, as the Gajendragadkar Commission has reported. But then, what our Deputy Prime Minister has been asking the people was, he was asking for some more time to see that the price rise is checked first, which is also the essential provision in the Gajendragadkar Commission's report. Is there anything wrong in it; if the Deputy Prime Minister says that he only wants time? Shri Nath Pai said that the Central Government employees are entitled to get the enhanced dearness allowance from February last. Well, from February to August, during these three six odd months, they have carried on; they have been living; not dead. (*Interruption*). They continue to be very patriotic people, and they can suffer. I know them I feel for them, and I am one with them. (*Interruption*) Therefore, I only appeal to their sense of patriotism and their sense of responsibility for this country. It is an appeal to them. Therefore, it would be wrong if some political leaders would put it into their heads that this is the time to press for their demands. It would be wrong from a patriotic point of view. We were only appealing to them to give us two or three months' time so that the Deputy Prime Minister may make attempts to see that the price rise is held. He is not averse to giving a rise in the dearness allowance; he is quite prepared for it. He is only

calculating the effects it will produce, the chain of effects it will produce on the economy. Therefore, he is only pleading for time. The approach is quite clear: that he does not want to deprive the Central Government employees or any other employees of anything whatsoever. That is the point. He is thinking not only of the Central Government employees but also the employees of the State Governments; he is thinking of the employees in the public undertakings and he is thinking of the employees of the local bodies. He is more alive to this question than anybody else. The hon. Members on the other side have said that he is not thinking of them: it is not so. Our Deputy Prime Minister is quite alive to this question and he yields to none in his feelings on this question that concerns the employees, and the thoughts entertained by them. I would appeal to the hon. Members of this House not to approach this question with a political motive, but to see that a patriotic motive is generated even amongst the employees, so that in these difficult times, to tide over the crisis, all of us may unite and make a little bit of sacrifice, so that in the long run we can pay them more and bring about socio-economic justice.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi (Cuddalore): Sir, even though the Gajendragadkar Commission's report has been placed before the House two months back, Government has not taken any decision to award the increase in DA in the form of cash. The hon. Finance Minister says, it will give rise to price inflation. Who is to blame? It is the Government of India to blame and not the workers. Now he says, we will give in the form of certificates. The commission was appointed for helping the workers to have a better life. Can certificates be eaten? Can it satisfy the workers?

The rise in prices is a phenomenon of the Congress Governments. They are responsible for all these things. When the Government of India raises the DA, it has to compensate the State Governments also in the form of money. Now the Finance Minister says, where can I find the money? If he cannot find the money, let him at least listen to the opposition's suggestions. We suggest demonetisation of the currency and unearthing of black

money. He does not do that. At least he can nationalise the entire banking system. It is the private banking system that is responsible for the inflationary tendencies. This capitalistic Government is supporting the capitalistic business and allowing the private banks to raise the prices. If the Deputy Prime Minister is unable to hold the price-line and to find money to compensate the workers, let him quit office; let his party quit. He has no business to continue in office after 15th of this month.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): Sir, I would only say that the Finance Minister has partly succeeded in his attempt to make the Central Government employees to agree to the Gajendragadkar Commission's award. Prior to the coming into being of that commission, the employees were opposed to the commission. They said, we do not want it. Now Mr. Morarji Desai has succeeded in pinning down the employees and making them accept the commission's award. Now he wants to go a step further and say, even that I am not going to give you. This is the simple logic of what he is attempting to do. He must clearly understand that the next step he is going to take is a false step, by which he will bring doom not only to himself and to his ministry, but to the people also by a general strike and by the very stout resistance of the entire working class of the country.

There is no logic in his argument that there is no money. There is money to pay for other things, but not to the poor Government employees, to whom the money is rightly due. Sir, 75 directors of 40 companies draw a salary of more than Rs. 10,000 a month, under the company law, to which his ministry is agreeing. I have taken this figure from the report of the company law board for 1964. He can allow such things, but when it comes to the question of employees, he says, there is no money.

I will give another instance.

Sir, the Railway Minister allotted Rs. 13 crores towards payment of increase in dearness allowance to the railway employees and because of that he asked this House to approve his proposal to increase fares and freights. His speech is on re-

cord and we have answered it. After getting the approval of this House to increase fares and freights, after keeping apart Rs. 13 crores towards payment of increase in dearness allowance to the railway employees, now the Finance Minister comes and says that no more money is to be paid in the name of dearness allowance, we can only give the increase in paper, the paper which only donkeys eat. Where did that sum of Rs. 13 crores go? Do you want to hoodwink the people. When you wanted to increase the fares and freights you came before this House and said that because you wanted to pay increased dearness allowance to the extent of Rs. 13 crores you wanted more money. When you got that money, you say that you would not pay anything. Sir, this will not do.

Their argument is that if more money is paid by way of increased dearness allowance there will be more inflation. In the last eight months, right from January up to this day, no increase has been given to the government employees in their dearness allowance. But the prices have gone up sky high. How did it happen? Therefore, it is clear from realities that it is not the increase in dearness allowance that is going to help the spiralling of rise in prices of commodities. It is a false theory. Many of my colleagues have already spoken about it and therefore I am leaving it at that.

Sir, the private sector has given hundred per cent neutralisation. Many many industries have done that. They do it by agreement. No body knows what they give and the prices do not increase. If crores and crores are paid by the private sector and there is hundred per cent neutralisation due to which there is no increase in the prices, is this increase that we are asking for twenty lakh people out of which twelve lakh people belong to the Railways going to increase the prices? It is only a drop in the ocean. It is only a theory. It is only to hoodwink the people that the Finance Minister has come forward with such a false theory.

If the Central Government employees are forced to go on strike,—they do not want to go on strike—if the Government

[Shri Nambiar]

creates a situation where they are forced to go on strike, then the entire responsibility must be borne by the Government, the Finance Minister in particular, and not the Opposition. We do not want to see an all-India strike. Do not think that we want to incite people to go on strike. We warn you. Do not create a situation where a strike will be made inevitable. Do not force the employees. Let them have wisdom at least at the last minute. Let the zero hour be an hour when they will understand, they will appreciate the difficulties of the employees. Let them understand the difficulties of the poor millions of workers on whose toil and service this Government is alive and existing today. Let them not forget that.

श्री श्री० बंकरटस्वामी (मिहीपेट) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रीमती बहुत सारे मेम्बरों ने सेंट्रल पे कमीशन के बारे में अपने अपने विचार प्रकट किए हैं। मैं अपनी तरफ से इस सिलसिले में थोड़े से सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। बहुत सारे अपोजीशन के मेम्बर यह समझते हैं कि सिर्फ वही सारे कर्ता धर्ता पूरे हिन्दुस्तान के सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लायीज के हैं। मैं कांग्रेस की तरफ से और आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० की तरफ से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे अन्दर वही दुख दर्द है जो आप जाहिर करते हैं। लेकिन हम जो हैं खामोश रह कर काम कर के बताना चाहते हैं और यह भी मैं कह सकता हूँ यह सही है कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लायीज के बारे में हमारा यह बजट सेशन शुरू होते वक्त, जनरल एलेक्शन खत्म होते ही जब डा० राधाकृष्णन दोनो हाउसेज को ऐड्रेस कर रहे थे तब उन्होंने यह आपवासन दिया था कि हम ने गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन अप्वाइंट किया है, भविष्य में वह हमारे सारे फैसले करेगा। बड़ी चिन्ता के साथ और बड़े अफसोस के साथ मुझे कहना पड़ता है कि गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के अन्दर हन्ड्रेड परसेंट न्यूट्रलाइजेशन को नहीं लिया गया है। लेकिन जो कुछ भी आया है, उस के बारे में मैं साफ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि

सारे देश के सेंट्रल एम्प्लायीज और न सिर्फ सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के एम्प्लायीज बल्कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के एम्प्लायीज भी इस तरह से मुंह खोल कर बैठे हुए थे कि जब कभी भी गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आयेगी गवर्नमेंट उसे इम्प्लीमेंट करेगी और जो भी मुझ पर मुसीबतें हैं, मुश्किलें हैं वह दूर होंगी। इसी विश्वास के साथ सारे 20 लाख एम्प्लायीज इन्तजार कर रहे थे। मगर मुझे आज चिन्ता के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज सारे एम्प्लायीज के अन्दर असन्तोष पैदा हो रहा है। आखिर कितना ही रुपया हम योजनाओं पर खर्च करते हैं, हजारों करोड़ रुपये की पंच वर्षीय योजनाएं हम ने बनायी हैं लेकिन हमारे एम्प्लायीज के लिए गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक कुल 60-62 करोड़ रुपया होता है। हमारे मोरार जी भाई, डिप्टी प्राइम मिनिस्टर, जैसा नाथ पं साहब ने कहा सचमुच वैसे ही बड़े मजबूत आदमी हैं, गोल्ड कन्ट्रोल को भी बड़े ही मजबूत तरीके से आप ने इम्प्लीमेंट किया, तो उन से यही आशा है कि जैसी भी रिपोर्ट आई है, कुछ भी हो जाय, उस पर एडामेंट रह कर उस को वह इम्प्लीमेंट करेंगे। मैं एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस को जल्दी इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया तो प्राइवेट सेक्टर की तरफ से और भी बहुत सारी गड़बड़ होने वाली है। प्राइवेट सेक्टर के अन्दर, बेज बोर्ड के अन्दर बहुत सी गड़बड़ होने वाली है। तो जो भी गवर्नमेंट इन्तजाम सोच रही है, विचार कर रही है उस को किसी न किसी तरह से जल्दी उस पर अमल करना चाहिए। मैं आखीरी एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि देर मत कीजिए, जल्दी से जल्दी अमल कीजिए। चाहे जो कुछ भी हो, दो तीन महीने के अन्दर जो भी गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है फौरन उस पर अमल कीजिए। सारे मुल्क के अन्दर यह हवा फैलने न दीजिए और अपोजीशन को यह चांस मत देने दीजिए।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai:

Shri Nath Pai: Thank you very much. Shall I begin again? I cannot disobey you.

An. hon. Member: He has already spoken.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. Shri Kripalani.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Guna): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have only a few words to say. I am sorry that our government lives from hand to mouth. When a difficulty arises, it tries to postpone it by appointing committees, and those committees are appointed of their own choice. But, when the committee gives a report I think the government is in honour bound to carry out the terms of that report. It is no use cavilling at what the committee has said. And what it has said is really reasonable. Therefore, not to prolong the discussions I would say it would be advisable for the government to carry out what has been decided by a committee appointed by themselves, resided over by the retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. That is the way of wisdom, if they do not want to create any trouble and discontent among Government employees.

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार (गुडगांव) :

मिस्टर स्पीकर साहब, इस पर कोई दो राय नहीं कि जो गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है उस पर अमल होना चाहिए। लेकिन इस मौके पर मैं अपने आप से गद्दारी करूंगा अगर मैं अपने दोस्तों को जो अपोजीशन लीडर्स हैं उन से यह अपील न करूं कि एक तरफ वह कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान का खतरा है, चीन का खतरा है तो मोरार जी भाई गलती करे या इन्दिरा सरकार की गलती से उस पर अमल न हो पाये तो क्या उस पर मोरार जी को सजा देने के बजाय या इन्दिरा सरकार को सजा देने के बजाय सारे देश को सजा देने के लिए तैयार हो जायें? आखिर जितने श्री सैट्रल गवर्नमेंट के मुलाजिम हैं वह सब देश के प्रति बफादार हैं, देश से प्यार करते

हैं, देश से मुहब्बत करते हैं या तो यह लोग कहते कि चाइना और पाकिस्तान शरारत करने पर तुले हुए हैं। लेकिन जार्ज फरनेन्डीज साहब यह धमकी देते हैं कि यह सरकार बिल्कुल खत्म हो जायेगी 11 सितम्बर को। अगर सरकार खत्म हो जायेगी तो याद रखिये जार्ज फरनेन्डीज साहब कि डिमोक्रेसी भी खत्म हो जायेगी। यह बिल्कुल सही है कि अगर एस० एस० पी० के लॉग और कम्प्यूनिस्ट मिल कर राज्य चलाने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं ... (व्यवधान) ... आप देश में ऐसा वातावरण पैदा करें और जो मुलाजिम सरकार की बफादारी करते हैं उन का आप इस तरह से इस्तेमाल करें इस सरकार को खत्म करने के लिये और देश को हानि पहुंचाने के लिये, तो याद रखिये कि न आप मुल्क की सेवा करेंगे और न अपोजीशन की सेवा करेंगे। मैं हुकूमत से अपील करता हूँ कि वह इस बात को याद रखें कि बच्चे ने कहा कि पीर जी, मेरी मां ने खसम किया, उस ने जवाब दिया कि खसम किया तो बुरा किया, बच्चे ने कहा कि कर के छांड़ दिया, उस ने कहा कि यह और बुरा किया। या तो वह गजेन्द्र गडकर कमीशन न बिठलाती, और अगर बिठलाया है तो उस की सिफारिशों को वह पूरा करे।

[شری عبدالغنی دار (گواگون) -]

مسٹر سہیکر صاحب - اس پر کوئی دو رائے نہیں کہ جو گجہندو گڈکر کمیشن کی رپورٹ ہے اس پر عمل ہونا چاہئے - لیکن اس موقع پر میں اپنے آپ سے غداروں کو اس کا اگر میں اپنے دوستوں کو جو اپوزیشن لیڈرس ہیں ان سے یہ اپیل نہ کروں کہ ایک طرف وہ کہتے ہیں کہ پاکستان کا خطرہ ہے چھن کا

[شہری عبدالغنی قر]

خطرہ ہے تو سرکاری بھائی غلطی کریں یا اندرا سرکار کی غلطی سے اس پر عمل نہ ہو پائے تو کیا اس پر سرکاری کو سزا دینے کے بجائے یا اندرا سرکار کو سزا دینے کے بجائے سارے دیہے کو سزا دینے کے لئے تیار ہو جائیں گے۔ آخر جتنے بھی سہیلندز گورنمنٹ کے ملازمین ہیں وہ سب دیہے کے پرتی وفادار ہیں دیہے سے پیار کرتے ہیں دیہے سے محبت کرتے ہیں۔ یا تو یہ لوگ کہتے کہ چائلا اور پاکستان شہادت کرنے پر نلے ہوئے ہیں۔ لیکن جارج فرنیلندز صاحب یہ دھمکی دیتے ہیں کہ یہ سرکار بالکل ختم ہو جائے گی۔ ۱۱ ستمبر کو۔ اگر سرکار ختم ہو جائے گی تو یہ یاد رکھئے جارج فرنیلندز صاحب کہ تیموودسی بھی ختم ہو جائے گی۔ یہ بالکل صحیح ہے کہ اگر ایس۔ ایس۔ پی کے لوگ اور گورنمنٹ مل کر راج چلانے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں (وہوہان) — آپ دیہے میں ایسا واپس آئیں اور جرج فرنیلندز سرکار کی وفاداری کرتے ہیں ان کا آپ اس طرح سے استعمال کریں اس سرکار کو ختم کرنے کے لئے اور دیہے کو بھائی پہنچانے کے لئے تو یہ یاد رکھئے کہ نہ آپ ملک کی سزا کریں اور نہ لہویشن کی سزا کریں گے۔ میں

حکومت سے اپیل کرتا ہوں کہ وہ اس بات کو یاد رکھیں کہ بچے نے کہا کہ جی مہری ماں نے خصم کہا اس نے جواب دیا کہ خصم کیا تو برا کہا۔ بچے نے کہا کہ کر کے چھوڑ دیا۔ اس نے کہا کہ یہ اور برا کہا۔ یا تو وہ گچھندر گڈکر کمیشن نہ بٹھلاتی اور اگر بٹھلایا ہے تو اسکی سفارشوں کو وہ پورا کرے۔

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard with the greatest attention the views expressed so forcefully by several hon. Members of this House on the question of Dearness Allowance which is pending at present. This is one of the most unpleasant duties one has to perform at this juncture and it is only with the consciousness of the unpleasantness of it that I am speaking on this occasion. I have been compared with Dhuryodhna, Don Quixote and what not. But that is not what worries me or brings unpleasantness to me. After all, Dhuryodhna was also very great in his own way.....(Interruption).

An hon. Member: And a very good ruler too. (Interruption).

Shri Morarji Desai: That is not my ideal. My ideal is not that of Dhuryodhna. That is perhaps the ideal of the person who compares....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My ideal is Arjuna

Shri Morarji Desai: I would only say, poor Arjuna. I was even taunted by my hon. young friend, Pro. Sondhi, whom I know well. But I did not know that he was capable of also abusing in such a manner. He said that I am carrying the burden of the whole country on me. Well, that is an unfortunate position in

which I am that the finances of the country have been entrusted to me I may be inadequate for it; I may not be capable of it. But that is the fact.

An hon. Member: Very unfortunate.

Shri Morarji Desai: Well, make it more fortunate. I will have not regrets. I will be very happy. Therefore, that need not worry my hon. friend. If I do not consider this from the point of view of the finances of the whole country, not merely of the Central Government but also of the States, I would have failed in my duty in this office. I have no quarrel with my hon. friends who argue in favour of giving or in favour of implementing fully the Report or the recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Commission. They are, certainly, entitled to argue and press about it. Am I also not entitled to appeal to them which I have done during the last two days to see the conditions of the country and what will be the effect of doing this? If they do not agree with me, I do not quarrel with them. I do not give them any adjective. But if they disagree with me, then I must accept whatever they say! This is a very cruel logic. That is all that I can say.

After all, ultimately it will be for the Government to take a decision considering all the aspects of the case. The decision may be difficult, may be full of difficult consequences, and yet, it has to be taken. If I feel and consider, after hearing everything, after considering everything, that injecting Rs. 175 crores immediately into the hands of a large number of people will create such conditions in this country at present when we are not able to improve the supplies of food-grains—whatever we may do, we cannot do it—and still if I do that, then the consequences can be far more serious than the consequences which my hon. friends have threatened me with. If I come to that conclusion, what choice am I left with? That is what I have got to consider. If I am wrong, I am prepared to discuss, to argue, to consider further, whatever is asked, I am prepared to do. But I do not want to sway my hon. friends with any oratory which my hon. friend, Mr. Nath Pal, now attributes to me. I cannot compare myself with him

in oratory or in flourishes because I have not been able to acquire that; I wish I had acquired it and in that case I would perhaps have silenced him more effectively. That oratory does not silence anybody is also known to everybody because ultimately facts have to prevail and to say today that if this amount is given the prices will not shoot up, I can only say that it is only those who do not want to see the facts who would say that. I do not see how it requires any technical or economic knowledge to see this factor. Every time dearness allowance has been given during the last few years, prices have shot up.

Shri Nath Pal: They have shot up even when dearness allowance was not paid.

Shri Morarji Desai: Then it is all the greater a danger that more fuel would be added to the fire....

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Who started the fire?

Shri Morarji Desai: That is what one has to consider. I am prepared to grant for the sake of argument, even though I do not accept it, that this Government is responsible for it; granted.... (Interruptions).

Shri Piloo Mody: Honesty has to be rewarded.... (Interruptions.)

Shri Morarji Desai: I have not granted it. Do not be too loud about it.

Shri Piloo Mody: I am sorry. I withdraw it.

Shri Morarji Desai: I am glad you withdraw it.

I have always admitted that Government has a share in it; I would not say that the Government has no share in it. My hon. friends have also an equal share in it; that, they are forgetting. (Interruptions.)

एक माननीय सदस्य: मकल है।

श्री मोरजी देसाई: हर चीज को माननीय सदस्य मकल या झूठ कह देते हैं। हर चीज उन के लिये झूठ हो जाती है। झूठ के समझा उन

[श्री मोरारजी देसाई]

को कोई शब्द मिलता ही नहीं है। बार बार झूठ शब्द सुनाते हैं। लेकिन हम से मुझ को कोई तकलीफ नहीं है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : आप चिकने घड़े हैं, आप पर कोई असर नहीं होगा।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई: जरूर नहीं होगा। यही तो आप को तकलीफ है। इस के लिये मैं क्या करूँ ?

I have got to see that the duties performed are loyal to the nation. That is what this Government has to consider.

In this view, if my hon. friends say that this Government should consider only the granting of Rs. 60 crores to the Central Government employees and that is the only task before this Government to consider. I would say that my hon. friends opposite are not saying what they were saying in the past few days to me. They have been asking me all the while to help the State Governments and all the while asking me to take up that responsibility in various things.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi: Even now we are asking.

Shri Morarji Desai: Therefore, if I am not able to give them money, should I not consider not putting more burdens on them? That is what I have got to consider. I cannot say that the Central Government are acting in a vacuum or that the Central Government should not bother if the State Governments come into difficulties. The Central Government have to bother, not only bother but to consider and see how these difficulties can be removed. After all, the State Governments and the Central Government do not work in isolation or do not work opposite each other. They work together and they have to work together and they have to consider the difficulties of each other. That is how the Central and State Governments have to work.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Does he propose to pay them?

Shri Morarji Desai: I do not propose to pay them.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Then, why talk of it?

Shri Morarji Desai: Therefore, I have got to consider how best I can help them.

Shri Namblar: By not giving to anybody? That is the solution?

Shri Morarji Desai: I am not denying; it is not refusal; I am not refusing to implement the Gajendragadkar Commission's recommendations. That is not what I have said. I made it very clear to my hon. friends when I discussed with them.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: He is committed to it.

Shri Morarji Desai: There is no question of committal to anything. I cannot say and nobody can say that this is an award.

At least I do not accept it even if people say it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is tantamount to an award.

Shri Morarji Desai: I would not say that I would not respect it. I have got to respect it. Government had appointed the commission and they have made recommendations after careful consideration. Therefore, one has to accept the major recommendations, but I cannot accept everything that they have said. If I differ on some things, well, I shall have respectfully to differ from them. When they say that a Pay Commission should be appointed after two years, whatever may be the condition, whether the price rise goes up to 235 or 245 or whatever it is or does not go up within two years, well, I do not accept that position. They also say that the capacity of Government or the employer cannot be taken into account in considering this. On this also, with all due respect....

Shri J. B. Kripalani: With due respect to the Finance Minister, may I ask him to let the House know what he proposes to accept? Moreover, all his arguments

will be valid if in other respects he effects some economies in the administration of the country.

Shri Morarji Desai: My hon..

An hon. Member: Leader.

Shri Morarji Desai: I cannot call him my leader. He has ceased to be my leader, but he is my elder. I certainly accept that, I shall always accept it and accept it with affection and not merely accept it ordinarily in language. And he knows that that is my attitude towards him. I may differ as he can differ from me and he can tell me, and he has a right to do so.

But as I had said before, I am not accepting these two things. As regards the other things, I have not said that I am not accepting the other things. What I do not accept is that it should be paid only in cash; I am not accepting it. But I would say that it is not merely that I am looking at it from this point of view that this can be done and nothing else can be done.

Here also, I have taken a lesson from the Gajendragadkar Commission's report. They say:

"We may, in this connection, incidentally point out that during the course of our discussions with some of the representatives of employees, we gathered the impression that if the Government took comprehensive action, unpopular though it might be, and involved the whole community in an endeavour to assist in the process of controlling prices, even a proposal to defer the payment of a part of dearness allowance which will be admissible to the employees on further rise in prices would be considered by them favourably".

By the employees' representatives.

"In fact, in one State, such a measure (which involves the payment of additional contribution to the provident fund or insurance schemes, thereby reducing the actual cash payment of additional dearness allowance) has already been adopted and,

we understand, accepted by the State employees. We were, however, told that we should not suggest any such measure in our report because if such a measure has to be adopted at all, it must be a part of an integrated effort, involving the whole community, and not an isolated measure by itself. The employees added that if profits, incomes and wages are sought to be controlled, both in the public and private sectors, an integrated and comprehensive scheme will have to be evolved, and in the context of such a scheme, a proposal to defer the payment of a part of the dearness allowance or any other similar proposal could be considered".

Therefore, they have also recommended...

Shri Nath Pal: No. Please see page 54.

"After examining all the considerations involved, we are unable to recommend any 'alternative forms of assistance..."

This is their final conclusion.

Shri Morarji Desai: A little further, they say:

"We are conscious that it is beyond our terms of reference to suggest any remedial measures to meet the present serious situation. We wish to make it clear that we do not purport to do so. Even so, we think it would be permissible to refer to some of the suggestions which have been made by several parties who discussed the problems with us".

This is how they have suggested it. I do not say they have made a recommendation. But they have suggested it and the suggestion is also a recommendation. That is how I look at it. I cannot look at it otherwise. I do not think language has any other meaning, if this is not the meaning.

Shri Nambar: So the recommendation to give monetary payment is not acceptable and is not a recommendation. But a suggestion is a recommendation. Recommendation is not recommendation! What a logic it is?

Shri Morarji Desai: A recommendation is a recommendation. I have not denied it. Where have I denied it? But if I am considering this suggestion seriously, could I not request my hon. friends to co-operate with Government in this matter? This is a national problem. Yes, I may go a little further, I may go a little less. This is a matter in which if my hon. friends are prepared to discuss with us seriously, Government are prepared to discuss with them as to what should be done in the matter.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: First you decide that you will pay in cash. We will find out the money for you.

Shri Morarji Desai: Therefore, that is not the discussion they want. So Government have got to decide themselves. Government will have to decide. If my hon. friends do not want to co-operate, I do not say they must. How am I to do that? But I hope they will think twice before they contemplate launching a general strike of government employees in this country....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Token strike.

Shri Morarji Desai: at a time when we are in a very difficult situation, as is admitted by all. Even if they blame us, they admit this. This is a fact. Do you want to increase it, to increase the travail of everybody? If this is what they want to do, I can only say that I feel sorry—I would not use any other language which they would provoke me to do. I do not want to be provoked. It is not right for me to be provoked. My hon. friends can be provoked. I will have no quarrel with it. But I cannot be provoked about it. It is not right for me to be provoked, specially in a matter where even my sympathies would be with them, considering the situation in a different manner. It is a question of what I have got to do in the circumstances in which I am. I do not want to speak more in this vein because then my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, will again say that I have all sympathies but it has no meaning. Therefore, I do not want to labour that point very much.

Shri Nambiar: Only lip sympathy.

Shri Morarji Desai: Why do you deny me even the right of having sympathy? I cannot understand it.

Then, my hon. friend also said I have become reasonable, but I am still tenacious. Does he want me to be less tenacious than he is? I am taking a lesson from him. He is more tenacious than me because he even refuses to argue, I do not refuse to argue. What can tenacity do more than that? That is reasonable tenacity. Mine is firmness, it is not tenacity.

What have we to consider in this matter? It is not merely looking after the interests of the employees, which is certainly the business of Government, of any employer to do, but the business of Government is not merely to look after its employees, the business of the Government is to look after the whole population. There are four times the number of Government employees who are getting far less than what the Government employees are getting, and their conditions are becoming worse and worse in the rise of prices, and if there is a further rise in prices, in trying to help my friends here I will make their conditions far more worse. They are a larger number of people. Because they do not or cannot create trouble, does it mean they should not be heard, and they should be put in the dust bin, and those who can promise trouble only should be heard? Therefore, that will not be a right thing. If my hon. friends want me to do well for them, then they must leave to me the finances to look after that, but if that is not done, and if the money which is available with Government is to be utilised only for Government employees, does the theory mean that the Government should run only to pay the Government employees?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We never said.

Shri Morarji Desai: It is not a theory on which the Government can work.

Therefore, this has got to be considered in all its aspects.

My friends do not want me to repeat all the arguments that we discussed. I will not burden them with all this.

श्री स० मो० ब०जी : वित्त मंत्री तो दिल्ली के लड्डू बांटते हैं—जो उन को खाता है, वह भी पछताता है और जो नहीं खाता है, वह भी पछताता है ।

Shri Morarji Desai: There is no question of giving any excuse. Why have I to give any excuse? I am not labouring under any mis-conception of my duties. I have got to perform my duties, and I am trying to do so. You may say I am doing it wrongly, to that also I have no objection, because that depends upon each one's view of what I do. I do not know whether I will succeed or not. It is not a matter for me to speak. If my hon. friends are so sure of their success, why do they want to threaten me? It is only the weak who threaten. The strongest people never threaten, and it is not the policy of the Government to threaten anybody. Why should we?

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : सरकारी कर्मचारी मानते हैं कि वे कमजोर हैं ।

Shri Morarji Desai: It is not my business to do so. My hon. friend who spoke just now has the largest share in upsetting every thing, because he always believes in this kind of stoppage of work, Bombay bandh, Hindustan bandh, this bandh, that bandh.

श्री रा० सेवक यादव : अभी कांग्रेस को बन्द करना है ।

Shri Morarji Desai: That is how also the economy gets upset. If the economy gets upset in that manner, how can you merely blame the Government? It is therefore that this question has got to be considered very clamly and objectively and in the interests of the people.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj (Wardha): They receive their orders from Peking and Moscow.

Shri Morarji Desai: That is all I would request my hon. friends to consider.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: The discussion brought forth valuable points of view, and I may assure you that dialogue and

discussion and a sense of co-operation motivated us in bringing this matter here, and therefore no personal invectives were intended, but we would be failing in our duty if we do not convey to this House the sense of bitter resentment, the sense of hopelessness, and I would even say, and I use this word advisedly, the sense of betrayal that is felt by the Government employees on this question.

We are concerned with wider public interests, and the debate showed that members of the opposition, and I dare say members from the other side also, were concerned with public interests. But should principles and assurances be given up merely because an emergency looks before us? Emergency is the time to assert principles, and even sometimes to reaffirm assurances. The loyalty of government employees is not doubted. Their patriotism was borne out by their exemplary behaviour whenever this country was faced with external aggression. My friend here was rather, I would say, frivolous in his attitude about Pakistan and China. We are serious about the question of Pakistan and China. We do not want war with them. But deterrence is the way of politics and we must deter Pakistan and China by our solid will and our solid strength. Dearness allowance for the government employees is, I submit in all seriousness, an effort to make them live above the subsistence level and give them solid strength and faith in that strength. . . . (Interruptions). I, therefore, suggest that the idea of cash payment urged by members on this side had been given with a sense of seriousness. . . . (Interruptions) The hon. members here assured the Finance Minister when they called on him the other day and I think he should not have any reason to doubt their assurance about their interest and concern. There is a party here which rules in Madras; it is concerned with the state of affairs there. We are all interested in helping the hon. Finance Minister in finding ways and means of getting resources. But the decision taken to upset the recommendations of Gajendragadkar Commission, a commission of such high standing, means justice delayed, that is, justice denied. That will create frustration which we must avoid. The strike is not intended to be a kind of some ominous warning. What

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

other way is there in a democracy to provide evidence of a unified will on the part of the employees. The right to strike is a sacred right in the annals of mankind and we will not be brow-beaten by suggestions that we are not patriotic. We are fully patriotic and we believe that the strike is an index of our will to have a bright future in this country.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Dearness Allowance Commission on the question of the grant of Dearness Allowance to Central Government Employees in future, laid on the Table of the House on the 6th June, 1967."

The motion was negatived.

Shri Nath Pal: Sir, what is it that you put to the vote? It only says that the House takes note. The procedure is quite wrong. I think that Dr. Ram Subhag Singh knows that such a motion is never objected to. It is the first time that the House has voted down such a motion.

Mr. Speaker: We go to the next item ..(Interruptions.) I had put the motion to the vote and I had declared that the Noes have it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, the Railway Minister is making a statement now, I believe?

श्री रघु निमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, नियम 342 के मातहत मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। नियम 342 इस प्रकार है:

"A motion that the policy or situation or statement or any other matter be taken into consideration shall not be put to the vote of the House,...."

An hon. Member: it has been agreed.
Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: When too many Members get up, when he wants to make his point, it does help anyone. Allow him two minutes; I will give my opinion. You are not really helping me by standing like this. The hon. Member has referred to

rule 342. Meanwhile, the others can look into the rules. It is not this rule which applies, but there is another rule.

श्री रघु निमये : यही तो मैं कह रहा था तो इन्होंने विरोध काहे के लिए किया ?

Mr. Speaker: This would not apply. I have already put it to the vote.

श्री रघु निमये : लेकिन यह गलत है, उसी वक्त मैंने कहा था लेकिन आप ने हां और नां उस पर लिया।

Mr. Speaker: It is all right. I have put to the vote.

You cannot raise it now, after it has been put to the vote.

Some hon. Members rose—

श्री रघु निमये : प्रोसीडिन्स से इस बोट को खत्म किया जाय फिर मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं होगा। अध्यक्ष महोदय, कार्यवाही से मतदान को खत्म किया जाय।

Shri N. Dandekar: The motion is to take not of the thing. But they have taken a vote on it; it is a mistake. There is some error in the procedure.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri C. M. Poonacha.

17.52 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. SECURITY OF PASSENGERS IN HOWRAH-KHARAGPUR SECTION OF S. E. RAILWAY

The Minister of Railways (Shri C. M. Poonacha): There have been sporadic cases of looting of passengers between Bauria and Deulati stations on Howrah-Kharagpur section, and since June 1967 this Section has been badly affected by the hold-up of trains for various reasons. In view of the incidents of rowdiness in the Howrah-Kharagpur suburban areas, escorting of most of the passenger trains has been started by three Companies of the Railway Protection Special Force