

श्री बेबेन सेन : (आसनसोल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने बाढ़ के सम्बन्ध में एक कालिग-अटेंशन दिया था उसको आपने रेजेक्ट कर दिया है, उसका क्या कारण है।

MR. SPEAKER : All calling-attention cannot be discussed here.

श्री प्रकाश बरार शास्त्री (हापुड़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप को और आपके विभाग को सहयोग के लिए एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। अभी आपके कार्यालय से जानकारी मिली है कि आपने इसी 15 तारीख के लिए उत्तर प्रदेश के प्राथमिक विद्यालयों के अध्यापकों के लिए ध्यान आवर्षण प्रस्ताव स्वीकार किया है और शिक्षा मन्त्री उसका उत्तर देंगे। मेरा कहना यह है कि चूंकि उत्तर प्रदेश में राष्ट्रपति का शासन है और वहाँ सारे प्रान्त की प्राथमिक शिक्षा ठप्प पड़ी हुई है इसलिए माननीय शिक्षा मन्त्री जो वक्तव्य दें उसके ऊपर इस संसद में विचार होना चाहिए।

MR. SPEAKER : Let me say about the Calling-attention Motions. Let me give some information. I have admitted some. Now the no-confidence motion is being discussed for these two days. On the 14th you are going to have a discussion that is about universities, and about the primary teachers on the 15th. Mr. Banerjee was asking for it and Mr. Joshi was asking for it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : There should be discussion.

MR. SPEAKER : I have admitted some calling-attention notices. I have allowed discussion on flood and famine. It is common for the whole country. We have also got some Calling-attention also. All right. Let us go to the next subject. Shri Chatterjee.

Before that, I shall now put the motion moved by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That this House agrees with the twenty-third Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 11th November, 1968."

The Motion was adopted

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : Sir, there is not a drop of oil in Calcutta. The road transport in Calcutta is at a standstill. There is an explosive situation there. No petroleum is available there. Road Transport has come to a standstill. You are allowing foreign companies to sabotage the country's internal affairs. You have surrendered to them. There is such an explosive situation in Calcutta, Sir.

12.28½ HRS.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—*contd.*

MR. SPEAKER : Shri K. K. Chatterjee. You have taken 15 minutes. You may please be brief.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJEE (Howrah) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, last evening, when my hon. friend, Shri Kanwarlal Gupta was advancing a lot of faltering arguments in support of the one sentence censure motion against the Government moved by himself, I was wondering what could have been the private motive behind this futile attempt on the part of an astute politician like him. Was it because the Jan Sangh had so far failed to cut any ice in the trade union field or was it just a clumsy attempt to enter that field through the back door? Probably he was emboldened to think that this might help the Jan Sangh politics in Delhi. The incidents at Indraprastha Bhavan were overdramatised by him. We regret very much the tragic incidents that took place in Indraprastha Bhavan on that day. We feel deeply aggrieved also to recall the tragic death of one of our class IV employees on that eventful day. They tried to bring out the case as if the Government did not take any step to see that justice is done to the employees who suffered on that day. On the 24th September, 1968, *The Statesman* came out with an article under the caption 'The Black Day at Indraprastha'. Please permit me to read out a few lines from that article to enlighten the House about what happened there. The article says :

"A Central District official said that they heard some employees becoming frenzied and throwing stones at glass

panes. Police say the smashing of the panes alerted them and with a view to averting further damage to Government property, they entered the building. But they could not even enter the portico..”

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : These are all cock-and-bull stories.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI : The article further says :

“showers of missiles rained on them from three directions; Vikas Bhavan, Central Revenue Building and Indraprastha Bhavan. Excitement grew, and adding to the confusion, came the Jan Sangh MP, Mr. M. L. Sondhi. He tried to pacify the crowd but more missiles came from the top floors of the building....”

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : That is why we say, accept the demand for a judicial inquiry.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI : Then, it further says :

....“...some people had gone to the roof and were throwing stones at the police....”.

This was what had come out in *The Statesman* of the 24th September. Further, we find :

“...Tension was high inside and outside the building; there had been small clashes; more tear-gas shells had been burst. Then Mr. M. L. Sondhi, MP appeared on the scene.”.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI (New Delhi) : Does my hon. friend know about the massacre at Amritsar?....(*Interruptions*).

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI : I shall be failing in my duty if I did not mention in this connection the role played by the hon. Minister Shri Jaganatha Rao. He did not lose a single moment in going there. Hon. Members on the other side of the House were expressing sympathy and sorrow for the tragic deaths that had taken place. But I may point out that the hon. Minister Shri Jaganatha Rao himself had gone there to sympathise with the employees and to express sorrow at what had happened. My hon. friend Shri Kan-

war Lal Gupta should admit that our Home Minister did not lose any time in bringing to book the offending police employees who were responsible for the police excesses on that day. It has become a fashion nowadays to ask for a judicial inquiry in season and out of season in respect of every big or small happening in the country....

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI : Has my hon. friend read the report of the Commission on the atrocities committed by Gen. O' Dyer ? Does he know about the verdict of the commission which reported on that, the commission with which Mahatma Gandhi and Shri Malavaiya were associated and with which Pandit Santhanam also had been associated ? We wanted to bring the atrocities to the notice of the Prime Minister but Shri Seshan did not answer the phone. Women were insulted by the so-called government run by a woman Prime Minister. They all harbour certain evil intentions which come out at such moments, and yet they pretend to be Gandhians....(*Interruptions*).

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI : I feel that the demand for a judicial inquiry is superfluous in view of the fact that the facts were so apparent. The facts were so apparent that it did not require any grand views of any judge to find out the facts. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : There is only simultaneous translation now; there cannot be any simultaneous talking. One of the two must talk, not both. If the hon. Members would not interrupt, Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterjee will finish in two minutes.

SHRI NAMBIAR : People have been shot dead. Why can they not institute a judicial inquiry ? These are common demands.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (वलरामपुर)
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि कल कांग्रेस के सदस्य श्री देशमुख ने अपने भाषण में श्री सोंधी के ऊपर आरोप लगाया था और आज यह श्री चटर्जी भी सोंधी जी के बारे में कह रहे हैं तो उचित यह है कि श्री सोंधी को अपनी स्थिति स्पष्ट करने का मौका दिया जाय ।

MR. SPEAKER : I shall give him a chance on one condition namely that he will not interrupt in the middle.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI : As I was just saying it has become a fashion these days to call for a judicial inquiry in season and out of season, into events big or small happening in the country. In this particular case, I feel that the demand for a judicial inquiry is superfluous because the facts are so apparent that it does not need the grand views or advice of any High Court judge to come to a right conclusion about what happened on that day.

It must be remembered also that when democracy is trying to function vigorously in the country, even a High Court judge cannot maintain that detachment of mind and he may also be carried away by popular bias or political bias on questions like this. Therefore, in spite of the exhortations of Shri M. R. Masani and other hon. friends, I do not think that there is any special need for a judicial inquiry into the happenings on that day.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : He cannot refer to the happenings, because prosecutions are going on and the matter is *sub judice*.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI : Shri S. A. Dange was speaking in a sarcastic vein and castigating Government for their failure. In doing so in a light-hearted spirit, he was trying to equate the responsibilities, rights and privileges of the workers employed in the industrial enterprises with those of the Government employees who were carrying on tasks connected with the maintenance of essential services for the nation.

I feel that the Central Government employees must accept voluntarily certain restraints on the exercise of their trade union rights, placed as they are. At the same time I would submit that Government should also come forward to do justice to the employees by meeting their economic demands which are just and proper. But I am very clear in regard to this matter, however, that the Central Government employees will have to put some restraints on their trade union rights.

Then, I would just refer to the point raised by Shri S. M. Banerjee.

MR. SPEAKER : He should try to conclude now. He need not reply to the points made by every Member. Let him leave something for the other Members also.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI : He made a very important point when he was speaking about how Shri Nambodiripad tackled the strike situation and how he had tackled the Central Government's instructions. In this connection, I would like to refer to a very wholesome editorial which appeared in *The Statesman* of the 24th September, 1968.

This is what the editorial had said :

"There are two major constitutional injunctions which no State can afford to disregard in its obsession with its own autonomy; its executive power has to be exercised 'to ensure compliance with' Parliament's laws (Article 256) and in such a way that it does not 'Impede or prejudice' the exercise of the Union's executive power (Article 257). These may not be disregarded by any State Government except on pain of inviting Central intervention."

I want to make it clear to everybody, to men and women here in this House as well as outside that this Government is prepared to deal with sympathy and good-will with their employees; this Government is even prepared to deal with extra leniency with their employees. But this Government is determined to counteract any political conspiracy or intrigues which might undermine the country's security. When deadly enemies are at our doors, when disruptionist forces are trying to fish in troubled waters in the country....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : The enemies are sitting opposite. They are the biggest enemies.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR CHATTERJI :this Government will not hesitate to liquidate those disruptionist forces. This Government will not hesitate to liquidate itself the moment it avails to carry out its obligations to the nation and to the people.

In conclusion, I would appeal to Government that they should not victimise their employees. They should be kind and generous to them, except to those who have

practised any violence or carried on any sabotage work. The others should be taken in, and Government should show generosity to their employees. Of course, they can also be firm when the time comes, and when danger comes to the country they should not falter.

Therefore, I recommend that the censure motion should be unanimously rejected by the House.

MR. SPEAKER: There are still some parties which have not participated. For instance, the DMK, the Communists (Marxist), and the PSP are there. Yesterday, I called some Independent Members also. About half a dozen of them had given names, but not one of them was here. I had called them one after the other but nobody was here. In the evening none of them was present, and I had to go in search of speakers from the Opposition. Today I shall not be able to call all of them. There are about nine or ten names from the Independent Group, but I shall not be able to call more than one or two of them.

The Home Minister will intervene in the debate at 4.30 P.M. Tomorrow, the Prime Minister will reply and, then, of course, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta will reply.

So far as the Swatantra Party is concerned, Shri N. Dandekar will speak, because his party has still a few minutes left.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): I spoke only for about 35 minutes....

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee pleaded for Shri M. L. Sondhi's personal explanation. I thought therefore that Shri M. L. Sondhi had to speak....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: That was only personal explanation. You have to protect him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Mover has already taken about 40 minutes. I cannot accommodate more Members. Shri Dandekar is being allowed because Shri Massani spoke only for about 15—20 minutes. Even according to the time allotment, they have taken only half their time. So they are not being allowed extra time.

First I must give time to the rest of the parties. I will not be able to give time to

two or three speakers from every party. Later on, if there is time, we will see. I do not mind any number of members speaking subject to time being available.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by paying my homage to those employees of the Central Government who laid down their lives to remind this nation that millions of our countrymen live in degrading poverty, abject squalor and are denied the rudiments of justice. By their supreme sacrifice, these men who died as victims of police firing have given a push, howsoever small it may be, howsoever modest it may be, to the stagnant social revolution in this country. Whatever the boasts of apologists of Government, whatever the tall claims of the spokesmen of Government, howsoever loudly the drums may be beaten and trumpets blown that the Government has won a victory, the verdict of history will be different that these men died as martyres to further the cause of social justice. They died to create a juster, richer and a better India. This will be the verdict of history, whether Shri Chatterji likes to agree or not.

I should like to pay my tribute to the employees of the Union Government who against heavy odds, despite the most massive concentration and deployment of the forces of oppression, those to brave the wrath and vengeance of a feeble and frightened bureaucracy and leadership rather than give up a just cause. The totally wrong approach of the Government of India is illustrated by nothing so much as the simple fact that this is the only country where a demand which is basically, essentially and fundamentally an economic demand, a social demand, is dealt with not by the Ministry concerned with Social Welfare, not by the Ministry of Economic Affairs or Finance but by the Ministry of Home Affairs. Basically this is an economic issue; essentially this is a social issue. It has some political undertones and political consequences too. But the archaic, medieval way of approach is illustrated by the fact that it is the Home Ministry which always deals with the matter whenever the employees of Government raise a demand for a better social deal. I do not think in any other country a Ministry concerned with the maintenance of law and order, which is concerned with administration, is seized of this problem or is

[SHRI NATH PAI]

allowed to deal with it. But this illustrates the total failure of the Government to understand what the issue is about, what the struggle is for, what the dispute is about and what the quarrel is about.

At the very outset, I should like to frame some questions, because all kinds of irrelevant things are deliberately being imported in order to confuse the judgment of this House, to confuse the ultimate judge in this country, the public of India. What are the issues to which we should address ourselves today during the course of the debate? Let us have a dispassionate discussion about them. Let us completely forget which side one swears by. Let us try to learn some lessons because this is a recurring phenomenon in this country. It was there in 1946, 1951, 1957, 1960 and now in 1968. I had learnt slowly to doubt the validity of the maxim that history repeats itself and I was losing my faith in it. But I have come to believe that history repeats itself in all totality and completeness at least so far as the Government of India is concerned.

Look at these years I mentioned—1946, 1951, 1957, 1960, 1968. What story have they to tell us? The same lack of imagination, the same lack of understanding, the same lack of sympathy, the same panicky and easy recourse to force and the same palpable, pitiable, unconvincing apologia, when the Government have failed to meet the challenge. I shall quote sufficient authorities in the course of my submissions to uphold it, but this is something that is usual in this country alone. Nothing is learnt from the sad lessons of the past. Government employees have a single demand, an elementary demand, and when I ask this question what the strike is about, I will quote chapter and verse from their own authorities and sources to substantiate my case, but here at this stage, I want to submit only this, that we are the one country or Government which tries to prove that history repeats itself and will go on repeating itself so long as this party is in power.

What was the strike about is the first question I should like to address myself to. The second question I should like to ask is: What were the causes of the strike? The

third question will be: Who was responsible for the strike? The fourth question is: what happened during the strike? And the fifth question is: where do we go from this strike?

What was the strike about? All kinds of irrelevant issues have been introduced. I say the strike was about something which Dadabhai Naoroji wrote about, raised his voice about, when he wrote *The Poverty of India*. The strike was something which was the main inspiration of the freedom struggle under Gandhiji, about which the Congress have been talking and pledging its word of honour to the people. It did so at Karachi, from Karachi to Avadi it started with a pledge to give a fair deal to the people of India. It is the Government employee who is trying to generate sufficient persuasive force and pressure to persuade the Government to redeem these long-standing pledges. This is the struggle that is being waged, this is part of the struggle, this is, you may say, the brunt of the struggle. This is the basic struggle that is being waged in the country since Dadabhai Naoroji wrote *The Poverty of India*, and this is part of that epic saga of the struggle of the millions of our people for an honourable life for the sons and masters of this country. The Government employees had to bear the brunt of the battle.

I was reading a book about what happened in Britain, and there Mr. Wooton, whom I will quote in the course of my speech, tells us how in Britain a Government employee does not fight, the others fight and the Government employees benefit. In India it is the other way round. It is the railwaymen, the telegraphists, the income-tax clerk, the people in the Accountant-General's office, the Civil Aviation man, the small Government employee who is trying to carry this battle forward, which was the main justification for our struggle for freedom, for a better life, a more honourable life, a richer life, a life of dignity and freedom for our people. It was about this, but perhaps they may say this is Mr. Nath Pai speaking.

12.49 HRS.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR]

What was the strike about is the first question I raised. We were told that it was politically motivated. I do not want

to chew the cud about political motivation. Human motives are mixed, that is true, but in any given struggle there is a main cause, a principal cause, a principal justification. Are they going to say that they are a bunch of saints and hermits sitting here on a kind of missionary work? There might have been undertones, so what is wrong? A strike like that is bound to have some political consequences, but what was the main cause, the main motivation? Was it mainly political? Other motivations might have been there, but the main thing was this urge, this goading coming from the compulsions of life, the poverty of India, the suffering in India, the rising spiral of prices in India, the suffocation, the stagnation, the strangulation of life in India. It was this that goaded them on to the strike.

May I now at this stage read something? Fourteen ounces of cereals, three ounces of pulse, a little vegetable, milk and other nourishing foods are necessary for a balanced diet. Who can say that this is asking for too much? Who can say that to raise a demand for this is to start a political revolution in this country?

A little clothing—How much of it? 18 yards per year. This is all that a need-based wage implies. This is all that their demand implies. This is what we have been asking for. This is what you promised them when the flag was unfurled on the banks of Ravi saying that we want to create a new India. This is what every Five Year Plan has been pledging them. This is what we say from every platform when the election comes. This is all the need-based wage implies. You have promised them a modest and moderately comfortable living. Looking back on the recommendation of the Indian Labour Conference of 1957 one is bound to be struck by the reasonableness of this demand. The reasonableness of this demand strikes whom? I will disclose that later to you. Even what was asked for is to lead as a life of simple dignity, not luxurious and extraordinary one. This is not a pledge by a fiery radical socialist. This pamphlet I am quoting is published by the Government of India. This is the justification that the need-based wage is the legitimate one, is a reasonable one, is a modest one, it is almost a humble one. This justification is from a pamphlet which was published by

the Government of India. Finally what does this pamphlet published by the Director of Audio-Visual Publicity say? The needs are genuine, the demand is just. Let us then do everything to meet them. What did you do when they came..

AN HON. MEMBER : Indraprastha.

SHRI NATH PAI : Again they say that the demands are genuine. They are doing everything possible to meet them. There is only one thing I say. What would have happened to the Government is the question. We do not deny that with his extraordinary parliamentary skill, Mr. Chavan will say I do not deny. I can anticipate the speech and give the reply to you right now. He will say 'I do not deny. Mr. Nath Pai is asking for 18 yards of cloth. I would like to give him 36 yards' and there will be an automatic applause from the Congress benches. 'If I give him 36 yards, what will be happening to my other countrymen? Here I am reminded of the plea his distinguished predecessor Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant raised while replying to the same debate. This is how history repeats same debate. This is how history repeats

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : On both sides.

SHRI NATH PAI : I am saying something and I will have to say it till you are convinced and accept its reasonableness. When they say that the essence of the demand for a need-based wage is a few more rupees, you talk of inflation, you then talk of the prices going further. What does the Government itself argue? It is not a few rupees, but the power to buy food, clothing, living space, etc., adequate way of life with dignity and if money can buy these things, then give us money and if money cannot buy them, then give us these things. When we raised a demand for a minimum wage, it was not a new demand. I give you the historical background and Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have something to do with it. I would not like to embarrass you as a distinguished colleague of yours from Poona. Sir, this aspect, this demand was raised by the employees not to embarrass the present Government. This was a demand made in 1957 also and in 1960 also I made a submission. I had then said in August 1960 by voicing that we are not receiving it. In

[SHRI NATH PAI]

1960 this was the first demand of the Government employees, a need-based minimum wage, but then we told the then Minister, Mr. Nanda that if you agree to accept the principle of giving not to-day but at least in phases, need-based minimum wage, we shall be satisfied. This was consistently being said by us for the past ten years. What has been the Government's response. Let us get the first issue very clearly. The need-based minimum wage was not a blatantly irresponsible demand as has been said. This is a very modest demand even according to the pamphlet published by the Government itself. In order to rebut the argument of the employees. That was one aspect, I think I have tried to throw some light on the legitimacy, on the modesty, on the reasonableness of the demand.

Now, I shall try to turn your attention to the second question which I have raised. What were the causes of the strike? We are told, because of political motives. I have said what I wanted to say about that. But what were the real causes? I want to submit that the real causes were once analyzed by the then Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Wise I become. Here again history repeats itself. He privately admitted that it was his Government that was responsible for the strike, but publicly he made me and my colleagues responsible for the strike of 1960. He blamed my immaturity, my irresponsibility. The fact that I had then come out fresh from the university was supposed to be the cause of the strike of 1960! (*Interruption*)

Now, privately he admitted something totally different. And what did he say privately? Now, this is the cause of the strike too; let us see. You know this Government so much specialises in that Jekyll and Hyde practice: one thing privately, one thing publicly; one thing on the platform and one thing when it comes to implementation; one thing on the floor of the House and another thing in the Central Hall.

Now, this is what the Prime Minister of India, who blamed the immaturity and the irresponsibility of the leaders of the strike as the cause of the so-called civil rebellion of 1960, says. He writes to his provincial

colleagues—his satraps—that would be the most appropriate word. I have said that in that speech. He says, "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 years pass",—sometimes decades pass, this is the amendment which I would like to make—"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 this leads to a conflict which is ultimately good for no one." This is Jawaharlal Nehru's confidential letter to the Chief Ministers of States written on the 30th June, 1960 to tell the real cause of the strike which followed on the 11th July, 1960. Precisely the same thing has happened.

The Prime Minister, in a circular letter which is now denied—but they should be very cautious in making such denials, because this becomes the archives and you are denying the right of access to the archives—but posterity will be able to read the full-set record. The letter was written belatedly, admonishing I think the Home Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister. (*Interruption*) We shall get it in course of time. Security has been tightened. It used to be a little more tightened. It used to be a little more liberal in earlier days. Now I have got a copy of that letter. This time it was proved. I know the heading of the letter and the paragraphs. There, the Prime Minister disapproved all the methods. Now, internal politics of the party, we are not interested in, nor do I wish to say anything about it. But the fact remains that privately a letter is written admonishing the Home Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister and the methods employed. I am not concerned with any individual. We are concerned with the Government and the party as a whole and we hold them collectively responsible for the posture. We know this game. The day when the Cabinet decided to issue an ordinance, the so-called progressive hold of some pressmen said, "We have voted against this ordinance." The reactionaries said, "What a Government what an atmosphere, what

collective responsibility and what mutual trust and faith indeed?" Within half an hour, some pressmen range up and they gave the names. We said we are not interested in this game. We are not interested in this kind of game.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : Madhya Pradesh also.

SHRI NATH PAI : You are quite right. It has been equally bad there. But two wrongs cannot make one good; even you will agree with this. We should try to set up a better example rather than other parties which follow your degrading example. Now, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that this was the basic cause. What were the causes? The total failure of the Government of India to keep its pledged word, to uphold its word of honour, to implement the commitment that they had solemnly undertaken. I refer to the general perspectives of the commitment which are in every Plan, which are in every election manifesto, which are in every pledge you take. But the specific commitment is incorporated in the agreement in the JCM which Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta and other colleagues pointed out. I want Congressmen, particularly those who are still serious about some of the faith which inspired them, to reflect and ponder over it for a moment. The employees did not demand, give this or that. They said, this is what we should get. You disagreed. All right; let us go to arbitration. You want to go to arbitration when it is bartering away the territory of India. But when your own employees will ask for arbitration—*Idam na mama*—like Viswamitra, you strike a posture and disown all responsibility. When Kutch territory has to be given, of course, Mr. Chavan with all his eloquence defended it here and in Bombay. But when his own employees ask for it, you disagree. Arbitration is provided, stipulated, promised and committed to. If we say, let us implement it, then of course, it is a crime! Article 16 says, compulsory arbitration shall be limited to pay and allowances, weekly hours of work and leave. This is very important. Article 16 of the JCM clearly, categorically, positively, accepts it and commits itself to it. But when they try to remind the Government of this commitment, you disagree. This

was the real cause. It was not the quantity that was denied. It was the failure of the Government to accept the principle.

It is like the cup of Tantalus. You know what happens. It is filled, but the moment it touches the lips, it is empty. Something is given and then it is snatched away. This concept of JCM was accepted first in a private communication by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when we wrote to them in January, 1960. Reply was very prompt in those days; even that we do not get now. The letter was written by me from Bombay. The next day the reply came from Bangalore. The last sentence of the reply was this: Regarding this machinery, there is something which the Government would like to accept and implement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He may conclude in a few minutes.

SHRI NATH PAI : I would like to resume my speech after lunch.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : All right. The House stands adjourned till 2 o'clock. 13 HRS.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR].

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—*contd.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Nath Pai may now resume his speech. He has already taken nearly 25 minutes. May I request him only to take another 10 minutes?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara) : Given him another 20 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is a request. I do not want to disturb him in the middle of his speech. That is my desire. Bear that in mind, please.

SHRI NATH PAI : I shall bear this in mind as also your anxiety not to disturb me in the course of my speech.

When the House adjourned for Lunch we were discussing what we were the causes and I tried to emphasize the first important

[SHRI NATH PAI]

cause that was the failure of the Government to keep its word. I also then suggested that when we resume the debate, I shall be substantiating this, namely, if there is a commitment on the part of Government that in the event of a dispute the dispute will be referred to arbitration. I said that there was. Now let me produce documentary evidence in substantiation of the claim of the employees and the assertion that I am making before you.

There was an agreement entered into by the then Railway Minister of India, Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, and Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan with regard to the arbitrability of disputes between railwaymen and the Railway Ministry. I may read this for the immediate reference of Shri Poonacha. This agreement has been solemnly signed and not only initialled. I say this because this Government makes a difference between 'initialling a document' and 'signing a document' when it is challenged. Shri C. Subramaniam once told Parliament, when he was reminded of an undertaking, that it was only initialled and not signed. We were taken aback. Now I am saying that it is not initialled. This particular document is signed on behalf of the Government of India by the Hon. Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, Minister of Transport and Railways, the Hon. Shri K. Santhanam, Minister of State for Transport and Railways, and Shri V. Neelakantan, Member (Staff), Railway Board. These were the signatories on behalf of the Government of India and Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan and Shri Guruswami on behalf of the railwaymen. This agreement very clearly provided for arbitration in the event of a dispute between railwaymen and the Ministry of Railways not being settled.

With regard to the present commitment, may I now point out that the railwaymen once again asked for a clarification from the then Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Hathi, and this is Shri Hathi's commitment—may I read the actual correspondence between the employees' leaders and the Government of India? The employees wrote :—

"Kindly confirm that reference of disputes to arbitration, both at departmental level and national level, will be

compulsory and that the award of the arbitrator will be binding on both the parties."

What is the reply when the employees asked for confirmation? This is what Shri Hathi writes on behalf of the Government of India :—

"Please refer to clauses 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 22 of the enclosed scheme which are fully explanatory."

I have already referred to clause 16 and have actually read out from the original document.

"In the matters for which compulsory arbitration is provided, as the name itself signifies, arbitration will be compulsory if a final dispute is recorded at a departmental or national level, as the case may be."

Here is the clarification. There were some lingering doubts as to arbitration being compulsory, obligatory or not. On behalf of the Government of India Shri Hathi makes this solemn commitment. Now we are told that it is not so.

How should the whole machinery work? When we asked for this machinery, the reference made by the then Prime Minister, Nehru, was to the Whitley Council. There is a confusion about the Whitley Council. Mr. Whitley was a Liberal Member of Parliament. Later on he rose to be the Speaker of the House of Commons. During the War there was unrest in the industrial sector in Britain and with a foresight those imperialist Prime Ministers thought it necessary to look into the causes instead of running away by saying that it was a politically motivated unrest. Therefore a committee was created headed by Mr. Whitley and the Council takes its name, Whitley Council, after Mr. Whitley.

Now, I am going to quote for Shri Y. B. Chavan and the Government of India what the spirit of the Whitley Council is and what the spirit of the joint consultative machinery should be. We were told that our joint consultative machinery was based on the underlying principles of the Whitley Council. Is that really so? Let me read out this :

"The essential requirement for a successful. Whitley Council system is the

willingness of the Government to adopt the same code of behaviour as other good employers".

Our Government want to be a model employer. In other countries, the private sector is the big employer. In India it is the Government which is the biggest employer, ours being a backward economy. Therefore, the responsibilities and obligation to be not only a good employer but a model employer are, therefore, all the greater. And how should they behave?

I am quoting from a speech delivered by Mr. Douglas Houghton, M.P., at the Indian Institute of Public Administration at the invitation of that institute which is a semi-government body. This is what he says :

"This they can do by separating their responsibilities as employers from the prerogatives of Government and allowing fruitful discussion with staff representatives on conditions of work and pay. Unless there is a yielding of the Central authority to meet the views and wishes of the staff in a spirit of co-operation and compromise, the Whitley Councils cannot succeed."

So, there must be a separation of the prerogatives which the Government of India has as a government and the responsibilities and obligations of Government as an employer. But there is a total shocking confusion about these two, the prerogatives of Government and the responsibilities of Government, and somehow there is a persistent tendency....

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Would my hon. friend read it out again?

SHRI NATH PAI : Yes, very much. The sentence is :

"Unless there is a yielding of the Central authority...."

—that is, yielding by the Home Minister and by his distinguished charming colleague on his left—

"...to meet the views and wishes of the staff in a spirit of co-operation and compromise...."

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Compromise

SHRI NATH PAI : Yes, compromise from him.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Compromise cannot be a one-party affair.

SHRI NATH PAI : The spirit of compromise has to be from him. How do I give up authority which I do not have? Let not the Home Minister look back to Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, because he will easily agree with him, but let him look at me and continue the argument. There must be yielding of the Central authority. Now the staff does not have the Central authority. The Government alone have it.

The sentence reads :

"Unless there is a yielding of the Central authority to meet the views and wishes of the staff in a spirit of co-operation and compromise, the Whitley Councils cannot succeed. But sometimes when the Government decides to do the yielding, the higher permanent civil servants fail to convey that spirit to the staff."

This is a moot point. Here, I would like to quote Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. I have personally nothing against the ICS. I radically disagreed with the Deputy Prime Minister when he chided the officials. I want to point out here that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had warned this country about how the ICS would behave when this nation would want to make a move in the direction of a better India. I do not want to use that language here because it is slightly out of date. This was what he said :

"Among those who have served in the ICS or other services there will be many Indians or foreigners whose services we may welcome when we have become free, but of one thing I am quite sure that no new order can be built in India so long as the spirit of the ICS prevails over administration and our public services. That spirit of authoritarianism and an ally of imperialism cannot coexist with freedom. The new India must be served by different men."

This was what Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had warned this country of.

Mr. Douglas Houghton tells us this interesting thing about the class I, class II and class III and class IV in our country. These are the classes that we have and the

[Shri Nath Pai]

mentality that prevails is this. The people who belong to the class I think that they are the special elite and they are a superior administrative cadre. Even the glasses are different for drinking water from. There is no country where this kind of degradation has been emblazoned as in India, as in the corridors of the Government of India. A friend of mine, a student of Mr. Laski, when he came into the External Affairs Ministry had this to say; he had come from the so-called low castes of India; I do not want to identify him because they may victimise him. On the very first evening of the day he joined, he came and wept and said that even the drinking glass was different; of course, he had been used to it earlier as an untouchable, but he could not drink from the same type of glass from which the upper caste people drank. We find that in the Government of India, the kind of curtain on the window, the kind of cloth that is spread on the table, the kind of glass that is used will depend upon whether you belong to class I, class II, or class III or class IV, and this conception still continues. We are a caste-ridden society, and this concept continues in every form, and the Government of India takes sheer delight in perpetuating this kind of class distinction, this kind of categorisation and this kind of distinctions.

In Britain they found that the Whitley Councils had this kind of difficulty in the initial stages because there was not that accommodating spirit that they were partners. Class I or class II may be for the purposes of pay and allowances, but so far as the job is concerned, there should be no distinction. This is the beginning of the social revolution that has to be ushered in this country. The ordinary fitter who runs the railways is as much necessary for the running of the railways and perhaps more than the hon. Railway Minister who only issues the orders; the job of the humblest of our employees is as much necessary as that of the President. Unless this is accepted by us in the true spirit, we shall be getting nowhere.

Then, he says :

"The higher civil servants who comprise the official side of a Whitley

Council must be willing to respond to the staff desires; there must be more sharing of responsibility for making people happy in their work."

Now, let us go into the deeper causes. Apart from this failure, there is another thing that I would like to mention. Here, I may quote the ex-Deputy Chief of the Planning Commission and point out what he has said regarding the chronic erosion of the real wages. This is the real cause, the chronic continued erosion of the real wages of the Government employees. Prices are rising; of course, prices rise everywhere and they rise in India also. But how do they rise in India? The Prime Minister is a very close friend and ally of President Nasser. I do not know what she has decided to learn from him. Many things are worth learning. In this context, may I remind her that since he took power in July 1952, to this day, the price of bread and butter and essential commodities has been held by President Nasser? This is something which she should learn from him and try to do. But what is her record in this country? Instead of going on signing those inanities about growing friendship etc. etc, this is something concrete which we could do.

Again, look at what Marshal Tito, another of our allies has done, in our little mini-summit. What has he done in his country? Workers' participation in management through workers' councils was the first revolutionary step that Marshal Tito took, and also stabilisation of the prices of essential commodities which the average man needed. Can we not imitate them in these matters? I do not know what the Prime Minister has chosen to do. But this is something concrete which she can learn and do here. But what happens in India, and what do we find? We find that there is a continuous rise in the cost of living index, and there is a spiralling of prices and that makes an erosion in the little meagre earning of the employees. May I here quote an authority, an economist trusted by them till the other day at least? And this is what he has to say :

"For eleven out of thirteen years these people... —that is, the Government employees—

...have suffered a chronic erosion of their meagre standard of living. Surely,

something should have been done about that."

There is this continuous rise in prices in India, sometimes as great as 11 per cent and sometimes as great as 13 per cent. The rupee earnings of the employees expands, of course, but the real earning is what he takes home ultimately; it is not how many rupees he gets that matters to him or to his family, but what matters to him is how much rice, how much wheat, how much jowar and how much jaggery and how much sugar and how much tea and how many pieces of cloth he can take home. It is these that have declined continuously since 1947, and particularly so far as the employees of the welfare Government are concerned.

Yesterday, it was pointed out with statistics and figures that in some sectors of our private industry the wages had improved and the employers had been compelled to give a living wage. It is this second failure, therefore, of the Government of India, to stabilise the price-line and to hold the prices of essential commodities and to make them available at a price level which is within their reach, which has been the main cause; this is an unseen cause but a perennial cause. This is a cause which you cannot see but which you feel every day, and which all of us feel. Failure to pinpoint this leads to finding out scare-crows everywhere, and then fingers are pointed out at certain people. We ignore what is under our feet and then we look for victims whom we can blame elsewhere.

Now, I would come to the psychological aspect of why strikes become inevitable. In this country it has been the tradition since Independence that nothing is done except under pressure. Whatever the legitimacy and whatever the reasonableness and whatever the justice of a demand, the Government of India never act unless they are confronted with action. Except under pressure, they never grant the reasonableness of a demand. This has become a mental habit in this country. Therefore, when every other road is closed to them, the Government employees are naturally forced to wage the only weapon which they have, namely strike, because it is general conviction in this country that Government will never act unless there is

action; they do not like to be threatened and coerced, but what will others do when they know that Government never act till they are coerced and till they are pressurised and till they are threatened. This premium on pressure is not the creation of the employees but the creation of Government. If the path of negotiation, the path of discussion, agreement and settlement, is pursued by you, there will not be any necessity for action. But it is you who have created the condition where action remains the only thing and then you sermonise and lecture that action ought to have been taken. These are the causes.

Now, I will be turning to what happened during the strike. There is a convincing proof that the causes were such that they were within the power of the Government to control and since they did not control them, the responsibility, substantially for the strike, is that of the Government. What a tragic chapter of harrowing tales! I do not want to go on giving harrowing tales of what happened during the strike. I think every Indian should feel deeply hurt at what happen. Violence might have been limited to a few fields. Let not Government take delight in that that it was limited to Bikaner, Pathankot, Shahadol, Mariani, New Gauhati and Bongaigaon. They should not take delight in that. It is no use telling that.

I am reminded of the unfortunate words of a Minister of State—he is no longer alive; I do not want to identify him—who once said that only 14 persons had died. I do not know how a man should have made that statement. He was rightly taken to task by the entire House including his party. Let it not be said that only 14 persons died. It is an Indian who has died that matters. The number does not matter. The number 14 is too big. Even if one Indian dies, it is a harrowing thing for us.

What happened during the strike? I do not want to go into the details. But the mentality behind it, the attitude behind it, the posture behind it, is what stuns. What is alarming is this that, twenty years after Independence, the police have not yet been made to regard what is their essential duty and obligation. I would beg of the Home Minister and the Prime Minister to get a television film of what happened in Britain

[Shri Nath Pai]

just in October this year when there was a 'Solidarity with Vietnam' demonstration. There was a talk that there will be a revolution; there was a talk in the British press led by the *London Times* that there will be a large-scale violence, that law and order will break down and that every single shop in the west of London, particularly on Regent Street, will be smashed. There were all kinds of precautions. The panic was real. What happened there? One section of the demonstrators assembled at Grosvenor Square where the American Embassy is situated—I have seen the film; I have seen the scene—and what happened is amazing. The police, row after row, seven strong, stood there firmly. Again and again, missiles came; again and again, brickbats came; again and again, assaults came. Never was the *danda* used, never was the gas used and never was the gun used. They stood there, firmly doing their duty. They cannot carry batons. Mr. Chavan knows that. They knew they were determined youngmen. This is something for the Prime Minister to see. On the eve of the demonstration, every leader of the demonstration which challenged the governmental authority was given equal time by the T.V. Do the Government of India allow other parties to put forth their views as to what they stand for to the people of India? Is the All India Radio always an instrument of the ruling party or is it something on which we should also have a right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Shame, shame !

SHRI NATH PAI : Then, Sir, once there was a strike in the city of Philadelphia of the municipal employees. What surprised me was that in the evening, along with the city's representatives, the representatives of the employees and the representatives of the citizenry were invited and given equal time to state their case. This happens in a capitalist country which does not boast of being a welfare State and which does not pretend to look after the working class. But these are the standards of this country which boasts of being a welfare State.

What happened in the Indraprastha Stadium is only a symbol of harrowing

scenes in India. My hon. friend, Mr. Manohar Lal Sondhi has been much maligned, much slandered and much abused. Sir, you have seen in your long distinguished career many harrowing scenes in India. These pictures should become a part of the debate of today. This is something which every Home Minister, every M.P. and every Indian for that matter should see, the danger that are symbolised. How thin is the wall between the sheer brutality and the pretence of civilisation? These pictures tell a terrible story. If you look at them, you see the pathetic hands raised and you see the sadistic look on the faces of the officers, how they are delivering these blows. You look at the petrified faces of young women, the pleading journalists and the photographer, I do not want to comment more on this. We immediately rushed there. This is something which passes the imagination and the comprehension of any decent normal human being. Here was an office where everybody was on duty; they were the most loyal of them; everybody was on duty; I talked to the officers, I talked to the chaprasis and they said that 99 per cent were on duty. What went wrong has been given in the two reports, particularly that of Shri Sarjoo Prasad and Shri Purshottam Trikam Das, which even Mr. Masani had to support having opposed the strike. Mr. Chavan has taken one step after much persuasion. I think, he ought to have summarily dismissed those two. He has dismissed 4,000 and more of employees, but in the case of those two men who were guilty, he took sufficiently a long time, nearly a fortnight or even three weeks, before he could persuade himself to think that they were in the wrong. When I went and saw, it looked something like a slaughter house. I do not know whether you, being a vegetarian, have ever gone to a slaughter house...

AN HON. MEMBER : Vegetarian !

SHRI NATH PAI : Yes; by birth.

But I have sometimes visited and it had the appearance of a slaughter house. I was not even born when Jallianwala Bagh took place, but I knew when we said :

हस खून को हमारे यारो न बूल जाना

Certainly the song which we had learnt as young fighters for freedom came to my mind because every wall was battered with

the blood of innocent men. It had the appearance of a slaughter house. Somebody said that it was a miniature Jallianwala Bagh. It was not a flourish of eloquence; it was a mild statement that one could make about what had transpired. Nobody was spared, whatever the office and whatever he was doing. There was no offence. Even men who were in the toilets and bathroom were dragged and beaten and trampled with. There are these photographs. All credit to those who have managed to take photographs. It is not enough to suspend people; if you want to prevent such things from happening, if Indraprastha must be the last that should happen in India, then something more—not merely suspending—must be done.

Lawlessness on the part of the employees, we are told. I have told Mr. Chavan on the 20th after returning from the Tihar Jail where I met the employees, what I saw. It was something appalling that I saw. The employees are supposed to be responsible in defying the law of the country. In the first place, they had taken powers which are to be taken only in an Emergency. It was not an ordinary law of the land under which they were operating. They had assumed those extraordinary powers by issuing an ordinance. And what happened? The law of the land was defied not by the employees who, after a warning, went on a strike, but by the guardians and custodians of the law. The magistrates in Delhi are an unusual phenomenon. I do not know by what stretch of imagination you call them the upholders and guardians of law. If anything, with all my responsibility and limited knowledge of law and jurisprudence, I want to submit that they are a blot on the judicial system of this country. Magistrates who will remand to custody without demanding for the accused being produced before them are not upholding the law but are disgracing the law of the land. 2,400 employees were sent to prison without even one of them being required to be produced. I have got a deposition signed and given to the Superintendent of Prison: 'what are the charges against us?'. I brought this to the notice of the Home Minister on the 20th. His response was that if this was true, this was a very serious matter and that he would look into it. This was the way in which they behaved. Indraprastha and the magis-

trates show the panicky behaviour of the Government, the utterly panicky manner in which the Government reacted to the token strike. All that generations of Indians have done to lay the foundations of India's solid recovery is wasted if a single day's token strike by government employees will bring about the collapse of the Government of India. Is this Government so fragile, is it so weak that a single day's token strike will bring about the collapse of the Government of India? Then, the sacrifices of all the martyrs and patriots have been laid waste.

In conclusion, I want to draw your attention to the tragic figures—4,000 discharged, 44,000 given termination notices and 8,000 prosecuted. What a sorry tale! These 14 people were victims of police firings. Where do we go from here? We want to create, we are told, normalcy. Government's pretension is: first get normalcy and then we will look into the legitimacy of the demand. There are only two points which I want to mention in conclusion.

They say, we would like to give justice but where is the means, where is the capacity. I don't want to go into all aspects of these things. We have to take two steps. One is the rehabilitation of these employees. Another is, this sorry chapter of suspension, of termination of break in service of these employees must be ended forthwith. Don't let us go on playing these cat-and-mouse games. Don't say, you misbehaved, you must behave better, and all that. This chapter must be closed and a new chapter must be opened in a spirit of mutual understanding, mutual accommodation. Let us not go on rubbing the point, you went on strike, you challenged us, now we can teach you a lesson. What has Mr. Subramaniam, a class-III employee getting a salary of Rs. 155, having his wife, a widowed mother, with three children, two young brothers, done that you want to punish him? He just asked you, help me, Mr. Home Minister. He should not be treated as a rival, as one challenging your authority. So, I want to plead with the Prime Minister, I want to plead with the Government of India, and demand, end it. The word need not be misunderstood by anybody. I want to ask them, Sir, that they must end this chapter by withdrawing this nefarious

[Shri Nath Pai]

ordinance, by withdrawing all the prosecution cases. Even yesterday some people came and told me that they are being harassed and they are being asked to take anticipatory action and all that. So, this sorry chapter must be ended. What has really happened, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, is this. The main issue which was the cause of the strike, that is, the basic minimum wage, has been forgotten and sidetracked. I will not allow that to happen. The capacity of the Government is there. In one sentence I will conclude. They have the capacity to subsidise. Let them not say that they have not got the capacity. They have the capacity to subsidise Mundhras, Amin Chand Pyarelals, Dharma Tejas and all that. But they don't have the capacity to subsidise, to give a little subsidy, for these poor employees to buy foodgrains. Let the public enterprises be run efficiently. They will yield an annual income of Rs. 600 crores. Let the Government go on plugging the loopholes of the losses to the exchequer made by the tax-dodgers and the tax-evaders. Let this be checked and let this colossal waste be ended.

Time and again, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, some congressmen came and told me, Mr. Nath Pai, you spoke very well, but give us something constructive. They said, we liked your speech, it was wonderful, and all that. It was somewhat embarrassing to hear compliments to one's face. Now, let me say something concrete and constructive: let them end this chapter of struggle and begin a new chapter of mutual understanding, let them start the Whitley councils, let them stop this prosecution forthwith, let them withdraw all these cases. After all, there was nothing serious; it was a legitimate demand which they wanted. Let us not, in the heat of the debate, forget about this, about their basic demands. I want an inquiry, a judicial inquiry to be formed wherever firing has taken place, wherever life has been lost. Mr. Chavan can make a new beginning. There will be persons among his colleagues who have rendered distinguished services to the country, but let Mr. Chavan make a new beginning, make a path of his own, that whenever there is firing, whenever life has been lost, there will be an independent judicial enquiry, not a departmental enquiry, whether

it is Indraprastha, Sahadol or Bikaner. Some day there will be Indians, those who toil, those who sweat, those who serve the land with the sweat of their brow, who will inherit this country and they will be the masters of India. They will be able to live in freedom and in liberty as honest and truly free men in India and those Indians will raise their hands in salute and bow their heads in gratitude to the employees who in 1957, 1960 and 1968, braved the wrath of this Government and tried to do their best to create a better India. Thank you very much.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI

(Bhubaneswar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the House have our full sympathies for the Government employees and for the entire working class of this country. I find nothing wrong in the expectation of the Central Government employees for a still better living standard, because, it is this Government which has created these employment opportunities for the millions of our brilliant young men and women in this country. The bulk of them come from the middle class. I feel that the time has come when the Government employees should be brought out of the political controversies and they should be given the opportunities of direct negotiations with the Government for the redressal of their grievances. I am quite sure the demands of the Central Government employees are genuine and cannot be brushed aside as some of us are thinking. But sometimes it so happens that when someone makes a wound, it has been our duty and responsibility to try to heal it. I am quite sure efforts are being made from all directions to heal the wound created by the most unfortunate incidents and the strike of the employees. In the present case, I feel nothing should be said or done on either side which would again cut open the wound which is being healed. I am quite sure extreme utterances on either side will not help solve the problem, will not help to reinstate the employees who went on strike whom we want to serve and benefit.

I have just returned from a tour of the most devastated areas of my State, Orissa. There hundreds of thousands of homeless men, women and children are starving. They have lost their homes, their every-

thing. A hundred grammes of *chuda* and a kilo of rice, have become so precious to them now. Even after 8 days starvation they were not able to get these. Who is there to give them food and clothing? Who is there to wipe out the tears from the eyes of these starving millions? The miseries of my people are so vivid and fresh in my mind that whatever we are discussing here about a need-based minimum seems to be far-fetched and so unreal.

When we sit in judgment on the actions of Government, we must do so in their totality. It has been stated by the Prime Minister many times that Government do not like to be vindictive in any way. She has reiterated that the problem before them is a human one and would be treated as such. Government have declared times without number that they would not stand on prestige or be vindictive to the employees. I hope Government stand by their own commitment. I am quite sure that whatever action has followed all these days has been in pursuance of that policy. I know they have taken decisions in pursuance of this policy of sympathy and understanding. And the withdrawal of notices of termination of service of 48,000 employees have been done in this spirit. Our party was the happiest at this decision as they had asked for it. I have no doubt that in gradual course of time the break in service will also be condoned, and we on our side shall urge upon the Home Minister and Government to do their best.

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA (Gauhati) : Whyn ot do it now ?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : We are doing it.

Our party is confident that the 7,000 permanent employees who were suspended will also be leniently treated, and we shall impress upon the Government and the Home Minister that they should be treated leniently as this is the policy of the Government. We can again say with confidence that the cases of the 4,000 temporary employees who were summarily dismissed will also be sympathetically considered on representations as Mr. Nath Pai has suggested and all the other members on the other side have also demanded. We shall also impress upon the Government and the Home Minister that they should take into consideration the cases of these employees.

In Orissa some action has been taken against some employees and we have approached the authorities there and we shall again impress upon the Government here that nothing should be done to give the impression that the Government is vindictive. My hon. friend Shri Banerjee has also said in his statement that the lenient policy followed by the Prime Minister is a clear guidance for the State Governments. So I hope all the State Governments will act accordingly. Therefore, the policy of sympathy and understanding of the Government has been appreciated by the vast majority of the Central Government employees and I see no reason why the Central Government should go back on this policy.

The cases of police excesses have been narrated here. Really what has happened in Indraprastha cannot be supported. There was resentment, and the Home Minister knew this was something wrong. So he acted quickly. If there is anything more to be done in this respect I have no doubt that he will again rise to the occasion. He will sense the sentiments of this House, and I have no doubt he will never be found lacking because the Government is always working with an open mind and with a spirit of understanding towards its employees.

You may have noticed that Mr. Dange was very conciliatory in his speech yesterday because he knows that a mess has been created and that something should be done to get out of this mess. Even immediately after the strike in a statement he said it was strange that some of the leaders who led this movement got themselves arrested before the 19th, because the leaders should have been there to lead, they should not safely go and sit in a prison, leaving the Central Government employees leaderless. Therefore, whatever incidents took place were because there were no leaders. I hope on future occasions the leaders will be present by their side.

With regard to the need-based minimum, it is a part of the 10-point programme which has been accepted by the A.I.C.C. The Congress has been the standard bearer in accepting this Ten-point programme in which is included this need based minimum

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]
 wage, and I hope the Government would try to implement the programmes accepted by the A.I.C.C.

A calculation has been made recently in terms of money as to what this need based minimum wage for the working class will come to. For Calcutta it will be Rs. 240.31, for Delhi Rs. 191.31, for Jamshedpur Rs. 274.35, for Ahmedabad Rs. 224.62, for Madras Rs. 189.99 and for Bhubaneswar Rs. 240.48. If you analyse it, you will find 57% of this amount goes for foodstuffs. Therefore, as Mr. Nath Pai was pointing out, we shall have to find a way out. Unless we bring down the prices of essential commodities, that is, foodstuffs, there is no meaning in increasing the rupee content of the salaries of the employees. Now to provide the minimum needs of the vast majority of our people, we shall have to work out a phased programme.

On the one side there is an area where people do not get water to drink and on the other side there is a section of the population where there is tap water all the 24 hours. Now we have to work out a policy of providing the minimum needs of the people. Sir, the priority sector will be the former and unless we have drinking water for everybody in this country we cannot think of others who have at least Rs. 300 or Rs. 400 per month as salary now. This can be achieved in three ways. Either we have to accept the Gandhian principle and ideology that everybody should lead an austere life reducing luxuries to the minimum till enough saving is accumulated.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : Start with the Ministers.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : We shall start with everybody. Secondly we have to reduce the disparity. Now I bring to your notice one thing. There is an oil company Oil India Ltd. in Assam. I think I shall submit it to the House. You will find in the list of senior executives 45 persons. The salary is Rs. 6750, dearness allowance—Rs. 825 and housing and accommodation—everything is free, gas and 5 gallons of petrol a day everything free.

AN HON. MEMBER : They are the perquisites.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : Now, therefore, it is amazing to find such

wide disparity. I hope, Sir, this would be placed on the Table of the House and it can be examined. I can give it to you because this is most revealing.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : They are 'Bakasuras'.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : The second point I was making is to remove the disparity. First thing is that we shall reduce the luxurious living. If we cannot do that, we have to reduce the disparities in all sectors of life and the Central Government employees had a responsibility. I, therefore, said that it is a new phase of the struggle because the monopolies growth is taking its roots in the Central Government offices. I have come across notings of these officers who have helped these monopolies to get all the advantages that they can get from the Government. Therefore, the Central Government employees have a great responsibility in checking the growth of monopolies in the country.

The third alternative before us is creating community wealth by productive labour. Here I am reminded of Mao Tse-tung. He asked the Government employees to go back to the villages from urban areas and closed down the offices. He said 'You will have no file work'. He sent the officers to villages to assist the farmer to dig wells as there was a drought in the country-side and in the shortest possible time 1 lakh surface wells were dug. You will find in Assam, Orissa, and Bihar millions of people who are homeless to-day. Why don't you close down the offices and send the officers to the rural areas so that they can help the villagers to build their homes. And reduce the file work by 50% and corruption will be checked to that extent.

Because the more you go on with file work, the more will you allow scope for corruption, and 50 per cent of the corruption is due to this file work. I hope the time has come when the Government will give serious thought to this matter.

I have calculated that out of every hundred rupees that the Government is advancing to the farmers by way of loans and advances and such other assistance, Rs. 45 is being paid to the various offices. The Government in an average is advancing every year Rs. 200 crores to the peasants

and farmers by way of loan, and fertiliser loans and subsidies. In advancing loans, why not the Government ask the farmer to deposit Rs. 20 in a bank, and open a savings bank account, and then channelise all the Government assistance not through the offices but direct to the peasant's account so that the peasants will have a sense of participation in the activities of the country? It is no use telling that the Central Government employees should not go on strike. I am afraid that more and more strikes may follow because the economic condition of the country is so bad, and we all shall have to fight poverty together. (*Interruption*) My analysis is different from Mr. Sondhi's. Therefore, I submit to the Government that this should not be taken as a passing phase. We should all try our best to solve these problems. All efforts should be made to have direct negotiations with the Central Government employees because they form a vast portion—two million and more—of the millions of our own middle classes.

AN HON. MEMBER : Not as political office-bearers.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : I say they must be free political leaders and Government should conduct direct negotiations with them. Lastly, I feel that our Government which has followed a most lenient attitude in the strike should keep up to it and try to see that whatever grievances are still left are settled with a spirit of understanding and sympathy.

I oppose this motion.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR (Basirhat) : Sir, I just want to submit that people like us who speak perhaps only once or twice during a whole session, who belong to a group of about 60 Independents, should be given a little more time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Yesterday, unfortunately, none of the Independents was present. We wanted to give some opportunity, and even today, after the recognised groups, after their turns are over, we will try to accommodate some Independents, time permitting. We do not ignore Independents as such.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam) : You said recognised

parties, but the Independents are also recognised Independents.

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : उपाध्यक्ष परम्परा इस प्रकार की डालिये कि जो रिक्गनाइज्ड पार्टीज हें उनको प्राथमिकता आप दें, और उनके अनुपात से उनको समय भी आप दें। इस में कोई आपत्ति हमें नहीं है। लेकिन जो इंडिपेंडेंट मॅम्बरज हें उनकी संख्या के अनुपात से जितना समय उनके हिस्से में आता है उतना समय उनको भी मिलना चाहिये।

SHRI BADRUDDUJA (Murshidabad) : May I submit that your predecessor, Mr. Hukam Singh, used to allot time according to the number of Independent Members, and that time should be distributed. But you have been systematically ignoring us throughout the earlier sessions. Never was a chance given to us, except once in a blue moon. We never got a chance to discuss these matters. We represent one million people and more. Should we not have a say on such serious matters affecting the country?

श्री यशवन्त सिंह कुशवाह (भिड) : जो स्वतन्त्र सदस्य हें उनको तो समय दिया जाए लेकिन इस बात का ध्यान रखा जाए कि हम लोगों में से जिन को तीन को आप ज्यादा पहचानते हें केवल उन्हीं को हमेशा समय न दिया जाए और दूसरे लोगों को भी दिया जाए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I should like to make one thing clear. While time is allotted, the strength of the Independents is kept in mind and that portion of time is always given to them. The question is one of accommodating them in such debates. Certainly some independents would be accommodated. Whom the Chair should call is a different matter.

MR. SEZHIYAN

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) : Sir, while participating in the debate on the no-confidence motion moved by my worthy friend, Shri K. L. Gupta, we on this side are aware of the arithmetic of numbers. Even the mover had no illusion of the fate of the motion at the end of the discussion.

[Shri Sezhiyan]

Because of the numerical strength of the treasury benches, they are bold enough and very confident to face this motion. As soon as the motion was moved, they said, we are prepared to meet it immediately. They showed their confidence even before the motion was moved. It is reported that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs told the press that they are very confident to face the motion. Had they shown half of the zeal with which they want to meet the opposition here to meet the employees and understand their grievances, had they shown one-tenth of the confidence with which they meet the no-confidence motion here to meet the employees' representatives outside, perhaps the happenings of September 19 may not have happened and we may not have had any occasion for this no-confidence motion itself. While we appreciate the confidence with which they are prepared to meet the opposition here, I appeal to them not to rely on numbers only. I appeal to their conscience and their democratic instinct to assess the pros and cons of the strike.

We know that the people form the Government. When a part of the people suffer, Government also should suffer. To that extent, Government should be aware of the trail of bitterness that has been left behind after the 19th September events. They speak of normalcy to be restored. We should go to the root of the matter. What made the normalcy to be disturbed? What made 2½ million employees to go on strike? Unless the basic issues which led to the events of 19th September are taken up for earnest consideration and early solution, the air is not going to be cleared. It is only a postponement of the evil.

Again and again, we meet the same set of issues. As Mr. Nath Pai eloquently put it, it has happened since Independence. In 1957 and in 1960, there were strikes. Even in 1960, action was taken against a large number of persons and the recognition of many employees' unions were withdrawn. But by 1962 they were re-recognised again. Therefore, I am not worried about that. The basic issue should be brought before us for discussion. Unless the Government is prepared to do something in that direction, I think this is going to be a perennial

issue and it will be left to the future, with more and bigger problems facing the future governments and future generations.

The basic issues were the need-based minimum wage, full neutralisation of DA and merger of DA with basic pay. This need-based minimum wage is nothing new. In 1957 at the Indian Labour Conference, under the able guidance of Mr. G. L. Nanda, this was propounded. In 1960, Mr. Nanda, who was then Labour Minister enunciated in Parliament the concept of subsistence wage, which worked out to slightly over Rs. 130/- then.

15 Hrs.

Sir, this principle has again and again been accepted though the Home Minister now says that this is an issue which is not arbitrable and which cannot go to arbitration. But, if you go into the Constitution—Article 43—you will find that the Directive Principles of the State Policy have been clearly enunciated. Article 43 reads as follows:—

“The State shall endeavour to secure, by suitable legislation or economic organisation or in any other way, to all workers agricultural, industrial or otherwise, work, a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life and full enjoyment of leisure and social and cultural opportunities and, in particular, the State shall endeavour to promote cottage industries on an individual or cooperative basis in rural areas.

Thus, Article 43 ensures that the State shall endeavour to secure to all workers a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life to all the workers, whether they are in the industrial sector or in the agricultural sector. This is the Directive Principle of State Policy. Now, I want to know what the Government have done? After having the Constitution for the last 18 years, what have they done for the agricultural workers for the minimum wage?

Here, political motives are being brought in again and again. Those who speak on the other side say that it is politically motivated. The parties may be politically motivated but the employees are not politically motivated; they are only wage motivated.

They want some more facilities for which they want a minimum basic wage which will sustain them.

Sir, I now quote from a newspaper which comes from Delhi and which is very close to the Prime Minister and the ruling Party, namely, The National Herald. In its Editorial on July 29 this year, it is stated :

"The increasing demands of the employees need not be misunderstood. They are essentially a protest against the economic policies of the Government, against their failure to control prices, to avoid extravagance and to effect savings."

Therefore, the strike that was conducted in which more than a million people participated was more a protest against the economic policies of the Central Government, against the failure of Government to control prices, against the inflation which has made a mockery of the pay that they receive. There is a downward trend of the real wages that are being paid to the workers.

Therefore, it is against these conditions that the Central Government should divert their attention. Some Members also spoke of the consequences that would follow if the Government were to accept the minimum wage policy. If the Government is to implement this policy in the case of Central Government employees, some have calculated that that would come to Rs. 200 crores. Yet some others said that applying the same standards to all the industrial and agricultural workers may come to Rs. 700 crores. What harm will be done if the Government is to leave this matter for arbitration before an arbitrator? They can as well put forth all these things before him. They say that, though it is desirable, yet it is not practicable. This argument also they can put forth before the arbitrator. Before him they can say that these are the calculations and these are the resources available, and therefore it is not possible to implement that. Some start can be made in this direction only if they accept this and if they really feel that they are bound by the Directive Principles of the Constitution. If they really feel that this is the desirable thing to be done, they should not have any objection for referring the matter to arbitration. But, here comes the crux of the problem. They pay lip service only;

they say that the need-based wage is a desirable thing but they would not implement it. There are many directives given in the Constitution like prohibition. They pay lip service to them but do not implement them.

As was pointed out by Shri Nath Pai, the wages have not even been maintained not to speak of any increase in wages. Though the pay envelope or packet is expanding the real wage is going down day by day. In 1947 the lowest wage earned by a Central Government employee was Rs. 55. Now he is getting Rs. 129. But if you take into account the increase in cost of living, Rs. 55 of 1947 would be equivalent to Rs. 162 of today. So, in terms of real wages a person who was getting Rs. 55 in 1947 should get today Rs. 162. But he is getting only Rs. 129. That shows that the real wage has gone down. I want to know what the government have done to make up for the loss in real wages by the workers.

Of course, big business have amassed huge profits. They are able to reap the effects of inflation. Inflation has given windfall profits to business tycoons, industrialists and big business houses. But what about the poor labourers who are getting poor wages? What about those who are getting fixed income like teachers and those working in offices and establishments? These people with fixed income have been hard hit by the inflationary trends, and the Central Government is squarely responsible for this.

Therefore, instead of increasing the wages which are not real, government should have adopted some measures for curbing the rise in prices, for curbing the inflationary tendencies. But, instead of curbing the rise in prices in the economy, instead of trying to hold the price-line, government seem to believe in the numerical strength inside Parliament and the numerical strength of outside and other forces for suppressing the discontented people and thereby solve the dispute. The prices of almost every item of human consumption are going up day by day and the real wages of the employees are coming down at the same time. If this atmosphere is allowed to last long it will certainly lead this country to a turmoil from which it would be very difficult to get out.

[Shri Sezhiyan]

It is not very difficult for the government even at this stage to formulate a policy by sending for arbitration the two basic demands put forth by the employees. Instead of victimising the people, instead of issuing suspension and termination orders, they should try to suspend the root cause, they should suspend the rigidity in their approach, they should try to suspend the rise in prices. Then only will they be able to hold peace in this country.

In the newspapers we see many classifications of those who participated in the strike. A few days after the strike, the papers talked of those who absented from work and those loyal employees who reported for work. A week afterwards, there was another classification,—“loyal absentees,” absentees who wanted to come but who did not come. The third day another adjective was used, “reluctant absentee”—an absentee who wanted to come but did not come reluctantly. I do not know how government were able to search the conscience of the people and classify them as ‘loyal’ absentees and ‘reluctant’ absentees. Two days ago a new classification has been devised—“active striker”, “instigating striker,” “real striker” and “reluctant striker.” I do not know why so many classifications have been given. Perhaps, government are themselves confused and they do not know who is a real striker and who is not a real striker. As was pointed out by many people, those who were at Indraprastha were loyal workers on duty but they were the worst hit. Therefore, the real cause has to be seen elsewhere and the real people who are to be arrested are not the employees; the real people who should have been arrested are those persons who are responsible for the increase in prices of daily needs. Those who are the blackmarketers, those who are the business tycoons and tax evaders, those who were responsible for this economic bankruptcy and those who were responsible for the ill-planning and ill-execution, those who are sitting on the Treasury Benches are the persons who should have been taken to task instead of the poor employees in the Government offices. Instead of exercising the big stick on the employees, they should have gone to the root causes.

Therefore, the Government and the Prime Minister and the Home Minister should first concentrate on this basic issue of price rises and unless this is done I am afraid they will have to meet again and again the same kind of problem. No doubt, this time the employees may have been suppressed, but a time would come when the force would become unsuppressible and I do not want Government to allow things to reach that stage.

Again, I would appeal to Government not to rely on their numerical strength here. I appeal to their conscience and to their human tenderness to treat their employees as their own brethren. On an earlier occasion, when the Home Minister was replying to a half-an-hour discussion, he had said that the entire Government was functioning as a family and the Ministers were the heads of the family. I want him to behave as the head of a family with the other members of the family instead of taking them as foes. Because they are not able to fight the enemies who come from outside we find that they are using their strength in fighting those who are their own brethren, namely the employees who are running the Government. Therefore, I appeal again to their conscience to remove all the suspension orders and to take back all the orders of dismissal, to stop other victimisations and to create an atmosphere of normalcy and to continue the dialogue to find a peaceful settlement of this vexed problem.

SHRI R. BARUA (Jorhat): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I was listening with rapt attention to the rhetoric and oratory of Shri Nath Pai. It was very good as far as it went. But then life is something different from rhetoric and oratory.

Our experience in this Parliament is that every session we face a no-confidence motion. In democratic life we are wedded to building up the traditions of democracy and this carries certain responsibilities as well. If constantly we come up with no-confidence motions without realising its implications then the consequences become very serious. For instance, on this occasion as soon as the papers broadcast the news that Parliament would be faced with a no-confidence motion, the attitude of the man in the street was one of cynicism only.

I feel, therefore, that by bringing forward these no-confidence motions, we have gradually allowed a progressive erosion of the democratic traditions of India. Here again, even the sponsors of the motion do realise and admit that it is not possible to topple the Government by this no-confidence motion. I do not say that they should not do it. They should do it. When a no-confidence motion comes up, it means that the Opposition is in a position to project a certain economic policy and a certain political approach whereby they could change the Government. This galvanises the people. We politicians create the impression by these frequent no-confidence motions that we are not very serious about building up democratic traditions but we are interested only in having certain debates. Then, again, in the course of the debate we only indulge in mutually acrimonious exercises. That does not ennoble or raise the standard of democracy which is yet in a very infant state in India. Therefore my first submission is that the very approach was wrong and Shri Masani was perfectly correct when he said that he and his party could not associate themselves with this approach.

श्री रवि राम (पुरी) : उन को अपनी तरफ ले जाइए, मसानी साहब को ।

SHRI R. BARUA : That is not the question. I have great respect for some of the Members of the Opposition, like Shri Joshi who has a dedicated life behind him and who is wedded to democracy. I am just giving vent to my feelings. They are also equally responsible for maintaining the traditions of democracy as we on this side. That is why I am making this appeal to every Member in the Opposition, including the sponsor of the motion, and not in the spirit of just throwing mud and criticizing anybody because of the censure motion.

Then, the argument is put forward that a need-based wage was the reason for the strike, that the Government did not agree to arbitration and so the strike was inevitable. We have a little confusion about a need-based wage and a minimum wage. There is a thing like a minimum wage for which there is a separate Act and that is being followed up. So far as a need-based wage is concerned, it covers a wider range.

The 1957 agreement has been referred to by the hon. Members on the other side and in fact we also believe in it. But what are the components of a need-based wage? It means cereals, other foodgrains, vegetables, eggs, milk, housing and so many other things to give a decent and dignified life. As Shri Panigrahi, just a few minutes ago, pointed out, the condition of the vast majority of the people is such that it is impossible in the present national economy to go in for a need-based wage. The concept or the idea is quite all right; let us strive for it, but in the immediate future it is not possible to give it.

Let us visualise the number of Government employees in India. Today, taking the States they have more than 1,45,00,000 employees if my calculation is correct. If, for instance, the Central Government decides that they will give a need-based wage to its employees, what happens? Give just Rs. 100 extra monthly to these 1,45,00,000 people and see what it costs the exchequer.

Shri Dange gave the argument that in India there are different rates of wages in different sectors and, therefore, there is nothing wrong if we seek a higher wage in a certain segment of the population while we do not consider the others. But once the Central Government employees get this extra, immediately there will be repercussion in the States. If that happens, shall we be in a position to meet it? That is a tremendous responsibility. Just as it is the responsibility of the Central Government to see that their employees are content, it is equally the responsibility of the Government not to create conditions and climate in the States that they just collapse and crumble.

In the recent past we saw how in different States movements were afoot to see that their wages were raised to the level of the Central Government employees. In that case what happened? The State Governments pleaded their inability and wanted the Central Government to subsidise it. It is not possible.

Therefore the need for a need-based wage cannot be conceded at the present state of economy.

[Shri R. Barua]

15.19 HRS.

[SHRI R. D. BHANDARE *in the Chair*].

To create an atmosphere and to go on a strike, to castigate the Government by saying that having accepted it in 1957 they have refused to do this, all these things are not the right perspective.

Then, it is argued that under clause 16 it was arbitrable and should have been referred to arbitration. That has been quoted here. A need-based wage has got a different connotation and a minimum wage has got a different accepted connotation. The pay and allowances and the need-based wage are two different things.

Then, Section 16 is very categorical which says that arbitration shall be limited to pay and allowances. Mr. Dange put forth his argument, when the Government was prepared to refer the case of pay and allowances to arbitration, why not refer the case of need-based wage also to arbitration? My submission is that the need-based wage is not something like pay and allowances. The need-based wage has a wider concept. Therefore, it is wrong to presume that the Government betrayed and rejected this demand.

With regard to the demand of absorption of the dearness allowance with pay, the Government agreed to consider it and to do something and to see what can be done. About other demands also, the Government accepted to consider them except the demand of the need-based wage because the interpretation of pay and the interpretation of the need-based wage is yet to be determined. It is not for the Arbitration Board to determine what should be the connotation of pay and what should be the connotation of need-based wage. *Prima facie*, as it is admitted by every section of the House, the need-based wage has a wider concept than what was visualised in the 1957 Agreement.

My submission is that it is wrong to assume that the Government acted in an arbitrary and irresponsible manner while they refused to refer the demand of the need-based wage to arbitration. It is argued with some vehemence that even if the arbitration awarded something for that

matter, the Government could have rejected it if it was not economically possible and if it went against social justice. But to create such an atmosphere to day in the country is something which is suicidal. This is not the stage at which you create a problem out of this.

Mr. Dange is known for his sarcasm. When the debate becomes monotonous, such a sort of spice and humour is necessary. In his sarcasm, he said that if the trains can run 36 hours late, what would have the Government suffered if they had allowed the strike to go on for 24 hours. It sounds very well. But it carries no sense. In reality, it is not so. In fact, during the last few months, during the last few years, a new trend in the trade union movement has cropped up in India. I do not say about the trade union movement of the Central Government employees. I mean the trade union movement as such of the country. In the recent past we came across cases of sabotage. In West Bengal, a transmission tower was sabotaged and so also, in other sectors, instances of that type we came across. Therefore, when the entire trade movement or the strike was preponderantly guided by political parties, the Government had to take note of all these things. This is a time when the quick movement of food is necessary to distress areas like Orissa, Jalpaiguri and many other places. There is also the question about the movement of other articles. The price question was also raised. Fortunately, for the last two or three months, there has been a tendency of stabilisation of prices. If you create such conditions and the things do not move, there will again be a spurt in the price rise. That would have affected the people. Therefore, taking all these matters into consideration, the Government had no other way but to promulgate the Ordinance. The Ordinance was just an enabling measure to see that in certain sectors the strike is prohibited. Unless that is done, no legal action could have been taken. No doubt, the service conduct rules are there which provide that if a Government employee joins the strike, he is liable to be punished. But the Ordinance was issued in order to create confidence in the minds of people and to tell them that the Government was doing everything to protect the people.

Lastly, I would like to say that I have been able to move about at least in some parts of my State. There is absolutely no cooperation, no support, from the common man except the Government employee. Even the Government employees of the States sector have had no sympathy for the strike. That is a factor which one must take note of. How can you run a movement and get the people into success when the vast majority of your own colleagues in the State sector and the general people do not support? Therefore, it will be completely misleading to the Central Government employees to believe that by such a strike they will be in a position to gain their objective because, after all, one must look to the common man, one must look to the general support of the people. Here is a case which not a single man supported. There were people who said: 'How is it that you are tolerating all this?'. They could not understand that this was, after all, motivated by political parties and not by the government employees. But, all the same, they created a situation in which the common man was against the Central Government employees. That is a very sad point.

Therefore, taking all these factors into consideration, I submit that this motion should not be taken note of and it should be rejected.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai): This motion of censure, I submit, is not like the motions of censure that we had been accustomed to in this House before. This is not an ordinary issue. In the past there have been motions of censure when we found the Opposition parties taking up different issues and even talking at cross purposes, but here is an issue in which barring the Swatantra Party all the Opposition parties are talking with one voice and on one subject. This shows the gravity of the situation and the gravity of the issue with which we are concerned....

SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYYA (Rai-ganj): Then why did you not mention that in the Motion? (*Interruptions*)

AN. HON. MEMBER: This can be considered next time.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Yes; this suggestion will be considered next time.

The main question is this. Why is it that we are moving this motion of no-confidence? This motion of no-confidence is moved because we want to highlight the facts about the strike of the 19th September. The entire attitude of the Government towards the issues that have been raised by the 19th September strike shows in a flash the nature of the Government, the character of the Government, the fact that this Government is a government which indulges in double-talk and which is hypocritically solicitous to the working class and peasants... (*Interruptions*) that this is a Government which serves the interests of big business in this country, a Government which serves the interests of the black-marketeers and tax-dogers. This is the type of Government that we have. I will show how this Government has been indulging in nothing but double-talk on this issue and various other issues.

They say that this is a politically motivated strike. About the strike, I am not going into all the arguments. They have been talked about by so many other people. But I want to point out that it was not the strike that was politically motivated, but it was the conduct of the Government that was politically motivated. Why did they behave in the beastly and brutal manner in which they behaved? They behaved in this way for this simple reason. Here is a Government that has been, during the last 21 years, behaving in a way, pursuing policies in a way, which have brought this country to rack and ruin, that year after year our Finance Minister has to go to America with bended knees and beg for aid. And today, after all these years, you find the country's economy in this sad state of affairs. There is unrest mounting everywhere; different sections of our people are fighting—students, workers, peasants and so on; everywhere there is unrest. If the Central Government employees, by their united strength, compel this Government to concede some of their demands, the Government feels that the other sections of the people would be strengthened in their fight and, therefore, they said: "We are a mighty Government; we have got the C.R.P.; we have got the police and the military and we shall crush you and thereby teach a lesson to the other sections of the people." That is the political motiva-

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

tion with which the Government acted. It is not sweet reasonableness that will have any effect on the Government. Mr. Nath Pai pointed out how reasonable their demands were, how the Government itself was committed to all these things. They know it. They know these things, but yet these did not make any sense to them because they were all determined to follow a particular policy; they want to put the burden of the crisis which is their making on the common man. They said, we will teach these people a lesson so that they will not fight; so that other people will take a lesson. That is the stand which they took.

A simple demand for arbitration was rejected. What are the arguments for it? It is a wonderful argument. Their argument is, how can we give that to you when the conditions of agricultural labourers are such as we find today, whose conditions are so poor. I would ask, what did you do for all these 21 years? What did you do all these years to improve the condition of the agricultural labourers? The only Government that passed a legislation and implemented it in the matter of giving a minimum wage for the agricultural labourers is the Government of Kerala which took that step in 1957. What did you do for all these 21 years? What action did you take so far as the agricultural labour is concerned? Even today, in Tanjore district what is happening? When we are fighting for the increase of just four annas per day for the agricultural labourers, your congress party has been telling the DMK Government, why don't you crush these people, why don't you send the police to suppress them and all that. The Minister of a party which demands the suppression of the agricultural labourers' struggle for an increase of wage talks about the conditions of agricultural labourers. The number of evictions that took place in the ten years of Congress rule in this country has far surpassed the number of evictions that took place during the hundred years of British rule. That is the party which is today talking of the conditions of agricultural labourers, in this country. That is why I say, can hypocrisy go any further? That is why I say, this is a Government of

hypocritical solicitude for the common people. Why don't they go and ask Mr. Birla, you should not take so much profits when the condition of the people is so poor, when people are suffering? Why don't you go and ask the monopoly friends of my hon. friend Mr. Masani? That is why we say, this is a Government of double talk. That they say that the matter is, if not directly, but indirectly before the National Commission of Labour. How can you raise this question? Have you got the guts to tell this to the bosses of the Burmah-Shell Companies and the Caltex Companies? You know that there is already a Commission of Inquiry to go into the question of the surplus in these oil companies. But even before the Commission has reported, Burmah-Shell has already retrenched and Caltex have already retrenched. Have you got the guts, to go and ask them not to retrench? How can you go and ask these foreign people when your policy is a policy of begging from them? When you come to your employees, a different standard is adopted. That is why I say, it is a Government of double-talk, and hypocrisy. What have you done for example in Durgapur? You are talking of destruction of public property. In the strike of the 19th September there is not a single case of destruction of public property. But in Durgapur, the Union, (INTUC), under the guidance of the boss of the congress party in West Bengal, Shri Atulya Ghosh, indulged in the destruction of public property. The Chairman of the Steel corporation himself has publicly stated this and the value of the property destroyed is over rupees one crore. What action did you take then? Again in the case of Shri Biju Patnaik, a former Finance Minister had asked for his prosecution and the entire file is still in the cabinet of the Prime Minister for the last ten years. What have you done in that regard? What action have you taken against such people? That is why I say that this strike has torn as under the democratic pretensions of this Government. It has shown what this Government really is.

They say 'we have no capacity to pay a need-based minimum wage'. 21 years after independence for a government in power to tell the world that they cannot give a living wage, not an adequate

living age but a need-based minimum wage. A Government which proclaims to the world 'we cannot give even that, not only that, the employees have not got the right to demand it, the right even to fight for it', only proclaims its utter bankruptcy and inefficiency. This is what the Government has proclaimed about itself not only here but throughout the world. Does such a Government deserve to exist for a single day ?

SHRI NAMBIAR : No. Get out.

AN HON. MEMBER : Not that way.

SHRI UMANATH : Then you will be kicked out.

SHRI NAMBIAR : The people will give the answer.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : Then they say there has been a bumper crop. They have been talking of holding the price line year after year. Could they hold it? Last year, they came and said 'we do not know what to do with the tremendous quantity of wheat and paddy that has accumulated in the Punjab. We do not know what to do with this problem of plenty'. Previously it was a problem of scarcity. But I ask what has become of the 'wheat revolution'? Where has all that grain gone? Where is the price line today? Have they been able to solve the problem? Day after day prices have been rising. Vanaspati price was raised only very recently. Last year they said we have got a bumper crop of groundnut. But somehow all that has disappeared and vanaspati prices have been increased. Soap prices have been increased. This is the way they have been functioning.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA : (Begu-sarai) : Serving the monopolists.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : Shri Nath Paj asked a pertinent question about subsidy. The subsidy that is being given to Amin Chand Pyarelal and a host of others could be taken away from them and given to the employees. But we know that this is a government of the agents of Amin Chand Pyarelals and others. So how can they take action against them? That is the reality of our situation today. That is why I say that this strike and the way the Government behaved towards it has shown

in no uncertain terms the true colour of this Government, who they really are. This is the way they have reacted to a simple basic demand of the Central Government employees.

Here was a strike which was perfectly legal. Under the law of the land, they had given notice of strike, a notice of 45 days. Government discussed the matter with them. But now they say it is politically motivated.

As far as some of us in the Opposition were concerned, we tried our best through unofficial channels and approached the Prime Minister because we wanted to avoid this strike even at the last minute. We wanted to use our influence and see if some way could not be found to avert it. Even as late as the 17th we made that approach. But what was the answer we received? 'However reasonable you may be, Government today, the Cabinet, has taken a decision not to move an inch. Therefore, we cannot do anything'. What does it show? Who has been motivated by political considerations? Is it we or is it the Government which has been motivated by political considerations, a Government which said 'we will not move an inch; we are determined to show them our might'? This is the real position.

While they adopt this attitude to the employees, what is their attitude to the recommendations of the wage board for newspaper employees. Did they tell the newspaper proprietors, the Tatas and Birlas, that they have to implement the recommendations? They never did that. When they defied even a Wage Board Award, what did you do? After two months the strike was over, but how can the Tatas, Birlas and Singhanias suffer a reduction of profit? Therefore, during the last 1½ months you have given them more newsprint quota than they were entitled to, in order to make up the loss of revenue. This is how this Government is behaving, and then they are preaching all sorts of homilies.

In Goa somebody said that since this is the Gandhiji Centenary year, we must rededicate ourselves to his ideals, and a wonderful debate took place about prohibition. Here is a Government which has in its Ministry a person who goes and

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

complains to the police that bottles of whiskey have been stolen from him, and here is the Prime Minister who has not got the guts to remove him from the Ministry. And you go and preach all sorts of things. That is why I say it is a government of hypocrisy, a government of double talk.

The employees were entitled to go on strike even according to the Constitution and the law, but suddenly six days before the legal strike, you make it illegal by an Ordinance. When Parliament was sitting, you did not take Parliament into confidence, but after Parliament was adjourned, six days before the strike you passed a draconian Ordinance, and say that anybody who disobeys it will be liable to this and that punishment. Despite this Ordinance, the fact is that out of 27 lakhs, nearly 10 lakhs of people struck work, had the courage to defy your law. Is it an ordinary thing? Even in 1921 when Mahatma Gandhi called for triple boycott, I do not think 10 lakhs or even 10,000 Government employees gave up their jobs and came out. I know they will say it is 3½ lakhs and not 10 lakhs, I know how the attendance was marked. But when nearly 10 lakhs Central Government employees went on strike defying your Ordinance, is it not something for the Government to sit up and wake up to the realities of the situation? Any Government would have thought of it that something was wrong when 10 lakhs of its own employees were defying the law, but this Government cannot think of those things, and then they say that in Switzerland and some other places it is banned and all that sort of thing.

Do you know what happened in France? Not one lakh or two lakhs but 9 million workers including Government employees went on strike, went and occupied the Government offices and Government factories. Did that Government behave in the way in which this Government behaved?

I do not want to go into the statistics of the 46,000 people against whom notice was served, but what was the result of it

all? Mr. Shivajirao Deshmukh from the other side said that the Speaker must find some method of punishing Mr. Sondhi for his misbehaviour. Here is a Government that has not got the courage to face a judicial inquiry into the incidents which happened in Indraprastha, and a member of that Party shamelessly comes and talks that action must be taken somebody else for that ghastly tragedy.

Here is a report, not of Sarjoo Prasad, but of the officer who was ordered by the I.G.P. to make a report on the subject. Who is that officer? He is an officer who is himself concerned with the whole thing. This report Mr. Chavan dare not publish. I am reading from this report and I am placing it on the Table of the House authenticating it. I am authenticating it Sir. I am placing* it on the Table of the House. Who are the witnesses he examined.

"I examined 27 witnesses. Their breakup is as follows: officers of the CPWD—11; officers of the Central Board of Revenue—2; Chief Auditor,—Commercial Accounts—1; Sales Tax Officers—16; Journalists—5; Magistrates—2; Police officers—4."

There is not one among the Central Government employees. Why should they be left out? That is the point. This is the objective enquiry that this gentleman conducted. What did he say? Mr. Chavan who was talking of....

SHRI NAMBIAR: Where is Mr. Chavan now? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI UMANATH: He has gone hiding. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I will just read that.

"After hearing the senior officers in 'Y' building I am left with a feeling that more than their injuries what has pained and hurt them is the shock resulting from such an unusual experience. Very little seems to have been done to assuage the feelings of these persons by the officers. Had senior officers who had gone inside the building shown some imagination a large number of senior

accorded the necessary permission, the Table.

*The Speaker not having subsequently paper was not treated as laid on the

officers would have been spared humiliation to which they were subjected."

Common people were beaten and put to this humiliation. That does not worry him. Senior officers have been subjected to humiliation! That is why some sort of action was taken. Even in that report what does he say? It is a report of the Deputy Commissioner. It is a confidential report. It has not been published. What does he say?

"But for some trouble at Sarai Rohilla railway station and looshed, the situation was quite satisfactory throughout Delhi."

Therefore something must be done in such a situation and violence should be resorted to. So they staged Indraprastha Bhavan. What has happened according to him? Let Mr. Shivajirao Deshmukh hear this:

"In the Indraprastha sector of the CPWD staff started collecting in front of the reception hall of the 'Y' building from 9.30 a.m. and in about 45 minutes the number rose to about 250 and some shouting of slogans was also heard."

It is only shouting of slogans, nothing more.

"No perceptible activity was reported from other buildings in that complex. Sometime between 10.15 a.m. and 10.30 a.m. Shri S. C. Pandey, ADM, went to the porch of the 'Y' building and advised the crowd to remain peaceful. This had some effect and there was no untoward incident till about 1 p.m. although some employees continued to congregate in the compound all this time.

At lunch time (1.00 p.m.) when the crowd swelled to about 200 and started raising slogans again, the zone officers ADM Shri M. K. Kaw and Shri Mohinder Singh reached the 'Y' building. On seeing that some of the demonstrators were trying to rush out of the compound they decide to deal with the crowd before the intensity of its demonstration increased and the trouble spread to other offices. The ADM warned the crowd through the public address system that it was an unlawful assembly and must disperse. The shouting of slogans, however, increased. Just then there was a

sound of breaking of glass; and two hand-grenades of tear smoke were fired under the orders of the ADM."

Mind you, no stone was thrown; no untoward incident. But some sound of breaking glass was enough to order fire! Then somebody started stone throwing. Mr. Shivajirao Deshmukh may hear it.

"At about 2.30 p.m. Shri M. L. Sondhi, M.P. arrived at the sector control room and requested the DIG to allow him to address the crowd. He thought that he could pacify the demonstrators. The DIG(R) allowed him to do so. From the control room Shri Sondhi then came to the road running between Indraprastha and Vikas Bhavan and appealed to the miscreants that brick-battling must be stopped immediately. The crowd hailed Shri M. L. Sondhi and stone throwing stopped."

This is his first crime. He should not have stopped it. Then what happened was that he hardly spoke for five minutes when the DIG, SPC and other people came on the spot and then stonethrowing was started. This is the report of no less a person than the officer appointed by them. I understand why Mr. Chavan is afraid of publishing this report. But I do not put much store by this report, because this report was made only for the purpose of finding a scapegoat. The things had become so nauseating that they had to find a scapegoat, and therefore the officer who is concerned directly with it was asked to make a report and he has made somebody a scapegoat. That is why they are today afraid of facing a judicial enquiry because a judicial enquiry will show the real thing, and a judicial enquiry will expose the whole lot of them, the DIG and probably Mr. Chavan himself might be shown as directly responsible for this. A conspiracy has been hatched and they want to hide this. After all, this is their responsibility. It is the CRP who was there. It is the CRP that was responsible for it. And we know what a wonderful force this CRP is. This is what has happened in other places, and in Pathankot and in so many other places. You refuse a judicial enquiry and why? After all, these are workers; but you consider them as dogs; worse than dogs that have to be killed and beaten up. Unless they hear us we have got to teach

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

them and they have done that. That is the sort of fiendish brutality that was let loose upon them. Only in Indraprastha, because some senior officials were beaten up, you have had to come out with some sort of punishment. This is the reality. And this is what happened everywhere.

15.50 HRS.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

This is they type of law and order you wanted to maintain everywhere. The CRP was in Kerala. Four of them have run away with sten guns and joined the dacoits and murderers. This is the wonderful CRP that you have got, and you want to keep the law and order with this force.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ramamurti will kindly conclude now.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: A few minutes more, Sir. I want to point out one thing. This police officer—the officer who investigated—says that the police behaved in unspeakable manner. He does not describe that. Why? According to him this happened because they were not told before, what the objective was, for entering that 'Y' building. If you do not tell them the objective, the police will go and beat all of them down! This is the sort of wonderful police you have got. If you do not tell them what the objective is, they pick up everybody and beat them! That is all their training.

Therefore, there was another State Government that has refused to tell you, it had the courage to tell you, that this is not the way in which law and order has got to be maintained. Law and order must be maintained in a different way by tackling the people. You say, well, this Government is incapable of keeping law and order and you are threatening that Government but it is not afraid of your threats. Neither are we afraid of your threats.

Therefore, what I want to say finally is only this. Even now at least, let this Government wake up and change its policies. I am not asking for mercy. I do not agree that there has been any question of generosity on the part of the Government. Where is the question of genero-

sity? Just for a simple one day's token strike, you have sent out 46,000 people; this is a question of victimisation, you are telling the private employers, "you may also victimise and we are here with you." Nothing more than that. Where is the question of generosity in this matter? It is not a question of generosity. I know as a matter of fact that some of your departments, the legal department itself, had questioned the legality of this and of these dismissals. They were not sure that these dismissals would have been upheld by the Supreme Court as has been seen in the judgment of the Supreme Court in an earlier case. Therefore, it is not a question of generosity. There is no other way. Because the Government's name was stinking in the nostrils in the entire country which was shocked by this mass dismissal, you retreated at bit. But there cannot be any distinction between the people who went on strike and those who asked them to go on strike. This is perfectly a legal strike. They were fighting for their just demands; according to the Government of India's own publication, if you do not have the means to give them, it is your fault. Even Mr. Masani had to say that it cannot be given because the Government's policy has brought the country to ruin. Whose is the responsibility for this state of affairs? Surely not that of the employees.

You say you have withdraw a recognition. What does it matter? What is recognition after all? Is it a favour to be bestowed? It is the fundamental basis of collective bargaining. No civilised Government can say 'we do not agree to collective bargaining, and collective bargaining cannot be carried out with unrepresentative unions, with mushroom unions'. No union can get a representative character because Mr. Chavan or somebody else in the Ministry says "I recognise it" and so on. A representative union must represent the mass of the workers and employees. Your withdrawal of recognition is only an uncivilised behaviour, to say the least. At least now let the Government wake up to the realities of the situation. You may be able to suppress strikes for sometime. But today that fear complex is not there among the Central Government employees and other people, because the conditions are such. They are not

created by the employees, but by the Government and its policies. Today the spirit of revolt is spreading day after day through section after section. The spirit of revolt can be curbed not by repressive measures. Repression has never curbed that spirit. It can only be curbed by removing the fundamental causes that give rise to it.

I would again request the Government of India to do some rethinking and see the writing on the wall, 10 lakhs of employees of the Central Government have defied your law and gone on strike. See the writing on the wall and realise what it means. This kind of repression is going to lead nowhere and more revolt in section after section will take place. Nothing can stop it. Even now, I ask the Government to withdraw forthwith all the cases of victimisation, withdraw the suspension notices served on 8,000 people and odd, withdraw the cases instituted against them, immediately rescind the orders terminating the services of the employees, immediately cancel the order of derecognition of unions and behave in a civilised manner, not in a brutal and fiendish manner. Let them behave as any civilised normal Government would behave dealing with the employees through representative organisations and not through stooge organisations which represent nobody.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : Sir, the question of the strike by Government employees is a very important question. I find there is no effort to analyse the situation. The Congress says that the opposition party is motivated politically. The opposition party can say that the Congress is motivated politically and they will support everything that the Government does. This cannot lead us anywhere. Let us understand the history of strikes.

We were told by Mr. Dange how by strike labourers were able to get justice. I would only add one thing. It was not only strike but also democracy which gave labourers the vote. Wherever that vote has been denied to the people, wherever there is dictatorship, there is no right of strike. Right of strike goes with democracy. It is not a right that goes with auto-cracy, by whatever name it may be called. Dictatorships have no place for strikes.

16 Hrs.

This strike has now spread to the white-collared workers in the Government. One day before the strike, I happened to be at Shri Nath Pai's house and some labour leaders collected there. I wanted to know what would happen if there was to be a strike. I said : "Supposing a train is at a particular spot in the morning, would the driver and the guard leave the train where it was?" They said : "Yes". If that is so, then I think it is a great injustice, not to the Government but to the people. I told them : "Will any Minister lose his sleep if the train is detained in an uninhabitable place?" They said "No." I said : "Who would lose his pay packet at the end of the month? Will the Minister lose it?" They said : "No." Then I said : "Who would lose that?" I said the people who strike would lose and their families would lose. It is not like labourers' strike in a mill or a factory. If there is a strike in a mill and if it continues, the mill-owner would go in liquidation. He would therefore come to a compromise with labour.

I would very humbly ask my friends to make difference between a strike in a mill and a factory and a strike in Government offices. You know that how the State is organised through the Government. Government is organised through the administration. If the people who have the responsibility of carrying on the administration themselves go on strike, it is not justified; some other methods will have to be found to avoid a strike.

I have no great love for this Government—remember that, Sir. I am only analysing the situation. After all, if there is disorganisation in Government, there will be confusion and chaos everywhere. Today it is only the lower employees or non-gazetted employees who go on strike. Tomorrow the Police may go on strike. Day-after-tomorrow it may be the Army. What shall we do if we are in that condition? It is really a delicate matter; we have to take counsel with each other and find ways and means by which such a strike, which will disorganise the Government can be avoided. It will be harmful to the people also. Wherefrom the funds will come to meet the demands of strikers? Will they come from China or from Russia? They will have to come from Indian people. And you are hitting at the very people from who you want help.

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

The employees may require much more help than the labourers. The labourers have more funds than the employees. Having not been properly organised, the whole burden will either fall upon the people and on those who go on strike and their families. I submit therefore that in this case we must be very careful. We have to take note of another thing also. When a labourer strikes, what happens? His wife and his grown-up children may be working and earning. That is not the case with white-collared employees. They have to pay at the end of the month so many bills. Someone's children may be in College; someone else's children may be in a school. They have to pay their fees; they have to pay to the grocers. They have to pay for the electricity. They have to pay the rest. They have also have to pay instalments for their insurance. On the 30th or 1st of every month they must get their pay packets and then alone all these expenses can be met. Now, take for example strike in the Press. Some pressmen had to sell, whatever they had, in order to maintain themselves. So, I submit that when we ask the government servants to go on strike, it is very dangerous.

Then, most of these employees come from cities. The labourer comes from the village. In the village his family has a plot of land. If the worse comes to the worst, he can go to the village and fall back on his land. This course is not open to the white-collared employee. Then, there is another consideration which must weigh with those who go on strike and those who encourage them to go on strike. It is not the political leaders who suffer. No political leader who engineered this strike has received a lathi blow. It is these poor people who are made to suffer. So, we have to be careful about asking the white-collared employees to go on a strike.

It may be that some parties think that a strike is a gymnastics for the revolution. Let me tell them that there is going to be no revolution on the hustings or on the barricades in India. We have a population which, however much you may tyrannize, will never rise. We have suppressed them so hard for so many centuries that we have made them even untouchables. Even the

untouchables did not rise for centuries. During the war three million people died in the streets of Calcutta. And the shops were full of eatables and the godowns were full of grains and yet these dying people did not raise a finger in order to save themselves. If they had robbed a shop they would have at most gone to jail and saved themselves, because, in jail they would have got food. Then we have the example when the Communist's asked the people after independence to take the land of the zamindars in Telengana. What happened? Who suffered? Not those who had given the call that the land of the landlords be taken over but the poor people. I know how the rebellion was put down. I know also what has happened in Naxalbari. The leaders are safe. They have nothing to lose but the poor people are the losers. So, if you want a gymnastics for a revolution, let me tell you that in these days there cannot be any revolution, because, even the smallest government has power of repression which it never had before. Earlier the people and the government had the same instruments for fighting. So, it was a question of numbers. There can be no revolution unless the army rebels and when the army rebels it is not the Communist Party that will come in power but the army will come in power as in Pakistan. Let nobody think that this gymnastic is going to pay. It is not going to produce a revolution. We must understand all these things before we encourage government employees to go on a strike.

I remember there was a strike of government employees in Uttar Pradesh, for three months. I sometimes went to Lucknow and found everything was all right; there was no dislocation of work. Because these employees do not work at all.

AN. HON. MEMBER : Beautiful !

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Only, there was greater cleanliness and more quiet in the Secretariat. But this was a provincial government where nobody cares; things happen at leisure. The correspondence with Government sometimes taken six months to be disposed of. How does it matter, three months' strike? Sometimes letters disappear; sometimes files disappear. Who cares? The world goes on.

I remember a little story and if you do not mind, Sir, I will relate it to this House. A German came here and went home. People back home asked, "What did you see in India?" He said, "I learnt to believe in God. I never believed before in God. I believed in myself and in my efforts to get the things I wanted, but there in India I saw that nobody cares for anything; nobody is responsible. The Government is irresponsible; what happens nobody cares." Then how do the trains run; may be, sometimes trains are running late but trains do run; how do aeroplanes go on; they go on though they may be going on irregularly. So, he said, "I started believing in God because God must be regulating them. I met no *sadhus* or *sannyasins*. I did not go to a yogi but I learnt from what happens in India that there must be a God of airs conducting in India." This is the country where we are living!

We must also remember that there is an atmosphere for strikes. A strike is like non-cooperation, satyagraha. This country is full of violence today. Every careful leader of labour or of employees will have to see whether there is an atmosphere of violence. If there is an atmosphere of violence, the Government can come down with its superior violence and suppress the people. If that suppression goes on, labour will not be encouraged but will be demoralised.

I remember, there was a strike in 1960 and some of the PSP leaders were involved in it. I was not in India. I was then in the PSP. When I came I said, "You have done something which you ought not to have done, because the employees cannot stand the rigours of the strike as the labourers can stand." The strike fizzled out in three days. Jawaharlal Nehru was a kindly man. He said that there would be no victimisation. I told my friends, "If there is victimisation, you will not be able to help those who are victimised." An officer, who has some grouse against a subordinate, will simply make the strike as an excuse for taking action against him. Even the ministers, if they want to save the strikers, cannot save them from victimisation. Therefore one has got to be very careful.

It is said that the police committed excesses; 'when have the police not committed excesses? When have they not replied brickbats with bullets? This police has been trained under imperial traditions and those traditions have not yet gone. They think, they are the masters of the land as the administrators think that they are the masters of the land. They do not care even for a minister. The police will simply attack and when they do so as if they are hunters. As the hunter does not care what is happening to the poor animal, these people,—I have seen them—when they begin to attack, they are like hunters. It is a game for them. Shall we give such a police an opportunity to behave thus? I would also say that this Government makes promises in order to get out of an awkward situation and, when the situation worsens, they go back upon their promises. Why did they say that the complaints of the Government employees would be referred to arbitration? There was some difficulty at one time and they wanted to get over it. They live from hand to mouth. The Government has no policy. They could have straightway told the employees that they cannot afford to have strikes in Government because from the Civil employee, strikes may spread to the police and then the army. Where will the country go? Many countries do not allow their employees to go on strike. They are allowed to combine; they are allowed to form unions but for cooperative purposes and for representing their grievances. They do not allow them to go on strike. It may be that in an aberration the French employees did what our communist friends told us. But that is one example against hundreds of examples where the employees of the Government did not go on strike.

We have got to view this question carefully not only from the point of view of the Government but from the point of view of the employees themselves. Nobody can save the employees who have gone on strike. Mr. Chavan might withdraw the cases and he might re-employ the temporary employees whose services have been terminated. But this administration of ours, the officers, will take vengeance upon them. You cannot save them.

I say and everybody says that the police went beyond their powers and they com-

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

mitted cruel excesses which were not necessary. I feel that even the Ordinance was not necessary. This strike could have been avoided. If it was not avoided, the arm of the law of the land was long enough to put down any violence that might have taken place. It was wrong to issue the Ordinance. It was wrong of the employees to go on strike when Parliament was not in session. If Parliament had been in session, we would have brought pressure upon the Home Minister, we would have brought pressure upon the Prime Minister and we would have brought pressure upon the employees and this strike could have been avoided. I say that those who advised the employees to go on strike when Parliament was not in session took a strategically wrong step. It is admitted that on the part of the Government there have been excesses and on the side of the employees, I consider, the strike was unjustified because, I feel, if this fever spreads, it may go into the army. Let us now cry halt. I would say that both the parties have done something that is wrong and let these wrongs cancel each other and let us have the *status quo* as was obtaining before this strike took place.

I would request the Government to see that there is no victimisation. I cannot say what the administrators will do. But I hope they will also play the game. Let us now start with a clean slate. Let us know whether the employees can go on strike or not. The employees organise the Government and the Government organise the State. If those who are to regulate the State themselves go on strike, then we are in a bad way. Let this bad chapter be closed and we begin with a new chapter of cooperation, of good understanding, of no victimisation and things proceed as they should.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO (Kakinada) : It was listening to the harangue of my friend, Mr. Ramamurti, on avoiding double-talk, on the right conduct in public life, on saying one thing and doing the same thing and so on. He has started preaching to the whole world as if there is no double-talk on the part of the Communist Party of India. Has he not approved of the Chinese way of Communism? Has he not approved of all that had happened in Naxalbari, West Bengal, and all other places? Today

even now when we talk to him, he stands by all those things. This is the technique of the Communist Parties of India, both Right and Left, to create trouble wherever it is possible. (Interruptions). They indulge in double-talk, their is the hypocritical behaviour. They profess democracy in order to find a way into the legislatures and wreck the democracy. (Interruptions) We know their policies; their policies are well defined; their ideologies are well known to the whole world; they have an admiration for China; that will remain undying till the end of their lives. What are they talking here? (Interruptions) They have the tactics of shouting down by creating noise when something inconvenient to them is said. I have been trying to understand the attitude of the Government of India in this matter. (Interruptions) Some of their fellow-travellers are making an attempt to imitate the other parties. (Interruptions). The real parties that matter are the Left and Right Communist Parties and the SSP which is trying to merge its identity with other parties. These are the parties that pose a danger to the peace and prosperity of this country. What have they done in Naxalbari? What have they done in West Bengal? What they are doing in Kerala today is an example of their behaviour. (Interruptions). Here are the documents containing the speech of Mr. Dange. He said on the floor of the House that there would be thousand and one gheraos and bundhs in this country and that the problems should be settled on the streets of cities and villages. Recently they have passed a Resolution that they do not eschew violence. (Interruptions)

SHRI UMANATH : What about the violence in Indraprastha ?

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO : They have infiltrated into every section of the trade union movement. Now they are trying their hands at white-collar services, at the government servants. I may tell you that I warned the Home Minister and the Defence Minister of the amount of loose-talk that goes on in the messes of the junior military officers; they abuse the Indian leaders, they abuse everybody and everything except the communist countries. This is the state of affairs. I think, the Home Minister has got advance information of the plan that they are having. As was said, this exercise of one day's strike is an exercise or rehearsal for a prolonged strike...

(Interruptions) They have misled the people; they have got them into trouble; they drowned the people in the tank while they were sitting on the bund, and now they have come to create an impression that they are trying to save them. I have seen the people who have suffered on account of the strike. In my own home-town, there were ten persons from the Posts & Telegraphs Department whom I knew before. Excepting one or two of them who are communists, all others said that they were misled by those elements that they had no idea of joining the strike but were intimidated to join the strike. There are old women, whose sons are in employment in long distances, and they were staying in their homes and waiting for the money order on the first or the second or the third of the month and they could not get the money order. They were in great difficulties. (Interruption). It is the responsibility of the Government to safeguard the integrity of this country. When the Telegraph and Telecommunication people strike, all communications are dislocated and destroyed. The army will be immobilised and it cannot move to the places where it is required. This is one of the tactics of the communists to paralyse the country. In such contingency, they would not hesitate to hand over the country to China. Are you going to have this? Do you want this to happen? I want to make a constructive suggestion. Greater attention should be given by the Government to the needs of their employees in respect of housing, in respect of emoluments and other facilities.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to an article written by an experienced trade unionist, Mr. B Shiva Rao who has given a very constructive suggestion with regard to various things, and the Government can consider it. Mr. Chavan has got a proper appraisal of the situation in the country and he has taken proper steps to deal with it. We need not be afraid of the double talk indulged in by the hon. friends on the opposite side. Thank you. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Dandekar.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : His speech should be circulated to hon. Members...

SHRI NAMBIAR... and also to Mr. Dharma Teja and his wife who are honey-

moonings abroad in South America. (Interruptions).

SHRI N. DANDEKER : (Jamnagar) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, just as we had feared, the Debate on this motion has degenerated into a set of intolerant speeches... (Interruption).

MR. SPEAKER : Order please. Let us hear him.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : Mr. Speaker. Sir, just as we had feared, the debate on this motion has degenerated into a set of intolerant speeches, concerning a very serious matter... (Interruption).

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : I hope these gentlemen on my left will show us the same indulgence that we extended to their leaders when they spoke. Now, Sir, the debate, as I said, has descended into a most intemperate kind of discussion concerning matters of very grave import, namely, the central government employees' strike, call it a token strike, or a substantive strike, or whatever it was supposed to be. Both for the Government as well as for those who went on strike as well as for the public too, it was an extremely serious matter. But unfortunately the debate, as it has proceeded, has taken a turn which was most unfortunate. On the other hand it has been sometimes raised to a level, as was done by Acharya Kripalani to whose speech one listened with rapt attention. By the mere choice of a "one-line" motion to censure Government, it has also enabled some speakers on the government side to resort to cheap jibes at the Opposition Parties by saying that there was nothing else they could find to censure Government with. It has also enabled some speakers, particularly on this side of the House, to obscure the issues, sometimes relating to the strike itself, or to side-track the problem by debates relating to the need-based wage and matters of that kind.

I must, therefore, begin by reiterating our position on my side. In the first place, we maintain—and we have said this over and over again—that strikes by public servants, as distinguished from strikes by those employed by government in their industrial undertakings—are altogether impermissible... (Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER : Hey Sheo Narain! (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : Will the hon. Member resume his seat? Someone shouted 'Hey Sheo Narain'. Let them settle it between themselves first! Someone has shouted as if it is a market place. This is the Parliament of the country. I expect hon. Members to behave better. Sometimes it is all right. But frequently resorted to, it becomes indecent. May I request all to observe dignity? I was listening to the speech of Shri Ramamurti before coming here and while being here and I saw that it was heard with great respect and patience. Here is the Secretary of the largest Opposition Party and Deputy Leader of the Party speaking, and speaking for the Opposition. It is not just Shri Thirumala Rao who is speaking now (*Interruptions*). It is not as if some member is speaking from the Congress Benches. If that was so, I could understand (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : Shri Thirumala Rao is our Deputy Leader.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN (Basti) : Do not be so cheap about our leader. If you give me ten minutes, I will pay him back in the same coin.

MR. SPEAKER : In the case of the Deputy Leader of the Congress Party, the ruling Party. I can understand. But they are not allowing one of their own Opposition Party leaders to speak.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : His is a subsidiary of the ruling party. It is isolated.

MR. SPEAKER : They are the biggest Opposition Party in the House, 45 strong. Whether they are isolated or the hon. Member and his party is isolated, is not my business.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : They go to Rajasthan with Bengal's money and fight elections (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : They have 45 members here and they have all come elected.

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK : Can the hon. Member make remarks like this? He may have got elected with Chinese money or Communist money. He does not represent the people. He has no faith in this

Parliament. He does not know how to behave (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON (Ernakulam) : Who the hell is he to shout like this? (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : All the hon. Members of this House are elected. Nobody is nominated or something like that. All are elected by the people from different corners, whether it is Rajasthan, Punjab or Bengal or Naxalbari or anywhere else. Therefore, let us not belittle one another.

SHRI HEM BARUA : Why Naxalbari?

MR. SPEAKER : That is also one section of view, whether he likes it or not. I would appeal to all to observe restraint.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : I would like to begin by briefly restating my party's position in this matter. Firstly and quite clearly, strikes by public servants, as distinguished from strikes by workmen in the industrial employment of Government, are, we think, entirely impermissible. They do no good to the employees themselves. They hold the entire government to ransom, and what is worse, they completely disorganise the entire civil life of the population. I think in this connection Acharya Kripalani was very graphic. But I would merely mention the dimensions of the problem. Something like 2½ million employees, had they all gone on strike, would have held up the life and labours and all that goes with it of 500 million people of this country. It is not permissible. We cannot allow half a per cent of the population to hold the Government to ransom or the public to ransom until the Government pays the forfeit they demand.

Precisely for that reason, our position, secondly, is this, that it is essential that in the organisation of Government and its relations with its own employees, there must be compulsory procedures for the settlement of disputes. We cannot have this thing going on and on and on: employees making demands, a considerable part of them perfectly legitimate; Government going on negotiating with them, nobody knowing exactly where they are, and Government then declaring that they have the final word on the subject. There is urgent need that there must be made available proce-

dures of a compulsory kind, the results of which would be binding both on the Government and on the employees.

Thirdly, Sir, we cannot in any event countenance, regardless of whether the strike was proper or whether it was improper, whether the Government was right etc.—regardless of all these considerations we cannot possibly countenance excesses in the enforcement of law and order such as were committed in Delhi and other places, just as we have refused to countenance the total inactivity by the police in States like West Bengal last year, and in Kerala during the course of the last year and this year. (*Interruptions*). The police have a duty to perform; and that duty they must perform and should not refrain from performing; and that duty they must perform without resort to excesses. It is a difficult and often unpleasant duty. I will not say that sometimes a little excess here or there would not happen. But the kind of happenings, of which there have been a great many graphic descriptions here,—the kind of happenings at Indraprastha Estate, the kind of happenings in Pathankot, Bikaner and elsewhere—are not the sort of excess that anybody with any decent sense of values can possibly tolerate.

Having said that, let me turn to matters of some importance. Let us attach some importance to the merits of the problem at issue instead of showing a good deal of mere heat or sentimental emotionalism or partisanship about all this. Turning, as I said, to some points of importance that were raised during the debate, I would like, first of all to commend what Mr. Nath Pai said about the importance to be attached to the institutions of Government themselves. Refusing to the matter of procedure, to which I also referred, I would like to emphasise the importance which Mr. Nath Pai attached to what is called the Whitley Council procedure. The Whitley Council procedure has worked admirably abroad. There is no reason why this should not work equally well here, provided the appropriate temper and the willingness to compromise were present on both sides. I say *both* sides because I am aware of the complaint which Mr. Nath Pai was making that there is a certain temper still, though not very much, among officials that they are

not prepared to compromise, that they are not prepared to come with the right temper to these negotiations. But equally I may say that the attitude, as far as I can make out, of those who were negotiating for the workers,—not of the workers or employees themselves, but of those negotiating for them, was also utterly uncompromising. But what I wish to emphasise is the importance of the point made by Mr. Nath Pai that whatever the procedure,—if it is Whitley Council, let us have Whitley Council; if it is adjudication, let us have adjudication; if it is arbitration; let us have arbitration;—but the approach to these matters in regard to their substance as well as the temper with which one approaches them is of the greatest importance; and I would, therefore, suggest that there is a good deal in what he said that is worth noting by Government. Then, Sir, Mr. S. M. Joshi described very graphically the course of events that eventually culminated in what is described as a token strike. I do not know whether the account that he gave us in detail was accurate; but I would certainly say it was very plausible. I think there is a responsibility cast on the Home Minister when he replies to clear the air in respect of those matters.

Some points of substance were also raised in Mr. Joshi's speech to which I must briefly refer. He said, and many others said, that it was a "token strike." A token strike, I could have understood, if only some odd civilian offices here and there were chosen deliberately for the expression of a token hostility or antipathy, whatever you may like, to the decision of the Government. But what kind of a token strike was this? Was this not a strike extending to the railways, a strike extending to the vital communications, a strike that was known to be extending to all systems of communications and transport vital to the life of this country, vital in carrying on the day-to-day business of the people vital to the defence of the country? I am *not* prepared to accept that kind of strike as a "token strike." I am, therefore, not prepared to criticise the Government for refusing to accept it as a token strike. I think when strikes by public servants extend to the life-lines, to means of communications and transport, they are nothing else but dress rehearsals for many worse things to

[Shri N. Dandekar]

follow. Indeed if the Government had not refused to regard this as a token strike and had taken it lightly, they would not be deserving of the right to govern, because they may not take risks of that kind when it looked like a dress rehearsal for a major operation.

Secondly, Mr. Joshi asked : was it necessary to declare by Ordinance this exercise as illegal ? It has been argued and I know this is correct because I was myself a public servant once, that there exist Rules of conduct whereby going on a strike or persuading anybody to go on a strike are matters in respect of which disciplinary action could be taken by the Government against its employees. But this was not a question of taking disciplinary action here and there. This was a case of a deliberate, —so far as the Government could make out, a deliberate, calculated and well thought out attempt to put the whole country and also the machinery of Government out of operation. Indeed even if you accepted it that it was a token strike, to put everything out of operation for only 24 hours. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI NAMBIAR : Why not arbitration ? It is said that it was a calculated attempt. It was calculated because they did not want arbitration.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : Even in those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I again have no doubt whatever that the Government had necessarily to provide itself with the appropriate preventive machinery to deal with the matter.

SHRI NAMBIAR : They had done it. It is their responsibility.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : The third point that was made by Mr. Joshi was whether this strike was popular ? Popular in the sense, whether a majority of the Government servants, or the public as a whole, were for it or against it. I do not know how all the public servants felt about the matter. But I have had the opportunity of speaking to a large number of public servants about the strike; that was when the strike was threatened. And they were all terribly anxious; and they were all hoping that there would be no strike. I have no doubt whatsoever. *(Interruptions)*

that for a large majority of them it was not going to be a popular exercise. The word 'popular' to me means also how the public at large viewed this transaction. What was the public view on this matter? I have not met anywhere any responsible or ordinary members of the public any common man, ordinary men or business men, who thought that this was a nice thing to do, that this was the only thing left for the public servants to do. I would like to go on record that this was not a popular strike so far as the public were concerned.

SHRI NAMBIAR : Which strike did you support in your life?

SHRI N. DANDEKER : Finally, about the police excesses, various reports have been read. Mr. Masani read from certain reports. I have with me a report made by the District Magistrate here as well as by a former judge, Mr. Sarju Prasad. I am accustomed to reading official documents with a good deal of calm imperturbability. And I cannot help feeling that here there is a matter which undoubtedly requires a very careful judicial enquiry, because the degree of excesses the kind of excesses, the absence of any necessity for any excesses of that kind,—all that sort of thing,—make it perfectly clear to me that in a situation like this where a large number of public servants are involved and where excesses of this kind against them are involved, there is no doubt about it that there has to be, and should be, a judicial enquiry. Only a judicial enquiry will bring out what the matter was and where it now stands.

Now, sir, within the few minutes left to me, I will turn to some more fundamental points that were made so ably, that were made with such persuasive eloquence though not with a great deal of validity of argument, by my friend Mr. Dange. I listened with great respect to his speech yesterday, when he expanded this concept of the need-based wage and also the question of the capacity to pay.

If the House will have some patience with me, I would like to devote very briefly, a few minutes, to these concepts like the minimum wage, the fair wage, a living wage and the need-based wage. It was in 1949 when a Committee called the Committee on Fair Wages reported upon this very difficult problem of appropriate wage levels.

They said there was such a thing as "minimum wage" below which the wages must in no circumstances be allowed to fall; and in case an employer could not pay a minimum wage, he had no right, no business,—he may work by himself if he liked,—but no right to employ any person who may get a wage which was less than the minimum wage that one should pay. Then there was concept of the "living wage" that enabled a person and his family to live decently. Let me put it in its extreme simplicity; it is simply this : a living wage is a wage that will enable an ordinary family to live with some decency as to the day-to-day living with some assurance against the hardships of life and so on. And they say that in between these two,—the minimum wage and the living wage—there should be a wage level called the "fair wage" for which you should strive to work; that one could work on a fair wage. They said that all the exercises in wage determination must be concerned with assuring the employees that they do not fall below a minimum wage; and if possible they should try and raise them to the level of the living wage; and somewhere in between there should be a level of which one could say it was a fair wage, having one regard to the numerous requirements such as the capacity of the particular unit to pay and having regard to productivity, profitability and so on. There is a whole list about these determinants six to seven determining factors which they said would have to be taken into account in determining the fair wage.

Then in 1957, there was evolved a concept, not just a minimum wage, but of a minimum need-based wage, a very useful concept. I will not go into the details of it. The details have been often narrated and frequently debated. But there is also one *proviso* to it which says that for anyone who is unable to pay a minimum need-based wage, the burden is on *him* to establish why he cannot pay the minimum need-based wage. I do not think anybody here would quarrel with that concept as a concept. You may have difficulties about the details of computing the minimum need-based wage. The minimum need based wage may vary from place to place, from region to region, and from time to time. But the concept that there is such a thing as the minimum need-based wage below which if possible we should not go; and

that if you do go below that the burden is on you to justify doing so, is not a concept with which we can quarrel. What Mr. Dange pointed out was that article 43 of the Constitution not only requires a minimum need-based wage to be paid but the effort of the policy should be to strive and strive hard in the direction of a living wage which, as I said, is at a higher level still.

Having said that, Mr. Dange went further and this is where I being to say that his case was invalid. In the first place, the Minimum Wage Body—the 15th Labour Conference as a matter of fact,—was expressly concerned with wage levels in industry; and here I make no distinction, between industrial employees of the Government and the industrial employees in the private sector.

They are all industrial employees. There is no reason why there should be separate yardsticks for the two. But expressly those concepts were applicable to industrial labour, not to Government employees. Secondly, at the earliest opportunity—I think it was before the Second Pay Commission—when a clarification was sought from Government as to whether they have accepted this and whether it applied to Government employees in general, Government quickly reacted and said, "no." At the same time, having said this and because I would like to put the record straight, I must add that Government have never accepted that they were bound by it even for their industrial employees.

But I say that Government ought to be striving towards it. Mr. Kripalani made an important point that these white-collared workers in Government service are far more severely ground between the nether stone of rising prices and the upper stone of increasing indirect taxes; and they have no supplementary income. The ordinary industrial worker has the good fortune of having a wife who perhaps earns a little; and may be also a grown-up son to assist him. But the white-collared workers have suffered increasingly for the last 15 years. Thanks to the utterly misguided and fundamentally wrong economic policies of Government and the utterly fantastic and extravagant expenditure of Government, like indulging in vast public sector enterprises with no money, it has not been possible for

[Shri N. Dandeker]

Government to finance these extravagancies except by measures which have brought about, on the one hand, rising prices and, on the other, increasing indirect taxes, with the result that these poor people, the white-collared brigade, have been the worst sufferers. Therefore, it is not enough for Government to say that they do not accept his particular concept of the need-based wage that they will do what we can, but they will not allow anybody to go into this question as to what should be the need-based wage at Madras, Delhi, Calcutta or Timbuctoo. The Government cannot claim that it is for them to go into this question at leisure and see how best they can strive towards it. I say it is their duty to assure their employees that that is their objective. The extravagancies of Government not only have been, but continue to be, so great and the cost of living so high that today even if an increase of a mere Rs. 5 was to be given in the pay of every employee of the Central Government, the State Government and the municipal and local governments, the bill would be of the order of Rs. 70 to 75 crores. When I say this, there come to my mind those moonbeams of lighter lunacies that were exhibited at Goa, the most dazzling of them being the undertaking of Mr. Morarji Desai that he would pay 50 per cent of the cost of indulging in the stupid exercise of enforcing prohibition in seven years' time. The Prime Minister, who was present, did not contradict him. A quick calculation shows that it would cost something like Rs. 135 crores. If Government has got that kind of money to throw away, I am not prepared to listen from them the story that they cannot pay, no more than I would be prepared to listen to a similar story from an industrialist. If I looked at his income and expenditure and if he said he could not pay a need-based minimum wage but had money to indulge in extravagant fads, I would ask him ten thousand questions before I accept it. I am not saying this theoretically. I had the good fortune to appear before the wage board for the cement industry in 1958. I told them the workers were entitled to receive a need-based wage, but as these gentlemen were also looking into our accounts, I also satisfied them that we cannot afford it. So I said to them; you make up your mind and if we have to pay, it must come

from a rise in the price of cement, i.e. the consumer has to pay. But we did not say that we would not pay. But what this Government says is : we will continue with our stupid policy of extravagance; we will undertake to make good 50 per cent of the loss put to enforcement of prohibition; but we cannot afford to pay a need-based wage. The Prime Minister was present and I must assume that this statement was made with her prior approval because she did not contradict it despite its being such an important matter.

If there is that sort of money available and if the State Governments can also afford to bear the remaining 50 per cent of the loss on prohibition, that is to say, if something of the order of Rs. 250 to 300 crores can be cheerfully drained away for this exercise in futility called prohibition, then, I am not prepared to accept the Government's case that they cannot pay a need-based wage to its employees. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : Now you must conclude.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : Now, Sir, I want to come to a close. As I said, it is unfortunate that this censure motion should have degenerated as it did into debate on such a serious subject at such a low level. As stated by Acharya Kripalani a strike by public servants is not permissible; and it could not be accepted even if all that they insisted upon was a machinery for the settlement of a dispute. Let there be no doubt about it. Mr. Dange was right only to the extent that he urged that when the need-based minimum wage has been accepted as a principle by Government for industrial workers, there was no reason why it was unacceptable as a concept equally valid for Government servants. If there was no capacity to pay, I can quite understand that, for it only means it will take time to reach that objective. If there was no capacity to pay these people Rs. 15 or 10 or even 5 extra per month, I can understand that too. But if there is capacity to drain down Rs. 250 to 300 crores per annum for prohibition, then I am bound to say that the Government's case is not only invalid but also dishonest.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have gone through this debate for the last practically two days. And, Sir, I

would like to confine myself to certain arguments that have been advanced and I do not want to say something which possibly might add to the bitterness that has been created by certain speeches here.

I would, certainly, as I said, deal with certain specific issues that were raised here. Unfortunately, the debate started here in a rambling way. But, I must thank Mr Nath Pai this morning when he tried to raise the issue to a certain relevant plane. And he tried to formulate certain issues on the basis of which this entire question can be examined. Therefore, Sir, I propose to take up the same issues that he has raised. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: What about Indraprastha incident? Why not you take up this first? I have not received any reply from our Prime Minister (*Interruptions*).

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The issues framed by Mr. Nath Pai include Indraprastha also. I would certainly cover this issue. But, I am not sure whether I will be able to convince my hon. friend, Shri Sondhi. I shall certainly have my say about it.

Sir, the first issue that was raised was this. 'What was the strike all about?' This was, really speaking, a question that I was asking myself. Throughout the last couple of months 'what is the strike all about?' Was a question I was asking myself Shri Nath Pai himself went into the history of the strikes of the Government employees in the last twenty years. He mentioned about the strike of 1946; the strike of 1951 and then 1957, 1960 and 1968. And he made a general remark that history is repeating itself. Yes, I myself say that history is repeating itself in one sense, namely, that the leaders of the government employees, rightly or wrongly, persisted in advising the workers to go on strike. During the last 20 years government's approach to this problem of the government employees has shown a definite change.

17.00 HRS.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Zero.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: If the hon. Member sees zero everywhere I cannot help it. But, really speaking, if we see 1946, 1951, 1957, 1960 and 1968 there has been a gradual positive approach that the gov-

ernment has tried to show to this issue... ..(*interruptions*).

श्री: जाजं करनेकीछ (बम्बई-दक्षिण) :

5 से 14 आदमी जान से मारे गये । 1960 में 5 आदमी गोली से मारे गये थे, अब की बार 14 मारे गये हैं ।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Somebody said this government has not shown any willingness to discuss this matter and we were given the example of Prime Minister Nehru. We always tried to follow him. But may I tell them that in 1960 when Prime Minister Nehru tried his level best to the last minute to avert the strike these very leaders did not listen to him and ultimately misled the workers to go on strike.

Really speaking, what was the issue of the strike? The main question that has been argued for the last 20 years is, if we come back to the crux of it, whether we should allow government servants to go on strike and paralyse the government machinery, which is the symbol of organised society. Really speaking, that is the issue and it was argued for the last 20 years that it should not be allowed. But, at the same time, it was said that there must be a forum where the problems of the government employees will be positively examined and considered.

I will explain why I said there was a change in the government's attitude. The first Pay Commission made a recommendation that such a forum should be created but it was not accepted at that time. The second Pay Commission made the same recommendation. It was not accepted in 1960. After that, Prime Minister Nehru himself took steps which ultimately led to this. As explained by Shri Nath Pai himself, for the last 7-8 years continuous efforts have been made to constitute a forum where the problems of government employees could be discussed and solved. I entirely agree that the problems of government employees should be sympathetically considered and positively solved. I have no doubt about it in my mind. It was with this purpose in mind that the government tried for years and, ultimately, in the early 1966 JCM was constituted on the pattern of the Whitley Council in the United Kingdom.

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

Now, let us see how it functioned during the last two years. I must say that in the history of the relationship of government and government employees the establishment of the JCM was a revolutionary step, qualitatively a very important step.... (*interruptions*). Some of the members explained that there are political motivations. When I say political motivation I mean that there are some elements who do not want JCM to continue, who do not want the problems of government employees to be solved constructively but only want destructive ideas in the form of strikes to be encouraged. They have tried to jeopardise its working.... (*interruptions*).

I would like to say how constructively we tried to go about in this matter. What is the essence of JCM? The essence of JCM is a dialogue between government and its employees and this dialogue can be carried on only with an attitude of understanding and an attitude of compromise.

SHRI S. A. DANGE (Bombay Central South): May I inform you that when other trade unions and leaders walked out of the JCM, the INTUC joined with them and walked out?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Let me tell you the full story. You are only trying to take the partial part of the story.

What I am trying to say is that for two years we have made a constructive and a consistent effort to see that this JCM functions well. I tried to find out how many discussions took place. Many meetings at the national level took place.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Majority of the representatives are.... (*Interruption*).

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: A permanent board of arbitration has been appointed to look into the demands. The ex-Chief Justice of India has been appointed as the arbitrator. I am told, 17 cases have already been referred to the Board of Arbitration set up under the scheme. There are a large number of problems and cases which are being handled.

Now let us come to the direct issues which are involved in this matter. Nearly ten demands were raised and were discussed for months together. I was told by the hon. Member, Shri Joshi, that if ultimately

they were to be held as non-arbitrable why they were discussed. Is it a right attitude? Even if it were non-arbitrable, we wanted to discuss them.

SHRI S. M. JOSHI: You should have told them first.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Let me complete it. I never interrupted you. Let me put my say before you and before the country. You may not agree with it. You have tried to condemn us publicly. We are entitled to put forth our point of view.

SHRI UMANATH: On the All India Radio you have condemned the employees.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Out of these ten demands, ultimately the issue came about three demands.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Four demands.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I would like to give the whole story as it happened.

One was about the merger of DA with pay, the second was the need-based minimum wage and the third was the neutralisation of the cost of living.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: And retirement.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Retirement also.

They discussed these matters for months together and ultimately it was pointed out to them that it was our preliminary view that some of the demands, particularly the merger of DA with pay and the need-based minimum wage, did not appear to be arbitrable. That was the view that was given to them.

Here I would like to say that Shri Nath Pai quoted some of the portions. He even quoted what Shri Hathi, then Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs, had stated. In what he quoted he mentioned two clauses, clauses 13 and 16 specially. What Shri Hathi said is subject to these particular clauses, clauses 13 and 16, of the constitution of the JCM.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Jainagar): Subject to your orders.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Now I would like to read clauses 13 and 16 which are very relevant. Clause 13 of the constitution of the JCM says:—

"If there is no agreement between two sides, the matter may be transmitted to

a committee of the Council for further examination and report. But if a final disagreement is recorded and the matter is one for which compulsory arbitration is provided"—

this is the most important thing—

"the matter is one for which compulsory arbitration is provided, it shall be referred to arbitration."

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Read clause 16.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Then I am coming to clause 16. I wanted to read it myself. The clause starts with the words :—

"Compulsory arbitration shall be limited to pay and allowances, weekly hours of work and leave of a class or grade of employees."

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We wanted to cover Class IV employees.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : If you refer to the debate, Shri Nath Pai merely read the clause excepting "of a class or grade of employees". He only read the earlier part of it.

SHRI S. M. JOSHI *rose*—

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : It was like a good lawyer. But one can possibly mislead an audience but not the judge, I hope (*Interruption*). You may accept that interpretation or not. The Government was, certainly, entitled to put this interpretation, that these two demands, according to the very constitution of the JCM were not arbitrable.

The Members said that they did not want to discuss these matters and they walked out. May be, they may have walked out. I can understand that. Sometimes, people walk out from here also. They do walk out. It is one of the accepted parliamentary institutions. But then later—we did not mind this—the Government itself discussed this matter amongst themselves at the highest level and we decided that we should not allow the thing to go out of hand like this because the main purpose, the soul of the scheme, is the discussion and, therefore, we decided that instead of allowing discussions to go on between the staff side and the employees side, it is much better that the discussion should be taken over by the Government itself and a Com-

mittee consisting of the Deputy Prime Minister, the Home Minister and the Labour Minister was appointed. Mr. Nath Pai mentioned to me as to why it is that whenever there is a strike between the employees and the Government, the Home Minister intervenes in the matter. The Home Minister also deals with the personnel side of the services.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We know the mind of the Home Minister.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : You do not know your own mind.

Sir, I made a statement on the floor of this House that we are prepared to discuss this matter, including the very question of arbitrability. What more reasonable attitude should be expected of Government to take ? For the first time in the history of Government, when at the highest level Government was inviting the Government employees to come and meet them, they said, "No". I was told yesterday by some Member here that it is only the militant Government employees who can make Government strong to defend the country. It is a wonderful idea of militancy. They should ask Government to accept their demands and if they do not accept reasonably, then, they should say, "No, we will go on strike. We will not discuss." And the Government should accept the refusal even to meet and discuss the matter, accept all the intimidations of going to strike and even if the Government issue an Ordinance, makes the strike an illegal thing, they must go on strike. What was expected of Government ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We met you before that.

SHRI NAMBIAR : They came and met you.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am coming to that. On 4th September, I issued a statement and we made our position very clear. Mr. Dange misquoted me yesterday. In that statement of mine, I never said that the question of need-based minimum wage was referred to the National Labour Commission. I did not make that statement. I have got a copy of that.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : The All India Radio announced it, both in English and Hindi.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : It was published in press also and lakhs of copies were distributed all over the country. You better read it again I only said that the question of minimum national wage was referred as a term of reference.

Sir, my case even today is that when the Commission is going into the question of minimum national wage, they have, naturally, to go into the very concept and they have to find out the criteria the norms, of fixing the idea of national minimum wage and in that they have to take into account the needs and the requirements of the people also. I also mentioned in that statement that the National Labour Commission in its questionnaire had raised some questions about it. I am sure, as a member of the Commission, Mr. Dange might have participated in formulating that questionnaire. At that time, I received a letter from the Chairman of the National Labour Commission asking me that I should inform the Cabinet Secretary and give them a memorandum on the question of national minimum need-based wage. So, our own point was : there was a Commission that, really speaking, was going into the very fundamentals of this very question and let us wait for the report of that Commission...

SHRI NAMBIAR : He is misleading the House.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : After 4th September—this date is very important—, after issuing the statement, we thought that we would have the good fortune of meeting the representatives of the employees. Ultimately, the Prime Minister wrote a letter to the Railway Federation Chairman, Mr. Peter Alvares. She wrote a letter, I think, on the 5th September. She made a suggestion in that letter, "I will be glad if you will meet the Home Minister and discuss the matter with him". I have got a copy of the letter that was sent to him. I waited for five long days...

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We got the letter on the 10th. Do not twist the story... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : You might have been out. I was told by Mr. Peter Alvares that he was out. My point is that we took the initiative in this matter and I telephoned to Mr. Peter Alvares, "My dear Peter, here is an invitation from the Prime

Minister; do you mind meeting me?" He said, 'No; I do not mind'. I must say that he responded in a friendly way, in a co-operative way, and we decided to meet on the 12th September and we met... *(Interruptions)* I am talking of the members of JCA which was led by my hon. friend, Shri Joshi. We discussed it; we tried to convince each other. As Mr. Joshi said yesterday, he certainly raised three points. He said; if you do not accept under clause 16 about reformulation of the demand... *(Interruptions)* He did make that suggestion. But I did not say 'no'. I told him : if you reformulate the demands, let them go back to the JCM and let them be discussed...

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : You did not say that.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I did say that... *(Interruptions)* I did say that. They said : if you want to accept, accept it straightway; there is no question of going back to JCM. They did not want the JCM to function.

Another question that was raised was about neutralisation of the cost of living. We told them that, really speaking, this question was not discussed in the JCM. Before the question could ever be discussed in the JCM, the walk-out was organised. Therefore, we told them that if it had to be discussed, it had to go back to the JCM.

The third question that was raised was that the National Labour Commission be the arbitrator. I did tell them straightway that I could not accept this position because a commission could not be an arbitrator; a commission, in its highest authority, is entitled to make recommendations to the Government which will ultimately consider them; if we try to combine arbitration and commission, it would be something impossible to accept... *(Interruptions)* I did make an appeal : "For God's sake, do not lead the things to this stage because it will certainly create a very difficult position for both the sides". I knew that that would force everybody to certain positions, that would commit everybody to certain positions and that it would be very difficult to withdraw from those positions.

Unfortunately I could not convince them nor could they convince me, about the whole matter and we parted. *(Interruption)*

On the 13th, the Government had to decide to issue the Ordinance. It was only after the failure of the talks that we decided to issue the ordinance.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी (पूना) : मैंने यह भी बताया था कि नीड-बेस्ड वेज को आप रखिये, लेकिन फुल न्यूट्रलाइजेशन का जो मामला है, अगर हम जे० सी० एम० में बैठ कर उस का फैसला नहीं कर सकते हैं, तो क्या आप उसको भेजने के लिए तैयार हैं और आप ने "नहीं" कह दिया।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I said, you better go and discuss with your men. But your main attitude was that there is no question of going to the JCM now. You suggested that. You said "you agree now; After the National Commission's report whatever may be its report, you agree to appoint an arbitrator then"... (*Interruption*)

SHRI S. M. JOSHI : Yes... (*Interruption*)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : You want to compel me to accept the arbitration now and the report later on.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : क्योंकि आप ने तो यह दलील दी कि जब तक वह नहीं होता है, हम कैसे करेंगे।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : That is putting the cart before the horse. I would not accept that. (*Interruption*) We made all attempts, all efforts to see that there should not be a strike, because, Sir, our main point was this. Whether we are treating our Government employees with sympathy or not whether we wanted to discuss matters with them or not, the question of the concept of need-based minimum wage is a sound concept and we have said that it is certainly unexceptionable. As a concept we will accept it. But it is one thing to accept a concept and another thing to make it feasible. It is a duty of the administration, not merely to go on passing resolutions that we accept the concept, but to implement it. And in order to implement a case or a demand or in order to be arbitrable, it has to be very specific in its nature. You cannot say that a concept is arbitrable. I can understand—a certain specific level of pay-scale can be referred to arbitrator and we can say, you better see whether this is right or something else is right. But you

cannot say that the idea of socialism is arbitrable and let it be left to arbitration. Can this be done, Sir ? (*Interruption*).

SHRI NAMBIAR : It is absurd...

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Need-based idea certainly consists of many concepts. It is not merely the economics. It also means certain social concepts also. It is not merely the price level, but what is the standard of living, and various other factors have to be taken into account and it is a wider issue, and if it is to be considered, first of all, it must be made specific. But when we say that we are waiting for the National Commission's report we want them to work out certain criteria, we want them to work out certain principles, we want them to work out certain norms on the basis of which the whole matter could be examined in detail. That was our approach, but we were told 'No. There is no question of discussing this arbitrability. It is arbitrable. Unless you accept it, the only other course left for us is strike.' That is what you said, and I said, history is repeating itself. All the efforts that the Government made were turned down only for the sake of insistence on the strike. (*Interruption*) No Government in this country or in any country... (*Interruption*) they may have their own loyalties to I don't know; No Government can allow this and be a very silent and helpless spectator of its own paralysis...

SHRI UMANATH : On a point of order, Sir... (*Interruption*). Sir, my point of order is this. When questions of references to parties or members were involved in the past, questions of loyalty of any group or parties or members in this House were not to be challenged, by saying that their loyalty is to some outside Government or outside countries. This is a very very controversial and serious issue. You had given a ruling that it should not be done and it is on record. Now, Mr. Chavan just now said...

MR SPEAKER : He said 'may'.

SHRI UMANATH : I accept it. He said it may belong. It means, it belongs or it does not belong. It does not belong is there on one side; it belong also is there. I have no objection at all. So long as I am here, I can use hundreds of epithets like that. But I would like you to insist upon that rule being enforced here. Otherwise, I can also do the same myself.

MR. SPEAKER : Nobody should do it. Luckily, he did not name anybody. No individual or party was mentioned. Otherwise, there would have been much more serious trouble. But in a general way, he used the word 'may' and said that.

SHRI UMANATH : 'May' casts an aspersion. Can that be done? I do not care about this. Let the Speaker give his ruling so that I can follow it myself. I do not depend upon anybody's kindness for my functioning here.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : I only want to point out that we have taken an oath of loyalty to the Constitution, not to his Government.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I did not want to question the loyalty of any member of the House. That was not my intention. But I certainly said that even a government outside which some parties may consider may be good or bad or ideal, even in that ideal concept, that State cannot accept this position that they will be silent and helpless spectators when the machinery of government is sought to be paralysed. That was my case. I did not want to question his loyalty. I am very glad that he raised this question which gave me an opportunity to explain.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : I am not loyal to him or to his Government.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN : We know that. The whole country knows what he is. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : So my case is that, really speaking, this strike was merely for strike's sake, that the sponsors of the strike did not want the JCM to function, they wanted to force Government into a position of accepting certain things which Government refused to do. That, really speaking, led to the strike.

Now about what happened during the strike. I hope Shri S. M. Joshi would not be angry with me, if I say something on that.

SHRI S. M. JOSHI : I am not angry with anybody.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : He is not angry, but he is very sweet.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Yesterday he said that we are *gunahgars*, offenders.

SHRI S. M. JOSHI : That is, if they are *gunahgars*, Government are *buda gunahgars*.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : This is an oversimplification. If somebody takes up a high moral position and presumes that everybody else's position is immoral, if somebody takes up the position he is a superman and others are sub-men, it is not very easy to convince the other man.

What is it, really speaking, that we did not do? We wanted to discuss this matter. I would like to reiterate that we stand by this philosophy, that we would like to see that our employees are justly paid and properly and sympathetically looked after. That is our case.

As for what happened during the strike. I am very sad indeed that firing took place and some people had to lose their lives. We are equally sorry about it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : You ordered the firing and you are sorry!

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The Delhi Administration has paid enough compensation to the families. We are very sorry about the firing and loss of life.

Then some hon. Member said that 10 lakh people went on strike. It is not a fact. 2,40,000 had participated in the strike out of 26 lakh employees. Some of them, nearly 10,000 were completely discharged, some were suspended or prosecuted. It comes to about 10,000—11,000. About 45,000—50,000 were also in danger of losing their jobs. But Government certainly did take a kind and sympathetic attitude.

AN HON. MEMBER : Never.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : But I must say that Government will always have to have a combination of firmness and sympathy. I am sorry that some people have lost their jobs, I am sorry that some people have been persecuted, I am not very happy about it. I have seen poverty, I come from a poor kisan family, I know what it is. But may I ask who are responsible for their losing jobs? *(interruptions)*. It is those people who, really speaking, instead of leading their followers misled them who are responsible. This is what they did in 1946, in 1951, this is what they did in 1957, in 1960, and history has repeated itself, and they have again misled them in 1968.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We have heard enough stories. Let him say what he is going to do.

SHRI NAMBIAR : The Home Minister has stated that it is a combination of firmness and sympathy. We want to know what he means by that.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : My hon. friend Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta said yesterday that the bodies of those people who were working inside were there, but their souls were outside. I do not know if he knows so much about the souls of people, but I know one thing, that their souls are with us, unfortunately their bodies are on the other side. You ask your neighbour about it.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Let him be fair to me and listen to me now. I must make this clear. When you issued the ordinance I condemned it in the strongest possible terms. That was your failure that you could not deal with your employees in a sympathetic way. But I did say to the employees that now that an ordinance has been issued I would not like them to take rash action under any instigation because I did not want them to take risk, because I would not have been a leader but a follower if I did not give the right lead, and I stand by what I said.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : That is exactly what I said, that your soul is with us, the body is on the other side. I am merely trying to paraphrase.

SHRI UMANATH : Now that he has said so many things, what does he propose to do with the action taken against the employees ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I must ultimately come to the very important point made by Mr. Dange. He reviewed his case very well yesterday, but as usual it was a very clever argument. When he starts talking about the elementary principles of Marxism and tries to teach us those principles, I have always a fear that he is trying to conceal something. What was it that he was trying to prove ? I am glad that Mr. Dandekar at least once seems to have agreed with Mr. Dange.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : I never used the word "Marxism" yesterday.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peermade) : Once you were a Marxist we are told.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : May I repeat what I said once about it in the other House ? I was a Marxist before I was 30. I do not want to repeat that thing again. But I do not want to go into that thing.

MR. SPEAKER : The point raised is : what is the attitude now.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I will certainly come to that. That is ultimately the last sentence that I will utter in this speech. Mr. Dange raised some points. I will deal with that particular aspect also. Mr. Dange tried to convince us about the necessity of having a need-based minimum wage. As I said, I accept that as a concept. Really speaking, the whole theory was rather based on a fallacious argument. Is the Government a profit-making industry ? Then, Sir, Railways—I know the Industrial Disputes Act applies to them—are not a private industry which makes profits only. It is a public utility. Ultimately it does service to the people. Whatever the profits and the margin, they will ultimately come to the Parliament. It is the Parliament which will fix the rates, etc. There is no question of profit motive and profit-getting capacity. It is not that. Therefore, whatever the argument may have been for persuading the private employers to accept this philosophy, his whole argument as far as the Government employees are concerned was completely superfluous. (*Interruptions*).

Now, what is to be done about the future. I think we have made our position very clear in this matter that Government has taken a specific position in this matter. Government cannot accept the principle that these people have got a right to strike. The idea of strike will have to be eschewed in practice. I have no doubt about this in my mind. An hon. Member said it was a token strike, how can a token strike be a total strike. Hon. Shri S. M. Joshi told me that the JCA has never decided it. Certainly JCA has a technical answer. You are arguing this thing in a legalistic way. You see that the Railway Federation in the month of May passed a resolution at Hardwar. Even about the token strike, you merely implemented their decision. (*Interruptions*) Government have decided and Government's mind is very clear. We have shown a sympathetic attitude towards some people but with regard to the other

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]
action that has been taken, Government do not intend to change the position. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : He should say something about the judicial enquiry.

SHRI NATH PAI : The hon. Minister when he began replying to the debate, promised and he repeatedly promised—let not that promise meet the same fate of the promises made to the Government employees—that he will deal with the points as they were raised by us here. Mr. Sondhi interrupted him by saying 'What about Indraprastha' and you said that even Indraprastha was raised by Nath Pai. While replying in the order, twice we have asked him about the withdrawal of the ordinance and withdrawal of the notices and to end all these prosecutions and persecutions. What about this awful manifestation of Police mentality as symbolised by Indraprastha? About judicial inquiry he said in one word. Let us have some clarification.

AN HON. MEMBER : He has given an order to fire.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I did make a passing reference to it. What happened in Indraprastha, Pathankot and Bikaner, I have said I am very sorry for them. (*Interruptions*) As far as Indraprastha is concerned I must say, and I have said publicly again, that there was certainly a very wrong use of force by the Police. I have no doubt about it. (*Interruptions*). It was a very wrong use of force and there was no occasion for that sort of provocation. This was the recommendation made by the inquiry officer and we have accepted that recommendation and even after a judicial inquiry. (*Interruptions*). Let us see the purpose of a judicial inquiry. What is the purpose of a judicial inquiry? (*Interruptions*) Judicial inquiry also is not a trial in itself.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Judicial inquiry is meant to find out what are broadly the facts as to what happened. And having found out the facts, there is very little left to the judicial process.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : In this matter, public opinion was for a judicial enquiry.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order, I am on my legs.

SHRI HEM BARUA : About Mariani and New Gauhati, he has not mentioned anything. I have visited those areas. I found that women were beaten down by police lathies at Mariani. A young girl who happens to be a college student was made completely naked at New Gauhati. Any insult inflicted on any woman in India is an insult inflicted on the Prime Minister of India who is a woman.

SHRI NAMBIAR : What about Pathankot? A woman was shot down there. I have visited Pathankot. The Minister must answer about what happened in Pathankot; whether there will be a judicial enquiry on this or not, I want to know from him.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Please sit down. I am on my legs. My point is, still the Prime Minister has to reply; she will be replying tomorrow morning; she will be speaking immediately after the Question Hour. Shri Tenneti Viswanatham will speak now.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Sir, all the facts must be brought out. I am yet to speak. I must be given an opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER : I will give Mr. Sondhi an opportunity. Mr. Chavan cannot reply now in parts after he has ended his speech. The Prime Minister will reply tomorrow. Mr. Tenneti Viswanatham. Ten minutes only. After him, Mr. Sondhi will be called; he will be the last. I would not adjourn the House without calling Mr. Sondhi.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (*Visakhapatnam*) : Mr. Speaker, Sir the real cause of the anger of the whole country is the excesses committed by the police, when the Government wanted to handle the strike in a particular way. The issue has been diverted to concepts and the ethics of strikes. What did the Home Minister say? He said, I am sorry. Does it satisfy us? After all, what he has got to do has been said here by the opposition. They did not say, "Give the minimum need-based wage straight here on the floor of the House." All that has been said is, "You hold a judicial enquiry into the excesses and punish those who are guilty of excesses

and also, as a matter of policy, as Mr. Kripalani has said, let us start with a clean slate, that is to say, withdraw the prosecutions, and withdraw the criminal proceedings against those persons so that goodwill may be created amongst all the persons concerned." On this aspect, the Home Minister, clever as he is, did not say anything. When prompted again and again and pressed by the Opposition, he said, "Well, I am sorry for it." This country expects something more than the mere expression of sorrow. Apart from providing the need-based wage, what is really wanted immediately is the creation of goodwill, an atmosphere of goodwill. Let me assume that only 2,60,000 participated in the strike. But 2,60,000 is not a small number. They are only a symbol; as they said, it was only a token strike. Therefore, all the persons were not really prepared. In fact, if I was a leader of the strike movement, I would never have said that it should be a token strike. Either it is a real strike or no strike at all. Because the leaders have said it would be a token strike, let me assure that the Government's figure is correct. But even that is not a small number. If it was a small number, why did the police behave in such a cruel way? The sound of the breaking of a glass pane was heard and immediately two hand-grenades were used at Indraprastha. What does the Home Ministry say to it? Some Members have said something about Mr. Sondhi. What does the confidential report of the D.C. say? Everything is in praise of him. The Home Minister says he would be firm and sympathetic, but I want him to be firm in his sympathy and not firm in supporting the excesses happening in this country. We were used to these excesses before independence. You and I, Sir, come from the same part of the country where the police began to beat the satyagrahis when they were eating food in the gardens, when they were in their houses or walking in streets. They were belaboured and quite a number of them died. The same thing is happening after independence. Because the Government never institute judicial enquiries, the police have developed a habit. They do not apprehend a man when he is committing arson or violence. But then they enter into the offices, houses, hostels and even the Vice-Chancellor's quarters. Who is safe in this country?

In this independent country, we want that a new atmosphere should be created by the Home Minister so that these things may never happen. The real issue is, as I said, the events that happened on 19th September and not what led to the strike. That is what the Home Minister and the Prime Minister must have in mind. We should be free to go about where we like in this country. Government servants at their desks should not be beaten by police. I should feel that I can sleep freely in my house without the police entering it. The Vice-Chancellors and students should be free to stay in their universities, hostel, etc. without molestation on the slightest pretext. We must have a sense of security. It is true we, on this side, are not able to control all the violent elements. Sometimes they are mixing themselves with those who organise the strike. I know violence is of no use. Even Gandhiji said that if violence is used, Government can use superior violence. People know it. But certain events have led to the strike.

It was a simple demand for arbitration. The Home Minister says, no. If pay scales is a matter of policy and not for arbitration, why not allow the arbitrator himself to say so? The Home Minister says, 'can socialism be made the subject of arbitration?' It was a good debating point, but it is a very cheap way of putting things. Will the country be satisfied with this answer? He has got a majority and whatever the validity of our arguments, certainly he will have the vote on his side. But he must have the public opinion and public conscience on his side. Will the Government servants be satisfied with what he says? He says, 'the soul of the Government officer is with me, but the body is with you.' But I ask him "why do you abandon the bodies into the hands of other people who do not 'understand' the problem? If you are in charge of their soul, have also their bodies. Don't say, they are being misled." They are never politically motivated. When Government servants organise a meeting, they invite not one party alone, but every party, including the Congress leaders. And it has invariably happened that the Congress leaders absent themselves. This has happened in Visakhapatnam; this has happened in Hyderabad.

Why do you say the agitation is politically motivated? It is a short-sighted view. As a man living for peace in this country,

[Shri Tenneti Viswanatham]

as a man who wants to consolidate the independence of this country I would say: "take a more far-sighted view and do not be led away." I know the Home Minister is a very experienced gentleman in office but, all the same, his experience being always in office, I am afraid he is going away a little from the people.

AN HON. MEMBER : Power mad.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM : I do not say a single hard about him. What I say is that he is unable to see exactly or feel the pulse of events. We attend the meetings of government officers. Since everybody is invited if there is a political motive, which is the party which is going to cash it? Supposing the strike succeeds? Which is the party here which is going to cash it? So, the charge of political motivation means absolutely nothing; it only means, you are not exercising your mind on the question. I submit therefore, for the Home Minister's consideration and the consideration of all those who are behind him: "Never treat these matters lightly by saying these are politically motivated." This is the worst way of sending away government servants into the hands of politicians. Please do not do it. Have a loyal band of workers with you and the whole country will be happy and then you will be solving the problems. But do not create problems.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI (New Delhi) : Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion and also to make a personal explanation because . . .

MR. SPEAKER : Do whatever you like within ten minutes.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI : . . . because a reference was made that there was an explosive situation to which I contributed. That such a statement should come from the supporters of government does no credit to the government because it is for government not to create explosive situations but to tackle explosive situations in the manner in which civilized society allows.

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

But what we have seen has taken place in New Delhi in the city called Indraprastha, at Indraprastha Bhavan in the Gandhi

Centenary Year. The question that comes to our mind then is, in the Gandhi Centenary Year and the Human Rights Year, is this the shape of things to come? Should we accept what the Home Minister has been saying with his skill of debate, or should we rather be cautious, sit up and see the mask has been torn off and the government appears red in tooth and claw. I do not wish to say a hard word. I wish to come to Gandhiji which is the greatest common factor in their life even today because Gandhiji was subversive and I quote from an article written about Gandhiji in the Gandhi Centenary Year which might be of benefit to members here. They are older than me, they have seen and served Gandhiji but for me Gandhiji is precious not only today but I dare say till the end of my life. I quote :

"Gandhi did not attempt to build bridges of understanding with or between foreign lands. He knew that there was a big enough job at home to build bridges between the Harijans and upper-caste Hindus, between the different religious communities, and between the privileged and the deprived. He left the making of a brave new world to persons like Jawaharlal Nehru, who felt like it. Interestingly, Nehru's daughter, now Prime Minister, was away from India at the inauguration of the centenary, building bridges of understanding abroad as if the task had been completed at home. But the Nehrus have doubtless meant well, at any rate no worse than most of the rest of us."

Sir, these bridges are important, bridges between the government and the governed, between the government employer and the government employees. Today what has happened? This debate shows, what happened at Indraprastha shows that the dialogue between the government and the governed has stopped. The purpose in coming here, the purpose in raising this issue is first of all to declare that citizens of this capital city need to be assured whether their life and liberty can be protected or not because, after all, they are the citizens of our country. What did they do at Indraprastha Bhavan? They went in a manner about which I need not even use my own eloquence. The Deputy Commissioner say,

"the police force indulged in much greater rowdiness than the one they had gone to quell."

Shri Chavan said, "*En passant* I will refer to Indraprastha Bhaavn." I will request him not to treat Indraprastha Bhavan in this manner because we in this country have certain memories, the memory of Lokmanya Tilak, who said that you must always stand up against the excesses of bureaucracy. That is our tradition. Remove the portrait of Tilak if you do not want us to be subversives. Then, we have Mahatma Gandhi.

Here I have a slightly personal note to enter. My father-in-law, who was the Secretary of the Punjab Congress for 20 years, was the Secretary of the Committee set up by Gandhiji to investigate the crimes of General O'Dwyer at Jallianwala Bagh. That book is not today available at Jantar Mantar but fortunately with my father-in-law's books we have a copy of that report. I would invite Shri Chavan to look into that report, an answer to the Hunter Commission's report.

Every single element of that finds a parallel in Indraprastha. People were unarmed there and people were unarmed here. They were fired at there; here it was teargas and lathis. After that, humiliation. There it was the crawling order; here people were led by twos and made to fall down. The man who was thrown out of the fifth floor shows the sense of people in New Delhi. He was killed inside. The highest officials have been left out in this report but we have got photographs. I have got a bunch of photographs and I can lay them here any time. If I am permitted by the Speaker to hold an exhibition in the Central Hall, I shall show them.

Why am I saying this? Let not the Home Minister misunderstand. Probably, people who are children of the revolution forget the revolution, but sometimes the grandchildren come to remember it again. It is a part of our heritage. What we protest against is the humiliation, the fact that something which turns out to be a crisis of confidence becomes into an occasion where human nature is degraded and human confidence is lowered. There it will not do to make it a debating point. This is New Delhi and we intend to make it civilised.

I had myself expectations of Shri Chavan. I had served under him in Bombay. But I must confess that the Chavan we see here makes us think not twice but several times. What is this CRP business? Who are these people? Were they members of the forces brought from the Borders of the Punjab who had been told how to charge at the Pakistanis and others? They were officered by people who confessed themselves that they did not obey the words of command. This report of the Deputy Commissioner says that. There are other references here of how people went in. I do not again wish to trouble you with that.

But here is a glorious conclusion which needs to be referred to Shri Chavan because he is directly responsible. He will take the credit tomorrow for organising things better in Delhi. Dr. Karan Singh, a colleague of his, takes the credit for beautifying Delhi. They all take the credit; they must accept the debit also. The debit is, his own Deputy Commissioner says :—

"In fact, in stead of a police force having been marched into the 'Y' building to fulfil a pre-determined objective a crowd in uniform was rushed there."

A crowd in uniform in the Gandhi Centenary Year! What for? What is the objective? What is it that we are aiming at? There was a certain conversation that took place between me and the DIG there. May God forgive Shivaji Rao Deshmukh because he knows not what he speaks! The DIG went to the extent of saying, "Do we have a country? Are we a people?" Is that the mentality which Shri Chavan has bred in his officers? It is a thousand pities. The ADM referred to the highest forum of the Indian people in words which I cannot quote.

What has the Home Minister to do? What example has he set to his officers? I also belonged to the services at one time. I can, in all humility, say, had I been in the position in which the DIG or the DC is, I would have said, "I offer myself to be the subject of a judicial inquiry; let it be clear once for all." But here there is a suspicion that there was malice aforethought to humiliate the Government employees.

[Shri M. L. SONDHI]

They say that the Jana Sangh is taking interest in these matters. Why not? Does not the Jana Sangh live in India? Does not the Jana Sangh participate in the climate of political education that is going on? Are we not people who believe in *Bharatiya maryada* and *Bharatiya sanskriti*? Does it not affect the toiling masses of India? Is Bharatavarsha suspended up in thin air somewhere? Bharatavarsha has to be made manifest in terms of our sympathy for the toiling masses. Let nobody indulge in sarcasm from that side because even that sarcasm is misplaced. In the Gandhi Centenary Year what has happened here is a thousand pities.

The DIG was there throughout the holocaust. There are photographs to prove that he was there. He pleads that he was not there and he is left out. I could mention the names of Lokmanya Tilak and others but I come to the substance and I crave your indulgence because I feel that this is a matter on which political education and education about trade union rights should go forward.

18 Hrs.

I have here something which I do not know Mr. Chavan is aware of or not. What is the position in France? I quote from this document which was presented by the Heaney Committee and read out by the Prime Minister of Canada. Our Prime Minister is conspicuous by her absence because she does not take interest in these matters. She is more interested in Latin American and other Caribbean problems. This is the position in France. I quote :

"Changes in French law in the last fifteen years have awarded the right to strike to all civil servants except members of the judicial, security, police and penitentiary services."

Are these Government employees the members of the penitentiary services?

Then, in Australia, this is the position :

"In Australia, it is mandatory for all labour-management disputes, including those relating to the Public Service, to be submitted to a conciliation and arbitration process. Arbitral awards are legally binding."

Finally, I come to Canada because that is a country which is often spoken of as cooperating with India. This is what the Committee set up by the House of Commons says in its patents realisation of what are the facts of modern life. Let us not get scare of threats of communism and raise all sorts of boogys. If we have to deal with communism and if they challenge us, the integrity of the country, I shall be amongst those who will go out and fight with them. But I am not prepared to make every issue an issue of communism vs. anti-communism. Now, I quote :

"The system of bargaining and arbitration will create both a challenge and an opportunity for the employer and the organisations representing employees, providing them with an incentive to apply themselves with determination and vigour to the solution of problems of joint concern. We have reason to hope that, in terms both of administrative effectiveness and the fair and equitable treatment of employees, the Public Service will stand to gain."

Sir, a few days ago I had an opportunity to visit South-East Asian countries like Malaysia and Singapore. These are countries which have even fought communism. Take their labour laws; take their capacity to introduce changes in official administration. They have gone for it and they have not raised these pleas. We have been wasting time because of a certain rigid approach on the part of Home Minister. If he is aspiring for leadership, as I think, he does—there is nothing wrong in that—he has to take the Government employees with him. Today, I have to say, in all humility, that the Government employees in New Delhi have lost their confidence in him and they have gone to the extent of saying, let Mr. Chavan go to Bombay from where he came. I am sorry for this. But this is the mood today in the offices. Let there be an answer to that, not the type of invectives hurled here. We are prepared to understand that our truth, our freedom and our country's progress demand true nationalism. We can even understand that there may be certain people who want to create chaos and create a crisis of confidence. But we believe that the tradition

of Indian freedom, the tradition of Indian national movement, declares today that let not the plea be taken that a judicial inquiry will serve no purpose. Let a judicial inquiry be there. I would also say—that this is Gandhian language—that Government must atone for what it has done because the responsibility is that of the Government. It is they who have the reins of Government, not we. They cannot allow the law of the jungle to overtake their minds. They cannot allow their officers to run amuck. They cannot make this country humiliate in the Gandhi Centenary Year. May I appeal to that *vidhata* which Tagore evokes in our National Anthem—*Bharat bhagya vidhata*. May that *vidhata* bring some sense into their head. I am not asking for any prayer because Lokmanaya Tilak has said: Do not follow the method of prayers, pleas and protests. My demand is justice and we shall get it in New Delhi. I have every hope that wisdom will dawn on them. Let them not indulge in these invectives, in this sarcasm, because all this will redound on them.

With these words, permit me, Sir, to pay homage to the martyr of Indraprastha Bhavan, Shri Arjun Singh who symbolises the martyrdom that has been enforced throughout our country because they were the people, the Class IV employees, who were aspiring to that divine discontent which Mahatma Gandhi had taught them. They went forward in the same manner in which he went forward on the Dandi march. I am sure the Home Minister of those days would have said, "Why does Gandhi agitate? Why does he go on the Dandi march? That shows the distance that exists. Once again, my final appeal is to bridge this distance, this gap, between the governed and those who govern. Then only the future will be sure.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे मित्र श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त ने जब केन्द्रीय सरकार पर कल अपना वह अविश्वास प्रस्ताव उपस्थिति किया था तो उस की शब्दावली केवल इतनी थी कि यह संसद मंत्रिपरिषद में अविश्वास प्रकट करती है। परन्तु श्री कंवल लाल गुप्त ने और अधिकांश सदस्यों ने अपने भाषणों को जिस ढंग से मोड़

दिया है उस से लगता है कि सारा अविश्वास प्रस्ताव केवल सरकारी कर्मचारियों की हड़ताल को लेकर ही है। उसी आधार पर अधिकांश चर्चाएं यहां पर चलीं। जबकि देश में कुछ इस प्रकार के ज्वलन्त प्रश्न हैं कि जिन प्रश्नों पर इस प्रकार के महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव के समय चर्चा होनी आवश्यक थी।

कई और प्रश्न भी इस प्रकार हैं जोकि चर्चा में आने अपेक्षित थे। उदाहरण के लिए हमारी सीमाओं पर चीन और पाकिस्तान की सेनाओं का दबाव बढ़ता जा रहा है। राजस्थान, कश्मीर और असम के अन्दर पाकिस्तानी घुसपैठियों ने फिर से अपनी घुसपैठ प्रारम्भ कर दी है . . .

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: You can ask him to continue tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No. Tomorrow the Prime Minister will reply. He is the last member. The hon. Member may please be brief. He has to conclude in five minutes.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कोई बात नहीं है मैं कल अपना भाषण पांच, सात मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा। कल को मैं अपने भाषण को पूरा कर दूंगा

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No; he has to conclude now. There will be no opportunity for him tomorrow. Tomorrow the Prime Minister will reply.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : जैसी आप की इच्छा। मैं आज ही समाप्त करे देता हूं। मुझे इस में भी कोई दिक्कत नहीं है।

मेरा कहना था कि कुछ इसी प्रकार की और भी ज्वलन्त समस्याएं हैं जैसी चर्चा में ने अभी की है। सब से बड़ी समस्या केन्द्र और राज्यों के सम्बन्ध की है। देश में शान्ति और व्यवस्था की स्थिति सम्बन्धी समस्या भी विषम है। असम के पुनर्गठन के बाद देश में एक नये विभाजन का मार्ग खुल रहा है। इस प्रकार की सारी समस्याओं पर इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर बहस के समय विस्तार से चर्चा होनी चाहिए थी।

[श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री]

जहां तक सरकारी कर्मचारियों का सम्बन्ध है मैं उन सदस्यों में से हूँ जो केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों और प्रान्तीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों में किसी प्रकार की कोई रेखा नहीं खींचना चाहते। क्योंकि बाजार में जिस भार पर केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारी को सामान आदि मिलता है उसी भाव पर प्रान्तीय सरकार के कर्मचारी को भी सामान मिलता है। इसलिए केवल केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों की बात करना ठीक नहीं होगा और उस से प्रान्तीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों में एक प्रकार के विद्रोह और संघर्ष को जन्म देने वाली बात होगी और इस प्रकार से दो हिस्सों में उनको बांटना होगा। मेरा अपना निवेदन है कि दोनों को अलग-अलग न रखें क्योंकि उससे हम उन के बीच एक नये संघर्ष और विद्रोह की वृत्तियाँ डालने वाली बात करेंगे। मेरा यह सुझाव है कि जहां तक सरकारी कर्मचारियों का सम्बन्ध है चाहे केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारी हों और चाहे राज्य सरकारों के कर्मचारी हों उनके सम्बन्ध में मैं ने कुछ दिन पहले भी एक स्थान पर चर्चा की थी कि— हम सब का एक ही परिवार है और वह और हम एक ही नाव के सवार हैं। अगर सरकार की आर्थिक स्थिति कुछ कमजोर है तो सरकार को उनके सामने अपने परिवार की स्थिति रखनी चाहिए। अगर सरकार सम्पन्न स्थिति में है तो सरकार की सम्पन्नता केवल एकपक्षीय नहीं होनी चाहिए और परिवार का जो दूसरा भाग है उस के पक्ष में भी यह सम्पन्नता जानी चाहिए। इसके लिए भी मेरा एक सुझाव है, जिस पर मैं विशेष रूप से बल देना चाहूंगा कि—जिस प्रकार इंग्लैण्ड की सरकार ने अपने यहां किया है कि वेतनों में एक अनुपात निर्धारित किया है इस से कम नहीं होगा और जो बड़े वेतन होंगे वह इतने प्रतिशत से अधिक नहीं होंगे उसी तरीके से भारतवर्ष के अन्दर भी एक अनुपात निश्चित रूप से इस के सम्बन्ध में निर्धारित होना चाहिए। बल्कि मैं तो गृह

मंत्री महोदय से यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कई देशों में इस प्रकार की परम्पराएं हैं कि जो छोटे वेतन वाले सरकारी कर्मचारी सेवा निवृत्त होते हैं उन की पेंशन का प्रतिशत अधिक होता है अपेक्षाकृत उनके जिनका कि वेतनमान अधिक होता है। भारत वर्ष में सरकार को कुछ इस प्रकार की नई परम्पराओं को भी जन्म देना चाहिए कि जिससे सरकारी कर्मचारी अनुभव करें जिन हाथों में गवर्नमेंट की बागडोर है वह हम को अपने परिवार का एक सदस्य मानते हैं और हमारी समस्या को अपनी समस्या समझ कर उसका समाधान करना चाहते हैं। उस समय मैं ने राष्ट्रपति महोदय को भी एक सुझाव दिया था। आज गृह मंत्री महोदय को भी वह सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ हड़ताल का तो जो होना था वह हुआ। आगे के लिये जिस प्रकार की धमकियाँ हैं वह भी चल रही हैं। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि पारिवारिक स्तर पर भी इस के हल निकाले जायें। कुछ दिन पहले जैसे रेलवे ने डिपार्टमेंटल स्टोर खोले थे दैनिक उपयोग की सामग्रियों के लिये अगर उसी प्रकार के स्टोर सब जगह जारी कर दिये जायें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम बहुत बड़े संघर्ष से बच सकते हैं। इस के सम्बन्ध में मेरा दूसरा सुझाव यह भी है कि सरकार को नई भरतियों पर कम से कम अब प्रतिबन्ध लगाना चाहिये। देखना यह चाहिए कि आज जो एक व्यक्ति हमारे यहां काम कर रहा है अगर उस को 50 रुपये अधिक दे कर हम उतना ही काम ले सकते हैं तो 250 रु० की नई पोस्ट बनाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। थोड़े से कर्मचारियों को ले कर अंग्रेज पेशावर से ले कर कन्या कुमारी तक और रंगून से लेकर द्वारका तक सारे देश का शासन चलाता था और उस शासन में दृढ़ता भी थी। किन्तु आज दुर्भाग्य से जितना-जितना स्टाफ बढ़ता जा रहा है उतनी ही सुदृढ़ता समाप्त होती जा रही है। हमें इन परिस्थितियों की तह में जा कर उसके सम्बन्ध में जांच करनी चाहिये क्या कारण है? इन्द्रप्रस्थ भवन में जो घटना हुई मैं उस का विरोधी हूँ। मैंने

गृह मंत्री महोदय को उस समय भी पत्र लिखा था कि आज कल की पुलिस में स्वतन्त्र भारत की नई परम्परायें आनी चाहियें। इन्द्रप्रस्थ एस्टेट में जो काण्ड हुआ है उस पर हर व्यक्ति की गर्दन शर्म से झुक जाती है। लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश में इस प्रकार की परिस्थितियों का सरकारी कर्मचारियों के लिये निर्माण नहीं होना चाहिये जिस से वह किसी एक या अनेक इम प्रकार की राजनीतिक पार्टियों के हथकण्डों के शिकार बन जायें जिन का हिंसा या तोड़ फोड़ में विश्वास हो। इस प्रकार की परिस्थितियां देश में आने से बचाई जानी चाहियें।

लेकिन इस से भी अधिक जो चिन्ता की बात मेरे मस्तिष्क में है, जिस को मैं किसी विशेष समय पर विस्तार से कहूंगा, वह यह कि हड़ताल से ज्यादा हड़ताल के दुष्परिणामों ने देश को चिन्तित कर दिया है। खाम तौर से राज्यों और केन्द्र के सम्बन्धों में जो कटूता बढ़ती जा रही है वह समस्या इस प्रकार की है जो हमारी आंखें खोलने के लिये पर्याप्त हैं। यही नहीं कि केरल के मुख्य मंत्री के प्रश्न को ले कर बल्कि कुछ दिन पहले एक इसी प्रकार की घटना मद्रास में भी घटी थी एन० सी० सी० के आर्डर्स को ले कर। अभी पंजाब के अन्दर वहाँ के कुछ नेताओं ने भी कहा कि राज्यों के अधिकार अधिक बढ़ाये जायें। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि अब समय आ गया है जब कि केन्द्र और राज्यों के सम्बन्ध में हम को फिर से खुले मस्तिष्क से विचार करना चाहिये। जहाँ तक मेरा अपना सम्बन्ध है, मैं अपनी बात को एक विधेयक के रूप में संसद् में प्रस्तुत भी कर चुका हूँ और आज भी दृढ़ता से दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस देश में विघटनकारी प्रवृत्तियों का दमन करना है और देश की एकता को कायम रखना है तो और कोई उपाय नहीं है सिवाय इस के कि इस देश में एक यूनिटरी फार्म आफ गवर्नमेंट का निर्माण किया जाये। यहाँ पर एकात्मक शासन प्रणाली होनी चाहिये, वरना हम विभाजन के नये द्वारों

को खोलेंगे। असम का पुनर्गठन कर के सरकार ने विभाजन की प्रवृत्ति को नया जन्म दे दिया है।

अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए मैं अन्त में दो बातें अवश्य कहना चाहूंगा। एक बात तो यह कि अभी जम्मू काश्मीर के अन्दर शेख अब्दुल्ला ने एक कांफ्रेंस बुलाई थी। मुझे श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण की वह बात पसन्द आई कि संविधान के अन्तर्गत ही काश्मीर समस्या का समाधान ढूँढा जाये। बहुत दिनों के बाद श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण के मुख से इस प्रकार का सुझाव सुनने को मिला, लेकिन हमें आश्चर्य हुआ कि वही जयप्रकाश नारायण हर मंत्री से मिलने फिरे कि शेख अब्दुल्ला से बात चीत करो। मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार के दृढ़ रुख की सराहना करता हूँ जो उन्होंने अपनाया। लेकिन मैं गृह मंत्री से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उन की मंत्रि-परिषद् के एक सदस्य—अगर आप नाम भी जानना चाहें तो मैं बतला सकता हूँ जिन का नाम है श्री युनस सलीम—मुजाहिद मंजिल में शेख अब्दुल्ला से मुलाकात करने नहीं गये? यह गवर्नमेंट के दो मुंह क्यों हैं? एक मुंह से गवर्नमेंट मना भी करती है और दूसरे मुंह से उस के साथ बैठे हुए एक आदमी उधर बात चीत भी करता है, उस व्यक्ति से बात चीत करता है जो श्रीनगर की पहाड़ियों पर खड़ा हो कर खुला चैलेंज देता है कि आजादी हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार धाली में रख कर नहीं देगी। उस के लिये हम को लड़ना होगा और मरना होगा। सब से पहले गवर्नमेंट अपने साथियों पर कंट्रोल करे, देश पर बाद में कंट्रोल कर सकती है।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह घुमपैठियों के सम्बन्ध में है, खासकर राजस्थान के सम्बन्ध में जो नये घुसपैठियों का क्रम प्रारम्भ हुआ है उस के सम्बन्ध में। काश्मीर में पहले भी यह क्रम जारी था और अब नये सिरे से आरम्भ हुआ है। असम में भी पहले था। इस लिये मेसा सुझाव यह है कि गृह मंत्रालय ही नहीं पूरी सरकार इस बात पर

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

विचार करे, जो कदम पहले हम को उठाना चाहिये था वह कदम पहले पाकिस्तान ने उठाया और तीस-तीस मील तक वह अपनी सीमा को साफ कर रहा है और वहां इस प्रकार के व्यक्तियों को ट्रेनिंग दे रहा है जो भारतीय क्षेत्र में आकर गुरिल्लों का काम करें। उस समय हमारे गृह मंत्री जी रक्षा मंत्री थे। जनरल रोले की उस समय क्या रिपोर्ट थी? किस प्रकार बाइमेर सेक्टर में घुसपैटिये आये। मेरा कहना यह है कि जिन व्यक्तियों की वफा-

दारी संदिग्ध हो, चाहे वह हिन्दू हों जो कि चीन का समर्थन करते हैं, चाहे मुसलमान हों जो पाकिस्तान के समर्थक हों, इस प्रकार के लोगों से अपनी सीमाओं को खाली कराया जाये। इस प्रकार की परिस्थिति में निपटने में सरकार अब तक असफल रही है। इसीलिये इस प्रकार की चर्चायें यहां पर विशेष रूप से हो रही हैं।

18.16 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, November 13, 1968/Kartika 22, 1890 (Saka).