

सभापति महोदय : आप प्रस्ताव का वापस लेने हे ?

श्री बिभूति मिश्र : अगर सरकार आश्वासन दे कि हम मनमा, बाचा, कर्मणा से इसके लिए कोशिश करेंगे कि इस देश में बेकारी दूर हो तो मैं वापस लेने के लिए तैयार हूँ ।

श्री बाल गोविन्द बर्मा . मैं माननीय सदस्य की भावनाओं का आदर करता हूँ और जिस प्रकार से उन्होंने कहा है सरकार का भी वही मत है कि जितनी जल्दी हा सके बेकारी को हम दूर करेंगे । इसके लिए पूरे कदम उठाए जा रहे हैं कि जल्दी से जल्दी यह काम हो । इसके साथ मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि माननीय सदस्य इस प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लें ।

MR CHAIRMAN Is it the pleasure of the House that he may withdraw ?

SOME HON MEMBERS Yes

MR CHAIRMAN So, at the pleasure of the House, it is withdrawn

SHRI BIBHUTI MISHRA I withdraw the Resolution

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn

16.54 hrs

RESOLUTION *Re* INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND LABOUR POLICY

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore)
Mr Chairman, Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution

"This House is of opinion that in the interests of overcoming industrial stagnation, developing self reliance and expanding social justice for the working class, the Government of India should immediately

adopt a new industrial relations and labour policy ensuring rights of trade union recognition, collective bargaining without third-party interference, removal of curbs on the right to strike and effective workers' control over production at different levels"

I have been motivated partly to bring forward this resolution because of the slogan which has suddenly become fashionable in this country emanating from the highest quarters namely that there should be a moratorium on strikes and lock outs. The Rashtrapati came out with this appeal some time ago in the name of self-reliance. The Prime Minister has supported the Rashtrapati's plea on one or two occasions and this morning I find that speaking in his capacity as chairman of the National Productivity Council, somewhere in Delhi, today, the Minister of Industrial Development, Shri Mohan Haque Choudhury has also appealed to the working class and trade unions to agree to a moratorium on strikes

SHRI S M BANERJEE (Kanpur)
And pay income-tax

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA I think that this is a very appropriate moment when this whole issue of the labour relations policy of this Government should be debated and discussed in Parliament

The key importance, in the whole structure of industrial planning and economic planning, of labour relations policy has been totally overlooked in this country. I think the hon Minister should pay a little attention to this matter. But I would request him that on the next occasion when Government in their official capacity would reply to this resolution, the hon Minister in charge, Shri Khadiker should be present because I want to know exactly, when he replies, what Government propose to do. No assurances will satisfy me. I want to know whether Government are going to adopt a new policy or not.

16.56 hrs.

[SHRI R. D. BRANDABAI in the Chair]

Why is it that industrial relations policy in this country in its vital importance, as far as the whole structure of economic and industrial planning goes, has always been neglected? Of course, I think the basic reason is that in a framework of a capitalist economy, there is still a tendency, whether we like it or not, for the worker to be regarded as a cog in the wheel of industry, as a wage-slave whose only obligation is to carry out his prescribed duties in return for the wages that he is paid and nothing more than that. Also, in our country, despite the growth of capitalistic economy and so on, we have inherited a lot of feudal ideology also from the past. We find various sorts of paternalistic theories about the relation between employer and employed, paternalistic theories which are a trade mark of feudalism and not of modern capitalism. Such theories are also peddled about in this country even today. For example, the legal concept of the relation between a master and servant is sought to be imported into industrial relations also many times. Then, sometimes, there are some employers who try still to convince employees that they are all members of a family in which the employer is the guardian or the father or the trustee of children; and the employees are his children and they should be obedient and respectful. These are all inherited from our feudal past.

These are ideas which regarded the trade unions as necessary evil. Privately, of course, the employers say that they are a nuisance. What is to be done? They cannot outright say that there should not be trade unions, but they are after all a nuisance, according to them, and one should try to regulate them always and control them by appropriate laws. The trade union movement is not regarded as a conscious organisation of the working classes which should be accepted as an integral part of any modern industrial society. It is not an object of charity. No modern economic society, whether it is capitalist or socialist, can make any progress if it does not willingly and consciously accepted the organised working classes as an integral part of that system.

17 hrs.

The attitude of the employers—I am not referring only to private sector employers, I

am also referring to Government in its capacity as an employer—has not been helpful. The Government has, I now, a dual role. When Government appears on the stage as the overall administrator of the country, as I shall presently show, it tends to be a little more objective in its attitude to the working class. But when it appears on the stage as an employer itself—in fact it is the largest employer today in the country—its attitude is not only no better than that of private sector employers, but, I regret to say, often worse.

Today we are really facing a crisis in this country in the sense that either we have to develop along a particular path of self-reliance and self-dependence and breaking off our dependence on foreign assistance and so on or continue in the old rut as before. At such a moment, the positive and even, I would say, the decisive impact which a strong and united trade union movement can have on this development is either not being understood or is neglected or even sought to be disrupted and sabotaged, by the anti-trade union attitude of the employers. That is why you will find that while on the one hand, we are drafting plans for developing an independent self-reliant economy—some people even say for building socialism—hand in hand with this, a most primitive, if I may use that word, structure of industrial relations continues in this country, which has nothing in common with any modern industrial society. This structure is based on a reactionary theory which is that workers are basically, intrinsically irresponsible; therefore, they must be kept under control. This is the basic starting point on which the whole structure of industrial relations in this country has been based. He is not treated as a partner, but as some sort of an enemy or nuisance or an irresponsible element who must always be suppressed, controlled, regulated and so on.

The present industrial relations structure of this country rests basically on two statutes: the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 and the Trade Union Act which we have inherited from the British intact with very small changes. I cannot go into details for want of time, but I say this that this whole

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

machinery consists first of all registration of trade unions, registration without any right or recognition. A union has to go through a prescribed form of registration which entails upon it certain obligations for maintaining certain papers, accounts, records etc. which have to be submitted every year for verification, inspection, approval to the government machinery. Such a union even if it satisfies all these requirements is not entitled to recognition.

We often talk about multiplicity of trade unions which is a favourite theme of the employers and the Government blaming the workers for having too many unions, but the Trade Union Act itself prescribes that any seven workmen can get together and have a union registered. I am asking members to consider this—we get into the old rut and go on thinking in a particular groove for years and years—and try to think afresh. Is there anything sacrosanct in the Trade Union Act except that its basic postulates were inherited from the old British Government in India? You permit any seven workmen to register a trade union under the law. Theoretically in a factory employing 700 workers, there can be 100 unions. You cannot deny that right to have 100 unions with 7 members each. Is this not an Act which is an anachronism and is it not time to think afresh whether some changes are now required in the law?

Then the Industrial Disputes Act with its whole machinery of conciliation is there.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): What is his suggestion?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I am coming to that. Don't be impatient. Compulsory adjudication at the discretion of the Government, whether there should be adjudication or not, ban on strikes in the so-called essential services or public utility services,—all this mechanism exists, and yet, in this 25th year of our Independence, no law has up to now been made which confers a statutory right of recognition on a trade union in this country. After 25 years, all

this mechanism is there, but the right of trade union recognition does not find a place on the statute-book. We have had four five-year Plans drafted and they are being implemented in the name of building socialism and parallel with that you have got a state of affairs in which the right of trade union recognition has not been accepted in law up to this day.

After 25 years, the right of collective bargaining without third party interference is not the general picture at all. It has been ousted by third party interference at every step. After 25 years, there is no machinery by which the workers, the organised workers, can exercise any sort of control or, let me say, a share in the control of the actual production process if not in the private sector at least in the public sector. We are talking about socialism after 25 years. Although that is not strictly my subject today, I cannot help mentioning it, that after 25 years there is no law in this country laying down a national minimum living wage. It does not exist.

So, I wish to maintain that it is this structure of industrial relations which is what actually lies today at the root of the problem of multiplicity of unions, the so-called inter-union rivalries. It is very easy to blame the workers and blame all the political parties and say that each party wants to have its own affiliated trade union, but what drives the workers to this? Where no trade union recognition exists by law, where no collective bargaining exists under the law, where third party interference comes in, at every stage, it is very easy for political parties to attract the workers to them in the name of exercising their political influence in favour of the workers.

We have to try to make a basic study of this problem and find out what is actually at the root of this provocation for strikes, and so on, the instability of collective agreements, settlements which are entered into. I think all intelligent employers even in the private sector today understand this thing; that there is no use in entering into agreements

and settlements with a union which is not capable of delivering the goods; whose political complexion you may like and therefore you make a settlement with them; because you do not like the political complexion of another union that agreement has no value because it becomes an agreement on paper because that particular union is not able to carry the workers with it. Is this a satisfactory state of affairs? Can you bring about industrial peace in this way when the workers feel that they have no stake whatever? It is very important. They have no stake; they do not feel that they have any commitment in the fate of that industry. Even in the public sector, this is a problem we are facing here; every day it is being discussed from so many different aspects why in these big public sector plants which have been set up with so many crores of rupees of public money, it is very seldom you come across the workers feeling consciously that they have got a direct stake in them and a commitment to it. Is it only because of political agitation? This is an easy explanation that is always given, that somebody, some agitator comes and incites or instigates them. Are they a lot of puppets or what? This is a contemptuous attitude towards the worker today - that he is a sort of puppet amenable to instigation and incitement by any agitator who comes along. He would not respond to such agitation if there was not some real basis for it and if at all he was able to feel that, "No; he has got a commitment or some sort of stake in this industry's fortunes upon which his own fortunes depend." But this thing does not exist today. Most employers will never recognise the unions unless they are compelled. There was the code of discipline; there was the tripartite agreement of 1958 which remains a dead letter in so far as recognition was concerned. Certain norms were laid down to serve as a guide for voluntary recognition. The employers signed it at Nainital in 1958 but it has never been carried out. The procedure of so-called verification of trade union membership by means of the official machinery has also become a terrific fraud which no union, not even the INTUC is satisfied with. I do not know if such a system exists in any other country. Where there is a single union, where is no multiplicity of unions in a

factory or an industry or a concern, the code of discipline has said that there was no need for any such procedure; the owner has got to recognise it. Even that is not done.

And this is not only in the private sector. The head offices of the National Industrial Development Corporation are situated in New Delhi. Only one union of the employees exists. After many years of agitation and representation, they have now reached a state where the Labour Commissioner of Delhi has told the employers: you have got to recognise this union; please recognise it. It is a public sector undertaking. But the management refuses to recognise. The same thing is happening in regard to the NMDC where there is only one union and also in Donimalai iron ore mines in Mysore. Only one union is there; yet it is not recognised by the public sector management.

What shall I say about the big private sector companies? Strikes are regarded as confrontations in which workers are to be beaten down. I recall that on 19 September 1968 there was the one day token strike of the Central Government employees. What a storm it created? There was a presidential Ordinance banning strike and so on. In this connection, I am reminded of the recent, seven week strike of the 280,000 coal miners in Great Britain in January-February. 289 collieries were closed down. In the depths of the severe English winter, you can imagine what happened, domestic lighting and heating, public transport, were all paralysed. 20,000 industries had to go on three day a week schedule because there was a power cut. Still we never heard of anybody shot or arrested. Often these people are a model for us: we have borrowed our Acts from them; they are a model of respectability—the British public and the British working class. You cannot imagine such a strike in this country even for two days. The entire engine of repression would have been let loose against the workers. We must learn to respect the workers and the trade union rights.

The slogan of moratorium is not the way to look at it at all. Is there going to be

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

a moratorium on prices? Or profits? Or retrenchment? Or on closures? If not, please do not talk about a moratorium on strikes

Strikes, as a factor in hampering our industrial growth, are being grossly exaggerated. In the Mid term Appraisal of the Fourth Plan and in the Economic Survey, they say that disturbed labour relations was one of the most minor factors that hampered industrial growth. Here they are speaking as Government, not as employers and are therefore a little more objective. There are so many other major factors which are responsible for the slow growth of industrial production in the country. They have listed them here. I am satisfied with what is said here.

I have worked out an interesting point. One paid holiday for all the employees of the private and public sectors throughout the country would result in 1,70,35,000 man-days being lost. That is the total labour force according to this little book which we have been given to us. In 1968, the peak year of the strike wave, the total number of man-days lost in the whole year was 1,724,40,00 which is equal to the number of man days lost by giving one paid holiday to all the workers throughout the country. Therefore, we should not exaggerate. Nobody wants that there should be more strikes, but one should not exaggerate and try to make the workers a scape-goat.

So, for the settlement of disputes and a proper modern industrial relations machinery which is consistent with the kind of plans that we are making for economic development, we should scrap the existing machinery and replace it by a new law which gives proper trade union recognition and the right of collective bargaining without any third party interference. Recently, three Central Trade Union Organisations of this country—the INTUC, the AITUC and the Hind Mazdoor Sabha—after prolonged mutual discussions, have agreed upon a large number of points connected with this question. One or two points have not yet been agreed to, but if I may quote from the communique

issued by the meeting of the representative of INTUC, AITUC and HMS :

“With regard to industrial relations, the meeting felt that the present system is totally inadequate and requires immediate change. The best way to promote healthy industrial relations is to leave all disputes to be resolved through direct bilateral negotiations. The parties may agree to refer the dispute to voluntary arbitration or, failing agreement, the workers have the right to direct action, including strike.”

This is the basis on which industrial relations are based in all the advanced capitalist countries and this is what has been agreed to by all these three Central trade union organisations sitting together. This thing has been submitted to the Labour Minister as the basis for a new legislation, which he is morally bound to accept, because he has told us on many occasions that Government will accept whatever the trade union organisations agree to. So, I want to know whether they are prepared to accept this and come forward with a new legislation on that basis or not.

There is a point in my resolution about workers' control over production. We do not agree with this idea that by putting one workers' representative in the Board of Directors, workers' control over production has been established. This is a bogus thing in our opinion, and what we were pressing for is that at least in the public sector to begin with—I know that in the private sector the employers will not agree to it because they think that it is the preserve of the management and the worker has no business to say anything about production—at every level of production, from the shop floor upwards, you should set up committees, call them production committees or anything you like, in which the workers will have equal rights with the management to go into the problems of production, whether the manning is all right, whether the raw materials are coming or not, whether the lay-out of machinery is all right or not etc. The

workers know much more about these things than the management because they work with their own hands. But uptii now they are not given any such rights. Therefore, if you want to make them a real partner, if you want that a really democratic system should be evolved, then it is very necessary that this question of appointing a workers' representative as a Director as a kind of window-dressing should be given up, and a proper democratic scheme of having workers' control over production with co-equal powers with the management at every level should be brought in.

Finally, I want a categorical reply to this question: On the basis of this agreed formula which has been submitted to the Government by the three central trade union organisations jointly, are the Government prepared or not to come forward with new legislation, replacing the old one, so that a new chapter in industrial relations can be opened?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that in the interests of overcoming industrial stagnation, developing self-reliance and expanding social justice for the working class, the Government of India should immediately adopt a new industrial relations and labour policy ensuring rights of trade union recognition, collective bargaining without third-party interference, removal of curbs on the right to strike and effective workers' control over production at different levels."

There are some amendments.

SHRI M. C. DAGA (Pal): I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—

after "working class" insert—

"based on the policies of democratic socialism." (1)

That in the resolution,—

after "recognition" insert—

"without detriment to the rights of independent workers" (2)

That in the resolution,—

after "interference" insert—

"and if necessary, arbitration based on mutual agreement" (3)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): Sir, may I begin by complimenting Mr. Indrajit Gupta for bringing forward this resolution, not because I would be able to support this resolution in all the constituent parts of it, but because it has afforded us a forum to discuss a subject which is urgently calling for serious attention and detailed examination. Persons who are serving the working class, whether they belong to this party or that party, think practically alike. It may be an accident that almost at the same time as Mr. Gupta gave notice of this resolution, the trade union workers belonging to this part of the House gave notice to their party to hold a party meeting to discuss this matter and already a serious discussion has started from today's sitting onwards.

17.22 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

The economic condition in our country, as revealed from the papers handed over to us in connection with the budget, does not reveal a very encouraging picture. The present slogan and aim of our economic policy is self-reliance, which means carrying on our economic activity without aid from foreign countries. The fourth plan was framed on the basis that we may require Rs. 4,100 crores of foreign aid. But the mid-term appraisal shows that if things continue as they are today, the foreign aid requirement will be Rs. 4,590 crores in the course of the fourth plan. Therefore, if we are serious about self-reliance production has necessarily to go up to a level in which we will not have to look forward to any other country for the purpose of bridging the gap in our trade balances. But looking at the industrial sector, agricultural sector, commercial sector, etc., we find there is a sag in the ultimate production and ultimate availability of goods.

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

Production is the keynote of our policy. The question is, who can give production? Who is the major partner or party who can give it? The producing wheel has got to be moving. Of course, the persons who invest money and those who manage have a major role to play, but they by themselves cannot give production. The man at the wheels alone can give it. And, they run into millions. The question is how these millions and millions of workers, whether in factories or in fields, could be welded into a solid whole, devoted and dedicated to the task of giving production and how their efforts may be made to succeed and may not be made to fail by reason of mismanagement, wrong interference, wrong industrial relations policy provocations, closure of the factories and making things impossible to carry on the work with self-respect. That is the real question. Therefore, I say that if self reliance is the key-note of our economic policy, then No. 1 priority must be given to the question of industrial relations and labour relations. But this is not being done. Whenever any law is framed, whenever any policy is evolved, nobody cares to look at it from the point of view of the workers, from the point of view of the organised working class. Umpteen times that has been proved here and members from different quarters have been opposing the trend.

To say this is not to concede that everything about industrial relations is bad. Here this resolution asks Government to 'adopt a new industrial relations and labour policy ensuring rights of trade union recognition. This gives the impression that there is no such law at present. There is a law, an amendment to the Trade Union Act. Only the States have been given the jurisdiction and right to implement it from such dates as they prefer.

We have got the Bombay Industrial Relations Act, under which recognition of trade unions is compulsory. Unfortunately, that happens to be the bone of contention in the matter of finalisation of the formula for recognition in the tripartite discussion which has been going on with the INTUC, HMS and AITUC. Government have taken the

stand at the tripartite and the Indian Labour Conference that if the trade union Centres evolve a formula and bring it forward they will sign on the dotted line. In order to arrive at an understanding 95 per cent of the work has been completed. We have gone to the extent of consolidating the trade union movement by setting up the national trade union centre. There is basic agreement even about that. It is not as though there is no recognised trade union. But everything stands held up because of the insistence of the AITUC, that unions recognised under the Bombay Industrial Relations Act be derecognised. Trade unions are being recognised and collective bargaining is taking place. The whole thing is being evolved by the tripartite discussions on the pattern of the ILO. There is nothing like force being brought in. The code of discipline is also being evolved on the basis of the tripartite discussion. By mutual discussion and understanding the code is being developed and implemented by stages by failure and by success, step by step, we have been moving forward and we have now reached a stage where it is felt that the entire thing must have a second look.

Therefore, a National Labour Commission was appointed and its report is before us. Industrial Relations Commission is a body which has been recommended by the Labour Commission. Certain trade unions including the AITUC, have been objecting to it. The Industrial Relations Commission will be a body to which anybody can go without a reference by Government automatically.

Coming to collective bargaining without third party interference, that is basically there. Of course, third party interference is there on some occasions. There are stages where a trade union rushes to the government and asks for interference. There are other occasions where an employer asks for a reference to the Commission. Therefore, on such occasions interference may become necessary. But collective bargaining is not objected to. Wherever there is some lacuna in the general structure that must be remedied, and that is being done in the forum of

the ILO or the Standing Committee, Government are keeping an open mind on the whole question. They want trade unions in the country. One industry one union is the slogan of the government but many people are objecting to it, unfortunately.

Coming to the removal of curbs on the right to strike, there is no curb as such but it looks as though attempts are being made to put a curb on the right to strike. I as a trade union leader want to go on record with my reaction to this call for a moratorium on strikes. A moratorium on strikes is not a new slogan; it is a 19th century slogan. No-strike law was promulgated to ban strikes. The working class had shed their blood to defeat that goal and got back their right to strike after serious struggle. Now we have come to a stage at which a human being as a worker has got the right to refuse to work. What is it after all? It is non-cooperation which Mahatma Gandhi had taught us, non-cooperation with evil, non-cooperation with something that is unjust, non-cooperation with something to which you cannot agree. There you say, "I shall not be a party to this arrangement; I strike work and go away."

Banning of strikes is not a new concept; it is an old concept. If banning of strikes, whether by persuasion or by sweet words, appeals or legislation, is attempted, the implication is what Shri Indrajit Gupta pointed out. You say, the villain of the piece is the worker. I resent the very spirit of that approach.

No worker wants to go on strike, because it means financial loss to him. The worker going on strike is undergoing a sacrifice and his family will be under penury; he will be going without his bread. Why it is that, in spite of this, the worker goes on strike? Does anybody look into that?

It is not moratorium on strike that we want. It is a moratorium on closure, mismanagement, victimisation, dismissal, handling of industrial affairs by people who bring in a bureaucratic mind to bear on the whole set-up, that we want. It is a moratorium on that that is needed. The mandate

that was given to Government, in my humble opinion, was not to implement a moratorium on strikes. The entire nation may say, "You shall not strike", but nobody can take away the right of the worker to refuse to work. He can certainly come away from work. Therefore, that is not the attitude to be brought about. "Moratorium on strike" is not the slogan which is necessary at this time. It is absolutely impossible to implement it.

May I instance a particular case? There is a factory, Premier Tyres. The General Secretary of my union was dismissed two years ago. I did not give a call of strike; I went to the Tribunal. The tribunal said, "It was a case of victimisation and dismissal; reinstate him with full wages." The company went to the High Court. The High Court said, "It is victimisation and dismissal; reinstate the worker with full wages, pay him full salary and pay the union and the worker the cost." But the factory said, "Whoever may say, I am not prepared to reinstate him." Now, I have no remedy except to go under the Payment of Wages Act and ask for wages under section 33 A of the Industrial Disputes Act. But is that the remedy? Has the Government got anything to compel that factory to take that worker back? I have exhausted all my remedies. Unless you can haul up the employer under the D. I. R. and compel the reinstatement how can anybody object to strike by workers?

There are umpteen such cases. So long as there are employers and employees, there will be industrial disputes. The question is how to resolve the industrial disputes. The only weapon, which the worker has got to force the resolution of the industrial dispute, is his ability to strike work. He does not have the money but he has the ability to strike work, and non-cooperate.

Now, the attempt is to take away that instrument from him. But who will protect him? What is his protection? If any attempt is made to take away that instrument from his hand, the worker is not going to agree.

The important thing is to evolve a machinery whereunder industrial disputes can be resolved.

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

If any trade union worth the name agrees to an arrangement whereby, be it for paradise to come on the earth, it will give up the worker's weapon of strike, that trade union is not worth the name of a trade union. That will be the reaction. That will be only irritating the worker.

The emphasis has got to be on some other way for the resolution of industrial disputes. For every move that the Government is making an anxious enquiry, a solicitous enquiry, has to be made as to how the fellow, who is producing the wealth in this country, will react. The fellow is the worker, be he a factory worker or a field worker. Unless you ensure that and react accordingly, there cannot be full production.

Therefore, this is a question on which very detailed discussion has got to take place. Nobody is against avoiding a strike. Every worker today is patriotic enough not to go on strike for political purposes. Anybody, who tries to call a political strike, will find that the worker is resisting. But mismanagement makes it impossible for him to work. That is the state in most of the public sector industries. People, who do not know about industries, bureaucrats, are there. They do not know how to behave. The worker, whether he is in the Tata concern or in a public sector concern, is of the same soil and of the same character.

How is it that the worker misbehaves there and the worker does not misbehave here? How is it that the production goes up there and the production does not go up here? The worker is of the same character. It is not that only a private sector fellow does the work and not a public sector fellow, or *vice versa*. That is not the type of an Indian worker. He puts his labour to make the Public sector a success. But, unfortunately, the managerial set-up, the administrative set-up, the entire set-up, to get work from him is such that it makes impossible for him to do his work. Nobody looks into that aspect of the matter.

Everybody blames the worker. Let that be stopped. Take the worker as a patriotic

man who is prepared to keep the wheels of production going. Don't blame the worker and label him as being the only villain of the peace. Accept him as a noble man and deal with him accordingly. You deal with him as a participator in the industrial production of the country. That alone is a solution.

About these curbs on right of strike, there is none at present. Therefore, this Resolution is not necessary. But this Resolution will serve a good purpose, to give an indication that any attempt to curb his right of strike will be resisted by him. I agree with Mr. Indrajit Gupta when he says that you will not be ensuring worker's participation if you put in a Director there as workers representative. If you want to have effective participation of labour, then something like a Yugoslavia sort of self-management system will have to come. Otherwise, there is no participation by the worker. You just put him on the chair and give a chance to talk and listened at the meeting of the Board of Directors. The worker of India is not going to be mesmerized by that act into a sense of participation in the managements.

This resolution has been given us an opportunity to discuss this vital matter. I think, 2½ hours time allotted for this Resolution is not sufficient and that more time should be given for a discussion on it. A detailed discussion must take place. The demands which are enclosed in this Resolution are with respect to things which are already mostly satisfied. Therefore, this Resolution suggesting that these things are not obtaining is out of place. Hence, I do not think I will be able to support this Resolution.

With these words, I have done.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the present Resolution is really timely in the sense that it has come after winning a war against Pakistan, when there was manifested a complete national unity of all sections of

the people including the working class and all sections of people participated in this great struggle of winning a war against Pakistan. Now also we are to win a greater and difficult war against poverty.

The President and the Prime Minister have given a call to maintain industrial unity in coming years so that with whatever we have achieved on the battle-field, we can win another battle that we are going to fight, that is, the battle to drive out poverty from this country, to win the battle of economic independence for the masses of our country and to win the battle of *Arthik Swaraj* as has been termed in the President's Address. Therefore, I do not find any apprehension, as some of my friends have that this is a prelude to a kind of banning strikes in the country.

Sir, I do not think, in 1972, the clock of progress that India has made can ever go back to 1967 or to pre-1967 days. We are marching from one victory to another and from one progress to another. There is no question of any apprehension. I do not find any apprehension that the call of having a moratorium for three years on strikes and lock-outs is a kind of thinking that all strikes will be banned in the country and the only right of workers to go on strike will be taken away. I do think, in the year 1972, the Government of India and the Congress Party itself which has got a massive mandate of the progressive sections, of the vast masses of people, will ever think of such a measure. I don't have that apprehension.

Here, the biggest challenge that we have before us is to win this new battle of economic independence and to make our country self-reliant. The major factor in achieving this battle for self-reliance is the working class. That is the main factor which should be taken into consideration. Unless the working class of this country develops a sense of involvement in the battle of winning economic independence or the battle of achieving self-reliance for the country, whatever measures, enactments, laws, that you pass in this House, or in the State legislatures, will not increase productivity in this country. Therefore, the basic question remains in almost

all the industrial undertakings in this country, either in the public sector or in the private sector as to how to maximise production. If you look to the economic Survey or the Mid-term Appraisal of the Government of India, you will find this. For example, in the case of the most essential sector of our economy like steel, you had set a target of ten million tonnes of steel. In the Mid-Term Appraisal you came upto eight million tonnes. You are in the Estimates Committee, Sir. I can even say without any contradiction that your target of steel production is on the high side; it cannot even exceed seven million tonnes, and if you can reach seven million tonnes, it is really very good for us. Take fertilisers or take the case of metals like zinc and copper which are the most essential materials for enhancing productivity in the essential sector of our economy. If you look into the survey carried out by the Reserve Bank of India, you will find that today, 35 per cent of the industrial capacity which had been created in this country remains unutilised. It seems to me that, to generate new productivity in this country, the 35 per cent unutilised capacity should be utilised. You are groping for capital and are taxing our people to find resources; you are also begging of the foreign countries to get some more aid.

The new call which Government has given, the call to achieve self-reliance, applies to all sections of the people; it is not addressed only to the working class; it applies to employers, employees and all sections of the people. Let us feel ourselves as part and parcel of this new slogan that has been given, to achieve self-reliance, so far as our economic development in this country is concerned.

Keeping this in view, I must say that no Government in this country will ever be able to think of taking away the only legitimate right of the working class. The right to strike. Here the situations are changing in this country. The situations are changing in the sense that Government is trying to see that more and more workers participate in the management, a kind of what is called, 'participative management' in the industrial production of this country. Joint Management Councils have formed; Workers Com-

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]

mittee and Joint Consultative machinery have also been set up. All these provide a really useful kind of machinery to maintain a proper relationship between the workers and the management so that they can have a collective bargaining in achieving their immediate problems and in resolving their differences. But even then, Government is not quite satisfied. We are also—as party men working in the field of labour—not satisfied with the kind of machinery set up because it only touches a fringe of the entire problem. So, it must be thought over by the Government that there must be a sincere participation of labour in all managements in the industrial production of this country. Why? It is because of this. Take, for instance, the question of strike. So far as this is concerned, the private capital is also in strike. They do not want to invest the funds available with them. They do not want even to plough back as much profit as possible to be invested in the investible funds of this country so that we could get more resources, more capital, and more industrial production by expanding our industries. Once the worker is given that kind of freedom, as my hon. friend said, he must be considered not as a kind of servant, it is not master-servant relationship. This is new India of 1972. It is a kind of equal partnership in the new venture of building a new India, building a socialist economy in this country. It is a new pattern. Therefore, the industrial relationship between the workers, the management and the Government should change. It should have a new orientation. That should be the aim and objective of the new industrial relations that Government wants to bring about. Perhaps it is already trying in that direction.

Therefore, I would submit for the consideration of the Government here one thing. Now, the biggest challenge that is with us is this. Supposing you are trying to put up one working class representative in the Managing Board of Directors of Hindustan Steel Ltd., it never happens. There are three or four unions. I think the Government are pursuing in the last few years the policy of having regular consultations with the trade union leaders and now we have the policy of

having one union in one industry. Let us hope that the Government is very sincere in their efforts. I hope they must try to see that it is implemented. But that won't solve the problem. We have to work out in the model as it has been worked out in Yugoslavia which has a kind of tradition for all these years that they have self-management councils everywhere, in every sector of the industry from the beginning to the assembly point. Their workers participate in the decision-making. It is no use to call the workers for joint monthly consultative machinery. What for? It is simply to find out as to what kind of grievances they have and if somebody is going to be retrenched, to offer some employment to him.

The workers must participate in the decision-making process at every stage. Therefore, the Government to-day should take into consideration the unutilised capacities of the different industries in the country, both in the public and private sectors and every sector of the economy should be an autonomous body and the Government should only in a general way think of the entire production targets of the country. In 1972, the target for steel is so much, fertiliser is so much. Once the entire production target is fixed, every unit in this country with the participation of the workers and with the possible supply of essential raw materials must decide how to implement this national target. Therefore, every factory, the Rourkela, Durgapur and everywhere, must try to fit in this national targets. Once the target is fixed, they must be given that kind of autonomy and liberty so that all the workers participate in all spheres of decision-making and all the workers should feel that they are part and parcel of the biggest battle that the Government and the people are fighting to-day to achieve self-reliance. That is the new slogan of the battle and every one of us is a part of the great struggle to wipe out poverty from this country and the working class to-day must bear the biggest burden because they are the persons at the wheels and they are really responsible for the increased productivity of the country.

Now, I don't want to take much time of

the House. I am quite confident that the Government accept the underlying principle of this resolution and the new direction after the great victory of Bangla Desh and even after the great massive mandate that we have won in the recent elections, a mandate from the progressive section of the vast Indian masses, not from the reactionary elements, not from the communalists, not from the capitalists which are now defeated, and this new progressive section of the society by its great mandate is moulding the Government policies and I am quite sure the underlying principle of the Resolution is accepted. Therefore, I think ultimately Mr. Indrajit Gupta will be prevailed upon after he hears our Minister to withdraw his resolution and I think the Government and the Party should try to see that new changes are coming in this country and unless the entire working class is taken into confidence and they feel they are part and parcel of this new process most of the troubles that we are facing to-day in the economic front, we will not be able to solve I think the Government and the Party is quite aware of this new direction. In the coming years the working class will have a new outlook, a new orientation so that we fit in the latest new orientation that we have to-day.

श्री झूलचन्द डागा (पाली) : सभापति महोदय, जो सकल्प माननीय इन्द्रजीन गुप्त ने रखा है उसके बारे में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश में समाजवाद लाने की जो हमारी नीति और जो प्रणाली है 25, 26 साल के बाद अगर हमने अपनी परम्पराओं को नहीं छोड़ा और हिस्मन के साथ आगे कदम नहीं उठाया तो यहाँ इंकलाब या क्रान्ति आयेगी। आप चाहते क्या हैं? मैं तो एक बात चाहता हूँ कि मजदूरों को आप मशीन की तरह से न समझें। मजदूर मशीन नहीं है। लेकिन अभी तक जो आपका कैपिटलिस्ट क्लाम है वह किसी न किसी तरह से यह समझ बैठता है कि मजदूर भी एक मशीन की तरह है और वह चक्र की तरह घूमता रहता है। मैं आज पन्द्रह सालों से उनमें काम करता हूँ। मुझे मालूम होता है कि हिन्दोस्तान में अगर कोई सोया हुआ है जिसको

गहरी नींद आनी है तो वह है वह है यहाँ का लेबर डिपार्टमेंट। इसका कारण क्या है? लेबर डिपार्टमेंट के अन्दर कोई भी जानदार आदमी यह नहीं सोच सकता कि आपके यहाँ गड़बड़ी है। इस बात को बहुत अच्छी तरह सोचना होगा कि आखिर क्या हम लेबर डिपार्टमेंट में या कानून में कोई संशोधन लाना चाहते हैं जिसमें मजदूरों की महत्ता को बढ़ाया जा सके? क्या आज जो अशिक्षित और असंयमी लोग हमारे मजदूरों के नेता बनते हैं, तथा जो अधकच्चे नेता मजदूरों में काम करते हैं, उनमें यह अपेक्षा की जा सकती है कि मजदूरों पर बजन डालें कि इतना उत्पादन वह बढ़ावें? हमारे मजदूरों का जो संगठन है, वह बड़ा मालिक और स्वस्थ है और अपने ऊपर इस बात की जिम्मेदारी लेना चाहता है कि यह देश हमारा है, इसको हम ऊँचा उठाना है और उत्पादन बढ़ाना है। लेकिन वहाँ आज अशिक्षित अधकच्चे नेता हैं जो फेक्टोरियों और कारखानों में पनप जाते हैं। इन यूनियनों के नेताओं ने चन्दा इकट्ठा करने और अपनी जिन्दगी को उस चन्दे पर चलाने की आदत बना ली है। क्या उसके लिए गवर्नमेंट कभी कुछ सोचता है। हमारे मजदूर लोग भी इस बात से अगंतुष्ट हैं।

आज मजदूर भी यह बात मान चुके हैं और श्री खाडिलकर साहब भी अपने भाषण में यह यह बात मान चुके हैं कि हमारे मजदूरों में असंतोष है, गहरी असंतोष है। मजदूर जानते हैं कि हमारा जो हक है जो हमारे परिश्रम का हक है, वह पूर्जापति खा जाने है। आज भी पूर्जापति और मालदार हों रहे हैं तथा मजदूर समाज का आखिरी पक्ष में खड़ा हुआ है। मजदूर की हालत नहीं सुधरी। आज समाजवाद के अन्दर मजदूरों की हालत बहुत खराब है। मजदूर जो मिल का मालिक चलाना है उसका मालिक नहीं है। मजदूर उस पूँजी का मालिक नहीं है। आज हम समझते हैं कि पूँजी बड़ी चीज है और

[श्री मूलचन्द डागा]

मजदूर का महत्व कम है। लेकिन इस दृष्टिकोण को बदलना होगा। मजदूर बड़ा है, पूँजी कम है। पूँजी का महत्व नहीं होना चाहिए। लेकिन हमारे यहाँ अभी कुछ नीतियों में पूँजीवादी अपना पाट प्ले नहीं कर रहे हैं। हमारी सरकारी मशीनरी पर, चाहे लेबर कमिशनर हो, चाहे लेबर के किसी विभाग का अधिकारी हो, पूँजीवाद हमला करता है और वह नौकरशाही और लाल-फीता-शाही मजदूरों को अपने हकों के पाने से महरूम रखती है।

मिल मालिक जान-बूझ कर कारखानों में काफी यूनियनों पैदा करते हैं। यूनियनों भी ऐसी बनती हैं जो मजदूरों को लड़ाती रहती हैं। मिल-मालिक कहता है कि जब तक तुम समझौता न कर लो, तब तक मैं तुम्हारे साथ बात करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। तथा ट्रेड यूनियन के अन्दर हम एक निर्णय कर लेंगे कि मजदूर एक आवाज से अपनी गरीबी को मिटाने के लिए, पूँजीवाद को खत्म करने के लिए और अपने आपको उद्योग का भागीदार समझने के लिए देश की दौलत और समृद्धि को पैदा करने में अपने को हक़दार समझे। एक काम होता है यकीन से और मन से और दूसरा होता है ऊपर से, वह अपने को गुलाम के रूप में ब समझकर खुद की दौलत समझ कर काम करने लगे, तो मजदूर समझेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान मेरा है और मैं हिन्दुस्तान को बनाने वाला हूँ। वह भावना मजदूर में कब पैदा होगी, यह तब पैदा होगी जब हमारे लेबर डिपार्टमेन्ट के आदमी यह समझें कि हम मजदूरों के नौकर हैं, उनके हितों की रक्षा करने वाले हैं, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य है कि हमारे भीतर पूँजीवादी हवा है, पूँजीवाद तो क्या हमारे जो अपने पब्लिक सैक्टर हैं, उनमें भी हमने मजदूरों को भागीदार नहीं बनाया है। आज पच्चीस साल की आजादी के बाद मजदूर को इस बात का गौरव अनुभव होना चाहिए, उसमें स्वाभिमान पैदा होना चाहिये कि यह जो

रुकैला और दुर्गापुर के कारखाने हैं, वह हमारे कारखाने हैं। देश की दौलत हमारी दौलत है और हमारा खून इसमें लगता है और हमको हिन्दुस्तान का निर्माण करना है। लेकिन जो सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं, जो पब्लिक सैक्टर के कर्मचारी हैं वह भी उन्हें महत्व नहीं देते हैं। उनको इज्जत की नजर से नहीं देखते। आज एक आदमी दूसरे आदमी पर हुकूमत करना चाहता है। पब्लिक सैक्टर में सबसे बड़ी गड़बड़ी यह है कि जो ह्लाइट कालर्ड परसन्ज हैं, नौकरशाह हैं, वह मजदूरों को उस नजर से नहीं देखते, जिस नजर से पूँजीवाद को देखते हैं। एक मजदूर आयेगा तो खड़ा रहेगा, लेबर कमिशनर उसको उस इज्जत और सम्मान की निगाह से नहीं देखेगा, जिस निगाह से वह पूँजीवादी को देखता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो हमारी लेबर को मनेज करने वाले प्रबन्धक हैं, वह अपने में और मजदूर में खाई समझते हैं। वह समझते हैं कि हमारे अन्दर ऊँचा दिमाग है, हमने डिग्रियाँ प्राप्त की हैं और हमारे पास ज्यादा बुद्धि हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक मजदूर और प्रबन्धक के बीच की खाई न मिट जाय, मिल-मालिक और मजदूर के बीच की खाई न मिट जाय, तब तक हमारे संबंध अच्छे नहीं हो सकते।

इसलिए हमें कुछ काम करने होंगे। पहला काम यह करना होगा कि एक कारखाने में जो यूनियनों हैं, उनको मान्यता देने के लिए एक तरीका अस्तित्व करना चाहिये, चाहे बोटिंग करनी पड़े या किसी और तरीके से। बाप मतदान करवा लीजिये और उसके बाद तीन-चार यूनियनों में से जो यूनियन अपना प्रभाव रखती हो, उसको रिकग्नीशन दिया जाय। अगर किसी यूनियन को हम रिकग्नीशन दे देते हैं तो वह यूनियन ही मजदूरों के हितों को देखने के लिए जो मिल-मालिक हैं उनके साथ बैठ कर बातचीत कर सकती है। उनमें समझौता हो सकता

है या आरब्रिटेशन हो सकता है। लेकिन आज कारखानेदार इसको मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। मैंने अपना संशोधन रखा है कि अगर मिल-मालिक और मजदूर के बीच कोई अडचन हो....

सभापति महोदय : अब आप समाप्त कीजिये।

श्री झूलचन्द डागा : आज ट्रेड यूनियनो में जो भाव है, वह भी नहीं होना चाहिये। ट्रेड यूनियनों समझती है कि हमें मिल-मालिक से झगडा करना है। मालिक और मजदूरों के बीच जो झगडा है, वह तभी दूर हो सकता है जब हमारी नीतियों में कुछ फर्क हो। आज भी सबसे बड़ा झगडा यह है कि मिल-मालिक मजदूर को हेय दृष्टि से देखता है। जब मजदूर भागीदार बनते हैं तो मालिक समझते हैं कि उनके अधिकारों का हनन हो रहा है। मालिक लोग नहीं चाहते कि मजदूर लोग भागीदार बन कर उनके साथ बैठें। मान्यता प्राप्त करने वाले नेता—मजदूर भी हमारे साथ बैठें। इसलिए जो आज आपके मन की खाई है, वह दूर हो सकती है, आज आप ऊपरी मन से या वाक्य रूप से चाहते हैं कि हमारा मेल हो जाय, लेकिन भागी-

दार की तरह आज भी कैपिटलिस्ट और पूंजीवादी उनको नहीं देखते।

मैं चाहूँगा कि जो ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट है, उसमें एक बात हो, कि वह उस बात की जिम्मेदारी लें और समझे कि हमारे देश का उत्पादन तभी बढ़ सकता है जब हम लोग यूनियन के अन्दर काम करने के तरीके को बदलें और देश को बतलायें कि हम लोगों की भी इतनी जिम्मेदारी है और हम अपना काम कर सकते हैं। अगर वह टग तरह से करे तो ट्रेड यूनियनिज्म भी स्वस्थ रूप में चलेगा।

हमारे यहाँ जो कैपिटल है उसका हमें नैशनलाइजेशन करना होगा, जो मांगे उद्योग देश से है, उनका नैशनलाइजेशन करना होगा लेकिन नैशनलाइजेशन करने से पहले हम लोगों को यह जरूर करना होगा कि यदि .

सभापति महोदय : आप अपना भाषण अगली बार जारी रखें।

18 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till eleven of the Clock on Saturday, March 25, 1972!
Chaitra 5, 1894 (Suka)