

lying with the State Governments, but unfortunately this amount has not been utilised so far. So, if the State Governments take this matter up and write to the railways that they want to convert the unmanned level crossings into manned ones, we shall absolutely have no objection; the States are not going to spend any money on this, but it is our money lying with the States for this very purpose. So, I would beseech the hon Member that if he could persuade the State Government to let us know how many unmanned level crossings they would like to convert into manned ones, we shall certainly consider it.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

14.58 hrs.

PAYMENTS OF BONUS (AMENDMENT) BILL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. We shall now take up the payment of Bonus (Amendment) Bill.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY) I beg to move

"That the Bill further to amend the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration"

As hon. Members are aware, this is a very simple Bill, and, therefore, I shall not take much time of the House. The House is aware of the amendment made in the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, last year to provide for the Payment of a minimum bonus in respect of the accounting year commencing on any day in the year 1971 at the rate of 8 1/3 per cent of the salary or wage of the employees and deposit of part of the bonus in certain cases in the provident fund accounts of the employees. It was thought that the final report of the Bonus Review Committee

would be received and that the comprehensive amendment of the Act would be undertaken soon. Unfortunately, the work of the Bonus review Committee has received a setback owing to the sad demise of one of the respected members of the committee, namely Shri Satish Loomba in the recent air crash, and it may now take a few months more for the committee to submit its final report. Meanwhile, bonus for the accounting year commencing on any day in 1972 has become due. It is, therefore, considered necessary that we should make the same percentage of bonus payable as was done on the last occasion. The amending Bill has been brought before Parliament for the purpose. I move.

15.00 hrs.

I would only add that this is the most non-controversial Bill for which members have been waiting. Members would even like to pass it without a discussion to help the employer to see that the workers get their bonus as early as possible.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Motion moved.

"That the Bill further to amend the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration".

Would you respond to that, Mr. Bhattacharyya?

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: I would have responded if the Minister had accepted my proposal to raise the percentage from 8.33 to 10 minimum. Why do I say this? What I have stated is 100 per cent justified. Shri Stephen who represents the INTUC will also corroborate it.

Last year the minimum bonus was raised from 4 per cent to 8.33 per cent. What was the consensus when this idea of a minimum bonus came? It was not money that the employers were paying gratis. First of all, it had nothing to do with profit, loss or production.

[Shri Dinan Bhattacharyya]

If you want to run an establishment/factory, you have to pay this minimum bonus to the employees of the concern. You cannot avoid it. This minimum bonus is the result of a long, long struggle by workers in this country.

What is the reason for this? The wages that the workers get from the employer are very low. The need-based minimum formula was adopted by Government in 1957. Since then, now here in any establishment has this need-based wage been given. It is not a fair wage, nor a living wage. It is far below a living wage, what to speak of a fair wage. The idea of minimum bonus came as a measure to fill up the gap between the wage he is getting and that he should get to make both ends meet. So it is deferred wage. It has nothing to do with profits or loss or production, whatever argument you may give.

Last year, Shri Khalidkar had to accept 8.33 per cent as the minimum bonus. Kindly go to your house and ask your wife what was your family budget last year and what is it today. You will find a big gap. In one year, really the value of money has gone down to a further extent. So the real money value of the wages they are getting is less than what they got last year in their pay packets. So, because of this erosion of the real income, I emphatically demand that this 8.33 per cent must be raised to 10 per cent. That is my first point.

At the same time, I ask why there should be a ceiling of 20 per cent. Pfizer, Glaxo, Tatas, and so many other companies are making huge profits and why should the workers suffer because of a ceiling on bonus? You must remove it. You have not put any ceiling on the income of the employers, and now you are still continuing the ceiling on the bonus that a worker is entitled to get. So I say that the 20 per cent formula must go, and there should be no ceiling. Where there is a profit the workers must get more

bonus than the 20 per cent. I say that the workers are already getting it in some cases. I have got personal experience of it. Last year, the Birlas had to pay 20 per cent plus Rs. 45 over and above that 20 per cent. That was after a long struggle, and the employers had to concede it. In the same way, in many other cases already they are getting it. Why don't you acknowledge it and remove that barrier of 20 per cent? So, my submission is that you should remove that barrier.

Coming to the most crucial thing which is now agitating the minds of the people of all over the country is that the bonus must be paid to all; bonus for all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Including contract labour!

SHRI DINAN BHATTACHARYYA: Including contract labour, casual labour, temporary or permanent, everybody. There should be no discrimination. It is most deplorable that even in spite of the fact that Shri Raghunatha Reddy has taken over charge of this portfolio, he has come forward with a Bill which has no provision for the payment of bonus to the railwaymen, the post and telegraph men, the defence workers, the building workers, the other Government employees, municipal employees and the hospital employees, etc. What is their fault? Even after passing the bonus (Amendment) Bill in the last year, you have taken one year and you have reviewed the whole thing. In the meantime the Pay Commission has come forward with their award and for the last one year you were giving hopes in this House that bonus will be considered by the Pay Commission in the case of the Government employees. Nothing has been done. Now, what is your decision? Why are you not giving bonus to the railway workshop people? A small engineering firm will give the bonus to its workers, but the railway workshop people where the workers are engaged in the repair of rail coaches and wagons will not get it. The Chittaranjan workers who are manufacturing all kinds of

occupations will not get it. The labourers in Gun and Shell Factory workers who are manufacturing fire-arms and other ammunition will not get it. (Interruptions) You will feel the consequence after two weeks, because, after the Government decision on the Pay Commission—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The point is so clear. You have made it so clear that it does not need much of elaboration.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: But they are abort of hearing. This Government does not hear. It is not their practice to hear what we say. (Interruptions) What I say is quite reasonable. Bonus for all must be taken for granted. That is my humble request to the hon. Minister.

One more humble request is this. You will have to do a way with one provision in this Bill. In the Bonus (Amendment) Bill you provided in the last year that any amount that is given in excess in comparison to the previous year's payment will be deposited in the provident fund account. Why? Why should it be deposited in the provident fund account? When the wages they are earning are low and when the real value of the bonus money which they will get will be far less than that of last year, why should they go and deposit it in the provident fund account for which you have got no respect because so many employers have fled away with the provident fund money?

You are coming again with the theory that it will create inflation. You cannot take other measures to stop black marketing and hoarding but you want to vent your wrath on the poor workers and that is why you ask them to deposit the extra money in the provident fund. That is bogus. Even the INTUC is not supporting you on this. He should at least see that this provision goes. I again appeal to the hon. Minister: give bonus to all and do not insist on putting the extra money into the provident fund.

श्री राजकिशोर भाई कर्मा (इलीर) : जो एमेंडमेंट लाया गया है वह वांछनी ता है। उस पर डिस्कशन का सवाल नहीं रहता। उस में 1972 के बोनस का ही सवाल है। किन्तु बोनस का सवाल अब एक बड़ा जटिल सवाल बन गया है। इस वास्ते इस सारे एक्ट के बारे में मैं अपने कुछ विचार सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

8.33 कम से कम बोनस देने का जो एक्ट बनाया गया है इस प्रकार बोनस का मतलब अब बोनस नहीं रहा है। दुनिया के देशों में धीरे धीरे भारत में भी बोनस, प्रॉफिट बोनस, प्रोडक्शन बोनस, इन्स्टिट्यूट बोनस या व्यक्तिगत प्रोत्साहन बोनस होता है। लेकिन इससे प्रोडक्शन का सवाल ही नहीं रहा, प्रोत्साहन का, एफिशिएंसी का या मूनाफ़ का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रहा है। इस वास्ते मैं समझता हूँ कि इसको वेतन का हिस्सा मान वेतन में मिला देना चाहिये क्योंकि अब यह वेतन बन भी चुका है। इस वास्ते आपको चाहिये कि आप वेतन में इसको मर्ज कर दें। ऐसा नहीं करने से मजदूरों के साथ फलपात होता है उन पर अन्याय होता है। कारण यह है कि बोनस एक्ट में साल में तीस दिन से ज़िन्दा न कर्म काम किया होगा वह इसका पाने का पात्र नहीं होगा। इस प्रकार तीस दिन से कम काम करने वाले अधिक के ऊपर अन्याय होता है। काम करते बक्त कुछ टूट फूट जाए तो बोनस की रकम में से उतनी राशि काट ली जाती है। अगर घाटे वेतन में मर्ज कर देंगे तो मजदूरों को यह नुकसान नहीं होगा। बोनस का आज कोई मतलब नहीं रह गया है।

बोनस एक्ट की धारा 15 में सैट धारा धीरे सैट भ्रम रखा गया है। इसका भी आज कोई मतलब नहीं रह गया है। मेरे यहाँ एक्सीमेंट करते 30 परसेंट से ज्यादा बोनस दिलाया गया है। आप के सैट धारा का क्या मतलब है। आप कहते हैं कि 20 प्रतिशत से अधिक नहीं। आपका कायदा एक तरफ नहीं रह जाता है। जब प्रॉफिट ज्यादा हो

[श्री एचसिंह भार्गव]

तो पचास प्रतिशत तक भी ले सकते हैं। यह सैट ग्रान और सैट ग्रान की बहुत भारी विमारी है। बर्सेस शीट एक सेरे पास है। मैं टेक्सटाइल की बात करता हूँ। यह 1972 का है। टेक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री के 100-125 बरस का इतिहास है। उसके इतिहास में तीन वर्ष ऐसे आए हैं, 1943, 1948 और 1972 इन सालों में टेक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री ने अनापशनाप मुनाफा लिया है; ज्यादा मुनाफा करने के बाद भी प्रबल श्रमिक को सका लाभ नहीं मिलता तो श्रमिक मुनाफा करने में विलचस्पी क्यों लेगा? इस मिल ने 59 लाख 11 हजार 92 रुपये का प्रॉफिट किया ..

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (मुरैना) क्या नाम है।

श्री रामसिंह भार्गव क्या हुकम चन्द।

1972 में प्रॉफिट किया है। इतना प्रॉफिट इस मिल ने जब से इसकी फाउंडेशन डाली गई थी अभी तक कभी नहीं किया। उस मिल में कम मुनाफा होने पर भी हमने चार महीने का बोनस बिनाया। अब अधिक मुनाफा होने पर भी 8.33 से ज्यादा बोनस नहीं बांटा गया क्या बेईमानी है? 1972 में मैं ग्रेजुइटी एक्ट बनाइ उसमें मुनाफा जो पिछले वर्षों की रकम निकलती है उस रकम में 40 लाख रुपये उस वर्ष के मुनाफे में से माइनस कर दिये, नैट प्रॉफिट में से, ग्राम प्रॉफिट की बात मैं नहीं कर रहा, नैट प्रॉफिट में मैं जबकि होता यह चाहिये कि बैंकिंग का क्षेत्र के अन्दर, 1972 के अन्दर प्राइवशन का जो जो खर्च है गद्दी डालना चाहिए डिप्रिजियेशन को उलगा चाहिए, रिटर्नपेमेंट ट्रिवेट को डालना चाहिए ग्राम जो वचे उसे गारन्स का ब्याज का काक नैट परमा चाहिए। यह नतीजा पिछला कर्मा उसक ऊपर वाप दादाका का कितना भी हो यह किसी भी साधन के प्रॉफिट में से नहीं निकालना चाहिए। 40 लाख निकाल देने के बाद मुकराना में दिना में जो बोनस दिया वह इसमें से माइनस करके यानी सट २

के अन्दर चार वर्ष तक का अन्दर पीछे मुकराना हुआ है तो और का साठ प्रॉफिट में से निकालने के बाद फिर केन्सुमेंट किया जाएगा तो क्या मिल ने गा फिर मजदूर प्रॉफिट कमाने में कोई विलचस्पी रखने वाले नहीं हैं, क्योंकि यह सैट ग्रान और सैट ग्रान जो है इससे मजदूर को सैट बैंक किया जा रहा है मानता हूँ। यह नहीं होगा चाहिए। होना यह चाहिए कि कारखाना जितना ज्यादा प्रॉफिट करे उतना ज्यादा मजदूरों को बोनस मिले और ऐसा होगा तो वे ज्यादा प्रोडक्शन करके आपकी दिखलाएंग।

एक मिल जिसका लगभग 30 लाख 91 हजार का पेइयब शेरर कैपिटल है, उसने जो कारखाना चालू किया और जो प्रब भी चल रहा है, हर साल कमा रहा है उसका दस रुपये के शेरर 150 का हो गया। अब इतने दाम उसके बढ़ गए तो उसने शेरर कैपिटल को बढ़ा कर तीस लाख से चार करोड़ कर दिया, रिजर्व बैंक में, सरपलस में मैंने किन बोनस प्रॉफिट चार्ज पर गेटेड दिया, ज्यादा नहीं दिया। बोनस शेरर आदि देकर के उम्मान चार करोड़ कर दिया ग्राम वह भी एक दिन के अन्दर कर दिया। 30 जून 1947 को 10 लाख था और 1 जून, 1947 को 4 करोड़ का कैपिटल हो जाता है। वे अपना प्रॉफिट बढ़ाते जा रहे हैं, एक भी जेब में से पैसा नहीं आया, मजदूरों का नमार्द से त, उम्मान सीधी बैंकिंग शीट बना करवा, हरको प्राप को देना चाहिए। बेचारा मजदूर गमशाना नहीं है उस पर ध्यान नहीं देता है। ग्राम ग्राज उम्मान का शेरर कैपिटल लगभग 8 करोड़ के ऊपर है। शेरर डिपॉजिट को ऐसे मांम ना में बहुत बारीकी से जाभा चाहिए। मजदूरों के साथ गन्याय न हो, उनको प्रोत्साहन मिले इसको देखना चाहिए ताकि हमारी नैशनल इनकम भी बढ़े, मजदूरों का लिबिगस्टेन्ड भी सुधरे और जनता की जल्दगी भी पूरी हो?

जा एमेडमेंट प्राप लागू है उसका फायदा क्या है। मजदूर तो बोनस लेने वाला है। अपने पदेया में मेने बढवा दिया है। तीस अगस्त आखिरी

तारिख होती है उसके बावजूद 15 घण्टा के पहले मेरे प्रदेश में 8.33 पूरा बटवा दिया है। जो बिजारी और बला पैदा हुई है और जो अधिक से अधिक शक्ति में से मजदूरों को नहीं मिल पा रहा है वह इस बास्ते है कि आपके कानून कामदे इस तरह से बने हुए है जो मजदूरों को जकड़े हुए है। मिला मालिक फ्री है, जो चाहे करे। लेकिन मजदूर हाथ डाल नहीं सकता है, बोल नहीं सकता है, समझ नहीं रहा है। आपको उसको ऐसे कानूनी दाब पेशो में नहीं डालना चाहिए।

आपने इस कानून में इसको 1972 तक रखा है। 8.33 को जा बात है वह तो रीछ का हाथ पकड़ने जैसी बात है इसको नहीं रोका, यह तो जिम्बारी पर देना ही पडेगा। 1972 के बाद तक के वर्षों में यह मिलना होगा। इसके बारे में आप एग्जैम्पट लाए। शर्तों अधिन में बोलना नहीं चाहता हूँ।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, after having realised the arrogant attitude of some of the employers, when the Government were bringing an amending Bill, we thought they would bring a Bill to amend the Act in such a manner that it will not be necessary to amend it every year. As my hon. friend, Shri Verma said, the amendment should be for all years to come. Why should it be only for the year 1972? Now after some months the question of bonus for 1973 will arise and you will have to bring in another legislation, which will make it a mockery of amending legislation. When an Act is being Amended once, it should be amended to suit the convenience of the employees for all times to come. As such, I hope the hon. Minister would agree to the amendment given notice of by Shri Verma and others.

Another question agitating the minds of the employees is the question of ceiling. Now some of the industrial units which are making fabulous profits are taking advantage of this ceiling.

In the pharmaceutical industry, where there is no ceiling on profits, concerns like Sarabhai Chemicals and others are making profits to the extent of 200 or 300 per cent of their capital. It is known to the Minister, Shri Raghunatha Reddy because he was the Minister of Company Affairs earlier. He knows how they were minting profits. They are applying this ceiling and paying only 20 per cent bonus. I would say that it should be left open to the workers to settle it with the employers by fighting and arriving at a figure which is based on justice and equity.

Then, there are some cases where the employers have not paid any bonus at all. In the textile industry in Kanpur there is an industrialist called Shri Ram Rattan Gupta, once a Member of Parliament, who has not paid any money to anyone including the Government. I want to know whether this 8.33 per cent bonus has been paid by him and, if not, whether any penal action has been taken against this employer, either by the State Government or the Central Government. Now that we have no elected Government there since we have got only honorary Assembly Members who get their salary without doing any work, this has to be attended to by the Central Government.

Then comes the question whether the workers are in a position to deposit something out of this 8.33 per cent bonus in their provident fund. It is a pity that even 26 years after freedom the prices have not stabilised in this country at a reasonable level. Not only that, the prices are increasing every day. Only today morning the hon. Home Minister, Shri Dikshit, admitted that very stringent measures have to be taken to see that hoarding is not resorted to and those things which are hoarded are de-hoarded. While the prices have shown an increase, there is a constant erosion in the wages of the working class. The real wages of the workers have fallen beyond expectation. Even the

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

Today wages have not been protected. Today the slogan of every worker is "12 months of honest labour and 12 months of wages" "बारह महीने का काम, तेरह महीने का काम"

because it is impossible for them to save anything. The indebtedness in the country goes to any textile or jute factory he will find that most of the workers find it difficult to come out of the factory on the pay day because the money-lenders, who have given them loans on exorbitant rates of interest, would be waiting outside to collect the loan and the interest.

Actually, the indebtedness has increased in the country, whether it is middle class or working class, it is impossible for anyone to save money. So, this particular clause, in cash or, as the case may be, partly by remittance for crediting in his provident fund account and partly in cash" should be omitted. If there is any practical difficulty, can the Minister assure us that this clause at least will not be implemented?

A willing worker can possibly deposit any amount in the Provident Fund. Let the Government make it possible for him to save money, the entire money, in the Provident Fund. We have no objection. But there should not be any compulsion under the law. If you cannot pay him more, if the minimum bonus cannot be increased to even 10 per cent, as suggested by Shri Dinen Bhattacharyya, why should this amount of 8.33 per cent be snatched away from him in the name of deposit in the Provident Fund? This was done by Shri Morarji Desai when dearness allowance was increased in the case of Central Government employees for six months. This was deposited in the Provident Fund.

What happened? Did the prices come down? Did the inflation stop in the country? No. It is a

wrong thing to say that it will increase inflation. There are many causes of inflation. I do not want to enter into them now. I say that this clause should be omitted completely.

Then, I come to another point which is agitating the minds of all Central Government employees, the State Government employees, the Corporation employees, the Local bodies, employees and even those workers in unorganised industries. You will be surprised to know that even the Public Undertakings have not been mentioned in this Bill. What does it say? It says, "every employee". Now, the definition of "an employee" in the original Act is there. We have moved an amendment that "an employee" includes all Central Government employees, the State Government employees, the Corporation employees, the local bodies employees, the insurance employees, the Bank employees, the Hospital employees, Journalists and non-journalists and all wage earners. Today, because of high prices, whether he is a middle class employee or a factory worker, whether he is Class IV or Class III employee or an industrial employee, it is impossible for him to save any money out of his own earnings. His entire salary goes for purchasing food articles, for buying books for his children, for paying house rent, etc. and, if he is able to purchase anything for his domestic use, articles like sewing machine, stove, etc., it is only the bonus which can give him those things. Otherwise, it has become impossible for him to keep his body and soul together with a meagre amount that he is getting today.

I would request the hon. Minister to kindly let us know his confirmed opinion and the Government's viewpoint regarding the payment of bonus to all Central Government employees. We have already moved an amendment that it should be given to all such employees.

It is a tragedy that when the employees of Public Undertakings got it, the workers of HAL who produced a wonderful Gnat which defeated Sabre Jet, the workers who produced wonderful Vijyantha tank which defeated and which fatally crashed to pieces Paton tank did not get it. This is what happened. The persons who manufactured sophisticated weapons got it, the employees who manufactured diesel locomotives or other locomotives got it. This is something strange that persons who manufactured bread in Modern Bakeries got it. But other technicians did not get it.

There is a feeling among the Defence employees in the country, numbering about 31 lakhs and they have taken a stand, both the Federations, on the question of bonus. The other day, Sbri Vidya Charan Shukla when he was replying said that there is some Government agency, some Ministry or some officials who have advised him and have said that no definite reply should be given. Is it the Finance Ministry. If the Finance Ministry has advised that no bonus should be paid, how is it logical that the workers of HEC and HEL are entitled to bonus while the Central Government employees working in Railways, Defence and P and T are not entitled to it? How can I, as President of the All India Defence Employees Federation, go and convince the Defence employees who produce the maximum working round the clock, who produce the sophisticated weapons, who produce tanks, machine guns, sten guns and all other things which are included in the missile, that they are not entitled to bonus? How can the leaders of railway employees go to the railway employees in Chittaranjan and convince them that they are not entitled to bonus? How can the leaders of P&T employees tell the P&T employees that they are not entitled to bonus? This is a very sad commentary, Sir, and the worst type of discrimination

against employees, I would request the hon. Minister to give a definite answer to this. Previously his predecessor, Sbri R. K. Khadilkar, whenever we raised the question, said that the matter was before the Pay Commission. We repeatedly pointed out in this House that it was not before the Pay Commission. We had known the Pay Commission since its inception and it was not included in its terms of reference. But he maintained and naturally we had to abide by it. Now, Sir, the Pay Commission has given its report and it has not said anything about bonus. Why should it be construed that the major recommendations of the Pay Commission, which have been rejected by us, also include an element of bonus? It would be a wrong thing to say that. I would request the hon. Minister to throw some light. I shall move my amendment later on.

With these suggestions I would request the hon. Minister to cover these points in his reply and tell us what is the intention of the Government about including all the Central Government employees for the purpose of bonus.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The main points of criticism are the same. I wonder whether any member has any new point. They are labouring on the same points.

Mr. B. V. Naik.

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister who has piloted this small Bill and wanted that the Bill should be passed without any discussion, is known as the Marxist intellectual. But, Sir, you had invited us to make certain points, and I would like to subscribe certain points.

[Shri B. V. Naik]

Marxism or not. (Interruptions) Marx has also taught us patience. He cannot be owned by a single party. **Marxism** or not, wages ..

श्री सुकन चन्द्र कछवाय : प्राया राम नया
राम.....

SHRI B. V. NAIK: जो नहीं, हिन्दी में उस का भाषान्तर अच्छी में तरह से कर नहीं सकना हूँ इसीलिए अंग्रेजी में ही कर रहा हूँ। wages are repayment of the labour loan for production, like any other thing which gets a return, let me repeat, wages are repayment of the labour loan for production. Under the circumstances, bonus is a matter of right, as much as interest is on capital, rent on land and profit on investment. Similarly, bonus on wages is a thing which is a 'must'. It is the rightful claim of labour.

Listening to our friends on the other side of the House, opposite to the Treasury Benches, I sometimes have feeling that they would like to usher in this country a socialist society without the socialist discipline that is necessary. On the one side we want higher and higher bonuses to be distributed, and on the other side we want strikes which mean loss of production, staggering of production, loss of productivity....

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): Who is responsible for that?

SHRI B. V. NAIK: You (interruptions) The hon. Member is again making provocation for strike. He is stopping me from speaking also.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can go on strike.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: I will go ahead with my work.

Under these circumstances, I think it would be very helpful for us at this juncture to recall what even in a country which we admire very much, Soviet Russia, a Soviet intellectual had to say about his own system. I am not quoting some of the known rebels like Pasternak or Zhivag. These are poets, unpredictable. I am speaking of one of the top scientists of Russia, the father of the hydrogen bomb of Prof. Andrei Sakharav which has been reported and he told the Swedish Television that the Soviet socialism seemed to him only an extreme form of capitalism. He is a Russian, a Soviet scientist and maker of hydrogen bomb. He says that the Soviet Socialism is nothing but State capitalism. Further Mr. Sakharav said that he did not believe that even in theory socialism has given a new idea for the better organizing of the human society. I would not like to go into further details about what he said. It is available in our library.

Under the circumstances, if under the democratic set-up in our country we want to bring in a socialist pattern compatible with our democratic form of government, certain basic exercises and home work will have to be done. In this behalf I would like to submit that in the present phase when the prices are chasing the wages and when we find that each wage hike or increase in the remuneration by way of bonus or other things do not yield the adequate amount of satisfaction, what prevents our Government, what prevents us from seeing to it that whatever is the surplus that is produced in any activity, in any production activity, is ploughed back for the purpose of expansion. Why I am saying this is that today as pointed out and rightly so by the hon Member, Mr. Banerjee, there is a large section of unorganized labour in the country—the gang workers, the contract labour and the casual labour. They do not have secure employment. Their employment is not guaranteed. They do not have any protection of

even the basic requirements of a civilised society. Under these circumstances, as stated very ably by one of the learned professors on Economic here in order to bring up the standard of living of the lowest one-third of the population of the country the other two-thirds or the three-fifths versus the two-fifths will in the course of years have to have a very heavy reduction in their standard of living. Under these circumstances..

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have yet to hear what you have got to say in the Bill.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: I am only making out a point with reference to a case point. I have brought to the notice of the hon. Minister for Labour a bonus case in respect of the West Coast Paper Mills

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Members time is up.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: I will be topical and conclude within a minute. This is in respect of the West Coast Paper Mills in Dandeli. The workers under the instigation of our friends without letting any body know, the Communist Marxist Party trade union has gone on a lightning strike, an illegal strike. They have resumed their work. But for whom? Did they go on strike? Only for the organized section and ultimately when the demands of the organized section, particularly, the strike leaders whose security of tenure was assured, the strike was withdrawn and the casual labour numbering about 7,000....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: Sir, it is a question of 35,000 people—workers and the families of the workers. These 7,000 people who are employed in contract labour under medieval conditions remain exactly where they were. Perhaps after the strike the condition has deteriorated. I wish that our

well-meaning Leftist friends will find out some solution in respect of this issue.

Sir, I have no grudge at all against people taking the bonus compulsorily, at the rate of 2.33 per cent. But, what in the name of God, are we going to do to our less privileged sections of society?

Sir, I do hope our friends will find out some solution and, until that is done, there will be no peace on the industrial front.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Sir, God is not here. Can His name be mentioned, Sir? In respect of anybody who is not here, can such name be mentioned?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Anyway, that is your view. God is present everywhere,

Shri Kachwai.

श्री कृष्ण चण्डबाबू (मुराना) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम इस बिल का स्वागत करते हैं। वास्तव में यह बिल बहुत पहले आना चाहिए था और जिन परिस्थितियों में यह बिल लाया गया है—बोनस की जो कमेटी बनी है, उसने काफी धिलख भगती रिपोर्ट देने में की है जिसके कारण यह बिल अब लाया गया है। सरकार को पहले ही पता था कि कमेटी इतने समय में यह रिपोर्ट नहीं दे सकती थी। उस लिए सरकार पहले ही यह बिल ला सकती थी। एक दुख की बात यह है कि इनमें काफी कठिनाई है, यह बिल जितना व्यापक होना चाहिए, जितना विज्ञान होना चाहिए—जैसा कि मंत्री जी के बारे में कहा जाता है कि मंत्री महोदय का हृदय बड़ा विशाल है, उदार है, परन्तु इस बिल में उन्होंने वह उदारता नहीं दिखाई और मुझे लगता है कि यह बिल जैसा उनको दिया गया है, बंसा

[श्री सुखदेव वामे उपाध्यक्ष]

ही उन्होंने पेश कर दिया। यदि वे हंसकी नीर के लक्षण को उनके उदारता का साक्ष्य देश की जनता को होता। परन्तु जिन परिस्थितियों में यह विषय लियार किया गया — दो साल पहले यह निर्णय लिया गया था कि 8.33 परसेंट बोनस दिया जाएगा, उसी बात को इस में कहा गया है। पिछले दो सालों में इस देश में नामा प्रकार की चीजों के मूल्य बढ़े हैं और उस मूल्य वृद्धि के कारण आज देश का कर्मचारी वर्ग छोटा वर्ग, बहुत परेशान है। वह आज की महंगाई का बोझ नहीं उठा सकता है। इसलिए सरकार से मेरा यह निवेदन है कि न्यूनतम बोनस जो 8.33 परसेंट रखा है, इस को बढ़ा कर साढ़े बारह प्रतिशत कर दिया जाए। इससे गायद कुछ राहत लोगों को मिलेगी।

15.42 hrs.

[SHRI S. A. KADAR in the Chair]

पे-कमीशन की रिपोर्टें प्रा गई हैं, कुछ समय पहले यहां पर चर्चा भी हुई थी, लेकिन सरकार को नियम कुछ अच्छा दिखाई नहीं देती, क्योंकि उस को लेकर आज कर्मचारियों के मन में कुछ संदेह पैदा हो गया है, उन का निगाहें सरकार की तरफ लगी हुई हैं, यह कब लागू होगा, इस का भगवान ही मालिक है। सरकार को बहुत ही खराब भावत हो गई है, सरकार से कोई चीज मागनी हो तो यह सरकार बिना डंडों और बपड़ों से नहीं सुनती, जब सगधों तब सुनती है, जब तक सगड़ा न करो, ये देना नहीं चाहते। हम चाहते हैं कि क्षान्तिपूर्ण ढंग से लोगों को दिया जाए, लेकिन भ्राम देना नहीं चाहते हैं।

बेतन काला है कि बोनस देश के अन्दर हर-एक वर्ग लोगों को मिलना चाहिए की भी बोनस पोली है—वाह केंद्रीय सरकार का कर्मचारी ही —राज्य सरकार का कर्मचारी हो, नगर पालिका का कर्मचारी हो, नगर निगम का कर्मचारी हो, सर्वथा बरेलु कर्मचारी ही, यह बोनस सम्बन्धी सुविधा सब को मिलनी चाहिए, सब को बोनस मिलने का हक होना चाहिए। परन्तु हमें ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार को इस क्षेत्र में जिस ढंग से विचार करना चाहिए, सरकार ने विचार नहीं किया है। अब यह भाव और पकड़ती जा रही है। सब वर्ग के लिये इस बात की महसूस करते हैं कि सब को बोनस मिलना चाहिए। यह बोनस विलम्ब से मिलने वाला बेतन है, इसलिए सरकार को बड़ी उदारता से साथ इस पर विचार करना चाहिए। लेकिन मंत्री महोदय जवाब देते समय कहेंगे कि जिन लोगों ने वे बातें उठाई हैं, वे वही पुरानी बातें हैं, जो पहले भी कहीं जा चुकी हैं। हमें कुछ इस बात का है कि यह सरकार इतनी भुलकड है, इतनी बूढ़ी हो गई है, इस की बुद्धि सठिया गई है। हमें बार बार इस बात की याद दिलानी पड़ती है। आज देश का सब बेतन भोगी इस चीज को मानता है, लेकिन इस सरकार का ध्यान इस और नहीं जाता।

कमेटी की रिपोर्टें जल्द प्राप्त हो, उस के लिए धाम कौन से कदम उठा रहे हैं? मेरा इतना कहना है कि इस कमेटी के अन्दर जो बोनस के लिए बनी है, इस में जिन चीजों को लिया गया है, उस में भी काफ़ी पक्षपात हुआ है। इस देश में ऐसे भयदूर संगठन हैं, जिनका अस्तित्व सब प्रान्तों में कायम है, सारे उद्योगों

हैं किन की प्रतिनिधियों हैं, हर एक दफ्तर में उन का कमरा है, लेकिन उन के प्रतिनिधियों को नहीं लिया गया। क्यों नहीं लिया गया वास्तव में सरकार के देखने की निगाह ठीक नहीं है, पक्षपात करके जिसको चाहा उसको ले लिया। आपने जो बोनस कमीशन बताया है, इस में धीरे लोगों को भी प्रतिनिधित्व मिलना चाहिए।

सभापति जी, काफ़ी मिन-मालिक पानबूत कर आज बोनस देने के मामले में टालमटोल कर रहे हैं, लेकिन आपने उस पर कोई प्रतिबन्ध नहीं लगाया कि कितने दिनों में बोनस दे देना चाहिए। मैं आप के माध्यम से सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप कोई ऐसा कानून बनाने जा रहे हैं कि जो बोनस देने में बिलम्ब करे उसे कठोर से कठोर कारावाह दिया जाय या रकब दिया जाय। मैं इस बात को कहने को तैयार हूँ। कि आज सरकार ने जो कपड़ा मिले अपने हाथ में ली है, उन के बारे में भी सरकार उदासीन है, जिस उद्योग का सवालन सरकार स्वयं कर रही है, उस के खजदूर भी बोनस से वंचित हैं, उन को बोनस नहीं मिल रहा है।

श्री राबिंसह भाई वर्मा (इंजीर) :
उन को मिल रहा है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कुशवाह : मैं जब नामों का उल्लेख करूँगा तब आप कहेंगे कि उन को नहीं मिल रहा है।

श्री लक्ष्मीनारायण दारडेव (मदसौर) :
मदसौर में नहीं मिल रहा है—सेठ लक्ष्मी नारायण नहीं दे रहा है। क्या आप वहाँ के मजदूरों को भी बोनस दिलायेंगे ?

श्री हुकम चन्द कुशवाह : जो लोग बोनस नहीं दे रहे हैं उन के लिये आप गया करने जा रहे हैं। मैं यह कहने में नहीं हिचकिचाऊँगा कि जो उद्योगपति बोनस नहीं देते हैं, उन के पास जो काना-खन है, वह सामने बैठे लोगों के चुनाव में काम आता है, इस लिये उन पर दबाव नहीं डाला जाता। मेरा निवेदन है कि इस में कोई विशेष सुधार होना चाहिये।

रेलवे, पोस्टमार्फिष्ठ, टेलीफोन या डिफेन्स में एंथोसियेणन्ड हैं, लेकिन इन को छोड़ दिया गया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इन को बोनस से क्यों भ्रमण रखा गया है। एक बड़े धारचर्य की बात है कि जो लड़ाकू विमान बनाने वाली फैक्टरी है, उस में काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों को बोनस मिलता है, परन्तु जो टैंक बनाने वाले हैं, युद्ध का अन्य सामान बनाने वाले हैं, उन को उससे वंचित रखा गया है। समझ में नहीं आता कि सरकार की दोहरी नीति क्यों है, इस के पीछे सरकार का क्या इरादा है ? मैं आप को सचेत करना चाहता हूँ कि जब जेगों के छन्दर उल्लेखना पड़ेगी तो उस से हानि होगी।

एक बात में धीरे कहना चाहता हूँ— आज देश के छन्दर ऐसे बहुत से लोग हैं, बहुत सी यूनियन हैं, जो ऐसे समय में जब कि आज देश आर्थिक संकट से गुजर रहा है, माना प्रकार की प्रदूषण और विस्तृत पैदा करने वाली यूनियन हैं। लेकिन जहाँ तक मेरी यूनियन का सम्बन्ध है, देश के आर्थिक विकास में, उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये हमें तैयार रहनी है धीरे उत्पादन बढ़ा कर देश का विकास ही,

[श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय]

देश का आर्थिक सकट दूर हो—इस बात पर विश्वास करने वाली मेरी यूनिअन है—इसलिये मेरा अनुरोध है कि मेरी यूनिअन को हर जगह प्रतिनिधित्व दिया जाय। मान्यता की बात बहुत दिनों से चली आ रही है, लेकिन आप ने अब नया तरीका निकाला है, मैं चाहता हूँ कि उस को पूरा कर के मेरी यूनिअन को अखिल भारतीय मान्यता दी जाय, जो सभी प्रान्तों में, सभी क्षेत्रों में काम करती है।

सभी क्षेत्रों में काम करती है। मैंने जो बात वहाँ पर उठाई है, मंत्री जी ने कुछ नोट की है तो इस बिल पर जो भाषण हुए हैं उनका उत्तर देते हुए मन्त्री जी हमारी बातों का भी उत्तर बने तो बहुत अच्छा होगा।

श्री बानोबर पांडे (हजारीबाग) : सभापति महोदय, सरकार यहाँ पर जो सशोधन विधेयक लाई है वह सरकार की ओर से एक अच्छा कदम है और हम उसका स्वागत करते हैं। यह सही है कि पिछले साल जो बोनस नियम बनाया गया वह सिर्फ उसी साल के लिए था और एक अनिश्चितता का वातावरण मजदूरों के दिमाग में था। वे लोग यह नहीं समझते थे कि भ्रम क्या होगा। इसलिए अनिश्चितता के वातावरण को समय के अन्दर कर देना बहुत समझदारी का कदम है। इसके लिए बोनस एक्ट में जो अमेंडमेंट लाया गया है उसका हम स्वागत करते हैं। लेकिन सिर्फ एक एक साल के लिए हम अनिश्चितता

का वातावरण टालते जायें तो उससे स्थिति कुछ विशेष सुधारती नहीं है। आज मान लीजिए इस अमेंडमेंट को मान लेते हैं तो इस साल के लिए कोई झगडा नहीं होगा लेकिन अगले साल क्या होगा? क्या अगले साल एक नया विधेयक अमेंडमेंट करने के लिए लाना पड़ेगा? फिर उससे अगले साल क्या होगा? तो जब हम महसूस करते हैं कि मजदूरों को बोनस की आदायगी, मजदूरों का एक भ्रम है तो फिर कोई वजह नहीं है, कि आज जो हम यह बिल इस रूप में ला रहे हैं इसको थोड़ा और सुधार करके न रखें। मेरा सुझाव है कि मन्त्री जी इस सुझाव को मान लें कि अगले आने वाले सालों में भी 8.33 परसेन्ट से कम बोनस नहीं मिलेगा। इसको मान लेने में कोई असुविधा होने की सम्भावना नहीं है और सुविधा यह है कि मजदूर जमात में कम से कम एक निश्चितता की स्थिति पैदा हो जायेगी, लोग यह महसूस करेंगे कि अब भ्रम आने वाले सालों में इसके कम बोनस नहीं मिलेगा। हम समझते हैं अगर ऐसी स्थिति पैदा नहीं करे तो आज एक साल के लिए अनिश्चित वातावरण को टाल कर फिर अगले साल नया झगडा मोल लेगे और फिर नये सिरे से बोनस का सवाल उठेगा कि 8.33 परसेन्ट ही क्यों उससे ज्यादा बोनस क्यों न मिले। तो क्या हर साल आप अलग अलग तरह से बोनस का झगडा निपटारेंगे? इसलिए अच्छा होगा कि कुछ समय के लिए आप इसे निश्चित कर दें कि इससे कम बोनस नहीं मिलेगा।

दूसरा बुझाव था पिछली बार जब कानून में व्यवस्था की गई थी कि उससे पहले सालकितना बोनस मिला उससे अधिक बोनस अगर उनको वॉलन्टरी के अनुसार मिलने का हक है तो वह बोनस उनके प्राविडेंट फंड में शामिल कर दिया जाये, मैं सबझता हूँ यह उचित नहीं था क्योंकि जो मजदूर बोनस लेना चाहते हैं उन्होंने ले लिया था जिनके पास ताकत थी उन्होंने उसको ले लिया, अगर सीधे कानून के जरिये नहीं तो दूसरे ढंग से, इसलिये आप क्यों इस तरह की बात करने हैं जिसमें एक गलत वातावरण फेले, गलत तरीके में बारगेन करने के लिये हमको छोड़ दें, हम जाकर इज्जत करवायें, भ्रमकी दें कि सीधे ढंग में बोनस नहीं देना है तो दूसरे ढंग से दा, एकम प्रेशिया लेना पड़ दूसरे ढंग में बोनस की सहायगी बरनी पड़े। इसलिए अच्छा होगा कि आप निर्दिष्ट कर दें कि मिनियमम बोनस का जा प्रावधान है, बोनस ऐक्ट के अनुसार जिसको जितना हक है वॉलन्टरी के अनुसार उसको नगद हाथ में मिल जायेगा। महंगाई का जा रूप है जिस ढंग से महंगाई बढ़ती जा रही है उसमें कार्ड इनकार नहीं कर सकता है। आज मजदूर जमात काफी परेशान है खासकर फिक्स्ड इनकम ग्रुप के जो लोग हैं, जो मजदूरी हैं, जिनका जीवने महीने की तभी तुली मजदूरी पर निर्भर करता है उससे डेफेंड पेमेन्ट की बात करे आप कहें तुम्हारा बाकी पैसा प्राविडेंट फंड में जमा कर देंगे और उसके प्राविडेंट फंड में उसके पैसे की क्या कीमत रह जाती है इस साल बाद उसके प्राकड़े अगर वह लगता है तो उसे खोम होता

है और उसे गुस्ता आता है। इसलिये यह जो व्यवस्था है बोनस ऐक्ट में कि जो एक्सेम बोनस मिलना चाहिए वह प्राविडेंट फंड में जमा हो जाये उसको खत्म कर दिया जाये यह मेरा निवेदन है।

मैं समझता हूँ सभी तरफ के लोगो ने माना है कि बश के राष्ट्रीयकृत औद्योगिक प्रतिष्ठानो चाण्डे रेलवे के, रक्षा विभाग के या पोस्टल विभाग के उनके कर्मचारियों ने भी बोनस की आस लगा रखी है। पिछले साल काफी लगडा हुआ। क्या हम चाहते हैं पूरा लगडा हो तभी उसको लागू करेंगे? क्या आप चाहते हैं ऐसी स्थिति मजदूरो में पैदा हो जाये जिसमें मजदूर होकर यह देना पड़े? क्या हम यह महसूस नहीं करते कि वे भी औद्योगिक प्रतिष्ठान में काम करते हैं, उन फिक्स्ड इनकम ग्रुप के लोगो को भी बोनस का हक है? मैं समझना हूँ इसको बहुत दिनों तक टाला नहीं जा सकता है। सरकार की ऐसी व्यवस्था करना चाहिये कि उन औद्योगिक प्रतिष्ठानों में काम करने वाले मजदूरो को भी, जो कि सरकारी प्रतिष्ठानों में काम करते हैं—रेलवे, पोस्टल और डिफेंस इस्टेबलिशमेंट्स में, और भी वैसे दूसरे सरकारी कारखाने हैं उनके लिए प्रतीकों में आप्रह करूंगा कि आज ही इस बिल में ऐसी व्यवस्था करे कुछ अमेन्डमेंट्स आयें हैं उनको मान ले तो अच्छा होगा कि ऐसे लोगो को भी बोनस मिलेगा।

इन बन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं मंत्री जी से आप्रह करूंगा कि मैं ने जो दो टाट गुना

[श्री शशीशंकर पाण्डे]

किंग हैं उद्यमों के मान में जिसके शायद श्रमों वाले दिनों में जो हम चाहते हैं कि मजदूर शान्तिपूर्वक मेहनत से काम करें, देश का औद्योगिक उत्पादन बढ़े, देश की उन्नति हो उसमें हम भी कुछ योगदान दे सकते हैं शान्ति व्यवस्था कायम करके और बोनस के कानून ने इस तरह का संशोधन ला करके तो हम भी उस दिशा में कदम उठाने चाहिए और मजदूरों को शान्तिपूर्वक काम करने का भ्रमर देना चाहिए । धन्यवाद ।

*SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN (Saem):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, on the Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Bill, I would like to say a few words on behalf of my party. Last year the Bonus Act was amended to enable the workers to get minimum bonus of 8.33 for the accounting year 1971. Due to the unfortunate death of a member of the Bonus Review Committee, Shri Sakish Lumba, the Bonus Review Committee has not been able to submit its final report and there is some delay in the submission of the report. As an amendment to the Bonus Act has become necessary to make payment of 8.33 per cent bonus for the accounting year 1972, this bill has come before the House. While welcoming this Bill I would like to make a few suggestions in regard to payment of bonus to workers.

According to the Bonus Act, 8.33 per cent has been fixed as a minimum bonus and the benefits goes to 40 lakhs of workers of our country. On the eve of this year's independence day our President has made an earnest appeal to the workers of our country. In his address to the nation, the President referring to the present economic crisis facing the country has appealed to the workers to desist from strikes for at least three years. He also pointed out that unless the

industrial production goes up there can be no tangible economic progress. In her address to the nation from the Red Fort of Delhi after flag hoisting ceremony, the Prime Minister too made similar appeal to the workers of our country and called for moratorium on strikes. I would like to point here Sir, that it does not lie in the mouth of a Government which has singularly failed in giving protection to the basic rights of the workers to make such appeals reminding merely the duties and responsibilities of the working class of our country. A Government which swears by socialism day in and day out should not merely stop with making appeals to workers to desist from strikes without fulfilling the corresponding obligations towards them.

Sir, the Railways play a vital role in the sphere of economic development of our country. There are as many as 17 lakhs of workers for manning our railways. Railways are a major revenue earning Central Government Department. It is quite necessary that in order to enliven this huge body of workers that sufficient incentive should be provided to them. Bonus to railway workers is one such incentive. We saw recently that the loco men had to strike work demanding fulfilment of a few reasonable and legitimate demands. Only last week Railway Minister announced in the House that as a result of that strike the Railways incurred a loss of Rs 13 crores. It is needless to point out that had the demands been considered sympathetically and promptly such a strike resulting in a loss of Rs. 13 crores could have well been avoided.

The Government have, rightly so, compelled the private sector employers to pay minimum bonus of 8.33 per cent to the workers and the hon. Minister of Labour has brought this Bill to extend this benefit for the ac-

counting year 1972. But the Minister has not been able to compel his colleagues, the Railway Minister, to accept the demands of the Railway workers regarding payment of bonus to them. This peculiar situation reminds me of a Tamil proverb which means that "Let the wife be generous to the host's ghee but be stringent with her own". When the Government are prepared to fix a minimum bonus for workers in non-Government departments they are unwilling to show the same sympathy to their own workers. In reply to this Bill in Rajya Sabha, the Labour Minister did not think it necessary to make any reference to this question of bonus to the railway workers. Instead, he said that the Government were considering a national wage policy which only shows that this Government has been helpless all these 25 years of independence.

16.00 hrs.

Sir I would like to refer to another section of workers. There are in our country about 20 lakhs of bidi workers. Out of these 20 lakhs only 5 per cent are in the organised sector and the rest are in the unorganised sector of industry. I would like to know how this Bonus Act will be able to cover the 95 per cent of bidi workers. Because of the deficiency in the Bonus Act these workers are denied bonus and I therefore appeal to the Minister to amend the Act suitably so that this large number of bidi workers may also derive the benefits of the Bonus Act.

Sir, earlier I made a reference to the Railway workers. I would also like to mention that the workers of the Posts and Telegraphs Department and the workers in the Ordnance Factories do also deserve bonus and it is unreasonable to discriminate this large number of workers from the workers in the private sector in the matter of 1753 I.S.-12.

payment of bonus. If the Government are serious in improving the revenues and avoid deficit financing and printing of currency notes and if they are serious in improving the productivity it is essential that they should give incentive to their workers by way of bonus. In this connection I would like to quote the example of Pallava transport Corporation in Tamilnadu. This transport Corporation is a State-owned Corporation. The Corporation decided to pay 5 per cent of this earnings as an incentive bonus to the workers. This proved to be highly beneficial not only to the workers but also to the revenues of the Corporation. The behaviour of the employees to the passengers showed marked improvement and the punctuality of the buses greatly improved. I therefore once again appeal to the Government to consider favourably the question of granting bonus to the lakhs and lakhs of workers in Railways, posts and Telegraphs and Ordnance Factories.

Sir, I would like to refer to another provision in the Bill imposing 20 per cent ceiling on bonus. This provision is unwholesome and must be deleted. There is no rational explanation as to why the Government should come in the way of the workers sharing the huge profits that are made by the profitable industries. The Industrial Unit which earn very huge profits exploit this provision of the Act and deny higher bonus to the workers. It is a matter of common knowledge that during the last two years the spinning and weaving mill owners have made unimaginably huge profit and converted the revenues into black money. As a result the workers were denied the legitimate share in the profits by way of bonus. I therefore submit to the hon. Minister that this provision of ceiling of 20 per cent bonus should be deleted.

In Tamilnadu, there is a real socialist Government of my party, the D.M.K. In fact the State Government is a workers representative Government. There is complete industrial peace in the State and the production is at its

[Shri E. R. Krishnan]

peak. The Central Government would do well to emulate the progressive policies being implemented by the State Government. Before I conclude I appeal to the hon. Minister once again that the Government should come forward to grant bonus to the workers of Railways, posts and Telegraphs, and Ordnance Factories. Supporting this Bill I conclude.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): I want to make a few suggestions to the hon. Minister. I have already moved an amendment along with some other colleagues. I should suggest that this Bill should not be restricted to this year alone. It is clear we are not going to go back in the years to come. Then why not make it a permanent affair? You can plead with the Government and place it before the Cabinet and get the consent. If it cannot be done now, I would plead with you to accept my suggestions and atleast by an Ordinance make it a permanent affair. It looks ridiculous to bring a Bill every session to extend the period.

Secondly there should be no deduction for Provident Fund from the bonus payable to the workers. This year especially due to the increase in prices there has been serious erosion in the real wage and bonus being deferred wage is only meant to fill up the gap between the actual wage earned and the wage that ought to be given. If you deduct the provident fund amount from the bonus it will result in erosion and therefore instead of helping him it will hurt him. At least in this Bill you should not bring in this provision for deduction. To that extent you should accept the suggestions made from the both sides by all the speakers so far.

About ceiling I should suggest that the upper-limit should not be there. Why do you want it? Why do you want to say that those who have made

fabulous profits must also be protected by this ceiling of 30 per cent? Why not the workers get the benefit atleast from those concerned which make fabulous profits? Therefore the ceiling or the upper-limit should not be there.

Some industries are taken over under the Industries Development and Regulations Act, and they are run by the State Governments under the Specific Relief Undertaking Act. I have already pointed out that they are passing some rules and issuing some notifications by which they exempt these units from the provision of the Bonus Act or similar enactment or even the standing orders under the Industrial Disputes Act. It is very unfair. When the Government runs an Undertaking it must be an ideal employer and set an example and it should see that the rights of employees are protected. Instead of that they exempt these units and deprive the employees of their statutory rights which they earned over a period of time. This is very unfair. You should clarify this point and issue directive to all the State Governments so that this is not done.

Lastly from the point of view of the working class, I make this appeal. If we say that bonus is a deferred wage, at some stage bonus will have to be merged with the wage. Are we going to accept the principle that the workers have a responsibility for productivity. At some stage are we not going to say bonus is profit sharing? That was the original concept.... (Interruptions) Make the minimum bonus a part of the wage. Later on the original concept of bonus still remains that it is profit-sharing. That means it must be correlated with profit and productivity. As a person connected with the trade union movement for over 20 years, I beg to submit that the stage has come in this country when all these

who represent the trade union movement must say that bonus must be related to productivity and that we undertake the responsibility of increasing productivity in every sphere and we will take bonus only as correlated with productivity.

All workers must be covered by at least the minimum bonus, the moment you say that bonus is a deferred wage, whether they are working in private industries or in governmental undertakings like defence and railways. What is the difference between a worker preparing razor blades in a private industry and a worker who is producing blades and arms for the defence of the country? Why should the latter not get bonus? Therefore the principle of bonus should be applied to all workers. I know defence is not a profit-making undertaking but as a deferred wage, you can give bonus to him in some form. That will serve as a tremendous incentive to all our employees in railways, defence and other governmental undertakings.

श्री जनशहा प्रधान (शहडोल) :
समागति मंडल, यह विशेषक विचारगृहित है। मजदूरों को 1971 के वर्ष में 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस देने के सम्बन्ध में एक कानून पहले पास किया गया था और उस व्यवस्था को 1972 में भी जारी रखने के लिये यह विशेषक मदद में लाया गया है। मैं इस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

बोनस का भुगतान केवल इस संशोधक विधेयक तक सीमित नहीं है। वह एक बहुत व्यापक प्रश्न है। आज मजदूरों में जो असंतोष व्याप्त है, उसको दूर करने के लिए छोटे छोटे उद्योगों सहित सभी उद्योगों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों को 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस दिया जाना चाहिए। हमारे देश का उत्पादन मजदूरों पर निर्भर करता है और मजदूर

जसी व्यवस्था में पूरी शक्ति के साथ उत्पादन कर सकते हैं, जब कि वे बुलहात हों और उन में संतोष की भावना हो। इसलिए सरकार को इस सम्बन्ध में एक राष्ट्रीय नीति विचारित कर के सब मजदूरों को 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस देने की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए।

आज रुपये का मूल्य केवल पच्चीस या तीस पैसे रह गया है और भंडाई बहुत बढ़ गई है। इस लिए मजदूरों को राहत पहुंचाने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि सभी उद्योगों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों को 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस दिया जाये।

बोनस रीज्यू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट अभी तक नहीं आई है। उस की रिपोर्ट आने पर सरकार को उस की शिफारिशों के आधार पर बोनस सम्बन्धी सभी बातों की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए।

देश में उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि मजदूरों को उचित और पर्याप्त मजदूरी मिले। सरकार को इस बात पर विचार करना चाहिए कि मजदूरी का वास्तविक स्वरूप क्या है और क्या होना चाहिए।

जो बीमार और बन्द कारखाने हैं, उन्हें पुनः चालू कर के उन में काम करने वाले मजदूरों को बोनस देने की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। इसी प्रकार सरकारी क्षेत्र के उद्योगों में काम करने वाले श्रमिकों और दैनिक आधार पर काम करने वाले मजदूरों को भी 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस देना चाहिए।

मंत्री महोदय स्वयं श्रमिकों को समस्याओं के बारे में बहुत जागरूक है और उन्होंने इस क्षेत्र में काफी काम किया है। मेरा अनुसंधान है कि वह देश के सभी श्रमिकों को 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस देने के सम्बन्ध में एक व्यापक विधेयक शीघ्र ही लाये और

[श्री धनसाह प्रधान]

मजदूरों के कल्याण के लिए कारगर अवस्था करें।

जो पाल मार्लबन शर्मा (धनबाद) सभापति महोदय, मैं पेमेंट ग्राफ बोनस (एनेडमेंट) बिल, 1973 का समर्थन करता हूँ।

इस बिल के बहुत ही सीमित उद्देश्य हैं। पिछले साल जो धार्जनेम जारी किया गया था, और उस के बाद बिल पास किया गया था, यह बिल उसी की अवधि को बढ़ाने के लिए लाया गया है। पिछले साल 1971 के लिए बिल लाया गया था और यह बिल 1972 में किसी दिन प्रारम्भ होने वाले एकाउंटिंग ईयर के लिए लाया गया है। अगर यही तरीका रहा, तो इस प्रकार के बिल को हर वर्ष लाने की जरूरत पड़ेगी। इस समय भी इस तरह ध्यान नहीं दिया जा रहा है कि 1973 के लिए भी ऐसे बिधेयक की जरूरत पड़ेगी। जहाँ तक इस बिल के प्रावधानों का सम्बन्ध है, मैं उन का तो समर्थन करता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि यह बिल जल्द पार किया जाये, लेकिन मैं सरकार का ध्यान कुछ महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दों की ओर दिवाना चाहता हूँ।

सरकार इस तरह के समोच्च ला कर ही क्यों बोनस सम्बन्धी इस प्रावधान को जारी रखना चाहती है? इस को कान्टी-न्यूटी देने के लिए उम को यह धमोक्षण करना चाहिए कि यह व्यवस्था कबल 1972 के लिए ही, बल्कि 1972 और उस के बाद के हर वर्ष के लिए होगी।

कम से कम 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस का प्रावधान है। जब 1965 में यह कानून पारित हुआ, तो इस का उद्देश्य था प्राफिट-शेयरिंग बोनस। जैसा कि कई मानवीय सदस्यों ने बलील दी है, यह मिनिमम बोनस वास्तव में तेरहवें महीने का बोनस है, क्योंकि

8.33 प्रतिशत पूरे एक महीने का बोनस होता है—बारह महीने के काम के बाद तेरहवें महीने का बोनस है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब हर उद्योग को यह मिनिमम बोनस देना ही है, तो इस हालत में हम क्यों न इस को बोनस का ही अंग मान लें। प्राफिट-शेयरिंग बोनस का जो उद्देश्य है, उस के अनुसार मुनाफे में मजदूरों का हिस्सा हो और उन हिस्से में कोई सैट माफ और रीट प्रान का प्राबिधन न हो। बोनस प्रतिशत की जो सीमा निर्धारित की गई है, वह सीमा न हो और उद्योग के मुनाफे और उम की शक्ति के अनुसार देने के लिए छोड़ देना चाहिए, क्योंकि मुनाफे में हिस्से में ऊपर की सीमा निर्धारित करना या नीचे की सीमा निर्धारित करना, इन दोनों में कोई भी मुनासिब नहीं होगा।

इस बिल में यह बात भी बटकनी है कि 'आज के दिन कहा जाता है कि 1970 के साल में जो मुनाफे का बोनस मिला, उसने बोनस से अधिक नहीं मिलना चाहिए। उस में अधिक अगर हो तो वह अधिक रकम प्रकॉन्डिटेन्ड के खाते में जमा हो जानी चाहिए। धा की जो स्थिति आज मुल्क में जिन तरह की म'वाई है जिस में कि मजदूरों को अपनी मजदूरी से अपना काम चलाना कठिन हो गया है उस में वह मुनाफे का हिस्सा बिल की कि वह कुछ और अपनी आवश्यकता की चीजों के खरीद फरोखत में लगते, वह उन का प्राबिडेंट फंड में जमा करने की बात आती है, तो प्राबिडेंट फंड का खाता सारे कानून के, सारे बन्धनों के, सारे प्रतिबंधों के बावजूद भी उस तरह का है कि बड़ा भाजिकों के खाते में 20 करोड़ और कोल माइन्स के खाते में 11 करोड़ का बकाया है। जो मजदूर का फाटा हुआ पैसा जमा नहीं करता है वह मुनाफे से हिस्सा दे कर किछ तरह से पैसा जमा करेगा, वह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। इस तरह के उस के लिए बहाना बन जाता है।

दूसरा मुद्दा यह है कि सरकारी उद्योग में जो लगे हुए हैं, जो डिपार्टमेंट ल उद्योग में लगे हुए हैं जैसा डिफेंस प्रोडक्शन है, ग्लोब है, पोस्ट एंड टेलीग्राफ है इन में काम करने वाले सभी लोगों को वित्त कर रखा है। यह प्रश्न जब जब कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी में उठता था तो श्रम मंत्री बराबर कह दिया करते थे। कि मैं इन को वे कमीशन के सामने दे रहा हूँ, मैं इसे बोनस रिब्यू कमेटी के सामने दे रहा हूँ। लेकिन यह क्वेश्चन के सामने आज तक गया नहीं। वे कमीशन की रिपोर्ट तो श्रम सामने आ गई। बोनस रिब्यू कमेटी अभी बंदी हुई है और न मालूम कब तब वैसे की बातें कि तब माननीय मन्थर या जो मिशन हुआ उस जगह की पूर्ण अभी तक नहीं की गई है और जब तक उस जगह की पूर्ण नहीं की जाती है, तब तक बोनस रिब्यू कमेटी का फंक्शन भी नहीं आया। मैं सरकार से चाहूँगा कि उस जगह की पूर्ण तब के बोनस रिब्यू कमेटी को पूरा फंक्शन करने का अधिकार दे और इन मांगे भूटों को जिन में कि सरकारी अफिसरों भी उन में शामिल हों, उन को भी बोनस प्राप्त करने का हक है या नहीं है, कम से कम इन महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्नों का फैसला उन से नहीं करा ले क्योंकि उन में मारे लोगों के प्रतिनिधि है। मैं सरकार से निवेदन करूँगा कि इन मामलों के ऊपर विचार कर के और गय कर के बोनस के का सुधार करने के लिए एक पूरा विस्तृत विधेयक सदन के सामने पेश करे। इसी शब्दों के साथ मैं इन विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री राज कर्कर (दॉ०) सभापति महोदय, बोनस समोधन विधेयक 1973 जो लाया गया है मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ लेकिन 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस देने का जो बिल सरकार लाई है वह केवल मात्र एक नहीं के बराबर है। आज की बढ़ती हुई महंगाई को देखते हुए इस का साना बहुत जरूरी था। मजदूर जो उद्योगों में काम करने वाले हैं उनमें एक तो सरकारी उद्योग हैं, दूसरे गैर सरकारी उद्योग हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मजदूरों की प्राप्ति में भी उन में फर्क है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह प्राप्ति की जाहे उद्योग सरकारी हो या गैर सरकारी हो, उन की प्रोसेस एक सी होनी चाहिए। उस में अंतर नहीं होना चाहिए। मजदूरों को कई वर्गों में आपने बाट रखा है। मेरा निवेदन है कि जितने भी आप के उद्योग छवें चलते हैं चाहे वह किसी भी श्रेणी के मजदूर उन से हों उन सभी को यह मिलना चाहिए।

इस के साथ साथ भारत में 25 प्रतिशत ऐसे मजदूर हैं जो स्थानी नहीं हैं, जो प्राइवेट बिल्डिंग पर काम करते हैं, ग्रामी संप्रदायों में रहते हैं, गरीबों के परिवार हैं और अपने परिवार का भरण रक्षित से भी संभाल रहे हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि इस बिल से सभी वर्ग के मजदूरों का संबंध है और उन की सूची सरकार को तैयार करनी चाहिए और सूची तैयार कर के जो बिल्डिंगों पर काम करने वाले मजदूरों हैं उन की भी पूरी देख रेख होनी चाहिए। मैं ने बहुत अवह देखा है कि बिल्डिंगों पर से गिर कर वह धमिक मर गए, तो उन की कोई देखने वाला नहीं होता।

[श्री राम कबरा]

जितने भी मजदूर किसी तरह से रजिस्ट्रेशन के बाहर हैं उन की धाराएं उन के नीचे तक या सरकार तक पहुंच जायगी लेकिन आज ऐसे शोषण मजदूर हैं उन को कोई पूछने वाला नहीं होता। उनको भगवान के ऊपर छोड़ रखा है। दिल्ली में साल में सी दो सी मजदूर ऐसे मरते हैंगे लेकिन उन को कोई पूछता तक नहीं है। मजदूरों में भी उन के नाम तक नहीं आते हैं। इसी प्रकार से जो झार्सित कार की फैक्ट्री बन रही है वहां भी कितने ही मजदूर मरे हैं। वहां के लोग मेरे पास आए। मैं पार्लियामेंट में बोला। लेकिन कोई सुनवाई नहीं हुई।

मेरा निवेदन है कि जो ऐसा मजदूर वर्ग है जिस के पास कोई खेतीबाड़ी नहीं है, कोई धीरे जीविका का साधन नहीं है उन की ओर सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिए सरकार ने गरीबी खत्म करने का नारा लगाया था तो उस कर्म से काम इन मजदूरों की ओर ध्यान देना चाहिए जो बेचारे दोनो टाइम के अंजन के भी मोहताज होते हैं। जो इस तपह के लोकल मजदूर हैं वह आज की स्थिति में कितनी कठिनाई से अपना जीवन व्यतित करते हैं? उन के बच्चे पढ़ लिख नहीं सकते हैं और वह कभी भी योग्य नहीं बन सकते हैं। कभी भी अफिसर नहीं बन सकते हैं। इसलिए जो गरीब हैं जिन के पास कोई सम्पत्ति नहीं है, जीविका का कोई साधन नहीं है, उन के लिए आप क्या प्रबन्ध करने जा रहे हैं, मंत्री महोदय इस का उत्तर अपने भाषण में दें।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Mysore-puzba): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is a matter for regret in a sense that, although a year has gone by since we passed the last amendment Bill, we are to discuss a Bill of the nature that we have before us, an *ad hoc* enactment, to meet a specific need. This has happened, as was pointed out by the Minister, because the Bonus Commission could not submit its report. One of the reasons was the demise of Comrade Satish Loomba who represented the AITUC on this Commission. I recall, with sense of sorrow that the AITUC could not choose to send their nominee on the Commission so that the Commission could proceed with its work; they have decided not to send their nominee at all. This correspondence and controversy took away a lot of time so much so the Commission could not proceed with its deliberations. As things are, in the Commission itself, the working class representatives are heavily over numbered by the representatives of the management and other sectors. Nevertheless, it is my hope that, before the next year comes, the Commission may be able to submit its report and the Government may not have any necessity to come with another *ad hoc* Bill.

The Bill, being in the nature of an *ad hoc* provision, is fairly simple and I would agree with the Minister that preliminary discussion may not be necessary and what has been done is something which has got to be welcomed.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Thank you.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: But I wish that certain of the provisions had a different character. I do completely support one of the suggestions that came up from different quarters in this House. One is with respect to the application of the Bill. The restriction of the application of the new provisions of the sub-section to Section III to the

year 1972 only. The other is the provision that the excess percentage may be funded in the provident fund.

Now I would just bring to the notice of the Minister one single case to demonstrate the possible inequity that is inherent in these restrictions. Last week I was in my State of Kerala to negotiate a bonus agreement on behalf of the cashew workers numbering about 1 lakh. The cashew workers are the lowest paid. The highest of their annual wage, if they work for all the days, will be about Rs. 750-800. A very few number will get that much and a large number will be getting much less, below Rs. 750. I cited this provision of Rs. 80 and the representatives of the workers said that at least Rs. 80 should be given to them. A reply came back; amendment which is before the P. rhame it is only for the accounting year 1972. What we were negotiating there was for the year 1973. I may inform for the information of the Minister that there are large sections of workmen in different parts of the country for whom negotiations need not necessarily be offer the conclusion of a bonus year. We do conclude and settle the bonus for the year 1973 in the middle of 1973. Now we have settled for 1973. For coir workers we do that. For a large number of such workers we do that. Those workers do not get this protection of section as amended. Only those workers for whom 1972 bonus is settled get this Rs. 80. What was thought of by the Minister or the Government as a very innocuous provision and that it may not affect anybody at all adversely presumably on the basis that a bonus settlement could not possibly be made except for the concluded year. As a result of that, a large chunk of workmen stands debarred from the protective provision which he is making for the workers. I am only pleading with the Minister to kindly see the inequity of this aspect. What do we lose by saying that this provision will apply irrespective of the year and when the final Act

comes in, you can, if you want, alter and the Act will automatically stand amended by that. But, in the meanwhile every worker should get protection of this proviso. Therefore, I plead with him that particular amendment which has been moved by the hon. Members saying that the restriction of the application of this provision to 1972 may be removed and the application may be extended without periodic restriction. That is No. 1.

Citing the same example, I say we have settled the bonus at 12 per cent. The largest amount that any worker could possibly get under this particular settlement is about Rs. 94.95 which is higher than the previous year's which was 10 per cent. 2-1/2 more which is in excess of Rs. 80. That means it is Rs. 14 more. That Rs. 14, according to you, must be put in the provident fund. Therefore, this small worker gets a bonus of Rs. 94 merely because he has struck a bargain at 12 1/2 per cent as against 10 per cent. This blessed Rs. 14 must not be handed over to the worker so as to ensure that it does not add to the inflationary spiral of the country, let this Rs. 14 not add to the inflationary spiral of the country. On the one hand the workers are denied the protection of Rs. 80 and on the other, the funding is provided for. Now, this is an anomaly. This is an inequity and it must be looked into. We know the price spiral I do not want to cover the same ground. That has already been covered by many friends here. There is absolutely no sense in providing that this amount must go to the provident fund. What exactly is the provision? Anything beyond the minimum should go to the provident fund. What is the payment beyond the minimum bonus? It can either be productivity bonus or profit-sharing bonus. How do profits come? Profits come because of workers' effort and the production increase. How does production go up under Section 34? Because the worker co-operates with the authorities to increase the production. As a result

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

of his co-operation, he collects money either under a formula of the Bonus Act or under Section 34 and you go on saying, 'Although you contribute your effort to increase the production of the country, the more money you are getting, that you put in the provident fund'. What sort of encouragement it will be to the worker to maximise the production in the country?

There is one particular aspect of the matter which I wish to emphasise, and that is, the mentality with which you approach the whole question. The mentality is this: The worker is collecting a little more money; the worker is not living in luxury; therefore he must save for the future. Is that the condition in the country? Is it the condition with 23 per cent increase in the price level in this country? Can he afford to do so? Can he afford to save for the future in this condition, Sir? Or, should he have this added money in order to meet his emergent needs? They have thought it proper to incorporate such a provision now of all years in 1973 when the working class and the fixed income group are groaning under the spiral of price increase. This shows the mentality which speaks volumes that they have absolutely no appreciation of the difficulties through which the working class in this country is passing. It is against this mentality that we feel that there will be a revolt and a feeling of protest. I know it may not be possible to accept the amendment immediately because the matter may have to be referred to Finance, this that and other Ministries. Nevertheless, with regard to 1972, I hope nothing prevents the Labour Minister to accept this so that large chunk of working class may get the protection of this particular provision.

In this connection I want to raise my voice of discord against the sentiments given out by my hon. friend Mr. Nalk. He said: Large number of unemployed people are there, large number of underemployed people are

there, who is taking care of them? Therefore, in order that they may be taken care of, let the working class people show some patience! To whom are you giving this advice? To working class people only? Then what about the large number of people, the upper class people, including the Members of Parliament? What about such upper class people who are living a cosy life? No sermon to them? If the community wants production to grow, they must pay the due to the working class. If you want the working class to produce for the community you must pay to the working class. The price of labour has got to be paid. For petrol you pay the price; for the price of raw material you don't grudge paying. How do you want us to believe that the price of labour you can't pay? If you cannot pay the price of labour, don't speak about socialism. We must give a fair deal to labour and labour is the real wealth of the nation. Give labour its proper deal. The worker must produce and what he does increases our wealth. Let us not starve the worker. To make the unorganised follow an abject for denying the right to the working class is not the correct approach. Now, finally, I appeal to the Minister. Kindly consider this question of 1972. Kindly make it applicable to the entire year and if your hands are free kindly consider removing this restrictive provision of the P.F. also so that the worker may be enabled to face the needs of the year 1973.

With these words I congratulate the Minister for coming up with this Bill in time so that we can approach the Diwali and Puja with equanimity. I support the Bill.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: (Rajapur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, regarding the amending Bill on Bonus and various other amending bills that are coming up from the Treasury Benches, I say that these are the indications of the fact that the entire approach of the Government on the

bonus issues is only a piece-meal approach.

Our criticism is that you must have a more clear hensive approach to this problem. Instead of coming before the House everytime with such amending Bills, it is better that you take a long-range perspective. There is a confusion in the mind of the Government regarding the very concept of bonus. And that is why, repeatedly, these controversies are being raised. Sometimes they describe the bonus as an ex-grota payment and at other times that is described as a deferred wage and things of that sort. Of course, they did not use the words 'deferred wage'. They are rather shy. The moment you introduce the clause on 'minimum bonus' for the workers irrespective of the profit and loss—we have indirectly already accepted the concept of deferred wage—as far as the minimum wage is concerned, or that also, there are a number of amendments that are coming forward from various Members, I think, they should also be respected. I know you have the brute majority and so, most of the amendments that were moved can be defeated. Even those who expressed themselves in favour of a number of amendments, I am sure, at the time of voting, will say that our mind is with you and our heart is with you but, after all, our hands are with the Minister.

That happened last time. Earlier there was an occasion when the leader of the Railwaymen's Federation moved an amendment and I pleaded with the House that their amendment should be accepted. I also mentioned that I was prepared to support his amendment and would remain in the House but I told the Member that when pressed for the amendment, he would himself run away but we would vote for that amendment. That is what is happening everytime. Therefore, I say that the Minister should take a long-range perspective of the problem. Repeatedly all sections of this House

have expressed themselves against certain of the provisions. Now, everybody is coming forward to say that this provision for the 8.33 per cent bonus should remain. Let us have a permanent arrangement. Everytime you cannot go on saying that you want to have a ceiling of 25 per cent. Repeatedly all sections of the House have expressed that a part of the bonus should be credited in the G. P. Fund account of the employees. That also is being thought of by every section of the House. Please take cognisance of this more important aspect also. Some Members have pointed out that whatever be the response of the workers, even in foreign countries, it has been established that there has to be an incentive over the production and a revision of wage. It may be a direct revision of wage or by way of granting of more bonus. This is for just filling up the partial gap existing between the existing and living wages. A country like Japan has conclusively established that the revision of wages with better conditions of the workers has been the greatest incentive for the production. And when the production goes up, general developmental trends also will go up.

Therefore, let us not enter into an academic discussion as to whether it is possible for us to revise the entire Bonus Act so that all categories of workers, whoever suffer from that gap between the existing wage and living wage, are to be brought within the purview of the Bonus Act. This should be removed from the Bill.

There is one more point which is relevant to our discussion. I would like to make a reference while passing. Repeatedly we are told and we are advised not to demand for more bonus and revision of wages. Why don't you accept the principle of linking up the wages with the productivity? This is a very dangerous argument. Apparently, it may appear that the argument is quite valid and quite rational. But, many of us are asking for linking

[*Prof. Madhu Dandavate*]

up the wages with the productivity for the very simple reason that it is the labour who plays an important part as far as productivity is concerned. In a number of enterprises and in a number of units, we find that the labour has played an important role. The extraneous factors like the non-availability of raw materials, mismanagement of the managers and a number of manipulations and other artificial scarcity that is created are all due to the inefficiency of the people in the units. And in spite of the efficiency of labour, the productivity may suffer. Therefore, it is a dangerous thing to link up the wage with the productivity of the labour. That argument has, therefore, also to be taken into account. Rather than linking up of wages with productivity, link up the bonus to the productivity. We would very much like that the principle of deferred wage should be accepted. I would like to make a reference to one point. I would not like to repeat the points which have been covered. This House has to consider that aspect also.

16.44 hrs.

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

While passing, I would like to make a reference. Just as we want various categories of workers—employees—to be brought within the purview of the Bonus Act, I would also like to point out that there are various categories of staff of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha as also of various State Legislatures—suppose you accept the proposal to include the Central Government and State Government employees within the purview of the Bonus Act, it is likely that as far as the staff of Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha, and various State Legislatures are concerned, they should not completely be overlooked—who should not be completely overlooked. Therefore, their interests also must be safeguarded. I know that they do not fall within the purview of the Government, and there is an independent machinery, and it is the

presiding authorities at the Central and State Legislatures within whose jurisdiction this problem falls, but I would like to ventilate their grievances also that due justice should be done also to these men who have proved their worth, as far as efficiency and output of work is concerned. Actually, it is a fact and very often I wonder how it happens, that as far as the Secretariat and this Parliament and the Legislature are concerned, they set a fine example of efficiency, but this efficiency does not percolate down to the Secretariat which is only next door. We always praise their efficiency. But in terms of emoluments, in terms of advantages of bonus and other facilities, they are always neglected. Therefore, I would take this opportunity also to ventilate their grievances.

I hope the almost unanimous view of the entire House on various issues which have been formulated will be taken notice of by the Minister, and he will not insist that 'I accept the spirit of various amendments, but at the same time, I request the Members to withdraw the amendments'. Let him please give up this idea of accepting the spirit and rejecting the bottle. For God's sake, let him not repeat that ritual but try to make cognisance of the unanimity that exists in this House on various proposals regarding ceiling, quantum of bonus, scope of the Bonus Act and also debiting a portion of the bonus to the provident fund account of the employees and so on. If all these suggestions are taken into account, I have not the least doubt that he will have to amend this Act and come forward some other time with a modified and more comprehensive Bill.

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI (Bombay-North-East): I am glad that Government have come forward with this Bill to amend the Payment of Bonus Act. Taking the experience of last year, the hon. Minister has no doubt come at the right time and did not

depend only on making appeals to the employees. If he would have done so, the experience he would have met with would have been the same as what he had the previous year. So, I am glad that this Bill has come.

It is true that the purpose of this Bill is not to change the bonus system as a whole, because the question of bonus is still under review by the Bonus Review Committee. Last year, it was only minimum bonus, and the limited purpose of the measure was to make it statutory. So, last year, it was provided that the year should be 1971. Now, instead of 1971, the year is changed to 1972. While we accept the purpose of this Bill, still we do feel that a lot of changes had taken place during the last one year and a half, and these changes should have been taken cognisance of. So year as 1971 was concerned, provision was made statutorily only for one year. There is no necessity that for 1972 also it should be only for one year. We would like to know whether the hon. Minister is going to make it statutory from year to year and keep the question of minimum bonus hanging in the fire every year. Is it because the Bonus Review Committee has said in its interim recommendation that the minimum bonus should be 8.33 per cent that the hon. Minister is making it statutory only for one year? The purpose, as we have understood is that the meaning of the word 'interim' is not that the minimum of 8.33 per cent is to be changed or it could be even less than that, but that this minimum will be there for the first year, it will be there for the second year and it is going to be the final figure for all the years to come so long as the Bonus Act as there and payment of bonus is to be made.

If the Government say that it is open to the Bonus Review Committee to raise the minimum quantum of bonus from 8.33 to 10 per cent and even higher than 10 per cent, I have nothing to say. But 8.33 per cent

means practically one month's wage, which means that the principle Government have accepted is that a minimum of 13 months wages for 12 months work. That is the whole basis of the recommendation of the Bonus Review Committee. It referred to it as 'interim' not because the amount was interim but it had under consideration some other aspect of the bonus scheme, the ceiling point and other prior charges which were to be considered. Therefore, that word has nothing to do with the quantum as such. I am sure the Labour Minister would consider this aspect and take into cognisance this fact and not restrict the minimum bonus of 8.33 per cent to 1972 only; it should be for the future also.

The second point on which members who spoke are agreed is on the question of deduction and deposit in the provident fund account. Last year, this was not acceptable to a large number of MPs. This year is a very crucial year. I would appeal to Government to reconsider this idea of making it statutory, deduction from the bonus and asking the employers to deposit the excess, more than the previous year's, in the provident fund account. I would caution Government that if this is done, it is likely to create a crisis. I come from Bombay which is the biggest textile centre. For some reason or other, 1972 has been for the textile mills the most profitable year during the last 10-12 years. They have reaped a harvest when the country was going through an economic crisis. They have had the biggest profit in 1972. Therefore, it might happen that if in 1971 out of 52 mills, 40 were paying the minimum bonus, now more of them would pay more than the minimum.

Now the workers are likely to suffer. The employers have got the profits. The Bonus Act does not say that the remaining part of the bonus will remain. The employers will get whatever they want, but the workers

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]
will be deprived of their share of the bonus. Immediately they need cash. If they are likely to get higher than the minimum, they should be entitled to it because during 1972 they passed through a hard crisis. The year was bad and they need the cash.

Therefore, instead of inviting unrest in big textile centres of the country and in other industrial centres also, I would appeal to Government to delete the provision relating to deduction and deposit in the PF account. I am sure he would consider it the pros and cons of it and accept both the amendments I have tabled.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, while introducing this Bill in the House, my esteemed friend, the Minister of Labour, said that it is a very simple Bill and therefore it does not require any discussion, but the fact that as many as nine lists giving 36 amendments which have been tabled by several of my esteemed friends, Members from various sections of the House, suggests that although this Bill is simple, it is not adequate. It certainly meets some points but does not go far enough. It is not, therefore, right for the Minister to say that the discussion is not necessary and "let us pass this unthinkingly." We want this Bill to be discussed in order that several points are brought out and the Minister's attention is invited to those points.

As all the other Members who have preceded me have welcomed this Bill, I too welcome this Bill, and I think it was to be expected and it was inevitable, and by the nature of things it was both a logical and legitimate piece of legislation. It was unfortunate that the Bonus Review Committee could not give its report in time and still more unfortunate and sad that one of its esteemed members met with a sad end on account of the Boeing crash. I am

referring to Mr. Loomba. But I do not know why the Government have not yet found it advisable to appoint another member in his place. Why do the Government not hurry up and see that the report of the Bonus Committee comes out soon so that a more comprehensive and better legislation can come out with regard to the problems connected with this issue?

Sir, if my impression is correct, the Government were, before bringing this Bill, hoping that they will make an appeal to the employers and that the employers will then by sheer good sense and understanding, go about giving bonus to the workers in 1972. But what did we see? We saw that the employers did not respond to the Government's appeal. Therefore, the Government had to come forward with this Bill. That alone shows the attitude of the employers in this country.

Sir, sometimes I wonder whether we are living in the India of 1973 as a part of the world of 1973. Whereas in other countries the employers and industrialists take a long-term and enlightened, self-interested view, unfortunately in our country I find that the habit of exploitation, the habit of taking more profit than is necessary and the habit of taking all kinds of exacting job from the workers still persists. Therefore, there is no use depending on the good sense of the employers only, and the Government must come forward, and come forward quickly and swiftly and determinedly with a proper legislation. So, I think from that angle also this particular Bill is inadequate.

I would suggest that the Bill is inadequate in two respects. First of all, it stops with 1972. Then, it proceeds and stops with 1973 almost at the end of 1973! I would like to mention, and ask the Minister whether he really thinks that he is not going to have a bonus bill again, a

bonus of minimum 8.33 per cent, for the year 1973, 1974 and 1975 and further on. In fact he will have to come forward with a Bill for bonus not only for further years but he will have to come forward with further ideas, to some of which my friend Prof. Dandavate referred. He will have to come with a very comprehensive idea and a comprehensive Bill, but he has not done so, though the Government can say for the time being they have no time. But I hope that next year they will not bring a Bill again for 1973 and stop there. They must come with greater ideas.

Secondly, I would also like the Minister to remember that it is not only some sections of the workers who feel the pinch....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I would like to make a few more points, Sir. I would not take much time. I want to suggest that it is not only some sections of workers who suffer. After all, even those workers who are not entitled to bonus under the present legislation are also suffering from the same difficulties. Mention has been made of the private sector employees, public sector employees, the workers in the railways, posts and telegraphs, Defence, etc. My friend Professor Madhu Dandavate rightly mentioned the staff of the Parliament Secretariat, both Houses, and the State Legislatures. Indeed, as regards the Parliament Secretariat, one can say that they are efficient, courteous and smiling, and their hard work is not being rewarded. We want this to be rewarded so that their efficiency gets accelerated and contagious in other fields of life. Why not extend this bonus to them? I want also to refer to the municipal employees like the scavengers who are poor people and who should also get this kind of bonus as part of their legitimate right. I want the Government and this House to understand

that this bonus of 8.33 per cent is not a *baksheesh*; it is not a *meherboni*. It is part of the legitimate right of the workers who have earned this right by their hard and long struggle. Therefore, we must move in that direction. This problem also involves certain larger aspects, such as profit sharing, partnership in industry, democratization in industry, industrial democracy etc. All these ideals are important and unless we take active and concrete steps in the right direction and make strides in that direction, society will not move forward.

17 hrs.

Lakhs of employees, whether they get bonus or not are suffering due to the rise in prices. Only some days ago, on 18th August, the hon. Finance Minister Shri Chavan said in reply to a question in the Lok Sabha that the value of the rupee, as measured by the All India Index of consumer prices for industrial workers (1960-100, i.e., with 1960 as the base year) declined by 47.82 per cent in a period of the years. The rupee value declined to 48.31 paise in 1972-73 from 9259 paise in 1962-63. This shows how the weaker sections and poorer people in our society are suffering. However much they may be paid, and even though their inadequate wages are coupled with increasing dearness allowances, this makes it ridiculous. The whole idea of increased wages becomes useless and meaningless because of the rise in prices. Therefore I want to sit down by saying that this Bill is not adequate. Even though we welcome this Bill we want to see that that the Government comes out with a fair deal to Labour not only in bonus matters but also in matters like gratuity, hours of work etc. and in regard to workers' right to withdraw their Provident Fund amount after 20 years of service, because such an amount given back to workers is simply what they are entitled to. Social Justice and an egalitarian society are two goals

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

which we must realise if we are true to our ideals of socialism and democracy.

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIXIT (Sitapur): Bonus is one such dispute which has accounted for the largest number of man days lost in more than half a century. Repeated efforts were made to resolve the problems but even then it could not be resolved. At the moment the Bonus Bill which is before the House for consideration lacks one thing. It relates to only one year. Does the Ministry want that the Bonus issue should become an issue of real bout between labour and the employer and this bout should continue from year to year so that law also is made from year to year? Let us neither place a premium on strikes nor give lease to such people who create disputes and bring about stoppages of work. Let this Bill not only authorise the Government to decide about the bonus for one year but also gives the authority to the Government to resolve this problem amicably and in a manner that ensures industrial peace.

One other point should be taken into consideration when a comprehensive scheme is prepared in regard to bonus. The law that exists puts a veil of sanctity on the balance sheet and gives to the employers a number of allowances whether the moneys are spent rightly or not. It should not be so.

I would plead with the Government to keep these two questions in mind and with these few words I support the Bill.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN (Quikm): I do not find fault with the hon. Minister for bringing forward legislation which is basically the potter of the Government at this stage, but I do not understand why he found it necessary to pin it down to the year 1972. It is a well-known

fact that there was an interim recommendation. The final recommendation will not go below that. If the minister had taken courage and declared that this will be the minimum bonus for the next two years, he would have done a great benefit to the workers and got the credit of establishing a minimum bonus for India. It was given to a despot and tyrant like Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar who declared deferred wage bonus as early as 1946 in the small State of Travancore. It was taken up by the first popular Ministry and the Labour Minister, Shri C. Kesavan, in the second tripartite conference also declared that bonus is a deferred wage and every industry, whether making a profit or loss, must pay a minimum bonus of 4 per cent. It continued to be in force in my State till 1971 when you brought in a higher rate. But you have this system of set-on and set-off. At least if you say that it will be for the next few years, then it automatically becomes a deferred wage. If you do not say at least 1973, as Mr. Stephen pointed out, you will be throwing out of the ambit of this Bill about 1 lakh of cashew industry workers and so many lakhs of workers in the coir and other industries.

Another very serious defect of this Bill which you have not thought about and which has not been mentioned by others is this. You say it must be paid into their provident fund. What about those employers who are defaulters, who have misappropriated even the share of the workers' contribution to the provident fund, not to speak of the employers' share? They have been doing it for the last so many years. More than Rs 20 crores are new in arrears from the employers. Therefore, you will have to say that at least in the case of those employees who are defaulters, the money will be paid in cash straight to the workers. Otherwise, these casual employees will misappropriate also through their atrocious

actions. In spite of all the amending Bills brought in by the Government, no defaulter has been made to pay the money. So, I would request that at least those employers who are defaulters should be forced to pay this straight to the workers without having the recourse of holding it back and misappropriating it in the name of provident fund.

You cannot bring in a national minimum wage in this country because it will be so small and so insignificant that you will be ashamed to declare it. But you can have a national minimum bonus because it is same percentage which can be respectable even if the cash that is get in hand will be insignificant. So, you must take the earliest opportunity of declaring a national minimum bonus, which must apply to every sector and every industry.

About the Bonus Review Committee, it is your own body. You have put in three major trade unions there. I do not understand the policy of Government running after a few trade unions and leaving the others in the lurch. You have to see that some thing is done effectively. Your own trade union leaders and even some opposition leaders are limiting this payment of bonus to certain classes of workers and denying it to the railway workers and others. But their representatives come here and shout that railway workers and others have not been included!

Therefore, the tripartite conference, the Indian Labour Conference and the Bonus Review Committee have not made any recommendation.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA (Serampore): For the last two years there has been no meeting of the Indian Labour Conference.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: Even in the Indian Labour Conference neither INTUC nor AITUC representatives or any other trade union leader has asserted that it should be paid.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The AITUC representative has appended a minute of dissent.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: A minute of dissent does not mean anything. If you say "we will not sign the report" then I can understand it. The minute of dissent is only for propaganda purposes; it has no other significance. If they were sincere and serious they should not have signed the report. I would request the hon. Minister to consider all these points and bring forward a comprehensive Bill. Let him take courage on both hands and come forward with a Bill for minimum bonus.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY): Sir, I am extremely grateful to the hon. Members who have taken such keen interest in the provisions of this Bill, participated in the debate and made very valuable suggestions. It is not my claim that it is a comprehensive Bill. As I said while I moved this Bill for consideration, it is a very simple measure which does not even call for a debate in this House. As hon. Members have already pointed out, it is indeed a simple measure and the various aspects pointed out are more in parenthesis than directly concerned with the actual provisions of the Bill.

Professor Dandavate made a very important point that wages should be related to productivity. I am quite in agreement with the hon. Member that there are many factors in production and productivity. It would be wrong to relate wages in relation to productivity because, as far as minimum wages are concerned, they cannot be related to production. There are many factors in production such as the growth of monopoly and sometimes even the economics of anti-growth would set in and that would go against the interests of the working class.

[Shri Raghunathan Reddy]

I am one of those who believe that the working class is the main or primary producer of both material and non-material values of life. Therefore, there is necessity here to reiterate that the workers must get their due share. We expected that the employers would comply with the requirements of the situation and pay 8.33 per cent as the minimum bonus even without any legislative enactment. But, then, we received a number of complaints from the trade union leaders and other responsible persons that this demand was not being complied with by the employers. In fact, an argument was advanced by the employers that they cannot do it unless a new enactment is brought in. We have brought in this measure only to remedy that situation. We have never claimed that it is a comprehensive Bill.

The bonus Revision Committee is yet to submit its report. Due to the very unfortunate and sad demise of a very well-known trade union leader of standing, ability, courage and conviction the Bonus Review Committee could not submit its report in time, as expected. We still expect that the Bonus Review Committee would submit its report at the end of this year, or even earlier. Once that report is submitted, all the points that have been raised by the hon. Members would certainly be taken into consideration with great respect and, if called for, a comprehensive Bill would certainly be moved in this House for consideration.

Another main point that has been made is that there should not be any deduction or there should not be any amount credited to the provident fund account, that is, the amount which is in excess of 8.33 per cent. Actually, when it is worked out, what it means is that the bonus upto 8.33 per cent is to be paid in cash in every case. If, however, the bonus beyond 8.33 per cent was being paid in 1970, then, for 1971-72, the percentage alone

would be payable in cash and the balance to be credited to the provident fund account. In other words, 8.33 per cent or the percentage of bonus paid in 1970, even if it is higher, is to be paid in cash and the balance is to be credited to the provident fund account.

This we thought would act as a measure of saving, not in terms of saving and investment alone, to the people so that their wives and children may have some satisfaction that there is some saving left by the bread-winner. This is the main consideration that we have in our mind.

A number of points have been made by the hon. Members in regard to rise in prices and economic situation. This understanding should undergo some change and certain modifications will have to be made. I have had discussion with the hon. Members. Certainly, the points made out by them will be kept in mind. If such a situation arises, suitable remedial measures, whatever type of measures, can be thought of.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Why don't you declare it now? If you have got any power, you do it now.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: The points made by the hon. Members with respect to transfer of excess bonus to provident fund account, etc., have been well made out. As I said, I have had discussion with the hon. Members and, certainly, if a situation arises, necessary steps will be taken. I am fully conscious of it. Therefore, I need not labour about that point. The hon. Members be rest assured that I have understood the question that has been raised with regard to this and the points that have been made by them.

About the rest of the points which have been made as I said, this is a very limited Bill. It is within the

purview of the existing provisions prescribed by the Bonus Act that this amendment has been brought in and not on the consideration of various issues as to whether the bonus should apply to the departmental undertakings or the Government and other undertakings which may be relevant for the purpose of considering the general question of bonus. This is a very limited Bill. Therefore, I am very anxious that this Bill must be passed so that the workers may get full benefit of it before the Puja holidays, the Diwali holidays.

All the points that have been raised by the hon. Members will certainly be taken into consideration at a relevant stage and I can say with utmost respect and consideration...

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: You can bring it for 1973 also. It will be passed. It is such a simple thing. I do not ask for anything more. Bonus has been settled for this year in seven industries, as has been pointed out by Mr. Stephen.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: You can pass this simple thing about 1972. We will think of simple thing about 1973.

As I said, this Bill has a very limited purpose. I do not want to go into details any further. Though some points have been raised by the hon. Members which are outside the purview of this Bill certainly, they will be taken into consideration at a proper time.

With these words, I commend the Bill to the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Payment of Bonus Act, 1963, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

There is a plethora of amendments to clause 2.

Clause 2—(Amendment of Section 10)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 9,—

after "employee" insert—

"whether employed in public undertaking, departmental undertaking or Central Government" (6)

Page 1, line 17,—

after "1972" insert—

"and subsequent years" (7)

Page 1, line 9,—

after "employee" insert—

"including employees in all public undertakings and commercial establishments such as Railways, Posts and Telegraphs and Telephones, civilian Defence establishments notwithstanding whether departmentally run or run by autonomous corporations notwithstanding anything contained in any of the provisions of this Act," (8)

Page 1, line 17,—

after "1972" insert—

"and ever subsequent year" (9).

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 9,—

after "employee" insert—

"including those of Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, Defence establishments, Civil Aviation

(Shri Ramavatar Shastri)

Reserve Bank of India, Hospitals, Corporations, Local Bodies, Universities and Bidi Industries." (12)

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE (Rajapur): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 9,—

after "employee" insert—

"whether employed in public undertaking, departmental undertaking, Corporations of Central and State Government" (13)

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 9,—

after "employee" insert—

"whether he is working in a private and or public sector undertaking or establishment" (17)

Page 1,—

after line 17, insert—

Provided that the minimum bonus shall be ten per cent or one hundred rupees, whichever is higher:

Provided further that for the purpose of this sub-section, the word "employee" shall also include every employee of the Central and State Government and all public sector establishments." (18)

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I beg to move:

Page 1, line 9,—

after "employee" insert—

"including those of Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, Telephones, Defence establishments, Civil Aviation, Reserve and Co-operative Banks, Hospitals, Corporations, Local Bodies, Universities, Medical representatives, Bidi and Engineering Industries." (20)

Page 1, line 11,—

after "1973" insert—

"and in the subsequent years" (21).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I beg to move:

Page 1, line 9,—

after "employee" insert—

"including employees of all public undertakings, departmentally run undertakings, Central Government, Bank, Life Insurance Corporation, General Insurance, Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff, Hospitals, All India Radio, Working and Non-working Journalists, State Governments and Local bodies." (27)

Page 1,—

after line 17, insert—

"Provided that the minimum bonus shall be ten per cent, or Rupees one hundred and fifty, whichever is higher:

Provided further that for the purposes of this sub-section the word 'employee' shall also include employees of all public undertakings, departmentally run undertakings, Central Government, Bank, Life Insurance Corporation, General Insurance, Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff, Hospitals, All India Radio, working and Non-working Journalists, State Governments and Local bodies." (28)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shall I put the amendments to the House?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I want to speak on my amendments.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I also want to speak.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Then how can you finish it by 5.30 p.m.?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The time has been fixed for the statement of the hon. Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, and not for this.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is an Half-an-Hour discussion.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Then this can continue tomorrow.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): The Half-an-Hour Discussion may be postponed by ten or 15 minutes.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Let the Half-an-Hour Discussion be postponed to some other day.

SHRI M. C. DAGA (Pali): No; it cannot be postponed to some other day.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Mr. Banerjee, do not bother about Half-an-Hour Discussion now. Let us finish this Bill.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: We want voting also.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Everything will be alright. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am suggesting that we may postpone the Half-an-Hour Discussion by a few minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have no objection.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I have also no objection, sir. But I would like to speak on my amendments. Not more than two minutes.

My first amendment is:

"Page 1, line 8,—

after "employee" insert—

"whether employed in public undertaking, departmental undertaking or Central Government."

My second amendment reads as follows:—

"Page 1, line 17,—

after "1972" insert—

"and subsequent years".

The hon. Minister has said that, when they bring a comprehensive legislation, all these things will be considered. Even after the publication of the interim report, the workers employed in the departmental undertakings of the Central Government were not considered at all. Can he assure me, Sir, that this question of payment of bonus to Central Government employees, including those who are working in the departmental undertakings like Railways, Defence and P.&T., will also be taken into consideration? Also, Sir, this should be made applicable for the subsequent years also. A very meagre request was made by Shri Sreekantan Nair and Stephen that this might cover 1973 also, but the Minister has rejected it by saying that he wants to bring a comprehensive legislation. We are tired of this 'comprehensive legislation'. Let us make this legislation which is before us a comprehensive one or let us at least amend certain things. I would request the hon. Minister to give a second thought to this and to hurriedly pass it. Let him accept some of the amendments which I am moving and which are helpful to the employees.

I would press my amendments to the vote.

श्री रामकान्तर लक्ष्मी (पटना) :
ज्वायका महीसय, मैं प्रमेसमेंट नं० 20 के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। रेल यकूरो, पी० एच० टी० एवं डिफेन्स कर्मचारियों के बारे में भी कतकी कह चुके हैं। मैं रिजर्व बैंक और नेशनल डिपॉजिटरी बैंक के कर्मचारियों के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ —उनको भी बीएम विद्या

[श्री रामावतार शास्त्री]

जाना चाहिये। हास्पिटल-ज किना मूहत्वपूर्ण काम करते हैं, उन के कर्मचारियों को इस के परबन्ध में लाना चाहिये। कारपोरेटिव लोकल-बार्डीज विश्वविद्यालयों के कर्मचारी एव मेडिकल रिप्रेजेंटेटिव को भी बोनस मिलना चाहिये। मेडिकल रिप्रेजेंटेटिव और विश्व-विद्यालय के कर्मचारियों को प्रायः अभी तक बर्कमेंट नहीं माना है। प्रायः कहते हैं कि हम उसके लिये कानून लायेंगे, लेकिन अभी तक नहीं ला सके। इसलिये उनके लिये कोई कानून बनाइये और उनको बोनस के परबन्ध में लाइये।

बीबी मजदूरों की आर्थिक स्थिति आज बहुत खराब है। वे घरा में काम करते हैं कारखानों में काम करते हैं लेकिन उनको भी बोनस नहीं दिया जाता। छोटी छोटी इजी-नियरिंग इण्डस्ट्रीज में काम करने वाले लोगों को भी प्रायः बोनस देने की व्यवस्था कीजिये, क्योंकि आज सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि स्थिति बयल रही है मरुगाई बड रही है—जब हम श्रमियों को बोनस देते हैं तो फिर इनके साथ विमातर जैसा व्यवहार क्यों हो? सब तरह के मजदूरों एव कर्मचारियों को बोनस दिया जाना चाहिये अतः इस तरह का कानून लाइये ताकि तमाम लोगों का इसमें शामिल किया जा सके।

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA
My first amendment is almost of the same nature as that of Mr S M Banerjee's and others, viz, after 'employee' insert—

"whether he is working in a private or public undertaking or establishment"

Further, I have said that for the purpose of this section, the word 'employee' shall also include every employee of the Central and State Governments and all public sector establishments. This is very simple. Why should there be any discrimination between one employee and another working side by side just as I mentioned, in the Durgapur Steel

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER You have made that point

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Durgapur Steel employees will get but the persons who are connected with the Government undertaking directly, doing clerical work or other jobs, will not get the bonus in the same Durgapur area. In Calcutta the Government Press—both Central and State Government press workers are not getting. There are incentive systems in some sections of the Chittaranjan Locomotive factory. They are not getting.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER You are repeating what you said during the general discussion

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Again and again we have to repeat. For the last 15 years we have been repeating that this should be raised to 10 per cent but that has not been done. So, we will have to repeat it again and again that they should make any discrimination between one employee and another.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER You have done that

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Yes, Sir

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER You have repeated

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: They are making discrimination and that is why we are repeating

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER You have done it

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: So, I come to my point. But the Minister has not stated regarding the quantum of the minimum bonus to be raised to 10 per cent. He has not spoken anything about that. He agrees that there has to be a rise in price

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him reply.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: He has not yet done.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He will reply

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Then I will appeal to you to ask him to at least reply to this point. Actually, the real wages are going down. Therefore, he must compensate it by raising the quantum of the minimum bonus.

श्री मधु लिमये (बांका) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मन्त्री महोदय से मेरी प्रार्थना है कि मेरे हमारी सभी बातों को ध्यान में ही नहीं रखकर कुछ समझौता करे। मेरी राय में तो सभी कर्मचारियों की, मजदूरों को बोनस देना चाहिए बिलाघात, लेकिन अगर उत्कास देने के लिए पैसा नहीं है तो कम से कम जो व्यापारिक प्रतिष्ठान है, कर्मचाल एम्प्लॉयमेंट्स, उनको तो कम से कम बोवस देकर एक प्रच्छा शुधारण करे। मैंने कहा है कि रेलवे क्षेत्र निजी क्षेत्र में होती तो वह मुनाफे के लिए चलती और बहा पर बोनस मिलता। प्रयुक्ति में रेलवे निजी क्षेत्र में है और हमारे यहाँ सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में है क्या इसलिए आप उनको दण्डित करेगे? अमेरिका में टेलीफोन निजी क्षेत्र में है और हमारे यहाँ सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में क्या इसलिए उनको आप सजा दे रहे हैं? उसी तरह से सिविलियन डिफेंस इन्स्टीट्यूट है। हथियार और बारूद प्रयुक्ति और डिफेंस में भी, निजी क्षेत्र में चलता है और हमारे यहाँ सरकारी क्षेत्र में चलता है क्या इसलिए आप उनको फौसी प्रयुक्ति में रखकर सजा दे रहे हैं?

सुझाव है कि इस सुझाव देकर, टेलीफोन, डाकघर, तार और सिविलियन डिफेंस एम्प्लॉयड के लिए बोनस देना सुधारण करे। यदि इन्स्टीट्यूट वाले बुकिंग डेवा लेकर बाड़े हो जाते हैं इसलिए हम उनको बोनस देते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बिगत साल इन्स्टीट्यूट महानगरपालिका ने एक राय से अपने कर्मचारियों को बोनस देने का प्रस्ताव किया लेकिन उसमें बढ़ावा कितने डाला? रजनी पटेल ने नहीं बल्कि पहले राज्य सरकार ने बढ़ावा डाला और उसके बाद प्रधान मंत्री की सरकार ने बढ़ावा डाला। जब स्थानीय निकाय अपने कर्मचारियों को अपनी ग्रामदर्जी से बोनस देने के लिए पैसा है तो उनमें बढ़ावा डालने का काम किया गया है। इसलिए उस पैसा का खर्च करने के लिए आप कम से कम रेलवे को, डाक, टेलीफोन और सिविलियन डिफेंस एम्प्लॉयड को देने की बात करे मैं मान नूना सज्जीता।

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: As I have already stated this is a very limited measure bringing 8.33 per cent as bonus in this year as it was done in the last year. That is why I am not going into the various points which have been raised, which though relevant, are not immediately concerned with the Bill before the House. After the Bonus Review Committee's recommendations are available, the point raised by Shri Bhattacharyya about raising this to ten per cent and the point raised by Shri Madhu Limaye about various commercial establishments will be looked into and further action taken in the light of their recommendations. As such, I am not now in a position to accept the amendments.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shall I put them together?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE Please put No 6 separately.

NOES

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER All right The question is.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA It is the same as No. 17. We may take it up simultaneously

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER In that case no voting can take place, because you cannot vote on a number of amendments together You can vote only on one amendment

Now, I am putting amendment No 6 to the vote of the House The question is

Page 1, line 9, —

after "employee" insert—

"whether employed in public undertaking, departmental undertaking or Central Government" (6)

The Lok Sabha divided

Division No 4]

1738 hrs

AYES

Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh
Banerjee, Shri S M
Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
Bhattacharya, Shri Dinesh
Bhaura, Shri B S
Chandraggan, Shri C K
Dandavate, Prof Madhu
Limaye, Shri Madhu
Mangalakar, Shri P G.
Pandaya, Dr. Laxminarsin
Reddy, Shri B. N.
Sen, Dr. Ganga
Sharma, Shri Mahadev
Singh, Shri D. N.

Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
Ambesh, Shri

Appalanaidu, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
Basappa, Shri K
Basumatari, Shri D.
Bhagat, Shri B R
Bhargava, Shri Bageswar Nath
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Brahmandandi, Shri Swami
Butta Singh, Shri
Chakieshwar Singh, Shri
Chandrika Prasad, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri Roban Lal
Chaven, Shri Yeshwantrao
Daga, Shri M C
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Derbara Singh, Shri
Das, Shri Anadi Charan
Das, Shri Dharnidhar
Dhamankar, Shri
Dwtvedi, Shri Nageswar
Eggt, Shri Hiren
Ganesh, Shri K R
Gangadeb, Shri P
Gomango, Shri Giridhar
Gotkhinde, Shri Anantshah
Hansda, Shri Subodh
Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
Ishaque, Shri A. K. M
Jafar Sheraf, Shri C K
Jha, Shri Chiranjit
Kadam, Shri J G.
Kafkas, Dr
Kapoor, Shri Sat Sai
Kavde, Shri A. R. M.
Khande, Shri Lal
Kotki, Shri Mahadev
Kotnis, Shri A. K.

Koya, Shri C. H. Mahomed
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Kushok Bakula, Shri
 Lakkappa, Shri K.
 Lakshminarayanan, Shri M. R.
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 Malaviya, Shri K. D.
 Mallikarjun, Shri
 Mandai, Shri Jagdish Narain
 Maurya, Shri B. P.
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mishra, Shri Jagannath
 Mura, Shri S. N.
 Mohammad Yusuf, Shri
 Murthy, Shri B. S.
 Nask, Shri H. V.
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
 Nimbalkar, Shri
 Oraon, Shri Karak
 Pamuh, Shri Paripornanand
 Pandey, Shri Damodar
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Patel, Shri Netwarlal
 Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Krishnarao
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaf
 Raghu Ramiah, Shri K.
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri
 Ramabekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
 Rao, Shri P. Ankhneedu Prasad
 Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
 Rathia, Shri Umad Singh
 Ravi, Shri Vagalar
 Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila

Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sankats Prasad, Dr.
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar
 Sevant, Shri Shankerrao
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri A. P.
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.
 Shivnath Singh, Shri
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Tewari, Shri Shankar
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
 Yadav, Shri R. P.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The
 result* of the division is: Ayes: 15,
 Noes: 95

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I
 shall put all the rest of the amend-
 ments to the vote

Amendments Nos 7 to 9, 12, 13, 17, 18,
 20, 21, 27 and 28 were put and nega-
 tived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The
 question is:

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3—(Amendment of section 13)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Are you
 moving your amendment. Shri Ram-
 avtar Shastri?

*The following Member did not re-record his vote:
 Noes: Shri Mohideen Wajid Khan

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI I beg to move

"Page 2, line 3,—

after "1972" insert—

"and in the subsequent years" (23)

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER I shall now put the amendment to vote

Amendment No 23 was put and negatived

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER The question is.

"That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted

Clause 3 was added to the Bill

Clause 4—(Amendment of section 19)

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE (Barka) I beg to move

"Page 2, line 11,—

after 'employee' insert—

"including employees in all public undertakings and commercial establishments such as Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, and Telephones, civilian Defence establishments notwithstanding whether departmentally run or run by autonomous corporations notwithstanding anything contained in any of the provisions of this Act" (10)

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE I beg to move

"Page 2, line 18,—

after "1972" insert—

"and every subsequent year" (11).

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI I beg to move:

Page 2, line 6,—

omit "percentage of the" (15)

SHRI S M BANERJEE I beg to move:

Page 2 lines 7 and 8,—

omit "or, as the case may be, partly by remittance for crediting in the provident fund account and partly in cash" (16).

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI I beg to move

Page 2, line 10,—after '1972' insert—'and in the subsequent years' (25)

Page 2, line 18,—after '1972' insert—and in the subsequent years' (26)

SHRI S M BANERJEE I beg to move

Page 2, line 11,—after 'employee' insert—including employees of all public undertakings, departmentally run undertakings, Central Government Banks, Life Insurance Corporation, General Insurance, Teaching and Non-Teaching staff, Hospitals, All India Radio Working and Non-working Journalists, State Governments and Local bodies" (29)

DR LAKSHMINARAYAN PANDEYA (Mandsaur) I beg to move

Page 2, line 11,—for 'an employee' substitute—"all those employees working in Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, Telephones and Defence industries" (33).

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER All these amendments have been moved I shall now put them to vote

SHRI S M BANERJEE I would like to mention that I would like to vote against it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"Page 2, line 7 and 8,

omit "or as the case may be, partly by remittance for crediting in his provident fund account and partly in cash". (19).

Let the Lobby be cleared.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

Page 2, lines 7 and 8,—

omit "or, as the case may be, partly by remittance for crediting in his provident fund account and partly in cash" (19).

The Lok Sabha decided.

Division No 3] [17.45 hrs.

AYES

Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Bhagirath Bhanwar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri Diben
Bhaura, Shri B. S.
Chandrappan, Shri C. K.
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao
Koya, Shri C. H. Mohamed
Limaye, Shri Madhu
Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarain
Sen, Shri D. N.
Sen, Dr. Ranen
Shastri, Shri Ramkrishna
Singh, Shri D. N.
Verma, Shri Phool Chand

NOES

Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Ambekar, Shri
Appalanaidu, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul
Basappa, Shri K.
Basumatari, Shri D.
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Brahmanandji, Shri Svaraj
Buta Singh, Shri
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
Chandrika Prasad, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal
Chhotey Lal, Shri
Daga, Shri M. C.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Darbara Singh, Shri
Des, Shri Anadi Charan
Das, Shri Dharnidhar
Dhamankar, Shri
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Engli, Shri Biren
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganesh, Shri K. R.
Gangadeb, Shri P.
Gavit, Shri T. H.
Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh
Gomango, Shri Giridhar
Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb
Gowda, Shri Pampa
Hansda, Shri Subodh
Hari Kishore Singh, Shri
Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
Jha, Shri Chiranjit

Kadam, Shri J. G.
 Keilas, Dr.
 Kapur, Shri Sat Pal
 Kavade, Shri B. R.
 Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 KotoKi, Shri Lardhar
 Kotreshetti, Shri A. K.
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Kushok Bakula, Shri
 Lakkappa, Shri K.
 Lakshmunarayanan, Shri M. R.
 Laskar, Shri Niber
 Malaviya, Shri K. D.
 Mallikarjun, Shri
 Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain
 Maurya, Shri B. P.
 Mirdha, Shri Naibu Ram
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mishra, Shri Jagannath
 Misra, Shri S. N.
 Modi, Shri Shrikishan
 Mohammed Yusuf, Shri
 Murthy, Shri B. S.
 Naik, Shri B. V.
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
 Nimbalkar, Shri
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Painuli, Shri Paripornanand
 Pabdey, Shri Dhanodhar
 Paraguthi, Shri Chintamani
 Parop Singh, Shri

Patel, Shri Natwat Lal
 Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Krishnarao
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafiq
 Raghu Ramalal Shri K.
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
 Rao, Shri P. Ankinesudu Prasad
 Rao, Shri Patebbhi Rama
 Rathia, Shri Umed Singh
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar
 Reddy, Shri K. Kodanda Rami
 Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
 Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Saini, Shri Mulki Raj
 Samanta, Shri B. C.
 Sanketa Prasad, Dr.
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar
 Savant, Shri Shankerrao
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri A. P.
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Swaminathan, Shri K. V.
 Tewari, Shri Shankar
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh
 Yadav, Shri R. P.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The result of the division is: Ayes: 37
 Noes: 109.

The motion was adopted.

The following Member also remained

Noes: Shri K. Suryanarayana

his vote.

Shri. ...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will now put all the rest of the amendments to vote.

Amendments Nos. 10, 11, 15, 25, 28, 29 and 35 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

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

SHRI RAGHUNATH REDDY: I move:

"That the Bill be passed".

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed".

जी राधाबत्तार कालको - बोनस देने के बारे में बिल सदन में पास होने जा रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार दोहरी नीति अपना रही है, कुछ को बोनस दे रही है, देने का फैसला कर रही है और कुछ को नहीं देने का फैसला कर रही है। यह मुनासिब नहीं है। जब प्रायः पब्लिक सर्विस के कर्मचारियों को बोनस देते हैं तो कोई बचक नहीं है कि बुरे को प्रायः ही पब्लिक सर्विस में हैं, रेलवे में है, पी० एण्ड टी० में हैं, डिफेंस में हैं, सिविल एम्प्लॉयमेंट में हैं या राज्य सरकारों के जो कर्मचारी हैं उनको बोनस न दिया जाए। इसी तरह से तयाम मजदूर वर्ग को चाहे वह कच्ची छिः काम करता हो, राखडीय क्षेत्र में करता हो या गैर खखडीय क्षेत्र में करता हो, मिनी क्षेत्र में करता हो, सभी को बोनस देने का सिद्धांत स्वीकार किया जाना चाहिए। वहाँ यह कहा जा चुका है कि वे पारदर्शी काम करते हैं और उनकी तरह यहीनों की उम्मीद है कि वे काम बिलगी चाहेंगे। वह उनका काम सिद्धांतबद्ध है। मजदूरों

का कच्चाया हुआ पैसा मीजिकों के यहाँ या सरकार के यहाँ जमा है जो उनको मिलना चाहिए।

सभी एक माननीय सचिव ने कहा कि सतरह प्राथमिकों के बोट से बोनस नहीं मिलता। यहाँ हम जकर कर रहे हैं लेकिन बाहर कटौतों कटौत लोभे हैं। रेल कर्मचारियों में बहुत बेचनी है इस सवाल को लेकर। प्रायः इंडिया रेलवे-मैन फंडेशन धीर ए० ए० आई० धीर० ने बोनस के सवाल को लेकर स्ट्राइक बैलट, हड़ताल का बैलट भी लिया था और लोगों को बड़ी उम्मीद थी कि वे लोग हड़ताल करेंगे। प्रायः इंडिया रेलवे-मैन फंडेशन ने 27 अगस्त की तारीख भी इसके लिए विवंचित कर दी थी। लेकिन वह हुई नहीं। जिससे सर्वा को निराशा हुई और हमें भी तकलीफ हुई कि इन तरह की बात प्रायः इंडिया रेलवे-मैन फंडेशन ने क्यों की और तारीख को क्यों बक्स दिया या स्ट्राइक को तयित क्यों कर दिया। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि बोनस की लड़ाई एक अवर्षस्त बड़ाई होने जा रही है। रेलवे मजदूर इसकी तैयारी कर रहे हैं। प्रायः इंडिया रेलवे एम्प्लॉयज कानफेडरेशन और माध्या प्रायः कर्मियन और तयाम फंडेशन के मजदूर इस बात पर विचार कर रहे हैं कि वे एक कानवेंशन बना कर पहले एक दिन की प्रोटेस्ट हड़ताल करने की तैयारी करेंगे। फंडेशन के लोग विच्छेद गये हैं। हम लोग चाहेंगे कि उनके पीछे चलने वाले लोग भी हमारा साथ दें और सब मिल कर यह तैयारी करें, ताकि हम बोनस जरूर लें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह नीयत न प्राये और सरकार रेल कर्मचारियों को बोनस देने का एहसान कर दे।

प्रधान मंत्री और राष्ट्रपति अपनी तरफ से हैं कि हड़ताल न करे, लेकिन समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं किया जाता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मजदूर, कच्ची छिः, तयाम कर्मचारियों और मजदूरों को बोनस देने का फैसला करे।

[श्री राजा रामाiah]

जबकि वह खेस नहीं करेगा, जो उसके हकदारों का मुकाबला करना पड़ेगा, जिनकी जरूरतें देखी सरकार पर होगी।

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Sir, these are not new points that have been made just now. These points were raised in the main debate. These points have been answered and, as I said, this is a very limited measure. Though these points may be relevant, they are outside the scope of the very limited measure that is before the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, as passed by Rajya Sabha be taken into consideration."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed"

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, we have got seven minutes to go. Can you finish in seven minutes?

SHRI M. C. DAGA (Patil): How can it be finished in seven minutes? It has to be extended.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): It may be extended by the time we lost.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes, we take up the half-an-hour discussion Mr Daga.

17. 53 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

QUERTIME ALLOWANCE PAID IN VARIOUS MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

श्री राजा रामाiah (प्रश्न): उपोध्यक्ष महोदय, 27 जुलाई 1973 को मेरे

एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में मैं खोजे हुए हैं जलका था कि 1971-72 में सरकार ने 83.37 लाख रुपया सम्योपरि भत्ते, प्रोकरादादा एनाउन्स के रूप में दिया। 1972-73 में यह 90.29 लाख रुपये हो गई। एक दूसरे प्रश्न के उत्तर में मैंने खोजे हुए थे बताया कि बीससत्तारह सौ बीसों से 1969 में 405.64 लाख रुपया 1970 में 488.43 लाख रुपया 1971 में 614.63 लाख रुपया और 1972 में 711.36 लाख रुपया प्रोपरिटाइम एनाउन्स के रूप में दिया गया।

बोबर टाइम एनाउन्स के सन्दर्भ में वे कमीशन ने प्रोपरी रिपोर्ट में लिखा है

"The total expenditure on OTA in all departments including the civilian establishments of the Ministry of Defence came to Rs. 41.59 crores in 1971-72."

वे कमीशन ने यह भी लिखा है कि 1951 से 1971 तक सैडल बचतमेट के विभिन्न विभागों का परसेंट बढ़ गया। इस के साथ ही समयोपरि भत्ता की धनराशि भी बढ़ गई।

1951 में हमारी कुल रेवेन्यू घामदनी 4800 करोड़ रुपये थी। उस में से सरकार ने 1150 करोड़ रुपये खर्चा 25 परसेंट, केवल खर्चित कर खर्च कर दिया, जो हमारे देश की पापसेशन का केवल 0.6 परसेंट है। मुंबाल यह है कि सरकार ने देश की सरत पापसेशन पर, गांधी में रहने वालों और बसेडर बसकरो पर, निकासी खर्च किया है, जिन से नैशनल इन्डस्ट्री का 50 परसेंट भाग प्रोसि होता है।