

Union. Most of their demands relate to basic and fundamental changes in the educational system. As this House knows, Government are also doing their best to see that during the fifth plan, changes in the educational system are introduced. The lines on which Government would like to introduce these changes have been recommended by the Central Advisory Board of Education and the Standing Committee of the Central Advisory Board.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The Planning Commission is going to reduce the amount for education.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: The allocations are decided by this House and I hope this House will take that into account.

So far as the cases are concerned, they do not concern my ministry.

12.42 hrs.

PAYMENT OF BONUS (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR (SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY): Sir, 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."

This is a very simple Bill and I shall not take much time of the House. The Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, was amended in September 1973 to provide for payment of a minimum bonus in respect of the accounting year commencing on any day in the year 1972 at the rate of 8-1/3 per cent of the salary or wage of the employees and for deposit of a part of the bonus, in certain cases, in the provident fund accounts of the employees. Representations have been received from the workers that the entire amount of

bonus due to them should be paid in cash. These representations have been considered by Government and it is proposed to meet the workers' request for payment of the entire bonus in cash. The amending Bill is now before the House. Since it is an absolutely non-controversial Bill, I hope the House would accept it and pass it without much discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

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

Shri Krishna Chandra Halder.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Ausgram): Sir, I will speak in Bengali.

স্বয়ংক্রিয় মহোদয় : मैं भी हलिन
पंजाबी में दूंगा ।

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: You are welcome.

AN HON. MEMBER: It should be interpreted.

***SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Ausgram):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the Bonus (Amendment) Bill, 1973 that is now under discussion in this House. While introducing the Bill, the Minister stated that it is a non-controversial Bill. Yet I would like to say that during the last session when the amendment to the principal Act of 1965 was introduced, the members of this House as also those in the other House, had suggested while taking part in the discussion, that 8.33 per cent bonus should be paid to the workers entirely in cash. At that time, the Government had not accepted the suggestions of the members but now the Government have accepted the proposal and they have brought the amending Bill before the House. I do not know why Government suffer from this kind of in decision. I would suggest that a

*The original speech was delivered in Bengali.

[Shri Krishna Chandra Halder]

comprehensive Bill should be introduced in this House, so that the different shortcomings that still exist in matters of labour relations and labour welfare should be remedied and workers labouring in factories and other establishments may get their due share through this comprehensive Bill.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as you are aware the Government have changed their earlier attitude and have now agreed to pay whole of Bonus to the workers in cash. This, to my mind, is due to the fact that Government too must have realised that they are not in a position to control the the price rise, which is rocketting high almost every month, and that the workers are being put to great hardship to meet the situation and hence the Government under these circumstances, had to change their mind and happily they have now agreed to pay the bonus in cash.

I would also like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to another aspect of the present issue. At present we are having a large number of foreign and monopoly houses like DUNLOP, CEAT, ALCHALIE CHEMICALS etc. who make huge profits and are in a position to pay the workers at least 20 per cent bonus but they are defrauding the workers and they are not giving this amount to them. I would, therefore, urge upon the hon. Minister that these Monopoly and foreign Houses should be compelled to pay at least 20 per cent bonus to their workers and to achieve maximum amount of bonus the lacuna should be set right.

Sir, recently the office workers of the HSL at Ranchi were given 11.67 per cent bonus. They had, in fact, demanded 20 per cent bonus, but against that demand Government had paid them 11.67 per cent and the matter is still under adjudication. Following this the steel workers of the Bhilai Steel Project have also demanded 20 per cent bonus and they

have also served strike notice. In this regard the Government have decided that the steel workers should be given bonus at 8.23 per cent and a sum of Rs. 100/- be given to them in addition to the bonus amount. Thus we find that the policy in regard to the payment of bonus to the steel workers serving in the different units of HSL is not uniform. I do not quite understand why the other Steel workers should be paid less than their counterparts or why there should be any discrimination in matters of payment of bonus to the workers of the same organisation.

In Durgapur, the place wherefrom I come, the steel workers are given bonus but other Government employees working in the Railways or other Government organisations like Ordinance factories etc. are being denied the benefit of bonus. This is an injustice which needs to be rectified and I would urge that all such employees should be brought within the purview of the benefits of payment of bonus as is now being given to the factory workers.

I would also request the Government that they must treat bonus as deferred wage. It is a well known fact that many foreign companies and monopoly houses often resort to increased production by activating their machinery and utilising the services of the workers beyond their sanctioned capacity and this brings huge profits to them. Without reiterating the matter I would only try to remind the members that during the discussion on the Industrial Development and Regulation (Amendment) Bill, it was pointed out repeatedly by many members in this House how the big companies became rich and richer and how the remittances of foreign companies increased year after year. It is also to be noted in this connection that the entire labour force who toiled hard to create the "surplus value" in the shape of profit for the management remained always neglected and they were not given their due share out of

the profit which was invariably cornered by the monopoly mill owners or they were repatriated outside the country.

Recently the Prime Minister is reported to have said that all those who are engaged in the industrial development of the country should consider themselves to be very fortunate.

I would only like to say that the lot of the industrial workers at least is not so enviable more so when we look at the quantum of labour that they have to put in and the remuneration that they get in return. It is equally necessary that the real wages of the workers should be protected adequately and it should not be allowed to be eroded by the rise in prices.

Therefore, while concluding I would once again like to emphasise that a comprehensive bill should be introduced and that the bonus should be treated as deferred wage and that the real wages of the workers should not be allowed to fall as a result of price rise. With these words, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI (Bombay—North-East): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome the amending Bill and extend my full support to it. In September last when the first amending Bill was moved, we were demanding even the deletion of this provision in respect of the obligation on the workmen to deposit a part of their bonus if it is in excess of the previous year's bonus into the Provident Fund account. Now this Bill has come. There may also be certain cases where the bonus for 1972 must have already been paid—in many cases.

We do not know whether the Government has taken care under this

Bill to return the amount if any is deducted under the existing provisions....

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: That provision is there.

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI: If it is there even then, within a certain specific period. If it is deducted, within a certain time limit, it should be returned. With all that provision, it may be now that there may not be any objection at all. There is a criticism why the trade unions are seeking this payment of the entire bonus in cash. Now, we would like to make it clear while extending the support on behalf of the trade unions to this Bill. When we want the entire bonus to be paid in cash, it is not that the working class is against saving. We have been making savings in the provident fund itself. More than Rs. 4 crores have been invested from the provident fund savings. We have made suggestions in the past because we, the working class people, are in favour of increasing the national savings. We made suggestions in the past when the PF contribution rate was 6½ per cent. We asked the Government to raise it to 8 per cent. We asked the Government to raise it to 10 per cent in many industries.

So, we are not against savings, especially the deductions in the provident fund account. But, what we want is that wages are subject to provident fund deductions and the contributions are deducted. To-day, the Government has not in this Bill made the status of bonus quite clear. It has not liberated the concept of bonus from the clutches of profit-sharing schemes. Therefore, on the one hand, the workers' claim of bonus as deferred wages has not been accepted, but at the same time, by other methods the question of deduction on

[Shri Raja Kulkarni]

account of provident fund has been inserted. This is an incongruous position. Therefore, this incongruity has now been removed and the workers are now getting the entire bonus in cash. In the present amending Bill it is only meant for 1972 bonus if it is in excess of the bonus of 1971. We say that if bonus becomes a deferred wage, there is no necessity for separate deduction. Let the wages and the provident fund be dealt with separately. If bonus is covered under that, it is a different issue. But, so far as the Bonus Act is concerned, when the payment is to be made, it should be made in cash, not only for 1972, but it should be done for all years, so long as bonus is made.

With these observations, I support the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. S. M. Banerjee. Would you like to speak after lunch?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir.....

MR. SPEAKER: That is all right.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): He has said only 'Mr. Speaker, Sir'. He may be on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: But my very calling his name entitles him. Anyway he has further confirmed it. Now, we adjourn for lunch and reassemble at 2 p. m.

13.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha reassembled after Lunch at Four Minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair].

PAYMENT OF BONUS (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Bill.

You may remember that when we discussed this matter practically all the Members who spoke wanted the amount of bonus to be paid in cash. I think that my friend, Shri Kulkarni said that the working-class people wanted to save money. But, in my opinion, they are unable to save money because of the high prices. And bonus has almost become a deferred wage to-day because the slogan given by the working class organisation is very clear that bonus is the 13th month wage for twelve months' wages. After his Bill is passed bonus will be paid in cash. Whether it should be paid within thirty days or sixty days that has not been mentioned in the Bill. They may get it after a lapse of so many months. There are many amendments to that effect and I would like to speak on that when those amendments are taken up for a discussion in the second stage of the Bill.

I take this opportunity of mentioning a very sore point for which there is a growing discontent among the Central Government employees throughout the country. When a question was raised in this House by the leaders of the Railwaymen, Defence, P & T and other unions, whether the Central Government employees are entitled to bonus or not, a reply was given by the hon. Labour Minister, Shri Khadilkar—former Labour Minister—who was the father of this 8.33 per cent bonus

formula that the entire question had been referred to the Pay Commission. After the submission of the Pay Commission's Report, it was made abundantly clear that bonus was not within the purview of the terms of reference of the Pay Commission.

My hon. friend, Shri A. P. Sharma, who is here and all others pointed out to the then Labour Minister, Shri Khadilkar, that in case the Pay Commission was to do something about it, then the Government should have included this as one of the terms of reference of the Pay Commission. When the Pay Commission's Report is out, all the Central Government employees throughout the country are once again disappointed that the Pay Commission has not touched on this particular aspect of the problem. We are also told that the Bonus Review Committee is likely to submit its final Report by the end of this month. I do not know whether the hon. Minister would throw some light on it and give an assurance that the final report would be submitted by the end of this month and whether, after the submission of the Report, all the Central Government employees whether they are working in the Central Secretariat, Income-tax, Excise, C.P.W.D., Defence, Railways and P & T, they will be given bonus. There is no doubt behind it that the employees working in the public sector undertakings such as the H.S.L., H.E.C. and H.A.L. when they have been paid bonus, how can the bonus be denied to those persons who are really the backbone of this country, namely, the Central Government employees? Generally, it is argued that because the number of the Central Government employees is more than two millions, they are not entitled to bonus or they will not be entitled to the bonus. Is that an argument? And is there any logic behind it? I cannot appreciate why, when an employee manufacturing aircraft in H.A.L. is entitled to bonus but an employee who has spent a
2542 L.S.—9.

major part of his life in manufacturing tanks and sophisticated weapons in Defence or even locomotives in the Railways or other articles of common use in the P & T, should be deprived of the bonus?

I gave a bright instance here. An employee employed in a public sector undertaking called 'Modern Bakery' manufacturing bread is entitled to bonus. But the persons who are manufacturing the Bren-guns or sophisticated weapons including those weapons which gave us victory, in the defence establishments, are not entitled to it. With all my eloquence I am unable to convince myself, what to talk of the employees of the reason for denying to them the bonus.

Both the railwaymen's federations and the defence employees' federation took a strike ballot on two issues, the Pay Commission's report and its modification and the question of bonus. Every federation is patiently waiting for the day on which the report would be submitted by the Bonus Review Committee. If the Review Committee does not include the Central Government employees, and the Government also do not decide about this question, I am afraid, in spite of all appeals by the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister, the Central Government employees are bound to march towards the drastic step, and in that case, there is going to be an all-India strike on this question of bonus...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior): When?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I am sure he will support us.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I would like to know the date

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The date will be decided after the submission of the Bonus Review Committee's report. The agitation is already going

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

on. Why is there so much of trouble in the public sector undertakings and in the Government establishments? Why are the railwaymen on strike? Why are the Indian Airlines men on strike? The issue is very simple. Let the hon. Minister of Labour realise the gravity of the situation and act accordingly.

I would request that an announcement should be made here and now, when the hon. Minister replies to the debate, that the case of bonus for the Central Government employees, one of their most genuine demands, will not be ignored.

Another point is that the insurance employees throughout the country are agitating that they should get something more as bonus. In 1972-73 they were paid 10 per cent bonus when the minimum bonus was only 4 per cent.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a different Bill.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: After all, bonus is bonus. Now, when the minimum bonus has been increased to 8.33 per cent, the insurance employees should get more than 10 per cent bonus.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is a different matter.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA (Buxar): I shall also discuss whatever he discusses.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That should be a different question.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I am only pointing out that at the time the minimum bonus was 4 per cent, they were paid 10 per cent...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has made that point already, and that should be enough.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The general insurance employees are paid 15 per cent bonus. So, an all-India agitation is going on among the insurance employees. I would request the hon. Minister to intervene in the matter, because the LIC has not conceded that point. I would request him to look into the matter and see that some extra bonus is given as *ex-gratia* to the insurance employees.

श्री राम सिंह भाई (इंदौर): श्रीमान्, मैं इस मूल मुद्धार के लिये मंत्री महोदय को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ क्योंकि पहले कानून में 8.33 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा निकलने वाली बोनस की रकम प्रीवीडेंट फंड में मिलायी जाय ऐसा कोई प्रावधान नहीं था। लेकिन जब पिछली बार 8.33% बोनस देने की बात हुई तो संशोधन लाया गया कि 8.33 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा रकम निकलनी हो तो वह प्रीवीडेंट फंड में मिलायी जाय और बाकी कैश न दी जाय। लेकिन उम अमंडमेंट को लाये ज्यादा टाइम नहीं हुआ था। आज उसको वापस लिया जा रहा है। उस का कारण यह है कि जो सशक्त श्रमिक हैं उन्होंने उस को माना ही नहीं। वह रकम उन्होंने ले ली। हम ने एक समझौता नागदा में किया और 32 परसेंट बोनस लिया और वह ऐग्रीमेंट से लिया है, कोई दबाव, धमकी या हड़ताल गो-स्वो से नहीं। तो जो भी कानून बनाया जाय वह व्यवहारिक बनाया जाय जिस से उस कानून को दोनों पक्ष भ्रमल में ला सकें। बोनस का जो प्रीवीडेंट किया गया था वह इसलिये कि विकास कार्य के लिये धन चाहिये। मैं एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि 8.33 परसेंट जो बोनस है उस का सम्बन्ध न प्रोडक्शन

से है और न प्रॉफ़िट से है, वह तो एक वेतन का हिस्सा हो गया। किसी भी ह्रावत में इतना तो मालिक को देना ही होगा। तो फिर उस बोनस का नाम क्यों देते हैं, इसे वेतन में क्यों नहीं मिला देते। अगर ऐसा करते हैं तो प्रॉवीडेंट फंड में ज्यादा रकम कटेगी, ई०एस०आई० की रकम में ज्यादा कटेगी और जो ग्रैचुटी दी जायगी उस में भी ज्यादा रकम श्रमिकों को मिलेगी। इसलिये इस बात को मंत्री महोदय समझें कि 8.33 परसेंट एक ऐसी रकम हो गई है जो वेतन का हिस्सा है इसे बोनस नाम से आप रखते हैं तो हमें शर्म आती है। मिल मालिक कहते हैं कि हम नुकसान में भी बोनस देते हैं। आप बोनस कहां दे रहे हैं? बल्कि सैट आफ़ और सैट आन के आधार पर जब प्रॉफ़िट करते हैं तो उस प्रॉफ़िट में से चार साल तक दिये गये मिनिमम बोनस की रकम को आगे किये हुए प्रॉफ़िट में से निकाल कर जो सरप्लस हो, तो बोनस गिनते हैं जिस से मजदूरों को ही नुकसान होता है।

मैं एक बैलेंस शीट आप के सामने रख रहा हूँ इस में इतना प्रॉफ़िट है शायद भारत में और कहीं न हुआ हो। मुनाफ़े को देख कर दिल दहल जाता है लेकिन मजदूरों को इस ने पहले चार प्रतिशत से ज्यादा नहीं दिया और आज 8.33 परसेंट से ज्यादा नहीं दिया। 1972 की बैलेंस शीट के अनुसार इस कारखाने ने अपनी शेयर कैपिटल 31 लाख से बढ़ा कर 7 करोड़ 95 लाख 47 हजार 950 रु० कर ली है। उस की करेंट लायबिलिटी क्या है? 9 करोड़ 5 लाख 11 हजार 597 रु०।

करेंट आसेट्स क्या है? 21 करोड़ 71 लाख 31 हजार 275 रु०, और इस साल जो प्रॉफ़िट है 7 करोड़ की कैपिटल पर वह आता है 6 करोड़ 67 लाख 29 हजार 795 रु०। यानी जितनी शेयर कैपिटल है उतना इन्होंने इस एक साल में ही प्रॉफ़िट कमा लिया है। डेप्रीसियेशन 1 करोड़ 42 लाख 28 हजार 669 रु०, डेबलपमेंट के लिये 39 लाख 76 हजार 982 रु०, टैक्स के 2 करोड़ 29 लाख और ग्रैचुटी के लिये 69 लाख रु० रखा और बाकी रिज़र्व और सरप्लस में 1 करोड़ 76 लाख 80 हजार 920 रु० एक साल के प्रॉफ़िट में से रखा है। तो प्रॉफ़िट की भी कोई सीमा होती है। इतना प्रॉफ़िट होने के बाद भी श्रमिकों को 8.33 परसेंट से ज्यादा नहीं दिया गया। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है मंत्री जी से, मैं ही इस बात को नहीं कहूंगा तमाम ट्रेड यूनियन्स के अन्दर काम करने वाले इस बात को समझेंगे कि यह 8.33 परसेंट जो मिनिमम बोनस की रकम है इस को वेतन में मिला देना चाहिये और फिर नया बोनस फ़ौरमूला प्रॉफ़िट शेयरिंग के आधार पर बनाना चाहिये। बोनस का सिद्धान्त या तो प्रोडक्शन बोनस या प्रॉफ़िट शेयरिंग बोनस होता है। टैक्स और डेप्रीसियेशन निकालने के बाद जो प्रॉफ़िट होता है उस में प्रॉफ़िट शेयरिंग होना चाहिये और उस में से श्रमिकों को बोनस मिलना चाहिये।

मैं पुनः निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि 8.33 परसेंट मिनिमम बोनस की रकम को वेतन में मिला देना चाहिये। हमें शर्म

[श्री राम सिंह भाई]

आती है जब कारखानेदार कहते हैं कि हम तो नुकसान की हालत में भी बोनस देते हैं। लेकिन वास्तव में उन को नुकसान में नहीं देना पड़ता है, बल्कि उन को जब प्रीफ़िट होता है उस में से नुकसान में दिये गये चार साल तक बोनस की रकम को माइनस कर बोनस गिनते हैं। इसलिए बोनस एक्ट में तरमीम कर के सेट ग्रान प्रीर सेट आफ़ के सिद्धान्त को उस में से बिल्कुल निकाल देना चाहिए। बराबर प्रीफ़िट-शेयरिंग होना चाहिए।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (मुरेना) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय जो बिल लाये हैं, हम उस का स्वागत करते हैं। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस विधेयक में काफ़ी कमियाँ हैं और अगर मंत्री महोदय मज़दूरों की बहुत सी मांगों को ध्यान में रखते हुए एक बड़ा बिल लाते, तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता। सभी लोग भली-भाँति जानते हैं कि देश के सब वर्ग और देश के सब क्षेत्रों में काम करने वाले मज़दूर इस कमर-तोड़ महंगाई से त्रस्त हैं। अगर मंत्री महोदय इस महंगाई को देखते हुए बोनस को 8.33 परसेंट से बढ़ा कर 12.5 परसेंट कर दें, तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। वह कोई ऐसा कानून लायें, जिस के द्वारा लोगों को और राहत दी जा सके।

बोनस विलम्ब से मिलने वाला वेतन है और इसलिए सभी क्षेत्रों में—डाक-तार, सुरक्षा उत्पादन और रेलवे विभागों में तथा

खेतों में—काम करने वाले सभी लोगों को इस का लाभ मिलना चाहिए। इन सभी विभागों से सरकार को कमाई होती है। तो फिर उन में काम करने वाले लोगों ने क्या दोष किया है कि उन्हें बोनस न दिया जाये? जब महंगाई का बोझ सभी लोगों पर पड़ता है, तब उन सब को बोनस मिलना चाहिए। सब यूनिवर्स की तरफ़ से यह आवाज़ उठाई गई है कि बोनस सब लोगों को मिलना चाहिए और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सदन के सब सदस्य भी इस से सहमत हों।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि बोनस की जो अधिकतम सीमा 20 प्रतिशत रखी गई है, उस को समाप्त कर देना चाहिए। अभी मेरे मित्र, श्री वर्मा, ने कहा है कि उन्होंने नामदा में 32 परसेंट बोनस दिलवाया। यह सीमा निर्धारित करने का परिणाम यह होगा कि जिन लोगों की क्षमता 20 प्रतिशत से अधिक बोनस देने की है, वे भी इस से अधिक बोनस नहीं देंगे। इसलिए इस सीमा को हटा दिया जाये। जितना मुनाफ़ा हो, उस के अनुसार जितना बोनस बनता हो, वह मज़दूरों को मिलना चाहिए।

हर एक कारखाने को शुरू से ही मज़दूरों को बोनस देना चाहिए। इस समय यह प्रतिबन्ध लगाया गया है कि कारखाने के शुरू होने के पाँच साल के बाद उस पर बोनस की व्यवस्था लागू होगी। मैंने इस सम्बन्ध में कई पत्र लिखे हैं कि ऐसे कारखानों के उदाहरण दिये जा सकते हैं, जिन में बीस से अधिक मज़दूर काम करते हैं,

परन्तु इसलिए कि उन्हें पांच साल के बाद बोनस देना पड़ेगा, वे दो तीन साल के बाद अपना नाम बदल लेते हैं, दूसरे नाम से रजिस्ट्रेशन करवा लेते हैं। ऐसे कारखाने भी हैं, जहाँ पचास-पचास आदमी काम करते हैं, लेकिन रजिस्टर में केवल पंद्रह आदमी दिखाये जाते हैं और अधिकतर आदमियों को टैम्पोरेरी घोषित किया जाता है। मंत्री महोदय और माननीय सदस्य इस बात को भली-भाँति जानते हैं। चाहे कोई घरेलू काम करने वाला हो और चाहे किसी फ़ैक्टरी में, सब को एक साल के बाद बोनस पाने का अधिकार होना चाहिए।

बोनस रीव्यू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बारे में सब मजदूर संगठनों के प्रतिनिधियों के साथ बातचीत करने के बाद तुरन्त फ़ैसला किया जाये। बोनस कमेटी और मजदूर संगठनों के प्रतिनिधियों के सुझावों का, और जो बहुत सी बातें छुट गई हैं, उन का अगर समावेश किया जाये, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि काफ़ी लोगों को इस का लाभ हो सकता है।

जब प्रारम्भ में यह कानून बना, तो बोनस की रकम को प्रोविडेंट फ़ंड में जमा करने की व्यवस्था का सभी ओर से—इस सदन में भी—विरोध किया गया था। सभी ने कहा था कि जितना बोनस बनता है वह मिलना चाहिए। लेकिन सरकार ने इस बात को नहीं माना। मजदूर क्षेत्रों ने सरकार के इस कानून की घञ्जियाँ उड़ा दीं और उस का विरोध किया। अब सरकार को मजदूर

हो कर यह संशोधन लाना पड़ा है। सरकार को ऐसा कानून बनाना चाहिए, जिस से ऐसी स्थिति फिर पैदा न हो कि सरकार को दो साल के अन्दर ही उस में संशोधन करना पड़ जाये।

मैं आशा करता हूँ कि मैं ने जो सुझाव दिये हैं, मंत्री महोदय उन का ध्यान रखेंगे।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattu-puzha): This is a short Bill with a limited purpose and there is therefore not much to speak on this Bill except to say that I welcome this Bill wholeheartedly. Having said that, I have been wondering how the legislative apparatus of the Government is functioning. In 1972 an amending Bill was brought before this House and passed which stipulated 8.33 per cent and the remittance of a share in the provident fund. Agitations started all over the country by different trade unions demanding that the provision for depositing this amount in the provident fund was inequitable and hence it should be withdrawn. Disregarding that demand, it fell to the lot of my friend Mr. Raghunatha Reddy to bring a Bill before this House in the last session reiterating the same provision. From all sides in the House there was a demand that that provision should be dropped in view of the hardship it would cause to the workers due to the rising prices. But the Minister could not find his way to accept that position and hence we passed his Bill. That was the signal again for an All India agitation; and the national trade unions combined and observed an

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

anti-price day. After that this Bill has come before this House and I must congratulate the Labour Minister for the efforts he made to get this approved by the Government.

Nevertheless in passing I should observe that when handling legislation of this type which touches millions of people in the country who are producers—I apply the word producers to workers—they should bestow deeper thought on the implications and the repercussions the laws will have. The Government proceed on the assumption that the workers are well off and so they could afford to save something out of this additional amount that is being paid to them. I can understand this if there is a national emergency and some country has attacked us. But because there is a price rise, to ask the workers to save compulsorily so much is atrocious; they are acting in the most unkind way.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: They have realised it. So, they are correcting it.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: But the attitude remains. I am not convinced that the attitude has changed. When they are handling the wage increase question of Central Government employees, they are putting forth the same demand. The workers are the people who are really hit. The Government are putting the picture of unemployed people as an argument against the legitimate demands of the producers to carry on their daily life. This is the most irresponsible and irresponsive way of reacting to a particular situation.

I want more and more nationalisation, but I am now sensing a danger. Until yesterday we had only to face the private employers. Now the Government is assuming the role of em-

ployer and it appears the private employers are fettering their real champions in the shape of Government. They are now forming a joint front against the employees and workers. As a result of this, even the benefits which are to accrue to the workers through class struggle from the private employees are also prevented. In the place of private employers, we are now facing a joint front of private employers and public employer. Nationalisation and socialisation of industries will have no value unless you accept that the worker is the producer of wealth in this country and his agony should be taken into account. Otherwise, mere appeals to eschew strikes will have no effect. Sir, something which should have been done earlier is belatedly being done. Even here, the charity is not complete. What about the amounts which were to be remitted into the provident fund account for 1971-72? You kindly check up as to how much money has been remitted. What about the unorganised section of workers? The Provident Fund Commissioner does not have authority to take action against people for not having remitted the remaining amount into the provident fund under the Bonus Act. Action is possible only if remittance has not taken place in accordance with the provisions of the Provident Fund Act. So, if remittance has not been made in accordance with the Bonus Act, the Provident Fund Commissioner not have any jurisdiction to proceed against the defaulter. Therefore, how much money has actually been remitted into the provident fund is a matter which may profitably be enquired into by the Labour Ministry. You will find that a great robbery must have been committed. If remittance is not made I have no sanction against the employer. The Provident Fund Commissioner does not have sanction to proceed against the employer. The money must have gone into the pockets of the employer. If you are satisfied that proper remittance has not taken place, I would request the minister to bring a further

amending Bill providing that the money be remitted back to the workers, so that we can proceed against the employer to collect the money which has been defalcated.

Shri Banerjee raised certain other issues which are not relevant now. When we received the report of the Bonus Review Commission, a comprehensive Bill will be coming forth and that will be the time for all of us to join hands to see that the benefits due to the workers are not denied to them.

*SHRI C. K. CHINNARAJI (Tirupattur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to say a few words on the payment of Bonus (Amendment) Bill now under discussion in the House.

The amending bill paves way for the payment of the bonus amount credited to the Provident Fund earlier in cash. Sir, this is a welcome step taken by the Government particularly viewed in the context of ever increasing prices in our country and therefore I support wholeheartedly this Bill. We have been feeling from the very beginning that the Bonus due to the workers should be paid in cash.

Sir, I would also like to point out here that this simple and short Bill only shows that the Government are just interested in touching the fringe of the problem without trying to remove the problem itself. I charge the Government that they are not keen in resolving the basic issues raised by the workers.

Sir, it is expected that the report of the Bonus Review Committee would be submitted to the Government in December 1973. All the workers in our country are anxiously awaiting the recommendations of the Bonus Review Committee, the reactions of the Government and the legislative shape that would be given in implementing the recommendations of the Bonus Review

Committee. I am of the view that a comprehensive legislation should be enacted incorporating the recommendations of the Bonus Review Committee. I may add here that unless bonus is treated as "deferred wage". I do not think that a tangible solution to the problems arising out of bonus would be found.

Sir, I am constrained to say that any kind of amendments to the Payment of Bonus Act would not solve the problems of the workers in relation to bonus unless the concept of the bonus is changed to mean deferred wage and so long as the Central Government do not come forward to grant bonus to the Railway workers of our country. I do not know why the workers of Railways should be denied bonus.

Shri Raghunath Reddy has brought forward this Bill to enable the workers to get the bonus in cash instead of its being credited to the provident fund and this he has done because of the fact that the prices have gone up very high. The minimum bonus statutorily fixed for the workers is 8.33 per cent. I do not know when the hon. Minister Shri Raghunath Reddy would raise this minimum bonus to 12 per cent. The demand for raising the minimum bonus to 12 per cent is already being voiced by the workers and it is in fairness that the demand is conceded more particularly because of the present price situation prevailing in our country. The workers all over the country are looking forward to the day when Shri Raghunath Reddy would concede their legitimate demand and raise the statutory minimum bonus from 8.33 per cent to 12 per cent. Sir, the Central Government did not show any hesitation in permitting the monopoly houses to increase their production capacity many times. I hope the Government of India would show the same zeal in meeting the demands of the workers who are really responsible for production. The workers all over the country

*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

[Shri C. K. Chinnaraji]

are looking forward to the day when the minimum bonus would be raised from 8.33 per cent to 12 per cent.

Sir, today our country is facing an economic crisis and the need of the hour is to increase the production quickly. It is in this context that the Prime Minister has been appealing to the workers to desist from resorting to strikes in ventilating and realising their demands. It is my hope that Prime Minister would react in the same spirit in satisfying the demands of the workers and the workers are hopeful that the Prime Minister would come forward to raise the minimum bonus to 12 per cent.

Sir, this Bill enables the workers to get their bonus in cash and all the sections of the House will welcome this Bill. At the same time, I would like to say that the arrears due to the Central Government employees arising out of the implementation of the Third Pay Commission's Recommendations should also be paid in cash on the same analogy that the bonus due to the workers is to be paid in cash. I do not see any justification in even considering a proposal to credit the arrears due to the Central Government employees in the provident fund. I would urge upon the Government that the Central Government employees are not denied the cash payment of the arrears due to them.

I welcome this Bill and conclude my speech.

श्री रामोदर पांडे (हजारीबाग) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस संशोधन विधेयक का स्वागत करता हूँ और मंत्री जी को बधाई देता हूँ कि देर से ही सही एक अच्छी बीज वह सामने लाए हैं और एक अच्छा कदम उन्होंने उठाया है। पिछली बार जब बोनस बिल पर विचार हो रहा था तो सदन में सभी तरफ से यह आवाज उठी थी और

सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने यह मांग की थी कि इस तरह की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए कि मजदूर जिस किसी भी कारखाने में 8.33 परसेंट से अधिक बोनस के एन्टा-इटिल्ड हों वहाँ उन को वह पूरा भुगतान नकद किया जाय। लेकिन 1971 के बोनस के संबंध में जो व्यवस्था बनी थी उसी को उस में यथास्थिति रख दिया गया था। इस से इस में काफी खामियां नजर आईं और देश के हर हिस्से में एक एजीटेशन का वातावरण तैयार हो गया और यह सरकार ने उचित समझा कि इस स्थिति को सुधारना चाहिए। इसीलिए यह बिल लाया गया है। इसलिए मैं इस का स्वागत करता हूँ।

अभी बहस के दौरान कुछ बातें उठी हैं और यह सही है कि मंत्री महोदय को उन पर ध्यान देना चाहिये। इस तरह का बोनस जिस की बात अभी करते हैं—8.33 परसेन्ट, इस के बारे में क्या नीति होनी चाहिये, किस ढंग से कानून बनना चाहिये। भविष्य हम को क्या बताता है, आगे क्या होने वाला है—इस के बारे में जीते-जागते उदाहरण अभी आप के सामने भाई राम सिंह वर्मा ने और हल्दर साहब ने किये हैं। एक उदाहरण प्राइवेट सेक्टर के बारे में था जो भयानक मुनाफ़ा कमाने के बावजूद मिनीमम बोनस भी बहुत दिक्कत से देते हैं और दूसरा उदाहरण हिन्दुस्तान स्टील का था। जब कि वहाँ बहुत काफ़ी घाटा हुआ था, फिर भी वहाँ के हैड-आफिस के मजदूरों को 20 परसेन्ट बोनस मिला था। जब उस में कम घाटा हुआ तो पता नहीं वहाँ के आफिसरों को क्या सबूद्धि या

हुर्दुई आई उन को 11.66 परसेन्ट बोनस मिला है । यह बोनस रूल क्या है, क्या कानून है, कुछ समझ में नहीं आता है ? आज क्यों हम को भिलाई में हड़ताल का नोटिस देना पड़ा ? क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के जो तीन यूनिट्स हैं, उन में भिलाई ही ऐसा यूनिट है जिस में प्राफिट होता है, बाकी यूनिटों में घाटा होता है, ओवर-आल लिया जाय तो हिन्दुस्तान स्टील में अभी तक कोई मुनाफ़ा नहीं हुआ है । लेकिन वहां के हेड-आफिस के लोगों को 20 परसेन्ट बोनस मिल सकता है, वहां के हेड-आफिस के लोगों को करोड़ों रुपये खर्च करने के बाद 11.66 परसेन्ट बोनस मिल सकता है तो भिलाई के लोगों को, जो मेहनत कर के मुनाफ़ा कमाते हैं, क्या उन को 20 परसेन्ट बोनस नहीं मिल सकता है ? वे लोग बही कसूर करते हैं कि मेहनत कर के मुनाफ़ा कमाते हैं । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि आप की नीति क्या है, इस मामले में स्पष्ट बातें होनी चाहियें ।

यह सिर्फ भिलाई की ही बात नहीं है । आप के भोपाल हेवी इलेक्ट्रिक में घाटा हुआ है, यह आप की बैलंसशीट कहती है, फिर भी आप ने मेहरबानी कर के 10 परसेन्ट बोनस दिया है । एच०एम०टी० में घाटा हुआ है वहां भी वाच फैक्टरी को 20 परसेन्ट बोनस दिया है । कहीं पर एक यूनिट की सिंगल यूनिट मान लेते हैं और उस के मुनाफे के आधार पर बोनस देते हैं और कहीं कहते हैं कि ओवर-आल में घाटा हुआ है । कहीं 20 परसेन्ट देते हैं, कहीं 11 परसेन्ट देते हैं, कहीं 10 परसेन्ट देते हैं,

लेकिन जो मेहनत कर के मुनाफ़ा कमाता है उस को कहते हैं कि नहीं देंगे—यह क्या है ? कोई निश्चित नीति नहीं है ।

आज आप बड़ी बड़ी कम्पनियां बना रहे हैं, होल्डिंग कम्पनी बना रहे हैं, आप ने "साल्ट" बनाया है जो बहुत बड़ी कम्पनी है, भारत कुकिंग कोल, हिन्दुस्तान स्टील, बोकारो स्टील, मैं जानना चाहता हूं क्या "साल्ट" के मुनाफे-घाटे पर सब का बोनस निर्भर करेगा या अलग अलग यूनिट्स के मुनाफे-घाटे पर बोनस निर्भर करेगा । भारत कुकिंग कोल में भी कुछ ऐसे यूनिट्स हैं जो भारी मुनाफ़ा कमाते हैं, कई कोलियरीज हैं, मैं व्यक्तिगत जानकारी तो नहीं रखता, लेकिन एन०सी०डी०सी० की कई ऐसी कोलियरीज हैं जहां महीने में एक-एक करोड़ रुपया मुनाफ़ा होता है, वे साल में 12-14 करोड़ का मुनाफ़ा कमाती हैं—क्या उन कोलियरीज के मजदूर 20 परसेन्ट बोनस के हकदार होंगे ? यदि नहीं होंगे तो उस के क्या कारण हैं ? कहीं घाटा होने पर भी 20 परसेन्ट देते हैं, कहीं 11 परसेन्ट देते हैं—यह क्या नीति है ?

बोनस एक्ट में आप इस समय जो अमेण्डमेन्ट लाये हैं, वह स्वागत योग्य है, लेकिन भविष्य के लिये अगर आप यह समझते हैं कि बोनस मजदूरी का हिस्सा है तो उस को मजदूरी में मिला दीजिये । जब उस को मजदूरी का हिस्सा मानते हैं तो कोई वजह नहीं है कि उस को मजदूरी से न मिलाया जाय, इस को पेन्केट मान लीजिये और फिर जिस

[श्री दामोदर पांडे]

यूनिट में रीयल प्रॉफिट हुआ है, जहाँ मजदूर ने मेहनत करके मुनाफा कमाया है, उस में उनको उचित हिस्सा मिलना चाहिए, उस के लिए प्रावधान होना चाहिए। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि आगे आने वाला बोनस बिल है, जिसे बोनस कमेटी के बाद यहाँ लायेंगे, उस में इन बातों पर विचार करके अभी से व्यवस्था करेंगे।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I agree with what the hon. Minister said that the scope of this particular Bill is extremely restricted. I can very well see your embarrassment when we find that many of the remarks made on the Bill are not strictly within the formal text and provisions of the Bill....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: They are closely related. That is why I have allowed.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: So, with this remark. I will stretch it a little further so that I can have a little elbow room to make some comments and observations. With that spirit....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Within five minutes.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Less than that, I do not want five minutes even.

All the Central trade union organisations and members belonging to both the sections of this House insisted last time that the portion of the amount of the minimum bonus which was to be deposited in the provident fund account should be revised and I welcome the Minister responding to the demand of the Central trade union organisations and also members belonging to all sections. But, at the same time, I want to make it clear to this House and the hon. Minister that by this argument of the trade-unionists, it should not be construed that we are against savings. Those of us

who are committed to a planned development of the country want the resources of the country to grow. We want the savings in the country to be stepped up. But, even then we feel that in order to give a better incentive to the labour and the agriculturists and to have better savings, it is necessary that in some form an incentive must come. Therefore, the 25 per cent of the gap that exists to-day between the existing wage and the living wage, if that gap is closed, if not fully but at least partially in that case, that offers better incentive. Once the wage is improved and the wage gap is filled up and at least the principle of deferred wages is accepted, to some extent, there will be a better incentive at a later stage for saving in the country and the economy of the country also will gain.

In this case I want to make a relevant suggestion which, I hope, would be accepted by the Minister. There is no reference to the demand of many trade union organizations regarding the period of implementation of the Bill. I would very much suggest that right from the day this Bill is adopted and it becomes an Act, from that time onwards within two months, the amount that has been deposited in the past in the PF account should be payable....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are amendments to that effect.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I do not want to speak on the amendments. Therefore, I want to make this suggestion at this stage. I hope that with the same earnestness of mind with which we are accepting this Bill, the same magnanimity of mind will be displayed by the Minister of Labour and he will also accept that particular point of view.

In this connection, once you accept that cash payment will be made, an incentive will be offered to the workers. In that case, you should go a step further and the incentive should be enlarged by seeing that

there is no distinction between various categories of workers. Particularly, I want to stress railways and the defence which are very vital for providing the important infra-structure. We have been pleading for bonus for all, for railway employees and local authority employees also. Particularly, the railways is such an industry that it provides the necessary infra-structure for the entire development of the country. Treat it as a commercial establishment and do not get bogged down with the technicalities and if you bring it out of the rut of the present thinking and extend the scope of the Bonus Act to railways also, you will be providing an incentive for development of railways and will take it in the positive direction and that will provide the infra-structure for development. That idea should be accepted.

In the end, I would only end that as far as these demands regarding bonus are concerned, these are not merely demands for the sake of demands. In a number of countries it has been accepted that in whatever form the revision of the wage-structure takes place and I fully agree with my friend that after all giving bonus is providing a differential wage. So, I would welcome even improving the wage of the workers by back-door methods. But I would very much welcome the day when a comprehensive Bill will be brought forward to bring about a revision of wages by a front-door and not by back-door in the form of bonus. If this is done, a better incentive can be provided.

These are some of the suggestions which the hon. Minister should consider, particularly the one regarding the period of implementation.

श्री राम नारायण शर्मा (घनबाद) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल के द्वारा जो मुल्क भर में मजदूरों ने मांग की थी और इस सदन में और दूसरे सदन में माननीय सदस्यों ने भी संशोधन रखा था जिस को

सरकार उस समय कबूल नहीं कर सकी, उस को कबूल करने जा रही है। इसलिये देर से ही यह बिल स्वागत योग्य है।

जहाँ तक 1972 साल के पेमेन्ट का सवाल है जिस में इस बिल के द्वारा संशोधन करने जा रहे हैं, यह लागू करने जा रहे हैं सितम्बर से। यानी जो पिछला बिल पास हुआ या पेश हुआ उस समय से ही। लेकिन इस के बीच में जो बहुत जगह पेमेन्ट हो गया है उस पेमेन्ट को निकालने की अवधि अगर और तरह से नहीं तो नोटिफिकेशन के द्वारा सरकार को निर्धारित कर देनी चाहिये। जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है जब मजदूरों में और मालिकों में इस बिल को ले कर तनातनी होने लगी, मजदूर पूरा चाहते थे और मालिक बिल के आधार पर नहीं देना चाहता था तो सरकार ने स्पष्टीकरण किया था और मालिकों को हिदायत की थी वैसे हालत में डिडक्शन के लिये मजबूर नहीं किया जाय। तो यह बिल जो है उस लेकुना को पूरा करता है। लेकिन जहाँ तक बोनस का प्रश्न है, वह बोनस रिव्यू कमेटी का, मुझे पता नहीं सरकार ने उस कमेटी का पुनर्गठन किया कि नहीं, जो अघूरी कमेटी रह गई थी जिस में एक माननीय सदस्य की मृत्यु हो गई थी वह पूरी हुई हो तो उस कमेटी के काम को एक्सपेडाइट करा के इस 8.33 परसेंट को मजदूरी के रूप में मान लिया जाय, जैसा कि माननीय राम सिंह भाई वर्मा के कहां कि जब 8.83 को मजदूरी के रूप में मान लिया गया है क्योंकि इंडस्ट्री को घाटा हो या नफ़ा, इतना तो उन को देना ही है, तो यह मजदूरी का

[श्रीराम नारायण शर्मा]

भंग हो गया है। इसलिये इस को वेतन का एक भाग मान लेना चाहिये।

बोनस का उद्देश्य था कि कारखाने में या उद्योग में मजदूरों की साम्प्रदायिकता को और उस सिद्धान्त को मानते हुए अगर उन के मुनाफ़े में मजदूरों का हिस्सा नहीं होता, और उद्योग कम से कम उन को दे कर संतोष करना चाहता है तो उस से कोई इंसेंटिव मजदूरों में नहीं रह जाता है, वह भावना नहीं रह जाती है जिस से वह अधिक से अधिक उत्पादन कर सकें और उद्योग को मुनाफ़े में चला सकें और उस से हिस्सा ले सकें। इसी तरह से जो सरकारी उद्योग हैं जैसा पांडे जी ने उदाहरण दिया, मैं एक उदाहरण दे करके आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि फ़र्टिलाइज़र कोरपोरेशन को एक उद्योग मान करके सारे देश भर में कम से कम मुनाफ़े पर बोनस भ्रदा करते हैं जिस से कोई इंसेंटिव मजदूरों के लिये नहीं रह जाता है। लेकिन ट्रीम्बे में मजदूरों ने अधिक से अधिक मुनाफ़ा दिया और जब उन लोगों ने काम बन्द कर दिया तो मालिक को मजबूर हो कर इस कानून को एक तरफ़ रख कर और अपने कानून को एक तरफ़ रख कर 20. 83 प्रतिशत बोनस उन को देना पड़ा। यह कानून जो 20 प्रतिशत का है वह भी खत्म हो गया 8. 33 परसेंट वाला भी खत्म हो गया, सेट आफ़ और सेट आन का प्रोवीज़न भी खत्म हो गया, और जो उस साल का उन का मुनाफ़ा था उस को उन्होंने मान लिया है। मुझे देख कर हैरानी होती है कि जो उपयोगी सुझाव होता है उस पर

सरकार इस तरह से काम क्यों नहीं करती है जिससे उद्योग में अग्रान्ति पैदा ही न हो ?

अभी रेलवे के लिये, या डिफ़ेंस प्रोडक्शन के लिये या पी. ०टी. ० के लिये, उन को बोनस देने के लिये, हर माननीय सदस्य ने कहा, किसी भी माननीय सदस्य ने इस का विरोध नहीं किया, सरकार केमिटेड है कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी में इस की बातें हुई हैं, लेकिन कभी भी सरकार ने इस के ऊपर ध्यान नहीं दिया है, और आज यह स्थिति होती जा रही है कि हर काम के लिये लोगों को काम बन्द करने की नौबत आती है। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि काम बन्द करने की नौबत लाने के बाद इन चीज़ों में आप सुधार न करें, बल्कि उस से पहले ही उपाय करें जिस से इस तरह की नौबत ही न आये।

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I congratulate the hon. Minister firstly for his trying to rectify the mistake that he and his Ministry committed though it was only partially. Secondly, I am happy that he is now bringing forward a comprehensive Bill shortly. I think it is relevant because he did not really spell out what the mistake committed by him is which he wants to rectify now.

I would refer you to sub-section (8) of Section 19 of the principal Act. You will find from there that there are two things—one is to make a compulsory saving and second is to put that amount in the provident fund. Both these aspects were known when the Bill was discussed and we pointed out that the compulsory saving was wrong and secondly, the provident fund remittances are mostly risky. Because, for a vast section

of the population, it runs to Rs. 25 crores. It is possible that the provident fund amount might have been misappropriated by the various employers by not crediting the same in the provident fund account. No effective action is taken by the Government till now for this misappropriation. No attempt has also been made to book the people who misuse the provident fund amount.

Every time he is asked a question he says that he would be bringing forward a comprehensive Bill. Let not the Ministry assume to itself this monopoly of wisdom. I am sure that he is aware of the fact that there are some reactionaries in the country who are out to shut out the Central Trade Union organisations in the conference of the Indian Labour Conference. I may tell you that we are there to give our sincere advice. If you do so, once again you will be in the same pitfall where you have fallen down if you go on bringing forward amendments after amendments to the so-called comprehensive Bill.

So, I would request the hon. Minister to give an assurance on the floor of this House that at least the trade union leaders will be consulted before giving a final shape to the comprehensive Bill; secondly, the comprehensive Bill should be placed in the Indian Labour Conference firstly. Generally, in the Indian Labour Conference and even the other organisations they just try to pull the legs of the other organisations; we never arrive at any decision nowadays. Therefore it may not be also possible to get a consensus of opinion in the Indian Labour Conference. It is of course possible to get advice from the trade union people in regard to the comprehensive Bill. He should give final shape to the Bill after hearing us and then he should take it to the Cabinet and then he should come forward to Parliament with a comprehensive Bill. With these few words, I support the Bill.

श्री बन्धू लाल बन्नाकर (दुर्ग) : :
उपाध्यक्ष जी, हिन्दी में एक कहावत है "देर आये दुस्त आये"। कुछ साल पहले इस बात की मांग इस सदन में हुई थी तथा मजदूरों ने भी हर क्षेत्र में मांग की थी। और अभी हमारे श्रम मंत्री ने इस विधेयक में संशोधन कर के जो पहले गलती महसूस की जा रही थी उस में सुधार किया है, इस बात के लिये मैं उन्हें बधाई देता हूँ कि बेर से ही सही ठीक लाये। पहले ही इस विधेयक को लाना चाहते थे, लेकिन किन्हीं कारणों से जिस से 8.33 परसेंट बोनस देने में कठिनाई न हो इसलिये नहीं लाये। अब यह बोनस रिव्यू कोटी की रिपोर्ट कब तक आयेगी? क्या अगले साल जब बोनस दिया जायगा तब वह अमल में आयेगी कि नहीं? क्योंकि अगले साल जितनी भी मिलें हैं चाहे प्राइवेट हों या पब्लिक हों, उन सब पर उस का असर होगा।

15.44 hrs.

मैं चाहता हूँ कि श्रम मंत्री बोनस रिव्यू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को जल्दी मंगाने का प्रयत्न करें और साथ ही वह बोनस से सम्बन्धित विभिन्न मंत्रालयों को अभी से चेतावनी दे दें कि उस रिपोर्ट को अविलम्ब अक्षरी रूप दिया जाये, ताकि अगले साल सभी लोगों को व्यवस्थित रूप से बोनस मिल सके।

जो बोनस एक्ट बना हुआ है, उस के अन्तर्गत न मालूम कितनी तरह के अन्त्याय मजदूर वर्ग के साथ हो रहे हैं। उस में नि-निमम 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस की व्यवस्था

[श्री चन्दूलाल चन्द्राकर]

है, जो सब को देना चाहिए, चाहे घाटा हो या लाभ हो। लेकिन इस से मजदूरों को अधिक उत्पादन और आय बढ़ाने के लिए कोई प्रोत्साहन नहीं मिलता है। अभी मेरे एक दोस्त ने भिलाई का उदाहरण दिया है। निस्सन्देह भिलाई के मजदूरों ने इस्पात के उत्पादन में एक ऐसा आदर्श उपस्थित किया है, जिस की मिसाल इस देश में प्राईवेट या सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में नहीं है। लेकिन फिर भी उन को उचित बोनस नहीं मिल है। उन को 8.33 प्रतिशत बोनस के अलावा 100 रुपये प्रति मजदूर के हिसाब से मिला है। लेकिन अगर अगले वर्ष भिलाई के मजदूरों को इस आधार पर बोनस नहीं मिलेगा कि जो ज्यादा कमायेगा, वह ज्यादा खायेगा और ज्यादा आय देगा, तो मंत्रालय को अभी से सोच लेना चाहिए कि क्या क्या दिक्कतें आयेंगी। जिस की प्राइक्टिविटी और प्राइक्टिविलिटी ज्यादा है, उस को निश्चित रूप से ज्यादा बोनस मिलना चाहिए। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि सरकार अगले वर्ष समूचे देश में इस सिद्धान्त के आधार पर नियम बनायेगी।

इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि इस वर्ष देश में मजदूरों द्वारा बहुत जगह आन्दोलन और हड़तालें की गईं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि सभी जगह उन की हड़ताल सही थी। लेकिन कई जगह मजदूरों को जो हड़ताल का नोटिस देना पड़ा, उस की जिम्मेदारी मंत्रालय या मैनेजमेंट पर थी। बोनस एक्ट में अभी भी यह व्यवस्था है कि मिनिमम 8.33 परसेंट बोनस तो देना ही चाहिए

और अगर मजदूर और मालिक आपस में समझौता कर लें, तो उस से अधिक देना चाहिए। लेकिन कई जगह ऐसा नहीं किया गया, जब कि एक प्राईवेट कम्पनी—टाटा—ने ऐसा किया है। सम्बन्धित मंत्रालयों के मंत्रीगण और अधिकारीगण को समय रहते ध्यान देना चाहिए था और मजदूरों को आन्दोलन या हड़ताल करने का मौका नहीं देना चाहिए था।

मुझे आशा है कि मिलों और कारखानों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों के साथ साथ ग्रामीण मजदूरों—खेतों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों—की तरफ भी ध्यान दिया जायेगा। इस देश में अभी तक उन को बहुत उपेक्षा हुई है, लेकिन वह उपेक्षा अधिक समय तक बर्दाश्त नहीं की जायेगी।

श्री जगदीश चन्द्र दीक्षित (सीतापुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सभी ओर से मंत्री महोदय को बधाई मिल चुकी है। मैं भी इस में माननीय सदस्यों का साथ देता हूँ। लेकिन मैं उन्हें पूरी बधाई तब दूंगा, जब इस पूरे बोनस एक्ट का वापिस ले कर एक नया बिल लाया जायेगा। इस की वजह यह है कि हमारा यह बोनस एक्ट पूंजीवादी इंडस्ट्रियल जूरिसप्रुडेंस का प्रतीक है।

बोनस के मामले जब सुप्रीम कोर्ट के सामने गये, तो सवाल यह था कि बैलेंसशीट पर दिखाई गई हानि और लाभ के आधार पर किस प्रकार से रीहैबिलिटेशन और माइनाइजेशन के आंकड़े निकाले जायें। जब इस बारे में झगड़ा उठा, तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने ही यह सिफारिश की कि बोनस कमीशन

वनाया जाये । मुप्रिम कोर्ट के फ़ैसले के मुताबिक वोनस कमीशन बना और वोनस कमीशन की सिफ़ारिश पर यह वोनस एक्ट बना । वोनस एक्ट का सारा आधार या तो मिनिमम है—वह 4 परसेंट हो या 8.33 परसेंट हो, और या बैलेंसशीट है । हम लोग मज़दूर आन्दोलन में हमेशा बैलेंसशीट को चुनौती देते रहे हैं । सब तरफ़ से यह कहा जाता रहा है कि उस में जो प्राफ़िट दिखाये जाते हैं, वे ग़लत हैं । लेकिन उस को कानून में स्थान दे कर, उस पर कानून की मुहर लगाने पर हम ने उस को पवित्र और सत्य मान लिया है ।

इस वोनस एक्ट में “एम्पलाई” की यह परिभाषा कर के कि वही लोग वोनस के अधिकारी हैं, जो उद्योगों में लगे हुए हैं, उन लोगों को अलग कर रखा है, जो “इंडस्ट्री” शब्द के अन्तर्गत नहीं आते हैं और इंडस्ट्री के एम्पलाई नहीं हैं । लेकिन इस एक्ट के प्रीएम्बल में “पर्सन्स एम्पलायड इन सरटैन एस्टाब्लिशमेंट्स” की बात कही गई थी, जिस से सब कर्मचारियों में आशायें पैदा हो गई थीं । आशायें तो सब तरफ़ पैदा हो गई, लेकिन इस एक्ट में वोनस की व्यवस्था को इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टाब्लिशमेंट्स के एम्पलाईज़ तक सीमित रखा गया है । कहा जाता है कि सरकार ने यह मामला पे कमीशन को रेफ़र किया । किया या नहीं, यह तो सरकार जाने, या जिन को रेफ़र करने की बात कही जाती है, वे जानें । लेकिन जो सरकारी विभाग “इंडस्ट्री” की परिभाषा के अन्तर्गत आते हैं, जैसे डिफ़ेंस और रेलवे, वे दो स्वयः ही कवर हो जाने चाहिए ।

यह वोनस रीव्यू कमेटी तो मौजूदा प्रावलम को हल करने के लिए हम लोगों का समझौता है । लेकिन यह तो तय करना ही होगा कि जिस संस्था या डिपार्टमेंट या इंडस्ट्री में उत्पादन से देश को लाभ हो रहा है, चाहे वह पब्लिक सैक्टर में हो और चाहे प्राइवेट सैक्टर में, उस के कर्मचारियों को वोनस मिलना चाहिए, क्योंकि “वोनस” शब्द का निर्माण ही “बून” शब्द से हुआ है और इस का आधार ही प्राफ़िट और लास है । यह बात साफ़ हो जानी चाहिए कि हर जगह प्रोड्यूसर्स हैं, जो उत्पादन करते हैं, उन को वोनस दिया जायेगा, ताकि पुराने कानून में पूंजीवादी वृत्तियों को जो आधार दिया गया है, वह दूर हो और साथ ही सरकारी कर्मचारियों में जो मतिभ्रम फैला हुआ है, वह भी दूर हो और जो लोग वोनस के पात्र और अधिकारी हैं—डिफ़ेंस और रेलवे के कर्मचारी—उन को स्पष्ट रूप से इस में कवर किया जाये ।

महंगाई को देखते हुए प्राविडेंट फ़ंड में जमा पैसा निकल रहा है, इस के लिए सभी सदस्यों ने मंत्री महोदय को धन्यवाद दिया है । लेकिन इस बात की भी आवश्यकता है कि प्राविडेंट फ़ंड के दफ़तरों में मज़दूरों को जो प्राविडेंट फ़ंड नहीं मिल रहा है, उस की भी जांच होनी चाहिए—इस बात की जांच के साथ साथ कि कितने मालिकों ने नहीं दिया है । मुझे क्षमा किया जाये, मेरे पास मज़दूरों से शिकायत आई है कि कई जगह प्राविडेंट फ़ंड के दफ़तरों में भ्रष्टाचार चल रहा है । इस बात की जांच होनी चाहिए कि कितने लोग मर

[श्री जयदीश चन्द्र दीक्षित]

गये हैं, या रिटायर हो गये हैं, लेकिन उन का प्राविडेंट फंड नहीं मिला है और बाबू उन्हें बीड़ा रहे हैं, भले ही उन की भी एक ट्रेड यूनियन हो, हम में से ही एक साथी उस का चेयरमैन हो और वह उन की डिमांड्स को रखे ।

लेकिन अगर दो चार सौ, या दो चार हजार, आदमी ऐसे हैं, जिन को रिटायर होने पर भी प्राविडेंट फंड नहीं मिलता है, तो हमारे सारे कानून और सारे प्रयास बेकार हो जायेंगे । इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय से इस बारे में एनक्वायरी की मांग करता हूँ ।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि नया विधेयक नये सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर लाया जाये, ताकि उत्पादन करने वालों को लाभ हो और और श्रम-उत्पादक को न हो और इस बारे में एक सम्यक व्यवस्था की जाये ।

श्री मूलचन्द्र झाग। (पाली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब सदस्यों ने बोनस रीव्यू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बारे में मांग की है । मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वह रिपोर्ट आने के बाद कब तक नया बिल पेश कर देंगे । क्या वह इस के लिए कोई डेफिनिट डेट या थ्रीअर बता सकेंगे ?

मैं समझता हूँ कि जब विभिन्न उद्योगों के लिए अलग अलग बोनस का फ़ैसला किया जाता है, तो उस से मजदूरों में असंतोष फैलता है । जहां तक बोनस रीव्यू कमेटी का प्रश्न है, उस की टाइमलिमिट मकर्रर की जानी चाहिए । इस टाइम तक वह अपनी रिपोर्ट दें और रिपोर्ट आने के बाद अन्वेष

सेशन में नया बिल आना चाहिए और नहीं तो होगा क्या ? मैंने बार बार कहा कि राष्ट्र की एक बतन नीति बननी चाहिए । जब तक राष्ट्र की एक बतन नीति, एक बेज पालिसी नहीं बनती हमें इस बोनस ऐक्ट से बहुत नुकसान होता है । इंडिया लेवेल पर आप की एक बेज पालिसी होनी चाहिए । जब तक वह नहीं बनती है तब तक जिन्होंने मुनाफा कमाया है और जो अपना एकाउंट आडिट कराए हुए हैं हम उन को चैलेंज नहीं कर सकते । हमारे यहां पाली में करोड़ों रुपया कमाते हैं और उन से कहो तो कहते हैं कि 8 परसेंट ही फिक्सड है । इम मे ज्यादा नहीं दे सकते । अब मैं राम सिंह भाई जैत करामातो तो हूँ नहीं कि लड्डू झगड़ कर 30 परसेंट दिला दूँ । अगर मैं उन मे लड्डू भी तो वह कहते हैं कि 8 परसेंट का कानून बना हुआ है जो आप के प्रगतिशील लेबर मिनिस्टर ने बनाया हुआ है । मुझे तो बड़ा दुख है । आप देखें इस बात को कि आज कल की महंगाई के साथ में मजदूरों को मिलता क्या है ? हमारी सरकार ने पे कमीशन मकर्रर किया । क्या मजदूरों के लिए भी कोई कमीशन मकर्रर है । मजदूरों की महंगाई बढ़ती जाती है और मजदूरों को मिलता कुछ नहीं है । इसलिए कभी कभी लोग कहते हैं कि यह अपना बोनस खत्म करो, हम एक मिनिमम बेज एन्वयोर करो । एन्वयोर एमिनिमम बेज । यह लोग कहते हैं कि बोनस खत्म करो और एक लिविंग बेज उन को दो । हमारी सब की तनख्वाह बढ़नी चाहिए, लेकिन मजदूर की नहीं बढ़नी चाहिए ? मजदूर की तनख्वाह बढ़ाने वाला

कौन है ? इसलिए लोग समझते हैं कि बोनस तो एक ढकोलला है, फर्क ज्ञात है। आज आप 8 परसेंट बोनस दे रहे हैं, बड़ा अच्छा कानून लोग कह रहे हैं आप लाए हैं, हम भी घन्यवाद दे रहे हैं। लेकिन मजदूर की मांग तो इस से पूरी नहीं होती। मजदूर की मांग पूरी करने का मतलब है कि जिस में मजदूर जिन्दा रह सके उतनी तनख्वाह उस को मिलनी चाहिए। इस के साथ साथ बोनस रिव्यू कमेटी के लिए टाइम लिमिट फिक्स करनी चाहिए। टाइम लिमिट फिक्स कर के जल्दी से वह कानून यहां पर लाना चाहिए।

SHRI A. P. SHARMA (Buxar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I know that the scope of this amending Bill is limited as pointed out earlier by some of my friends. But I would like to take this opportunity to place one or two important points before this House through you.

Sir, many of the friends have congratulated the Labour Minister for coming out with this amendment Bill perhaps to rectify a mistake which has been committed earlier. I wish I were able to join with them. But like my friend Mr. Dixit. I would also like to reserve my word of congratulation for the Labour Minister till the demand, this burning issue, namely, the payment of a minimum bonus of 8.33 per cent, is met by the Labour Minister in the case of the railway employees, the defence production employees, the posts and telegraphs employees and also the employees of the Government of Indian presses.

I do not understand why this issue regarding this class of employees has been kept pending for long. Perhaps, if the consideration is that they

are run by departments of the Government of India, then, may I know whether it changes the whole character of the employment? If that is so, if the answer is in the affirmative, I would remind the hon. Labour Minister that in a similar situation in England, the employees of the posts and telegraphs department who were also civil servants compelled their Government to convert them into employees of a corporation. Now, a public corporation is managing the posts and telegraphs department in England. If this is the only difficulty in our way, we would very much wish that the Indian railways may be run through a corporation; the P. and T should be run through a public corporation; the defence production department should be run through a public corporation.

I have said in the beginning that I reserve my congratulations for the Labour Minister to the day when he comes out with a complete review of the Bonus Act after receipt of the Bonus Review Committee Report. I will be failing in my duty if I do not congratulate him for coming out to rectify this mistake in time. If this was not done it would have assumed the form of an All India agitation on behalf of those employees who were being forced to deposit part of their bonus in the provident fund. The Labour Minister is a nice gentleman and we always see a smile on his face. But he should look at the lakhs of railway employees and defence production employees and others to whom I referred and the amount of anguish and anger in their face. I do not agree with many of the remarks of Shri Banerjee or Shri Dandavate. I did not go to the village panchayat workers or to the municipal corporation employees. My definition is very much limited; fortunately I represent the Central Government employees on the National Council also. There also we have made it clear that instead of compensating the whole issue, we stand for payment of minimum bonus to the

[Shri A. P. Sharma]

Central Government employees who are industrial employees of the Government of India.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: We oppose that; we want for all employees.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: But the majority supported us. With all the emphasis at my command I want to stress the point raised by Shri Daga. The hon. Minister should see that the the Committee submits its report as early as possible and soon after that he should come to this House with a comprehensive Bill so that all the Central Government industrial employees would be covered by the Bonus Act. Then the million of workers—they cannot come into this House—and we ourselves will congratulate the Labour Minister for an act for which he deserves to be congratulated.

While closing, I would remind him that the Railwaymen have taken a strike ballot on the question of bonus and we have persuaded them to wait for the report of the Bonus Review Committee. They are waiting to see the reaction of the Government. I hope the Labour Minister will take notice of this and come with a comprehensive Bill after the report of the Bonus Review Committee is received.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: I am extremely grateful to the hon. Members who had participated in this debate and made very valuable suggestions. I am also very grateful to the hon. Members who have extended their whole-hearted support to this Bill. It is gratifying to note that there is not a single dissenting voice as far as this Bill is concerned. My friend Mr. A. P. Sharma extended limited congratulations. . .

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: I have said whole-hearted support.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Though some of the points mentioned may fill within the doctrine of

relevancy, it is my submission that they do not arise out of the provisions of the Bill just now before the House for discussion.

The question was asked why the Government was not ready to pass this amendment last session itself. When the question of payment of 8.33 per cent bonus came up, we sent a communique to all the employers' organisations that they should pay at that rate. In the absence of an amendment, it was brought to our notice that some of the employers were not taking necessary steps in this direction. Therefore, we thought it absolutely necessary to bring forward legislation as early as possible. At that stage no doubt very valuable suggestions were made, but my anxiety was that that Bill should be passed at that time and 8.33 per cent bonus should be conceded without any ambiguity, so that the employers may not run away under some pretext without paying 8.33 per cent. That was why I requested the House to pass that Bill at that time, apart from the fact that we were also anxious that some money should be left to the worker's family ultimately. But when once hon. members pleased to point out that the present situation demands that the entire bonus must be paid in cash, I realised the necessity of it and almost immediately we wrote to the employers concerned that notwithstanding the legislation, the entire bonus may be paid in cash. Some of them obliged and some found legal difficulties. To remove those legal difficulties, we have brought this Bill.

A demand has been made for a comprehensive legislation. As Shri Sharma and others have pointed out, the Bonus Review Committee is deliberating on the question. We do not know what their recommendations will be. It is not proper for me to anticipate anything and commit Government to any recommendation that may or may not be made. After the

committee submits its report, Government will have to consider their recommendations and take decisions. In pursuance of those decisions and certainly with the support of the hon. members, comprehensive legislation would have to be thought of.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: After the Bonus Review Committee submits its report, will Government examine the payment of bonus to Central Government employees? When the interim report was submitted, the public undertaking employees were brought within the purview of this legislation and were paid bonus. What is the difference between a worker in a public undertaking and a worker in defence or railways?

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Mr. Banerjee is a senior and respected member and he knows the provisions of the Bonus Act. I can only act within the framework of the Bonus Act and not go beyond that. The point made by him is in our minds and at the appropriate time when it becomes relevant it can be considered.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: What about those employers who deducted the amount but did not pay it into the provident fund?

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: The Bonus Act provides for appropriate action in this regard. I do not think there need be any apprehension about it. If there is any lacuna, we will not hesitate to come before the House for taking very severe action in this regard.

I do not want to take the time of this hon. House. I am again grateful for the welcome which the hon. Members have extended to this piece of legislation. As far as implementation is concerned, I can assure the hon. Members that the Government have their full sympathy for the workers and would take such necessary steps as would be called for in the implementation of the Act.

I may say here as a matter of information to the hon. Members that during the first six months of 1973 the number of man-days lost was less by three millions days as compared to the corresponding period of last year. It is a matter for congratulating the workers in this country who are responsible for increasing the productivity of this country, because production is our lifeline and without production we cannot make any progress. So, I would expect the complete and full cooperation of the working class and their leaders, so far as improvement of productivity is concerned.

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."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We will take up clause-by-clause consideration. There is no amendment to clause 2. The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: To clause 3 there is one amendment by Shri Ramavatar Shastri. I find he is not here.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: He has authorised me to move it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It cannot be done. The question is:

"That clause 3, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved: 15.30 hrs.

"That the Bill be passed."

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The hon. Minister has not made any commitment about the Central Government employees. With all the sincerity and eloquence at my command I would appeal to the hon. Minister to remove the injustice done to the Central Government employees in the matter of bonus, after the submission of the report of the Bonus Review Committee, and I would submit that they should be brought on par with the employees in the public sector undertakings.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: During the consideration stage I made a point about the reimbursement of the bonus from the provident fund. This Bill relates only to the period 1972-73 when the workers will get the benefit of the bonus credited to their provident fund. I am suggesting that the amount credited to the provident fund even in the years 1970 and 1971 should be made available to the workers and an amendment to this effect should be accepted by the Minister.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: So far as the point of Shri S. M. Banerjee is concerned, I have to work within the framework of the Act. So far as the point of Shri Stephen is concerned, the most respectful consideration will be given to it, when the comprehensive Bill is brought forward, of course within the framework of the Act.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

BURN COMPANY AND INDIAN STANDARD WAGON COMPANY (TAKING-OVER OF MANAGEMENT) BILL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up the Burn Company and Indian Standard Wagon Company (Taking over of Management) Bill. Shri T. A. Pai. Two hours have been allotted.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): This is an important Bill, Sir. The time should be extended. The Business Advisory Committee is meeting today at 4.00 p.m.

SHRI RAJA KULKARNI (Bombay—North-East): What is the time allotted?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: For the time being it is two hours. The Business Advisory Committee will meet, I am told; they may review it.

THE MINISTER OF HEAVY INDUSTRY AND STEEL AND MINES (SHRI T. A. PAI): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the taking over, in the public interest, of the management of the undertakings of certain companies, pending nationalisation of such undertakings, with a view to ensuring rational and co-ordinated development and production of rolling stock, other products of iron and steel industry and other goods needed by such industry, and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be taken into consideration."

In saying so, I would like to make a few observations.

For some time past, we were receiving disturbing reports about the gross mismanagement resulting in an alarming drop in production and erosion of capital reserves in two of the finest engineering companies in the country, namely, Messrs Burn and

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.