

17.08 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**
—contd.

**REPORTED STRIKE BY PORT AND DOCK
WORKERS OF BOMBAY**

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister of Labour and Employment will now make a statement.

The Minister of Planning and Labour and Employment (Shri Nanda): Nearly 17,000 port and dock workers in Bombay struck work this morning. This strike does not arise out of any demands concerning their own employment. This is a sympathetic strike in support of the municipal employees in the city of Bombay. It appears that this sympathetic strike is intended to last till the midnight of 20th August, 1963.

As there is no dispute between the dock workers and the port authorities, no action is called for on the part of the Central Government specifically in relation to this strike.

As stated by the Home Minister on 17th August, 1963 in this House, the strike of the municipal employees of Bombay falls in the State sphere. I am glad to note that direct talks to end the municipal strike have already been initiated with the meeting between the chairman of the Socialist Party and the Chief Minister, and I hope that the strike will come to an end soon.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of clarification....

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): May I know whether this statement is on the calling-attention-notice?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of clarification. The hon. Minister, if I have heard him aright, said that the issue of the civic strike fell within the State sphere. We are well aware of that. But has he examined this matter from the point of view of

article 353 of the Constitution in the context of national emergency, which not merely empowers but requires the Central Government to issue instructions to the State Government with regard to such matters, as far as the executive powers of the State Government are concerned?

Secondly, has Government examined this matter of the dock and port workers' strike from the standpoint of its possible, nay, inevitable, repercussions on the psychology of the workers in general and on the defence effort of the country, particularly the defence effort which Bombay, which is the *urbis prima in india* of our is putting forth? If so, is the Government not concerned at the adverse repercussions on the defence effort of the country, and if that be so, what action is Government taking in this regard?

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Does he want political workers to be arrested?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Settle the matter.

Shri Priya Gupta (Kathihar): On a point of order.

Shri Nanda: Government is deeply concerned and it is for that reason that the Home Minister in his statement here has opened the way for the strike being brought to an end. In pursuance of what was stated here—and I think even before that—that line of action was being pursued. As I have said, talks are going on with a view to bring the strike to an end. That means that whatever is necessary is being done.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Permit me to say that the Central Government is showing masterly inactivity, nothing else.

Shri Nath Pai: May I ask of the Labour Minister whether even at this late stage, when matters have been allowed to drift so far—deteriorate so deplorably—whether he and the Home Minister consider the desirability of

trying to persuade the Maharashtra Government to give up its legalistic and unhelpful attitude, not point out that the strike which began today is not a dispute for any trade union purpose but a sympathetic strike? Is it not a fact that the strike which commences tomorrow—continuation of the strike which began today—is a dispute aimed against the rising prices? In the light of this, shall we think it proper to continue sitting tight on some legal point? Do they not consider it their duty from the Centre to terminate this unhappy state of affairs? Is it a fact that the talks are going on with the Chairman of the SP and that the leaders of the strike are being kept out? Will he give an assurance that the strike leaders will be made free to open negotiations with the municipal authorities?

Shri Nanda: I have stated the facts. I will supplement the information.

Shri Raj Narain Singh, leader of the Socialist Party, along with a few leaders of the striking workers met the Chief Minister at 8.30 a.m. on the 18th. The Home Minister and Labour Minister of Maharashtra were also present. Discussions took place for nearly 2½ hours. After that, Shri Raj Narain Singh was allowed to see the leaders of the strikers in jail. He again met the Chief Minister and other Ministers at 4.30 in the afternoon and discussions continued for more than 4 hours. The Chief Minister requested the Labour leaders to withdraw the strike and leave the matter to him. He assured them that he would do his best to look into the problem expeditiously and with maximum sympathy.

Shri K. N. Pande (Hata): I have a very important question to ask.

Mr. Chairman: Let me first call those who are signatories.

Shri Priya Gupta: On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Unless there is a point of order pertaining to this, I cannot allow the hon. Member.

Shri Priya Gupta: It is arising out of what the Labour Minister just said.

According to standing laws in the country, when there is a strike, whether with or without notice, legally or illegally, in an establishment which is a public utility service, the Labour Ministry is bound to intervene and take it as a dispute and arrange conciliation. Therefore, he cannot deny that it is a dispute, and say that he will not intervene.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order. He is making a speech.

Shri Priya Gupta: No. He has ruled out intervention (*Interruptions*).

रघुनाथ बाबू, आप तो बड़े सीनियर मेम्बर हैं ? Let me continue.

Shri Priya Gupta: The point is that the Labour Minister said that he was not going to intervene because it was not a dispute. I have raised a point of order because his decision is wrong, because the dispute is there.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order. It is only criticism of the Government. Please resume your seat. No excuse for making a speech.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
सभापति महोदय, आप की आज्ञा से मैं एक प्रश्न भी पूछूंगा और अभी कुछ सूचना मिली है उस को भी सरकार के सामने रखना चाहूंगा। सूचना रख कर उसी की रोशनी में प्रश्न पूछना चाहूंगा।

Mr. Chairman: Not a long preface to your question.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : नहीं बहुत लम्बा नहीं है। हमें अभी अभी ट्रंक काल से सूचना मिली है कि लगभग ८५ हजार मजदूर जिन में ३० हजार म्यूनिसिपल मजदूर, २० हजार बी०ई०एस०टी० के मजदूर, १५ हजार टैक्सी वाले, ३५ हजार गोदी

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

मजदूर और ५ हजार होटल के कार्यकर्ताओं ने हड़ताल कर दी और मुकम्मल हड़ताल हुई। अध्यक्ष, अखिल भारतीय सोशलिस्ट पार्टी वहां के मुख्य मंत्री और कार्यकर्ताओं से मिले। यह निश्चय हुआ कि भूतपूर्व वित्त मंत्री श्री मेहता, जो कि सर्वोदयी नेता हैं, इस मामले में पंच बनाये जायें और वे अगुआई करें। लेकिन सरकार इस को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। मशरूफ सरकार ने माना है कि महंगाई बढ़ी है। तब यह कहा गया कि २५ फीसदी न मानें लेकिन शुरू में थोड़ा बहुत मान कर, फिर बाद में तीनों अर्थात् मजदूर, कारपोरेशन और सरकारी नुमाइन्दे, बैठकर मामला तय करें। लेकिन मामला तय होता नजर नहीं आता। अभी मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि शायद नेगोशिएन्स चल रहे हैं और मामला तय हो जायेगा लेकिन मेरी जानकारी है कि यह मामला तय होने नहीं जा रहा है। बात चीत फेल हो गई है क्योंकि मशरूफ सरकार अपनी प्रतिष्ठा पर टिकी हुई है और कोई रास्ता निकाला नहीं जा रहा है। तो इस रोशनी में मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या वे इस मामले में पड़ कर इस हड़ताल को खत्म करायेंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो उन की न्यायोचित मांगें हैं उन पर विचार करें और विचार करने के बाद कोई फैसला लें। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि पहले मजदूर जो हैं उन को दबा दिया जाय और उस के बाद सरकार बातें चलाये।

दूसरी चीज जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि श्री चव्हाण, जो रक्षा मंत्री हैं, वह चले जायें तो आज ही यह सारा मामला उन के जरिये से तय हो सकता है। उन को भी मजदूर पंच मानने के लिये तैयार हैं। मैं सरकार और मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या श्री छत्र ही वे रक्षा मंत्री को भेज कर इस मामले में बिचवानी कराने के लिये तैयार हैं? (Interruptions).

श्री त्यागी : मैं एक प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ। जहां तक मैं समझा हूँ पार्लियामेंट का यह कायदा है कि कोई भी मेम्बर अगर किसी मामले में पर्सनली इंटरस्टेड हो तो वह इस सवाल को पार्लियामेंट में नहीं उठा सकता। मेरे दोस्त खुद स्ट्राइक करा रहे हैं (Interruptions)। इसलिए व इस स्ट्राइक को खत्म करवाने के लिये पार्लियामेंट का फोरम इस्तेमाल नहीं कर सकते।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : इस में मेरे निज का क्या सवाल है ?

Shri Priya Gupta: Where is the point of order?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should realise that he has made a constructive suggestion for settling the dispute. That is why I allowed him to make the statement.

Shri K. N. Pandey: I also want to say something.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. Minister going to say anything?

श्री नन्दा : I cannot say anything very useful. अभी जो कहा गया कि यह जो बातचीत हो रही थी वह शायद कामयाब होती दिखाई नहीं दे रही है, यह बड़े खेद की बात है। यह अगर नहीं हो रहा है तो इस का मतलब यह है कि उन का इरादा है कि न हो। मैं ने वहां के होम मिनिस्टर साहब को ३ बजे फोन किया। उन का यह खयाल था और उन की यह आशा थी कि शायद श्री राज नारायण फिर से मधु लिमये से मिल कर आयेंगे और बातचीत जारी रहेगी। इस बीच में अगर कोई मेसेज भेजी गई है कि बातचीत खत्म कर दी गई, तो शायद ऐसा हो गया होगा। लेकिन मुझे पता नहीं है।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : मैं साफ कर दूँ। मंत्री महोदय जो यह बात कह रहे हैं वह गैरजिम्मेदारी की बात है। यहाँ से कोई

सन्देशा नहीं गया कि यह बातचीत तोड़ दी जाय। मगर मेरा प्रश्न है कि क्या रक्षा मंत्री और सर्वोदयी नेता श्री वी० एल० मे०ता को पंच बना कर सरकार मामले को खत्म कराने के लिये तैयार है (Interruptions)? सम्भा-पति महोदय, मेरे प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं मिला। मैं मंत्री जी से इस का उत्तर चाता हूँ।

Shri K. N. Pandey: I also want to say something on this.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): His name is not there.

Shri K. N. Pandey: I am going to raise a very important question.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Why don't you see this side?

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar): Have we no right to speak in this House?

Mr. Chairman: He has placed before the House whatever information he has in his possession.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने एक आरोप लगाया है कि यहां से खबर भेज दी गयी है कि ... (Interruptions).

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Serampore): The other side seems to be carrying the day by simply shouting.

Mr. Chairman: No, no. Those who have given notice are allowed to put questions. . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Daji (Indore): In view of the constructive statement made by the Home Minister day before yesterday which opened up the possibilities of negotiations and in view of the fact that the view expressed then was that the negotiations were not carried on by the leaders of the strike, I want to know this. The reports in the papers today indicate that it is the Maharashtra Government which is putting up almost impossible conditions and

says that it may be left to the Chief Minister without there being no concrete negotiations. The talks may go on, they say but they also say that concrete terms and proposals cannot be accepted till the strike is withdrawn. The Central Government has got to intervene and see that fruitful negotiations of concrete proposals take place. Will the Central Government see that this is done and that the Maharashtra Government does not stand on prestige?

Shri Nanda: The hon. Member has not understood the precise import of what I said. The assurance of the Chief Minister came earlier. After that these talks have been going on and as I said the Chief Minister was expecting a further visit from Mr. Rajnarain. Therefore, it is not the question of the Chief Minister as such. These talks are meant to find some basis, some means of bringing about an end of the strike.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The hon. Minister says that negotiations have already started and the Chairman of the Socialist Party is negotiating. I want to know whether he is aware that there is going to be a Bombay bandh strike tomorrow involving half a million people belonging to the working class and if the situation is not checked properly, a situation like that may develop in the whole country (Some Hon. Members: No, no.) Since the Government of Maharashtra has failed to negotiate because of its arrogant policy, is the Centre going to intervene? (Interruptions.)

Shri R. S. Pandey: Do I take it that the Maharashtra Government is at the bar of the House?

Mr. Chairman: Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:

Shri K. N. Pandey: Sir, I have not been allowed to say what I wanted to say though I represent one of the biggest unions in the country.... (Interruptions).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Go to Bombay and settle it.... (Interruptions.)

Mr. Chairman: Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

17.25 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): Sir, I do not know what I am required to do.

—————

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): Is the hon. Labour Minister prepared to accept arbitration? Am I required to ask a question or to speak on the motion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You are to speak on the no-confidence motion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): In the morning, the Speaker said....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You cannot get up in the middle. I am very sorry.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: As I rise to support the motion of no-confidence....

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : अध्यक्ष महोदय ने इसारे से कहा था कि मैं बाद में बोल पाऊंगा। मंत्री जी ने एक बात यहां कही थी कि शायद हम लोगों ने यहां से सन्देशा भेजा है कि हड़ताल जारी रहे। यह बिल्कुल गलत है। हम चाते हैं कि हड़ताल खत्म हो।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri to speak on the no-confidence motion.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं हड़ताल के बारे में कहूंगा कि सरकार कोई भी बात करने को तैयार नहीं है जब तक कि मजदूर हड़ताल वापस न ले लें।

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): He is not a signatory. He cannot speak. (Interruptions.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members cannot go on like this.

Shri Priya Gupta: Did you permit the extension of sitting of the House toady?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member perhaps was not here then; I told the House that the House would sit till 6 O'clock today.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: As I rise to support the motion of no-confidence moved by Shri J. B. Kripalani, I feel I owe an explanation to the House and to the public as to the reasons which impelled our group to lend support to both the motions of no-confidence that were tabled the other day. We first rose for the Communist motion, and for that, both in the lobbies and outside, we have been taken to task. One Calcutta paper has even gone to the length of finding fault with us not so much for rising in support of the no-confidence motion as such but for rising in support also of the no-confidence motion moved by the Communist party. This is indicative of the fact that there is a section of Congress opinion in the country which is not so much against the no-confidence motion but against any association with the Communist party.

On the other hand, we have our Communist critics who find fault with us for having risen in support of the motion that is under discussion today. But I might remind the friends of the Communist group that a no-confidence motion is a no-confidence motion against the entire Government and