

Dated.....25.11.53.

**THE**  
**PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**  
**(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)**  
**OFFICIAL REPORT**

1125

**HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE**

*Tuesday, 1st December, 1953*

*The House met at Half Past One  
of the Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

*(See Part I)*

2-30 P.M.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to inform the hon. Members that I have received the following letter from Shri Banerjee:

"I have been suffering from blood-pressure and have been advised by the doctor not to leave Midnapore.

So, Sir, kindly grant me leave of absence for this session of the House of the People and oblige".

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri Banerjee for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the present session?

**Hon. Members:** Yes.

*Leave was granted.*

552 PSD.

1126

**PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE**

**FINAL ORDER NO. 3 OF DELIMITATION  
COMMISSION**

**The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas):** I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 9 of the Delimitation Commission Act, 1952, a copy of the Delimitation Commission, India, Final Order No. 3, published in the *Gazette of India, Extraordinary*, Part II, Section 3, dated the 13th November, 1953. [Placed in Library. See No. S-182/53.]

**EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS  
(AMENDMENT) BILL**

**Clause 16.—***(Substitution of new section for section 17 in Act XIX of 1952)*

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the Bill to amend the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952, as passed by Council of States.

Clauses 2 to 15 have been disposed of. Clause 16 was under consideration. That is what the Parliamentary records say.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** Clause 15 was not voted upon at all.

**Mr. Speaker:** Clause 15 was passed. There is the record here. The hon. Member will agree that it is more correct than the impressions of hon. Members.

**The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali):** Yesterday he was speaking on his amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** So, I will call upon the Minister to reply.

**Shri Abid Ali:** There are other amendments also.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava** (Gurgaon): All the amendments to Clause 16 had been moved.

**Mr. Speaker:** All the amendments had been moved.

**Shri Abid Ali:** The amendment moved is concerning the words which have been mentioned in the Bill to say that if the benefits are not less, then there can be exemption, but if the benefits for the workers are less, then exemption can not be granted. The contention of the hon. Member there was that we are taking away the right of the workers and reducing the privileges. But I may draw his attention to the following words in line 8 of the original Act, Section 17(a): "generally which are on the whole not less favourable to the employees than the benefits provided under this Act". We are retaining these as they are in the Act itself and removing the earlier portion which is superfluous because of the lines which I have just read. Therefore, there is no change and there is no decrease of the privileges. I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am putting all the amendments together but, I feel a little confused as to how all these amendments can be put together for voting.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** Originally, amendment No. 1 was moved. Afterwards, I asked the hon. Member to move all his amendments. So, all the amendments have been moved.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is true, but the question now before me is how to put them together for voting. There are groups which can be put together, but it would create a difficulty in voting, if all the amendments are put together because they refer to different points.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** Different points in the same Clause.

**Mr. Speaker:** So, I am putting these amendments separately. Hon. Mem-

bers may refer to the Lists. Amendment No. 10 in List No. 1 is the same as amendment No. 21 in list No. 2.

The question is:

'In page 6, line 11, for "not less favourable" substitute "more favourable".

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

In page 6, line 13, for "not less favourable" substitute "more favourable".

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

In page 6, line 21, for "not less favourable" substitute "more favourable".

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

In page 6, after line 23, add:

"Provided that the appropriate Government has ascertained the opinion of the majority of such employees before arriving at the opinion."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

(i) In page 6, for lines 39 to 46, substitute:

"(c) any person or class of persons employed in any factory to which the Scheme applies, if such person or class or persons is entitled to benefits in the nature of provident fund, gratuity or old age pensions and such benefits, separately or jointly, are on the whole not less favourable than the benefit provided under this Act or the Scheme"; and

(ii) in page 7, line 1, for "(3)" substitute "(2)".

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

In page 6, line 45, for "not less favourable" substitute "more favourable."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

"That clause 16 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 16 was added to the Bill.*

**Clause 17.**—(Substitution of new section for section 19 in Act XIX of 1952)

**Mr. Speaker:** There are no amendments to this Clause. So, I put it to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That clause 17 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 17 was added to the Bill.*

**Clause 18.** (Amendment of Schedule I, Act XIX of 1952)

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** I beg to move:

(i) In page 7, omit line 50.

(ii) In page 7, after line 50 add:

"(ia) The following items shall be added at the end:

Cigars and any preparations of tobacco other than cigarettes.

Coffee.

Tea.

Rubber.

Pepper.

Fertilisers.

Heavy Chemicals.

Drugs and Pharmaceuticals.

Paints and Varnishes.

Soap.

Tanning and Footwear.

Glass.

Petroleum products.

Power alcohol.

Matches.

Sugar.

Vegetable oils and Vanaspathi.

Food products.

Ships."

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sir, in the original Act the provision was "manufacture or production", and in this Amending Bill the word "production" is being omitted. That is to say, they want to take away from the purview of this Act coal mines and gold mines and their production. In the coal mines there are 3,25,000 workers. I know there is a Coal Mine Provident Fund Scheme, but the provisions there are not so favourable as the provision under this Act. For them the contribution is only from the basic wages. No deduction is made from the dearness allowance, nor is any deduction made on account of the cash equivalent due to sale of cheap grains. These two things—contribution on dearness allowance as well as cash equivalent of foodgrains—are very important. In another Act, i.e. the payment of compensation, these are taken into consideration, but here it is not done. So, I want to bring within the purview of this Amending Bill coal mines and gold mines. Then there are other industries, such as the chemicals, and chemical products industry, and the cigar and preparations out of cigar industry, and also the bidi industry. Although a number of workers are engaged in the bidi industry, still the workers engaged in that industry do not come under the Schedule. As far as I know—I am not sure—in the cigar industry, though it is a flourishing industry, still there is no provision for any kind of a provident fund for the employees. I would request the hon. Minister to include the bidi workers also within the scope of this Bill.

As regards plantations, only yesterday it was pointed out, in the course of the discussion on the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill, that the plantation workers should be brought within the scope of that legislation. Why have the plantations been omitted? Is it because they are mostly British-owned, and managed with British capital? Is it because of the fear that it would interfere with our membership in the Commonwealth? These capitalists have been invading province after province, and earning a lot of

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

money by way of profits, and why should we exempt them from the purview of this legislation? Plantations like pepper, rubber, etc. could be easily included in this Bill. Similarly, the tanning industry can also be included in the Schedule, which applies at present only to six industries.

If any factory is not able to pay, then it is up to Government to see that some sort of a contribution is made to them from out of Government revenues. For instance, there is a factory, about 20 miles from here, viz. the Modi Spinning and Weaving Mills, who have made a profit of Rs. 14 lakhs this year, and they have been exempted from the payment of income-tax also. To that extent, our income-tax revenues have been depleted. When such concessions are being given, and we suffer some loss in our revenues, by foregoing income-tax dues and other things, why should not Government take the responsibility for contributing towards the provident fund of the employees, in cases, where the factories are not able to pay? Government can certainly pay, for they have plenty of money. For instance, they are prepared to pay for one individual like the Rajpramukh of Hyderabad, a sum of Rs. 1 crore a year, Rs. 50 lakhs as privy purse, and Rs. 50 lakhs as compensation for the *saref-e-khas*. But when it comes to the workers, whose wages are far less, and who are compelled to starve, being unable to make both ends meet, after putting in eight hours of hard labour, to deny them such a simple provision as the provision for old age, is understandable.

I would very strongly urge upon Government to include within the scope of this Bill, all those workers, who have not been included in it already. I commend my amendments to the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Amendments moved:

(i) In page 7, omit line 50.

(ii) In page 7, after line 50 add:

"(ia) The following items shall be added at the end:

Cigars and any preparations of tobacco other than cigarettes.

Coffee.

Tea.

Rubber.

Pepper.

Fertilisers.

Heavy Chemicals.

Drugs and Pharmaceuticals.

Paints and Varnishes.

Soap.

Tanning and Footwear.

Glass.

Petroleum products.

Power alcohol.

Matches.

Sugar.

Vegetable oils and Vanaspati.

Food products.

Ships."

**Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang):** I beg to move:

(i) In page 7, omit line 50.

(ii) In page 7, after line 50, add:

"(ia) the following items shall be added at the end of the Schedule:

Tea

Coffee

Rubber

Petroleum

Matches."

Yesterday I made a point, in the course of my speech, in regard to the omission of the word 'production', from the Schedule, proposed by Government in this Bill. I was expecting that some explanation would be coming forward from Government, but I am sorry to say that no explanation has been put forward so far. I had pointed out yesterday that if the word 'production' is omitted, the scope of the

Bill would become limited. As I had understood the scope of the Bill, I felt that it was merely a Bill to regularise the administrative machinery, as a result of experience, and not for the purpose of making substantive changes in the original Act. But the new amendment proposed by Government in this Bill, is of a substantive character, and if accepted by the House, will restrict the scope of the Bill.

I do not know how Government are justified in limiting the scope of the Bill, especially when they gave a definite guarantee at the time of moving for the consideration of the Bill, that the scope of the Bill will be gradually broadened and not lessened. If they try to lessen the scope, they should come forward with an explanation. But no such explanation has been put forward by them. Therefore I am at a complete loss as to the justification for having made such a provision in this Bill.

I had explained yesterday that production and manufacture are two different processes in the same industry, and both may occur in any industry. If you want to limit the scope to manufacture only, that means you want to give the benefit only to the factories, and not for others. I have already contended that it is not necessary to limit the benefit merely to the factories. In my opinion, it is necessary to extend the benefit to the entire industry, and not only to a portion of it. If the entire industry is to be covered, then both the words are required.

Moreover, there are other industries which have not been included in the Bill, such as transport, and so on. These also should have been included, and I do not know why it has not been done. I am extremely sorry that a proposal to limit the scope of the Act, should have emanated from the Labour Ministry. It is not a matter of policy at all, where some new decision is taken. The policy was decided and adopted by this House about a year ago, that the scope should be

gradually extended to other industries as well. Therefore, this amendment of the original Act should not have been pressed by Government. I still hope that Government would withdraw it.

I have moved an amendment for the inclusion of the tea, coffee, rubber, petroleum, and match industries in the Schedule. All these five industries are long-established ones, and they are perhaps the best established ones in India today. The secretariat of these industries is in no way less than that of some of the State Governments. These industries are spending on their managerial staff, fabulous amounts, including pensions paid to the retired managerial staff. Just before the tea crisis, I had read in the papers that there was a meeting of the retired planters in London, when they passed a resolution demanding that their pension should be increased, because the purchasing power of the pound had gone down. They got a pension, and they had a right also to ask for increased pension. But what about these workers? There is no provision for their old age pension. Yesterday I had quoted from the Rege Committee Report, published in 1946, in order to show that they had recommended—they quote the Labour Inquiry Committee's Report made in 1921—that some provision should be made for tea labour, for superannuation, although no such provision had been made so far. Even now, the tea industry gives provident fund to its employees. Not only does it give provident fund to its labour, but it again spends one rupee per week per worker when the worker has nobody to support him on his superannuation. So, the tea industry itself is forced to make some sort of *ad hoc* provision for the support of the worker. But that support is nothing. Therefore, as I said yesterday, the man dies much quicker than he would otherwise do. If this provision is applied to the tea industry, it would accept it. There is no question of asking the tea industry. It is a question of basic policy. If the nation decides that as a basic policy we should have provident fund, why shall it not be so decided?

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

Then, again, this is not a taxing measure. This is a saving measure. The Planning Commission has decided that there should be saving. Through this provident fund, so much money will be realised and that could be utilised for housing. Something like Rs. 9 crores have been provided in the Five Year Plan for housing. Where does that money come from? It comes from all these collections. Therefore, it is the basic duty of the Government to go on expanding this, so that we may get more money for the purpose of labour welfare, including housing. But today this has not been done. The moment we expect the small savings scheme to succeed, it is incumbent on the part of Government to come forward with the inclusion of this industry. Take the tea industry in Assam. If only one anna is contributed by the employers and workers in Assam, from that province alone you will get Rs. 2 crores per year. That would be the saving to the Government and within a period of five or ten years the building programme can be completed. The industry is paying; it has to pay; it cannot but pay to its superannuated people in some way or other, however small the amount may be. Therefore, if this scheme is applied, it would be a boon to the industry itself. Obviously, the industry is not opposed in regard to matters like the provident fund, etc. Even in the conference which was held in December 1952, which the hon. Minister attended.—it was at the time of the tea crisis—this proposal that this contribution may go to the provident fund was made. I made the proposal and I had hoped that it would be accepted, but at that time the industry was not interested in this; it was interested in the cash conversion. Therefore, they did not accept it. But still this proposal was worth considering on its merits, but unfortunately days and months have passed and the Government has not thought it fit to include the tea industry and the plantations within the ambit of this Bill.

Take petroleum, which is the biggest industry in Assam. It has one of the

biggest hospitals; it has a very big staff. (Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: 300 per cent. profits). Yes, 300 per cent. profits. The Ministry itself found out that the profits amounted to 300 per cent. Why is it that this provision has not been applied to that industry? When will it be applied? Then, take the match industry. It is also an established and longstanding industry. I do not know why it has not been included. I do not know why it should not be included. It is not a new industry. It has been earning profits for a long period. I feel therefore that it is very necessary that these industries should be included. Every amendment that comes must come for an extension, both in scope and application, of the Bill and if an amendment does not come; then it must irritate all hon. Members who have the good of the workers at heart. I therefore request the hon. Minister that, since there is no policy involved, since the Government of India is committed to this policy of extending gradually these benefits, since no employer would object to this, since it is a measure good for every worker as well as employer, since it is a measure which is good for the entire country, since it is a measure which will help in advancing the Five Year Plan.—since it is all these things, I hope the Government will accept this amendment of mine and in anticipation I thank them for the same.

Shri Abid Ali: I quite appreciate the feeling of my hon. friend Shri Tripathi when he says that hon. Members have a right to get irritated if there is a curtailment or decrease of the privileges which the original Act gave to the workers. I entirely agree with him and I assure him that there is nothing of the kind proposed in the Bill. The word "production" is being removed from the schedule. But as he will see from page 2 of the Bill, the definition of "manufacture" is being widened. In Section 2(g) of the original Act, factory is defined and there "manufacturing process" is mentioned. This Act primarily applies to

workers in factories engaged in manufacturing process, and this limited definition has been widened by the proposed amendment as it stands on page 2.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** How is it widened?

**Shri Abid Ali:** It is widened.

**Shri S. S. More:** Section 2(g) refers to manufacturing process. Now you are trying to explain what is meant by manufacturing process, by this new amendment in the definition, but as a matter of fact the original connotation is more clear. There cannot be any extension of a thing by a mere definition.

**Shri K. P. Tripathi:** May I also point out that if you take away this provision, then you may not be able to include the tea industry in the schedule without changing the preamble?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat):** How about tea pickers?

**Shri Abid Ali:** I may submit that plantations of tea, coffee etc. cannot be brought within the purview of this Bill unless the Act is amended. Section 2(g) makes the Act applicable to factory workers. Because in Schedule I the word "production" is mentioned. The plantation workers cannot come in; it will be illegal.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Why do you want to take away the word "production"?

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** Match factories can be included. It is the policy of Government to extend the provisions of this Act gradually.

**Shri Abid Ali:** Match factories can be covered by the Act.

**Shri S. S. More:** The hon. Deputy Minister was saying that by introducing the definition of "manufacture" on page 2, he is trying to expand the ambit as covered by the definition in Section 2(g) of the original Act relating to factory. I should like to be

enlightened on that point by concrete instances.

**Shri Abid Ali:** I was mentioning that because the word "production" is mentioned in schedule I, automatically the Act cannot apply even if Government intends to apply it to plantations. I was submitting that in Section 2(g), factory is defined and manufacturing process is mentioned on page 2 of the amending Bill, where we have defined manufacture. There is no intention of curtailing in any way the right of the workers which they have under the original Act. I want to give this definite assurance to the House that there is not the slightest idea of taking away from any individual worker any right or preventing any individual worker from enjoying what was possible to be enjoyed under the original Act. That is not the intention. The only intention in bringing this amendment is to remove the superfluous word. When we came forward with this amending Bill, the idea was to put all phraseology in proper order and remove all possible doubts. As I have said, other industries besides plantations can be brought under the Act by notification to be issued by the Central Government. It is not necessary for that purpose to amend the Act in any manner.

3 P.M.

**Shri K. P. Tripathi:** May I point out that in every plantation there is a factory; so, even as it is, it may be applied to the factory in the plantation.

**Shri Abid Ali:** Yes, Sir, the factories in the plantations are covered by the Act but the scheme has not been applied to those factories. Government can apply this Act to the factories in the plantations also by a notification. That is another point.

With regard to 'production', Sir, I have made my submission.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** Does the hon. Minister propose to do so in the near future?

**Shri Abid Ali:** That is of course a question which was sufficiently explained yesterday. The Act has been applied only from the 1st of November

[Shri Abid Ali]

1952. It is getting stabilised; the whole machinery has to be established. Much work has been done, and has yet to be done. Our intention is that once the Scheme is stabilised with regard to the industries at present included, further industries should be brought within the scope of the Act by a notification to be issued by the Government of India for which it is not necessary to amend the Act. I oppose the amendment and I hope my hon. friend Mr. K. P. Tripathi will appreciate what I have said and will not press his amendments.

**Shri K. P. Tripathi:** Do I understand from the hon. Minister that in the near future an amendment will be brought in so that industries like this might be included?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He has referred to it and said that he cannot give an assurance.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** We want to know from the hon. Minister what are the difficulties in extending this to the other industries that are not covered. What are the difficulties exactly encountered by the Government in extending this?

**Shri Abid Ali:** Sir, as I have said in reply to my hon. friend Mr. Bhargava, there are difficulties. The Act has been brought into force only from the 1st of November 1952 and we have completed only one year.

So far as the other industries are concerned, I may assure the hon. Members that they are under an impression that because the Act has not been applied to those industries, there is no provident fund for the workers in such industries. There is provident fund in petroleum industry also but not of the standard of the scheme. That is correct. Our coal mines have got provident fund, which came into existence five years earlier than this Act. So, other industries also have got provident funds. Some of them pay more, to the extent of 10 per cent. a few no doubt.

**Shri S. S. More:** What about the sugar industry?

**Shri Abid Ali:** Some of the sugar industry workers have got provident fund scheme but not all. In reply to the question asked by my hon. friend, Shri Vittal Rao, I may assure the House that we are earnest about it. We will extend the Act to other industries whenever possible.

**Shri P. C. Bose (Manbhum North):** The hon. Minister said that these industries—tea and coffee—have not been brought under the scope of the Act because the administrative machinery has not been stabilised. May I know how long will it take to stabilise it?

**Shri Abid Ali:** My hon. friend has misunderstood me. I said that tea and coffee cannot be brought under the scope of this Act unless the Act is amended.

**Shri K. P. Tripathi:** Sir, I do not press my amendments.

**Shri S. S. More:** Sir, he is true to the traditions of those Benches.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will now put amendments 16 and 19 to the House.

The question is:

In page 7, omit line 50.

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

In page 7, after line 50 add:

“(ia) The following items shall be added at the end:

Cigars and any preparations of tobacco other than cigarettes.

Coffee.

Tea.

Rubber.

Pepper.

Fertilisers.

Heavy Chemicals.

Drugs and Pharmaceuticals.

Paints and Varnishes.



Soap.

Tanning and Footwear.

Glass.

Petroleum products.

Power alcohol.

Matches.

Sugar.

Vegetable oils and Vanaspathi.

Food products.

Ships."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That clause 18 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 18 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 19 was added to the Bill.*

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

**Shri Abid Ali:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** Sir, in listening to the debate for the last two days on these two labour Bills, one has got the idea that the Government has not realised that there should be a broader and intelligent economic policy. It is not only a question of humanitarianism—the granting of old-age benefits in one case or retrenchment benefits in the other. As we have seen, the entire failure of our Five Year Plan has been that there has not been enough purchasing power in the hands of the people. Sir, every amendment that has been made has been to restrict in every way this purchasing power and to give as little as possible to the workers. We are further trying to restrict the scope of this Act as it exists. The very idea of taking away the word 'production' in this Bill is one such example. Actually, the hon. Minister seems to think that by taking away the word "production",

this is just a verbal change—as he calls it, a change in philology and that it makes it more simple and direct. Actually it will only allow those who are engaged in the manufacturing process to participate in the benefits of the scheme. Those who are engaged in the pit-heads, for instance, those who carry the ores, who come and go and bring the ores etc. may not be taken as part of the manufacturing process. There may be scope for restricting the scope of the Bill by taking away this word "production". Therefore, it is not very clear to many of us, why it is that you want to take away the word 'production'. We feel that it is restricting the scope of the Bill. If at all there is any difficulty it will be on the side of the workers.

There are other examples of that but I do not wish to go into the details. But, if you view it from the broader point of view, we do not also understand why this whole question of financial stringency has been brought in for cases of exemption. On the face of it, it looks as if by bringing this clause we are saving those small industries where the owners are unable to keep the industry going. But if you see that the entire industrial policy is dependent upon the purchasing power of the people, if we regard that as one of the basic policies of a welfare State, then at least in those cases where the small employer is unable to meet the demands of the scheme, the Government should come in and give the contribution for that period of crisis when the employer is unable to pay his share of the benefit. This is another example where we find the whole attitude incorrect. By the Government giving benefits, in these cases it will lead to the increase in purchasing power and help the industries.

Of course, I am not reiterating what my hon. friends Mr. Tripathi and Mr. Vittal Rao have said. But we find it has not been possible either in the earlier Bill or here to include such industries as petroleum, tea etc.

Yesterday, Sir, the same difficulty came up. I would just mention here

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

what the Federation of the Chambers of Commerce said about bonus awards: "the effect of bonus awards has been to fritter away the profits of industry." Yet if we look into the jute industry which is a leading industry in my province and in which I am interested, you will find that between 1945 and 1948—between these two or three years—the British employers gave two bonus shares up to three times the face value of the shares. If we calculate it, you will find that they took away 2·3 crores by way of bonus shares and 4·1 crores as dividends. Sir, if that is the position and if that does not fritter away the resources, why is it that such a scope is not given here, and such benefits which we want to give to the workers are not here in the case of many British industries and exemptions are allowed to many. Why does the Government yield to them? No reasonable account has been given by the hon. Minister as to why these British industries cannot pay. If you could have shown as really that these industries are unable to pay, then we would have certainly at least pondered as to why these exemptions are being allowed. Why is it that many of these industries are not taken within the scope of this Bill? In answer to this, and to the questions that have been raised in this House, no satisfactory answers were given.

The third point which I would like to make is that there is exemption to the Government and its factories. Now, Sir, if we really believe that we are a welfare State, the Government must set up an example to the employer and say there has been no exemption for the Government too. Often, the private employer turns round and says that if you give exemption for Government, then the same exemption must be given to the private industry. Of course it may be argued that the Government does not make profit and that therefore there is no scope for giving them the benefits. But I think that if we take into consideration the whole concept of the welfare state and if we take into account the basic necessity

of giving the purchasing power to the people, then this old age benefit for Government factories must be included within the scope of this Bill.

**Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati):** Nonsense.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** It may be very nonsensical to some of the hon. Members but it may not sound so to the vast masses of the people.

Then another point—on the agreement necessary between the employer and the employee for granting benefit to which reference has been made by one of the hon. Members over here. We know that often technical points are utilised on behalf of the stronger person whereby pressure is brought to bear upon the weaker person. For instance, I will give you one small example. We have what we call 'Bhagchash Law' (share-croppers law) in our State. They take one-third share, that is, one-third share is to be given to the landowner, one-third has to be taken by the peasant and one-third by those who give the implements. Now, the landlords have used that clause and they have made the peasants sign a false document saying that 'we are agricultural labourers'. And, therefore, they have been able to get two-thirds of the share. These are technical points but very dangerously twisted to serve the stronger partner. Unless we can get the employers and the employees to agree by terms of this Bill the benefits cannot be given. Even in cases where 100 per cent. of employees wanted the benefit, and the employers say, "No"; there could be no question of extending this benefit to them. This is another point, I should like to make. The last point is the 'less favourable' and 'more favourable' clauses. I am afraid we have not understood why this clause has been inserted. How it extends the scope of this Bill to a larger section of the workers is a point on which we would like to have an answer. Whether the exclusion of the 'more favourable' clause—will help those who want to lower the standard already existing in their factories is yet to be

understood. This will allow them to lower the benefits without reference to the Central Commissioner to whom they had to refer according to the earlier clause of the Bill. These are some of the points which I would like to make in the third reading of the Bill, especially to impress upon the Government the desirability to look upon all these labour Acts not only from the humanitarian point of view, which is necessary no doubt, but from the proper economic point of view—of giving more purchasing power to the people and not regard the provisions as nonsensical as some hon. Member suggests.

**Shri Altekar** (North Satara): While I am in general agreement with the provisions of this Bill, I would like to point out certain features and make some remarks with respect to the enforcement of the provisions therein for the benefit of the employees. This Bill, as has already been said, is mainly brought with a view to remove certain difficulties in the administration of the Act and to see that it is administered well for the benefit of the employees. But I have received some complaints and if I look to them, the gist comes to this: "Save us from our saviours." They say that the applications for exemption that is given under Section 17 of the Bill, for giving them the benefit, have not been properly looked into, and that the benefits which they are enjoying under the old provident fund schemes of the factory in which they are working should be allowed to them. That is, they should begin to contribute or be allowed to contribute to the old provident fund of their factories. According to their existing schemes, they reap more benefits by way of raising loans from the provident fund and also higher rate of interest from them. Some of them who have reached 50 years of age or over are working there, and if they are asked to go out, they will be put to great disadvantage and if the new scheme is made applicable to them, they will be under great hardship. Their main grievance is that when they are making these representations to the proper authority, they are not being look-

ed into. These applications should be carefully looked into and they should not be disposed of *ex parte*. When they are making repeated representations, those representations are not heeded, and their grievance is that when they are making their representations, no orders adverse to the demand which they have made therein should be passed without giving proper thought and consideration and without calling them and asking them to give any explanation if it is needed. Many of them are persons who are well educated—some of them are graduates—and more than 400 workers from that factory i.e. Kooper Engineering Factory, Satara have made these applications. About 40 or 50 of them were allowed, but the others were not allowed. So, the general grievance is that when applications are being made and the Regional Commissioner or the Central Commissioner—whoever he may be—thinks that the applications and the demands made in those applications are not in the interests of the worker and if the applicants insist that they are in their interests, they are disposed of without consulting them. They feel that in such cases, no adverse order should be passed unless they are consulted, unless the matter is discussed with them, and unless a proper procedure and a proper way of disposing of those applications was followed, by convincing them of the justness of disposal. Whenever it is in their interests, and if the majority of them so desire that the old scheme should be made applicable to them, it should be made applicable. I would like to suggest to the Minister that if there are certain representations, and a large number of the applicants are making such representations and if a fairly large number again are educated persons who understand their own interests, then, greater attention and consideration should be given to them, because when the employees themselves are so persistent in their demands, their prayer should be complied with. They were so persistent in their demands, that they were asking me whether any appeal could be preferred over the order passed by the Regional Commissioner. When the

[Shri Altekar]

Matter is of such great importance to them and when they are not convinced in any way of the reply and the views entertained by the Regional Commissioner that rejecting the application is more in the interest of the workers, then, as they do not wish to join the new provident fund scheme, they should be allowed to continue in their old provident fund scheme. Therefore, I beg to submit that when such a question comes in and the matter has to be decided, the question should not be lightly treated and the impression in their mind which I have gathered from the correspondence they had with me and also the talks which I had with some of them, and which is to the effect that their applications are not being properly considered and no sufficient attention is being given to them, should be removed. Therefore, I submit that when such representations are made and the workers themselves are making such representations, then, in that case, the matter should not be decided against them and if they say that they should be called and explanations should be taken from them or that the whole matter should be placed before the Regional Commissioner and he should look into all these various aspects of the case, then it should be so done. No impression should be left with the worker that the Government is not giving proper attention and that the applications of the workers are not properly looked into. That is an important point that I have to make with respect to the enforcement of the particular section of the Bill.

Another point which arises is regarding the interpretation with respect to the particular wording of the section: whenever the workers themselves are putting forth a certain view in their interests, and what they think is to their advantage, then more attention and better favour should be extended to the viewpoints of the workers. These are the only two points that I have to make with respect to the working of this Act and how this principle is to be enforced.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** The principle in this amending Bill—the Employees'

Provident Funds Bill—is that the employee and also the employer contribute. But taking into consideration the low standard of living, we should see, if not now, at least in the next two or three years, that there should be no contribution taken from the employees at all. There is nothing new in this. In China they have got a labour insurance scheme; in Soviet Russia they have got social security. Of course, China has not reached the stage of social security; it is only labour insurance. But there the whole contribution is made by the Government as well as the employers. Similarly, here also we should exempt the workers from their contribution and ask the employers or the Government to make the whole contribution.

Then, Sir, secondly we have not got a unified system. For example, in the railways it is a contribution by the Government of 8½ per cent. Of course, they have got gratuity also separately. Here in some industries it is 6½ per cent. Then, in the mines it is a slab system and the contribution is not more than 6½ per cent. In all these schemes there should be some uniformity. This Provident Fund Act is an improvement over the Railway Provident fund. Though the rate of deduction is less there is a contribution for the dearness allowance as well as the grain concession. Now, when we go and approach a coal mine management to introduce this scheme, they naturally ask us: "Why don't you approach your Government and ask them to introduce the same scheme in the railways where it is operating?" What moral right has Government or anybody if it itself does not do things for the employees of its own and ask the private employer to do more. This is the sort of reply we get. So, there should be a unified system of provident fund. Otherwise this will give rise to eternal trouble. Now the workers will give a strike notice that this scheme should be made applicable to the coal mines also, where the managements are making as much profit as the concerns governed by this scheme. To avoid all this: there should be a unified system of provident fund.

Then there is the provision for exemptions. Whenever exemptions are granted, I would appeal to the hon. Minister to see that the democratic verdict of the workers is ascertained. They should have the right to vote whether they would like to continue under the old scheme or would like to come under the new scheme. So, their opinion should be taken into consideration in granting exemptions.

Another fact which I wish to bring to the notice of the House is that yesterday the hon. Minister pointed out that out of Rs. 5 crores collected, Rs. 16 lakhs go towards meeting the administrative expenses. This fund can easily be allowed to be operated by the trade unions. This has been so successfully done in other countries like China and the Soviet Union. Here too the contribution of the employers and the employees should be handed over to the Unions to be managed. Of course, certain rules may be framed so that the fund is operated to the benefit of the workers.

Finally, Sir, I would say: let there be no exemptions at all. We know how little we are getting. So, I would earnestly appeal to the hon. Minister to come at least in the Budget session with a Bill for a unified system of provident fund scheme.

श्री आबिद अली : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर, अभी मेरे दोस्त श्री विट्ठल राव ने फरमाया कि चीन और रूस में जिस तरीके से प्रोविडेंट फंड वर्गरह चलता है, वही चीज यहां भी होनी चाहिये। मैं उनसे अर्ज करूँ कि हम उस तरीके से जाना नहीं चाहते, क्योंकि उस तरीके की पहली जरूरत यह होती है कि हमारे दोस्त उस पार्टी के जो कि सामने बैठे हुये हैं, वह यहां पर नहीं रहें। हम यहां पर डेमोक्रेसी चाहते हैं और डेमोक्रेसी का तरीका यह रखना चाहते हैं ताकि इस मुल्क में हर एक को पूरा आजादी हो और हर एक पार्टी को सरकार की मुखा-

लफत करने का हक हो और वही डेमोक्रेसी का तरीका हमको पसन्द है। हम उस गलत तरीके को जिसके लिये वह स्वाहिसामंद ह, अपना नहीं चाहते, उनके लिये वह तरीका अच्छा हो सकता है, लेकिन हम उस तरीके को अच्छा नहीं समझते हैं और हम तो चाहते हैं कि हमारे ये सब मुखालिफ दोस्त यहां पर बैठे रहें और हमेशा डेमोक्रेसी इस मुल्क में कायम रहे।

ट्रेड यूनियनों के बारे में आपने फरमाया कि पांच करोड़ रुपया जो इस प्रोविडेंट फंड में आता है, वह ट्रेड यूनियन के जिम्मे कर दिया जाय।

अभी मेरी मोहतरम बहिन श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती फरमा रही थीं कि ट्रेड यूनियन के वर्कर्स और कारखानों में काम करने वाले मजदूर बिल्कुल पढ़े लिखे नहीं हैं और मालिक जाकर उनसे दस्तखत लेकर एग्जम्पशन की दरखास्त भिजवा दिया करते हैं, मैं अपनी बहिन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि एक तरफ तो आप यह कहती हैं कि मालिक उनको धोका देकर दस्तखत ले लेते हैं, क्योंकि वह बिल्कुल अपढ़ हैं और फिर दूसरी तरफ वे चाहती हैं कि पांच करोड़ रुपया उन लोगों को सौंप दिया जाय। मालूम नहीं इस फंड का क्या हश्र होगा, अगर हम इस चीज को मान लें। ये दोनों चीजें अभी यहां पर उनकी ओर से पेश की गई हैं। मेरी अर्ज है कि यह प्रोविडेंट फंड के खर्च के लिये जो पैसा आता है यह मालिकों से वसूल किया जाता है, इसमें मजदूरों का एक पैसा भी नहीं आता है और कारखानेदारों से पैसा वसूल करके यह फंड चलाया जाता है, इसलिये कम धज कम मेरे उधर बैठने वाले दोस्तों को तो कोई ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिये।

अब रही एग्जम्पशन की बात . . .

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** May I rise on a point of explanation. I could not follow everything that the hon. Deputy Minister said in Hindi. The point that I was making was that by making agreement between employers and employees absolutely necessary for giving the benefits of this Act, even if all the employees are agreeable the employers can veto it and deprive the employees of the benefits of the scheme.

**Shri Abid Ali:** Today, and yesterday also my hon. friend Mr. Chatterjea was saying that workers are duped, workers are wrongly induced by the employers to sign petitions for exempting and these petitions which come under the signature of the workers should not be given any attention, because their signatures are not voluntarily obtained, but under threat. The hon. lady Member also said that the workers are illiterate and they do not know what they are signing. While this suggestion was made, Shri T. B. Vittal Rao on the other hand was saying that the whole fund should be administered by the workers themselves. I was referring to that.

हां, तो मैं एग्जम्पशन के बारे में अज कर रहा था। हमारा ब्याल इसके बारे में यह है कि . . . . .

**Shri S. S. More:** Of course, the hon. Deputy Minister has every right to speak either in Hindi or English, but he is speaking something in Hindi and something in English. Why should he alternate between the two.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Because there are workers and employers, both.

**श्री आबिद अली :** मेरी अर्ज यह थी कि कुछ मेम्बरान का शायद यह ब्याल है कि एक दफा एग्जम्पशन दिया, यानी एग्जम्पशन हो गया और इसलिये एग्जम्पटेड फौवटरीज के मजदूरों को प्रोविडेंट फंड नहीं मिलता है, अगर उनका ऐसा ब्याल है तो बिबल्कुल गलत है। एग्जम्पशन का मतलब

यह है और जैसा कि मैं पहले अर्ज भी कर चुका हूँ कि सिर्फ प्रोविडेंट फंड कमिशनर के सीधे ताल्लुक से एग्जम्पशन हो जाता है, प्रोविडेंट फंड स्कीम का अमल होता है लेकिन पैसा जो ट्रस्टीज हैं उनके पास जमा रहता है।

जिनको एग्जम्पशन नहीं मिलता है, ऐसे फंड का रीजनल कमिशनर और प्रोविडेंट फंड कमिशनर से सीधा ताल्लुक रहता है। इसके बारे में मैं दोबारा अर्ज करूँ कि अगर वर्कर्स की मेजोरिटी चाहती है उनकी ट्रेड यूनियन्स चाहती हैं कि एग्जम्पशन दिया जाय और कारखाने दार भी इस बात के लिये राजी हों कि प्रोविडेंट फंड वहां रहे, और दोनों मिलकर जब हमारे पास आते हैं तो हमारा रीजनल कमिशनर इसकी तहकीकात करता है, रेंट गवर्नमेंट फिर से इस सब चीज को देखती है, फिर यहां का प्रोविडेंट फंड कमिशनर इसकी तहकीकात करता है, और जब उसको यकीन हो जाता है कि यह चीज वर्कर्स के फायदे में है, तब उनको एग्जम्पशन दिया जाता है, और वह भी हमेशा के लिये नहीं, कुछ दिनों के लिये दिया जाता है। नोटिफिकेशन में इसका ऐलान होता है। कल भी मैं अर्ज कर चुका हूँ और आज दोबारा अर्ज करदूँ कि अगर किसी ट्रेड यूनियन वर्कर को, किसी ट्रेड यूनियन को या किसी मेम्बर साहबान को यह लगे कि वर्कर्स को बोखा देकर उनके दस्तखत ले लिये गये हैं, तो वह फौरन मुझे इसकी इत्तला करें। वर्कर्स अपनी राय जाहिर कर सकते हैं, और अगर कहीं भी वर्कर्स चाहें कि एग्जम्पशन रद्द कर दिया जाय, तहकीकात करने के बाद अगर वर्कर्स की स्वाहिष होगी और उन के फायदे में यह चीज होगी तो एग्जम्पशन रद्द कर दिया जायेगा। इसमें किसी किस्म का संकोब

हमारी तरफ से नहीं होगा इसका मैं आप से वादा करता हूँ ।

दूसरी बात जो मेरे दोस्त श्री अल्तेकर ने फरमाई, हमको उससे बिल्कुल इतिफाक है कि जल्दी तस्फिया होना चाहिये । शुरु शुरु में जरूर कुछ देर हो गई थी, लेकिन अब तो इस स्कीम को अमल में आये हुये एक साल हो गया है और अब देर नहीं लगती है । मैं उन्हें यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि वर्कर्स जो चाहेंगे वही होगा, उन की मर्जी के मूताबिक होगा और जल्दी फैसला हुआ करेगा, इसमें उनको अब जरा भी शक नहीं होना चाहिये ।

एग्जेंशन के सिलसिले में मैं इतना और अर्ज कर दूँ कि एग्जेंशन्स ज्यादातर इस लिये मांगे गये हैं कि वर्कर्स का पैसा जो जमा होता था उस में कर्ज मिलता था । हम चाहते हैं कि वर्कर्स को फंड में से कर्ज न मिले, इसलिये कि हमारा यह मानना है कि जब वर्कर्स रिटायर होते हैं उस वक्त उन के पास काफी रकम होनी चाहिये ताकि रिटायर होने के बाद चाहे वह जमीन लें या दूकान करें या जो जी चाहें करें । उनके हाथ में काफी रकम आनी चाहिये । ट्रेड यूनियन के एक खादिम की हूसियत से मेरा यह तजुर्बा रहा है कि वर्कर्स अपने प्राविडेंट फंड में से काफी पैसा निकाल लेते हैं और उन के ऊपर काफी कर्ज हो जाता है । जब वह रिटायर होते हैं तो उन के पास बहुत थोड़ा पैसा बच जाता है क्योंकि बड़ा हिस्सा कर्ज की अदायगी में चला जाता है । इस लिये हम चाहते हैं कि कर्ज वर्कर्स न लें । वर्कर्स एग्जेंशन इसलिये चाहते हैं कि उन्हें कर्ज लेने की सहूलियत हो । इस लिये कल जो कहा गया कि उनको बगैर उनकी मर्जी के राजी करा लिया जाता है, मुमकिन है कि यह चीज उनके

कर्ज लेने के रास्ते में आती हो, लेकिन हमारा तो मानना यही है कि जहां तक हो सके वह कर्ज न लें, उन का पैसा जमा रहे ।

जूट इंडस्ट्री के बारे में आनरेबिल लेडी मेम्बर फरमा रही थीं कि वहां अंगरेज हैं और इस लिये गवर्नमेंट उन पर बहुत मेहरबान है । मुझे यह सुन कर बड़ा ताज्जुब हुआ । शेड्यूल १ में टैक्सटाइल के बारे में ब्रैकेट में दिया हुआ है :

"Textiles made wholly or in part of cotton or wool or jute or silk, whether natural or artificial."

जूट ट्रेड तो पहले शेड्यूल में ही दिया हुआ है । जिस दिन यह स्कीम अमल में आई उसी दिन जूट इंडस्ट्री के ऊपर यह कानून अमल में आ गया है, फिर भी उन्होंने शिकायत की । हमें इससे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं कि वह अंगरेज है या अमरीकन है । और अगर रशन का न होना उनको बुरा लगता है तो वह भी बिजनेस में आ जायें और वह आकर यह बिजनेस कर सकते हैं । इस लिये जो कायदे अमल में हैं उस में कोई अंगरेज है, अमरीकन है या रशन है इस से हमारा कोई ताल्लुक नहीं जिन इंडस्ट्री को लाना चाहिये, जो लाई जा सकती हैं, उन को हम लाते हैं और जैसा मैं ने अर्ज किया कि यह चीज नहीं है कि हम दूसरी इंडस्ट्रीज पर यह कानून नहीं लगाना चाहते हैं । यहां पर आकर सिर्फ ऐतराज कर देना और चीज को न पढ़ना, और पढ़ना भी तो बिना समझे हुए गलत गलत ऐतराज कर देना उन की आदत हो गई है । यह बात आनरेबल मेम्बर जानते हैं कि हम किस तरफ और कैसे जा रहे हैं । मेरी अर्ज यह है कि हम वेलफेयर स्टेट के उसूल को मानने वाले हैं, हम कम्प्लीट सोशल सिक्योरिटी की तरफ जा रहे हैं । हमारी

[श्री आबिद अली]

गाड़ी अब रास्ते पर आ गई है और बराबर बढ़ चलेगी और तरक्की करते हुये चलेगी। हम अपने मुल्क को बढ़ायेंगे, मुल्क की जो इन्डस्ट्रीज हैं उनको बढ़ायेंगे। और वहाँ के जो मजदूर हैं उन को पूरा हक जरूर मिले, मैं मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ कि कोई भी जो उस तरफ बैठा हुआ है, मुझ से बढ़ कर आतुरता से इसका इन्तजार करता होगा या करने की कोशिश भी करता होगा।

मेरी माननीय बहन ने फरमाया कि इस में कहीं ह्यूमनिटेरियन प्वाइन्ट आफ व्यू नहीं है, यह चीज हम से बहुत दूर है। हम ह्यूमनिटेरियन प्वाइन्ट आफ व्यू को तो जरूर मानते हैं, लेकिन आज हम कम्यूनिटी सोशल सिक्वोरिटी की तरफ जा रहे हैं और जरूर जायेंगे मैं जानता हूँ कि मेरे दोस्त जो उस तरफ बैठे हुये हैं उन को बुरा लगता है कि हिन्दुस्तान तरक्की की तरफ जा रहा है, हिन्दुस्तान तरक्की कर रहा है कि उन को अच्छा नहीं लगता है उन को तो तबाही और बरबादी ही चाहिये।

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** What is the meaning of this insinuation?

**Shri Abid Ali:** It is their turn to hear me now. It has become their habit to go on making charges and not hear the reply.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty rose—**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The Minister is not yielding.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** I have made certain specific allegations. He has not replied to them. He cannot make such condemnations.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** The Minister has said that we are not interested in the progress of India. Is it proper for him to say like that?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** He has to cite examples.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no general allegation that they are not interested. They are as much interested as others. (*Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:* Perhaps more.) In opposing it, they are not interested—that is what he means.

**An Hon. Member:** Let him say that.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta North-East): Let him explain it if he chooses.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There are certain things which are retrograde according to him. On the other hand others might feel that certain other things are absolutely useless and conservative. Each hon. Member is entitled to have his own view. But no hon. Member, either on this side or that side, need give by any expression any room for doubt so far as the *bona fides* of Members are concerned. With regard to any amendment or any speech made or any proposition brought before the House another hon. Member may say it is reactionary, it is not calculated in the best interests of the community as a whole etc. But to generally attribute *mala fides* is not proper. I understand it is not to attribute any *mala fides*, but evidently he was changing from Urdu to English and from English to Urdu. That was the difficulty.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** He is suffering from so much red-phobia that he does not answer some of the specific points made.

श्री आबिद अली : मैं ने सब प्वाइन्ट्स को एक के बाद एक लिख लिया है और एक के बाद एक देख कर जवाब दे रहा हूँ। मैं यह भ्रज कर रहा था कि इसमें क्या लिखा हुआ है। पहले ही यह स्कीम जूट इंडस्ट्री के लिये भ्रमल में आ गई है। कल उन्हीं की पार्टी के कुछ मेम्बर साहबान ने एतराज किया था जूट इंडस्ट्री के लिये एग्जेंशन की



घाई हुई दरखास्तों के बारे में। फिर भी अगर उस पार्टी के एक मेम्बर आकर कहते हैं कि जूट इंडस्ट्री के लिये हम इस स्कीम को प्रमल में नहीं लाये हैं, हम प्रंगरेजों पर मेहरबान हैं, और उनके दोस्त हैं, और अगर इस का मैं जवाब देता हूँ और उस पर वह नाराज होते हैं तो हुआ करें। अगर वह जवाब से नाराज होते हैं तो गलत ऐतराज न करे और अगर गलत ऐतराज करना है तो जवाब सुन कर नाराज न हुआ करे।

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Sir, may I make a point of personal explanation? The hon. Minister has not followed the speech at all. The point that was made was that even in big industries like jute so much profit is made. In the same way we have made those points about other industries like petroleum and tea. It is not that in jute the Act does not apply. The point was that in spite of all the surplus value being made there, bonuses which like Provident Fund gives further purchasing power to masses are being restricted. That point he has not followed at all.

**Shri Abid Ali:** If the hon. Members opposite feel that wisdom, understanding and intelligence is their monopoly, I do not quarrel about it.

**Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour):** Some basic knowledge is necessary to understand what is being said on the other side. (Interruption).

**श्री आबद अली :** मैं एक के बाद एक उनकी बातों का जवाब दे रहा था और उन राइट प्राफ आर्डर और दूसरी चीजों का जो कि उन्होंने आपके सामने पेश की हैं। आपने जो फरमाया उसको मैं मानता हूँ। लेकिन कल ऐसे ऐसे अल्फाज इस्तेमाल किये गये हैं, उनकी स्तोत्र मोजूद हैं और इस किस्म की बातें हमारे बारे में कही गई हैं जो कि नहीं कहनी चाहिये थीं। अगर हम यह कहते हैं कि हम एक खिदमत कर रहे

हैं, अगर हम यह कहते हैं कि हम इंडस्ट्रीज को बढ़ाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, हम वर्कर्स को फायदा पहुंचाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं और इसके लिये हर तरह से मेहनत कर रहे हैं, और यह लोग सिर्फ गड़बड़ और तबाही पैदा करना चाहते हैं, तो यह सच्ची बात है और सब लोग इसको जानते हैं। तब फिर नाराजगी की इसमें कौन सी गुंजाइश है। तो वही मैं भ्रज कर रहा था कि अगर वह लेने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं तो मेहरबानी करके देने की भी कोशिश न किया करे।

तो मैं भ्रज कर रहा था कि न सिर्फ हमने कम्पलीट सोशल सीक्योरिटी की बात को माना है बल्कि हम उसको प्रमल में लाना चाहते हैं। सवाल यह है कि हम मुक्त को तबाह करके या इंडस्ट्री को बरबाद करके यह नहीं चाहते कि कुछ महीनों के लिये वर्कर्स की जेब में कुछ पैसे आ जाय बल्कि हम चाहते हैं कि वह रोज बरोज खुशी की तरफ बढ़ते जायें। अगर वर्कर्स की मेजोरिटी यह चाहती है कि किसी एक खास फैक्टरी में प्राबीडेंट फंड बन्द कर दिया जाय इसलिये कि वर्कर्स को इस बात का यकीन हो गया है कि अगर प्राबीडेंट फंड जारी रहेगा तो इंडस्ट्री इसके बोझ को सहन नहीं करसकेगी और कारखाना बन्द हो जायेगा तो ऐसे कारखाने पर स्कीम नहीं लगाई जायेगी ताज ग्लास वर्क्स के वर्कर्स को इस बात का यकीन हो गया कि कारखाना नुकसान में आ रहा है तो प्राबीडेंट फंड तो क्या उन्होंने अपनी तनखाह तक कम कर दी और मालिक को कहा कि अगर तुमको नुकसान होता है तो हम इसमें से कुछ बरदास्त कर लेंगे और हमारी तनखाह कम कर दी जाय। और इस तरह से ताज ग्लास वर्क्स जारी रहा क्योंकि वर्कर्स ने अपनी मर्जी से अपनी तनखाह कम कराली। तो एसा कैसे किया जा सकता है

[श्री आबिद अली]

कि जहां तनखाह कम कर दी जाय वहां पर भी प्रावीडेंट फंड जारी रखा जाय। यह बात गलत होगी। हम इंडस्ट्री को बन्द नहीं करना चाहते हैं। सब काम वर्कर्स के सलाह व मशविरे से होगा। आपके सामने जो यह बिल है उसमें यह है कि अगर वर्कर्स की मेजोरिटी यह चाहती हो कि प्रावीडेंट फंड न रहे और हमको यकीन हो जाय कि कारखानेदार वर्कर्स को छोला नहीं दे रहे हैं और यह चीज वर्कर्स के हक में है कि प्रावीडेंट फंड जारी न रखा जाय तो हम यह करेंगे कि जितने दिनों के लिये जरूरत हो प्रावीडेंट फंड अमल में न आवे। इसमें हमें कोई दिक्कत नहीं दिखती। सद्र साहब, यह कह कर, यह बिल पास किया जाय ऐसी मेरी अर्ज है।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### BANKING COMPANIES (AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now, the Banking Companies (Amendment) Bill.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** May I bring to your notice, Sir, that according to the previous agenda circulated, the Ancient and Historical Monuments and....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Last evening it was announced in the House.

**Shri S. S. More:** I know that according to the latest circular issued, the agenda has been modified.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It was also announced in the House last evening.

**Shri S. S. More:** But, we have been complaining that the notice is always short.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat. We have already said that the agenda is being changed. This Bill was put off on account of certain documents which the hon. Minister wanted to circulate to hon. Members. They wanted to have sufficient time to look into them and the hon. Minister wanted to have sufficient time to circulate these things. Now, the Bill has come. To avoid any surprise being sprung, it was also announced last evening in the House and the House also accepted it. I am afraid there is no force in this contention just now. Let us proceed with this Bill.

There was an amendment to refer this matter to the Select Committee. Shri Tulsidas had also a similar amendment. Was that put to the House? Are we on the Select Committee motion?

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha):** We do not accept the Select Committee motion.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The general discussion is going on. Yes; Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I find from the Objects and Reasons appended to this Bill that it is the Government's desire to relieve, by means of this legislation, the distress of the depositors. I fear, however, that the Government has opened its eyes a little too late and has now come forward with a measure which is somewhat in the nature of a face-saving device. I do not say that this measure is not necessary. It is. But, it has been long overdue. That is why I say that it is somewhat in the nature of a face-saving device that Government has come forward after so much of delay.

Bank failures happened on a dangerous scale as early as 1947 and by now, it appears that all realisable assets have been collected and mostly spent. According to the report of the