

[Shri Kasliwal]

The Report has already been circulated to hon. Members and no amendments have been received. I hope the House will adopt the Report.

Mr. Chairman: The question is—

“That this House agrees with the Twenty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members’ Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd March 1955.”

The motion was adopted

RESOLUTION RE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY WORKERS

Mr. Chairman: The House will now proceed with the further discussion of the Resolution regarding collective bargaining by workers moved by Shri K. K. Basu on the 11th March, 1955. Shri Nambiar will resume his speech.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): I am glad that I have got the hon. Minister of Labour here to hear my speech. While I was speaking last, I had no occasion to make him hear my speech.

Unfortunately, while my Bill for the compulsory recognition of trade unions was discussed the other day, I was not here. But I was careful enough to go through the speech of the hon. Minister of Labour and the speeches of other Members. I find that there was a misunderstanding deliberately created by hon. Members opposite. Shri D. C. Sharma, who spoke the other day, said that if 5 per cent membership was taken as a condition for recognition of trade unions, then naturally there would be 20 trade unions in each industry. Shri Keshavalengar says—I am sorry he is not here—or he pretends that he is a man on the side of labour. He says he belongs to the INTUC. He said that it would be a very bad day, if this Bill was passed, to labour. Well, I could not follow the spirit in which he made such a remark. It is clear my suggestions as regards the Bill as well as the suggestions made by Shri K. K. Basu as regards this Resolution all go to show the demand that there must be

compulsory recognition of trade unions. If there is any dispute about the strength or the representative character of a trade union, that must be referred to some authority. These two points have to be met and there is no meaning in side-tracking the issue and bringing in any other element. Have the Government ever agreed to the policy of compulsory recognition? You can sermonise. The hon. Minister the other day attempted to sermonise to the working classes of this country, that there is no necessity to have a statutory provision to force recognition; it is the voluntary strength of the workers which will fetch recognition. I can understand all these things; the trade union movement in this country is old enough, older than many of us and the trade union movement has forced the issue and today the stage is reached when the legislature has to tell the employers who do not recognise trade unions to give compulsory recognition to them. That stage has been reached. Will the hon. Minister of Labour agree on that point? His predecessor, Shri V. V. Giri, agreed, and many a time he repeated that compulsory recognition is a thing which must be accepted. I quoted the fact the other day. He could not challenge it. Subsequently, in tripartite conferences, many trade union representatives also agreed, all unions agreed and the employers also agreed. I cannot understand how the Government can go back from that proposition, from that position. Is it due to the fact that when the Minister changes, the policy also changes I do not know if that is so. If the policy also changes when the Minister changes, let them definitely say so. Let them not put the blame on the workers and say that the workers in this country are not united enough to force recognition, and they need not come to Parliament to seek recognition. Let them not be accused. Let the Government say that they are not prepared to accept this principle. Though they accepted it previously, they are going back on it. Is it a fact that the spirit of the Avadi resolution is this?

Are they going to bring in a socialistic pattern of society if they are refusing even this elementary, basic and fundamental right of the worker? They must answer that point. Therefore, the compulsory recognition aspect of the question has to be tackled on its merits and there is no meaning in accusing workers and saying that the workers are not yet united. The workers are united; the workers have their own trade unions; but you cannot expect cent per cent trade unionism. It is nowhere in any country; even in the so-called democratic countries in the west which they compare and which they praise, even there you do not have cent per cent or even 50 per cent membership. I can understand if the Minister says that 5 per cent membership is too low a limit. If it is raised to 10 per cent, or some such figure, the question can be considered. If you pose the issue in that way I would consider that.....

Shri Jhulan Sinha (Saran North): Sir, the same subject was considered and covered by a motion for the consideration of a Bill which was rejected by the House the other day. I wish to draw your attention to the fact that we are again discussing the same subject over again in this House. Will it be proper and will be permitted by the rules?

Mr. Chairman: A point has been raised that substantially the same question was discussed on the occasion of a Bill by the hon. Member. I would request the hon. Member speaking now to kindly tell us the difference between that Bill and this resolution and whether there is any difference at all.

Shri Nambiar: The difference is this. In the Bill there was a limitation of 5 per cent membership; in this Resolution even that is not there.

Mr. Chairman: That is the only difference? Then let me hear the hon. Minister.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): The point is what is the difference of substance between this Resolution and...

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member need not interfere at this stage. I am calling on the hon. Minister for Labour to kindly enlighten the House on this point.

The Minister of Labour (Shri Khandubhai Desai): There is absolutely no difference between the Bill the House rejected and the Resolution that has now been placed before the House by Mr. Basu. As Mr. Nambiar has said, if 5 per cent is too low and if it is to be increased to some other percentage, he would agree. That itself means that there is no substantial difference between the Bill which was rejected and this Resolution. In the end I would have to say the same old things which I have said when the Bill was last under discussion.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): May I draw your attention to rule 321?

"A motion must not raise a question substantially identical with one on which the House has given a decision in the same session."

Mr. Chairman: This is exactly the objection taken by Shri Jhulan Sinha. After hearing the hon. Minister of Labour and other Members, I have considered the Bill as well as the Resolution and I find from the statement of Mr. Nambiar that according to him also there is no difference between the two except for this that his Bill required 5 per cent membership. As a matter of fact, the House did not accept even that and the House is not likely to accept a proposal which does not require even five per cent membership to be necessary for the recognition of a union. I therefore, hold that the question in the Bill and the Resolution are substantially the same and that discussion is barred by rule 321.

Now, we will proceed to the next Resolution.

Shri Nambiar: Can I make a submission? I request ..

Mr. Chairman: I asked the hon. Member kindly to enlighten me. He gave his opinion then. And, I asked other Members and the hon. Minister of Labour and I asked for other opinions. Nobody stood up and I, therefore, gave my ruling. Now, no question arises. The ruling may be right or wrong but it is a ruling.

RESOLUTION RE IMBALANCE IN
PRICE STRUCTURE

Shri Amjad Ali (Goalpara-Garo Hills): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that in order to obviate the imbalance created in the price structure of the country by the fall in prices of agricultural commodities and industrial raw materials and the absence....."

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): On a point of order, Sir. I have no desire to curtail or stop any discussion. We always welcome discussions on any questions relating to our Ministries. Yet, I think it is a little too close on the debate on the Food and Agriculture Ministry's Demands, especially when there have been more than one cut motions referring to this price question. I would, therefore, like to have your ruling whether we have not during the course of the very day, not only of the session, but on this very day, discussed substantially the same question and a very comprehensive statement has been made by my senior colleague the Food and Agriculture Minister. Here also, even if I am called upon to make a statement, it will substantially be the same almost in every detail as has been made before the House and on which a debate has taken place and the cut motions have been rejected. I think, therefore, that so far as this Resolution is concerned, the same sort of objection as in the case of the previous one should prevail.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Some of the cut motions to the De-

mands of the Food and Agriculture Ministry....

Mr. Chairman: First of all, let us know what the Mover has to say.

Shri Amjad Ali: The contents of my Resolution would amply show that the cut motions which were going to be moved....

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Which have been moved and nagatived.

Shri Amjad Ali: Is it the contention of the hon. Minister that they substantially raise the same point?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: My contention is that the cut motions raised substantially the same, if not almost identical, issues as are being raised or can be raised under this Resolution.

Shri A. M. Thomas: For instance cut motion 380...

Mr. Chairman: Let me hear, first of all, the Mover of the Resolution, if he has got to say anything. If he has not got anything to say, I will ask other Members also.

I do not think he has anything to say.

Sardar Lal Singh (Ferozepur-Ludhiana): I would beg the hon. Minister kindly to allow the discussion to proceed because I am certain that there are many Members who would like to stress certain views. Undoubtedly, the matter was discussed sometime ago, but because this Resolution was on the agenda and we knew that there would be time to discuss this particular subject of prices, we did not like to say very much during the discussion on the Demands. So, if this subject is pursued now, Members will have an opportunity to stress their views. I would earnestly request the hon. Minister to allow discussion as something good is bound to come out of it.

An Hon. Member: It is not for the Minister to allow but for the Chair.