

the Rehabilitation Ministry to the vote of the House.

The cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I will put the Demands to the vote of the House

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the order paper in respect of Demands Nos. 85, 86, 87 and 133 be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P.P.]

DEMAND NO. 85—MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,42,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ministry of Rehabilitation'."

DEMAND NO. 86—EXPENDITURE ON DISPLACED PERSONS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,38,22,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons'."

DEMAND NO. 87—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum

necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Rehabilitation'."

DEMAND NO. 133—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,73,54,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Rehabilitation'."

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

PRESENTATION OF FIFTH REPORT

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg to present the Fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Demands for Grants for the Ministry of Labour. I will place the Demands formally before the House.

DEMAND NO. 65—MINISTRY OF LABOUR

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 28,99,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ministry of Labour'."

DEMAND NO. 66—CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,73,000 be granted to the

*Moved with the previous sanction of the President.

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Chief Inspector of Mines'."

DEMAND NO. 67—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,97,87,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour'."

DEMAND NO. 68—EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES AND RESETTLEMENT

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,18,48,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Employment Exchanges and Resettlement'."

DEMAND NO. 69—CIVIL DEFENCE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,10,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Civil Defence'."

DEMAND NO. 130—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,83,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the

31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Labour'."

Members and Leaders of groups will hand over the numbers of the cut motions which they select to the Secretary. The usual time-limit for speeches will be observed.

A correct labour policy

Shri Tushar Chatterjea (Serampore): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Delay in implementation of the Minimum Wages Legislation

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Proper minimum and living wages for labour

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Retrenchment

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Trade Union rights of labour

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Right of labour to get bonus from the employer

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Comprehensive legislation to settle industrial disputes

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Obligatory recognition by employers of registered trade unions

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Ratification and adoption of I.L.O. conventions and recommendations

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Occupational Diseases

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Labour Appellate Tribunal

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Launching of productivity studies without improving the working conditions.

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

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Unsatisfactory service conditions of Insurance employees

Shri Nambiar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Equal minimum wages for men and women labour

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Large-scale retrenchment of women workers

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Maternity benefits

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Lack of labour welfare schemes under each Ministry

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Quick and satisfactory settlement of industrial disputes

Shri B. S. Murthy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Neglect of the agricultural labour

Shri B. S. Murthy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Working conditions of the agricultural labour

Shri B. S. Murthy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Implementation of the Conciliation Proceedings of 1951 in the mineral concerns of Chavara

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon-cum-Mavelikkara): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Inefficiency in tackling industrial disputes

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Enforcement by law of the basic minimum wages

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Enforcement of the Minimum Wages Act in the Tea Industry in Duars area, West Bengal

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Unsatisfactory treatment to the Dhanbad Colliery workers

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Fatal accidents in coal mines

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

"That the demand under the head 'Chief Inspector of Mines' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Housing for coal mines and gold mines employees

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

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Departments

and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Indifferent treatment of patients in Dhanbad Hospital

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

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Investment of Labour Welfare Fund in deposits

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Distribution of the cultivable but unoccupied Government land to the landless

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Delay in the Report by the Shiv Rao Committee

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

"That the demand under the head 'Employment Exchanges and Resettlement' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Shall we sit till 7.30 today?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. I will apply the guillotine at 7. If both the hon. Ministers, junior and senior, intend to take part, between them I will divide one hour and ten minutes. The rest of the time will be allotted for speeches by hon. Members. I will allow 15 minutes each—not more than 15 minutes.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: The Business Advisory Committee decided to give one day for Labour, that means four hours. We should have that four hours.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But the House also decided to give half an hour more for the other Ministry, and some hon. Members are not satisfied even with this extra half an hour. They want further elucidation regarding some squatters. Now, each Ministry is important. Therefore, we are now and then making inroads into another Ministry.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Let us go upto half past seven.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At half past seven there was no quorum yesterday.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: It is up to the ruling party to see to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Tushar Chatterjea.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: Sometime back, I read in the press a report about our Labour Minister speaking at the Labour Conference held at Mysore. In that report I read the very sweet words uttered by the Labour Minister. He said:

"Let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of labour. Labour would not accept conditions that they accepted five or ten years back."

These words are no doubt inspiring, but the point is whether these words mean anything for the vast mass of the labour population that is groaning under low wages, unemployment and retrenchment. These words do not mean anything to the working classes. They are face-saving and sweet words intended to befool the people at large. Today, that is quite evident not only from the criticism of the Opposition, but also from the criticism that is daily being made by the INTUC leaders and also by the Congress M.Ps. generally in the papers. we read a lot of criticism made by

the Congress M.Ps. on the labour policy of Government. Thus, the labour policy of Government stands condemned and criticised even by their own followers. The failure of the labour policy of Government is therefore evident.

But I would like to point out that there is not only the failure of Government to give proper living conditions to the labour, but Government have come with full force to suppress the labour movement, and to suppress those people who have not got any benefit from Government, and are trying to make their own efforts to improve their conditions in their struggle for existence, by asking for living wages, for stoppage of retrenchment etc. They are, after all, making their normal struggle for existence, but the Government who have themselves failed to provide any relief to them come out to suppress them in their struggle for existence. This is not at all a very new thing. Everyone knows that labour unrest is growing everywhere. The working classes are starting their own movements and fighting—they are not fighting for any capture of power, but—for the simple things of life, viz., increase in wages, payment of bonus, and—the stoppage of retrenchment. These are very simple things, which it is the obligation of Government to provide for labour. But what is happening in the country is this. Government come out to suppress labour ruthlessly. The Burnpur incident is still fresh in our memory, and ruthless repression is going on on trade union movement. There was the police firing in Bombay, the arrest of the Kanpur textile workers, and the repression of the coal workers and the mica workers. Wherever we go, we find labour unrest, and Government trying to suppress the same.

It is in this context that we must judge the labour policy of Government. Unless we judge it in this context, we would not be able to properly understand the degree of failure of Government's labour policy.

When we study the situation in this context, we must bear in mind certain very vital matters that are facing labour. The unemployment situation and the appalling retrenchment are well known to every section of the people. I have got figures here, but I shall not quote them, because that will simply take away my time. But the volume of unemployment and retrenchment are so well known that even Government for their part accept the position in their statements. Government accept that there is unemployment, and they utter words of concern about the same.

But what exactly is their policy in regard to this retrenchment? What are they doing for stopping this retrenchment? We know well that Government's policy in regard to retrenchment is not only to provide nothing for the retrenched workers, but in reality it is one of encouraging the employers to go on with their plans of mass retrenchment.

The other day, the hon. Finance Minister almost categorically stated that rationalisation is good and necessary, and although it will mean throwing out of all surplus labour and suffering of labour, Government are not going to do anything or evolve any formula. As we read in the papers, that point was raised by the Congress Members also in their party meeting, and they had also protested against this sort of policy that goes to support rationalisation which leads to disastrous conditions. But Government have not changed that policy. They have stuck to that basic policy of rationalisation.

What is the effect of this Government's support to the policy of rationalisation? We read in the papers that in the textile mills, nearly eighty per cent. of loom-workers are going to be rendered surplus by this policy of rationalisation. In jute, we know the situation is more serious. Only the other day the President of the Indian Jute Mills Association made a declaration that they are going to follow

this policy of rationalisation not so much for reasons of efficiency, but particularly as a labour-saving device. I have read the report of the speech delivered by him, wherein he had clearly stated that even those mills which are not modernised are not less efficient from the point of view of production, but still they wanted to pursue rationalisation mainly because this will give them low cost of production as also low labour costs. And Government's support to rationalisation only encourages this sort of employers, particularly the jute bosses and the textile bosses. I know something about the condition of the jute workers. I know from my own personal experience that in jute at least—most probably in textiles also—every retrenchment is followed by an increase in the workload. Thus, retrenchment not only throws out a large number of labourers out of employment, but also puts additional burden of work on those that remain employed.

So retrenchment is causing this sort of havoc. Government are following such a pro-rationalisation policy that in their own offices also—Government offices also—retrenchment is going on and increasing workload is being carried on.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Two minutes more.

Shri Tushar Chatterjee: So I should finish very soon. Sir, the little remedy that has been given through the amendment of the Industrial Disputes Act—relief for lay-off and retrenchment—leaves out the casual labour. It leaves out also those persons who are thrown out as a matter of punishment. At least in the case of jute, I know a very large number of casual labour are suffering due to this new amendment, although this new amendment gives relief generally to the retrenched. Both in jute and in textile mills, mass charge-sheeting is going on and employers are taking shelter under the clause whereby as a matter of punishment they can throw out anybody.

[Shri Tushar Chatterjea]

Sir, I will not go into details. In regard to labour legislation, I will just point out two or three things. The wage demand is a very vital demand. But what has the Government done with regard to this? The Minimum Wages Act is there. But this Minimum Wages Act is not only applied in a very limited way, but the vital thing, a national minimum wage required to be fixed for the working people, has not been attended to. That is being shelved all along. Secondly, there is the Fair Wages Committee's report which suggests something to be done with regard to fixation of a minimum wage. That report has not yet been respected. As regards State insurance, we know that only 8 per cent. of the total insurable workers have got up till now the benefit of the State Insurance Act. As regards industrial housing, we know that the provision made by the Government makes such a situation in which unless employers want to spend money for housing of their workers, the workers won't get the benefit of housing. The Government has no power; the Government does not want to exercise power to compel big mill-owners even to construct houses for their workers. Thus in connection with all the vital interests of labour, i.e., work, wages, housing, Government is not doing anything. On the contrary, whenever the question of intervention comes, we know the Government intervenes only most reluctantly. The Government says that there is a machinery for conciliation. But what exactly is happening? We know the Government sets up a Tribunal, but not until the situation is desperate. The other day they had a Coal Tribunal set up but only after a long period—eight months—of persistent demand. Only when notice of strike from 1st March was given, was the Tribunal set up. Again the Insurance employees, even in spite of a persistent demand, are not getting a Tribunal. On the contrary, whenever any question of intervention comes, we see Government intervening not in favour of the employees, but

against the employees. A glaring case is the Bank Tribunal. The Bank employees preferred an appeal for reconsideration of the Tribunal Award. Then Government preferred an appeal so that a good number of employees might be left out of consideration. So Government intervenes not for the employees but against them.

This is the situation and, as I have said, the trade union movement is being suppressed. Government does not discriminate between legal and illegal strikes. Recently there have been the Titagur Paper Mills strike and the Durgapur (DVC) strike. Although the strikes were legal, why was repression resorted to, why was lathi-charging resorted to and why was section 144 enforced? Government wants to discriminate between legal and illegal strikes only formally, but in practice, in reality every strike—whether it is legal or illegal—is being suppressed. Unless the Central Government follows that sort of policy, the State Government would not dare to go that way.

Just one more thing. Sir, on behalf of the jute workers we came before the Central Government with a representation, with the signature of 20,000 workers, on the bonus issue. The stand of the jute workers was correct. This was said even by the Chief Minister of West Bengal. There was no illegal strike. There was no such situation in which peace was broken. In spite of the normal condition of the movement, mass arrests were made simply for making a bonus demand in West Bengal, and that was done with the connivance of the Central Government. What does all this mean? This means that the Central Government and the State Governments have adopted a policy whereby they would not allow the working class to make their own struggle for existence. Trade union organisations are being suppressed in different ways. The Recognition of Trade Union Act is there which compels the trade

unions to follow the employers' own direction. Unless certain conditions are fulfilled, unless employers' own ways are followed, no union can be recognised. The Government is the biggest employer, employing at least 20 lakh people. What is the Government going to do for them? Is there any labour code for them? Is there any machinery to settle disputes between the Government employees and the authorities? Nothing of the kind. For the Government employees, Government does not want to recognise even the elementary trade union right. For the general working class, Government does not want to recognise the normal trade union rights that every civilised country must sanction. Any registered trade union must get unqualified recognition. Any movement—any democratic movement—must not be interfered with. There must not be application of section 144 on the general working class. There must not be any arrest for a simple strike. But the Government is moving in a completely different way. This means that the Government not only deprives the workers of their wage, of their work, of their housing, but also wants to deprive them of their ordinary human right to make a struggle for existence in the event of Government failing to give them proper relief. With these words, I conclude.

Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang): I am constrained to comment on one point of the speech of my friend, Shri Tushar Chatterjea, namely, Burnpur. I am obliged to disagree with him about the situation there. I had occasion to go there myself sometime back when there was a turmoil and I was surprised to find that the quarrel was not between the workers and the employers, but between workers and workers. This quarrel was created by a fight for leadership of the trade union movement there. I may tell my friend that wherever there is such a fight for leadership between two wings of trade unions in any

area or any unit, the workers' cause must suffer. Therefore, it is a reminder to all of us that workers must unite. The workers must not divide; when the workers divide, it is a great advantage to the employer and it is also a great advantage to the Government. Therefore, I would, with all the earnestness at my command, appeal to the trade unions of India to think coolly as to whether the move of dividing the workers on political grounds or otherwise is a right move. I would say humbly that it is the most unwise move on the part of the workers anywhere. I have heard again that the condition in Burnpur is worsening. It is very unfortunate. I have heard that the trade union workers were waylaid and beaten and the case is now pending, even after the matter was settled. The matter should have been permitted to die down and gradually a proper unified trade union movement might have been built up. I hope this will be borne in mind by all sections of the House here and also outside in the country.

I consider the policy of the Government, taken as an overall picture for the last few years, has been of a progressive nature. It is true that when this Government came into power, it inherited certain cobwebs and those had to be laid by. It has not been possible for this Ministry of the Government to do that within the short space of time. But, the way in which it was approaching, I think, was a progressive way. From the report of the Government you will see that gradually the number of strikes has gone down. With the lessening of the strikes, the number of hours lost is also lessened. This is the barometer to find out whether the policy of the Government has been in the right direction. Though, in the beginning, things used to be decided by strikes, gradually the trade union movement—which originally was opposed to it—has come to adjust itself to adjudication. People who were completely opposed to adjudication came to demand it for workers. That shows that the policy of

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

adjudication which was adumbrated by the Government has been accepted by the workers and followed.

Shri Namblar: At least adjudication.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: I fully agree; after all, we workers are pleased with 'at least'; we have no chance of getting 'at the most'. So, we have been trying to get this at least and through this policy of adjudication there was a development in the labour trade union field. But, most unfortunately, we have found that even this policy of adjudication has not been followed in the right spirit by the Government. It is not a fact that the Government have referred to adjudication all just cases; it is not a fact that they have done it quickly. Therefore, there has been a great deal of bickering and suffering which might have been avoided. I draw the attention of this Government to this fact because, after all, it is their own policy of adjudication. They said, 'let there be adjudication instead of strikes'. Workers said, 'All right, we agree', and came forward. When the workers have agreed to this, to say now, 'We shall not give it', is, I think, unfair. The great demand of the workers for adjudication in different parts of India must be taken note of.

Take for instance, the demand of the workers in the tea industry in Assam and Bengal for bonus for the last 6 years. We have been trying our best, but it has not been referred to adjudication. I think this will be borne in mind. This is a very sore point in labour circles today.

For the last few months, the workers of India are getting rather afraid because of a new development in Indian politics and that is the development of an employers' "lobby" in Delhi for the purpose of influencing Government's labour policy. There has been a continuous fear of the Government's labour policy being influenced by the employers. It shows that the labour policy pursued by the

Government is right and the employers are trying to influence it. This the workers are viewing with great anxiety. I hope the Government will not succumb.

An Hon. Member: It has succumbed already.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: A government is a hydra-headed monster and even if some parts of it succumb, there are other parts which may not succumb. Therefore, when it appears the Government is about to succumb, what happens is that though some part of it is about to succumb, it can be resuscitated and recovered. Therefore, I hope that the Government, although great pressure will be put on it in the near future, will rise to the occasion and carry forward its labour welfare policy. After all, the Prime Minister declared that this is a Welfare State. The question is, whose welfare? Is it the welfare of the workers or the welfare of the employers or the welfare of the agriculturists? Every section of the people today has been asking: whose welfare?

Shri B. S. Murthy: Government's welfare.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: Government is nothing separate. We have to establish a Welfare State. Therefore, the policy of Government should be for the development of welfare. Welfare means the quantum of happiness produced. This quantum of happiness must be produced and the test will lie in whether the quantum of happiness is progressively increasing from year to year. From this point of view, I feel that the most important Ministry in the Government of India should be the Labour Ministry.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): Quite right; it is.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: I do not know; influences are at work but I hope these influences will be countered. In countering these influences, it is

not enough that only Government people should be concerned, but it is necessary that we ourselves, the workers, should also be concerned.

Shri Nambiar: The workers also.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: We the workers must be concerned and must apply ourselves so that the reactionary forces working behind may not carry the day. I really congratulate the Ministry on passing the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, which gave the workers the right to compensation for lay-off and retrenchment. This was a very progressive step in a State where there was no unemployment benefit. Therefore, it was hailed by the workers all over the country. We thought it was a benefit. But, I want to point out to the Minister that the employers are trying to utilise this for their own ends. They are trying to utilise it for the purpose of justifying retrenchment through rationalisation. We, who agreed to this, never thought that rationalisation was to be justified under this cloak. It will be remembered that there has been a great deal of criticism in the Press of this Act. But, it is forgotten that this was a bi-partite agreement on which it is based. When it is a bi-partite agreement, it shows that it was a policy agreed to by the employers also. Therefore, it was advantageous to them also. To say that, 'Oh! Government is going too fast; this legislation is going to crush the industries of India: all development is going to stop because of this legislation', is wrong. I think, if such a cry is being raised, it is for some other ulterior purpose and that ulterior purpose, to my mind, seems to be an attempt to force technological rationalisation in the country. So far as technological retrenchment is concerned, we have been opposing this systematically and we feel that, under the present conditions of the economy of India, such a step would be a retrograde step. I have still a hope

35 P.S.D.

that the Government will not embark on a policy of this nature. In the Five Year Plan it is stated that nearly 18 lakhs new workers arise every year out of the growth of population. In five years, about 90 lakhs workers will have arisen. We find that about 15 to 20 per cent. of the Plan will not be fulfilled. So the employment created would be at the most 50 lakhs. Therefore, there would be a shortfall of employment of nearly 30 lakhs, and that shows that at the end of the five-year period, there would be 30 lakhs of unemployed people strutting about the streets of India.

4 P.M.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Over and above what exists today.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: Yes, over and above what exists today. Therefore, to embark on a policy of rationalisation will be a suicidal step. I feel that rationalisation should not be undertaken in the existing industries. If it is undertaken, it will only mean increased profits to the employer and will not mean increased wages to the workers; even if increased wages are there, there will be retrenchment, and the retrenched workers will have to be borne by the employed workers. Therefore, in the ultimate analysis in our economy workers are never benefited. Whenever there is rationalisation, wages increase, but unemployment does not occur. The total increase in wages there is really an additional gain to the workers. In the eastern countries where there is so much unemployment, although the wages increase the burden of employment falling on the workers. Therefore, the net result of rationalisation will be that the present conditions will still go down. I hope that this matter is being considered by the Government constantly and continuously and they will find it possible not to retrench people through technological rationalisation. So far as ordinary rationalisation is concerned,

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

which brings in no retrenchment but higher wages to the workers. I think the workers will agree to such a scheme. Already, there has been an agreement between the Ahmedabad textile workers and the employers on such lines. and, therefore, workers all over the country will accept the scheme because the total quantity of the wages increased will not bring about any retrenchment and they will not have increased dependents to bear.

As regards the unemployment, provident fund and the insurance questions, I feel that the Government have taken the right step, but somewhere somebody has erred, not in plan, but in courage, and, therefore, the progress has been very slow. If the cost of the social welfare measures are borne separately in the different departments, they would be too heavy and, therefore, Government should consider merging of these social welfare units by creating a separate department for it, where all the social welfare measures that are mapped out for the next five to ten years, may be undertaken. In that case, the overhead cost would be low and the worker and the employer will not grudge. It has been claimed by the employers that 10 per cent. of the cost is raised by these measures. I have examined it through our research section and I find that that is totally wrong. The increase in cost comes to 10 per cent. of the wages only, and it comes to about 3 per cent. of the total cost. The Government has been misled into thinking that it is as high as 10 per cent. of the total. There are certain industries where this figure comes to only 0.5 per cent., and in some it is as low as 0.1 per cent. The result of their being misled was that Government were permitting industries and units to go outside the Plan and have their own schemes. I feel that when Government are thinking in terms of expanding the benefits, they should think in terms of bringing all

these units under the same department, and in that case, the overhead cost will be reduced.

The Plantation Labour Act was also passed, but it was not implemented. The implementation of the Acts generally has not been sufficient and properly done. I think that the Government should take more effective steps to see that a better implementation of the Acts takes place. There is a great desire all over the country among the workers to increase their wages. Comparing the profits of the employers, I find that there has been a constant rise in profits, and the industrial profits have increased in all industries. The index figure for all industries has increased from 187 to 310; that of jute from 244 to 679, for cotton from 316 to 551, for tea from 146 to 103 (there is a slight decline in 1951, but now of course, the condition of tea is booming and so it is needless to say anything about it), for sugar from 137 to 420, for paper from 284 to 604, for iron and steel from 133 to 157, for coal from 82 to 178, for cement from 128 to 419.....

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): What are these figures? Profits or security? Please read the heading.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: The heading is "Industrial profits—index numbers based on 1934". It will be remembered that there has been a general attack by the employers that the condition of the industry is going down and, therefore, wages should not be increased and bonus should not be given. From these figures, we find that it is not so and we support the idea that wages should be increased. I am very glad to say that my hon. friend Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, who is here, has been advocating that wages should increase, and from the speech of the hon. Finance Minister on the Budget, in which he said that we should be able to live up to our means, I find there is a welcome change in the Government's attitude.

This is clear from the speeches of the Finance Minister and the Commerce Minister—namely, that the wage structure of the country should be revised. I do not know whether it will be carried out in practice, but I feel that it will be done. Unless and until the wages increase, the economy of the country cannot be balanced in terms of increase in production. The production of the country has increased by 33 per cent. In every country where development occurs, the production is always counterbalanced by increase in wages. For the last forty years, I am told, in America the wages have increased corresponding to the production, which was 3 to 4 per cent. per year. In the countries of the East, the wage structure is so low that in the tertiary sector there is very little employment. The employment figure in the tertiary sector in India is only 17 per cent. whereas it is 51 per cent. in America and over 30 per cent. in Japan. In modern industries the employment created is very little because of the mechanised process. Unless and until the wage structure is boosted up or increased, there is no corresponding employment in the tertiary sector. If there is no corresponding employment in the tertiary sector and the employment in the industrial sector, that is the primary sector, is reduced by technological improvement, then there will be a continuous decrease in employment, which will constrict the economy of the country and extinguish the people.

Therefore it is very necessary that wages should be increased. My time is up. But I am glad that I find a very welcome attitude on the part of Government. In this connection I would like to point out that Government set up a committee some-time back to fix norms. But, unfortunately, this has not functioned. Norms should be fixed in the light of which minimum and other wages should be decided all over the country, so that the present disparity in norms that obtains may be reduced.

Shri K. L. More (Kolhapur *cum* Satara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): My Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity. As you are aware, the most worrying problem that faces everybody today is the problem of unemployment. Even the vexed problem of U.S.A.-Pakistan Military Aid Agreement which affects the security of our country, is not likely to engage our thoughts so much as the employment problem in our country. It is very heartening to note that Government have now realised the serious implications of this problem and have directed all their energies to its solution. This has been clearly reflected in the speeches of the Finance Minister and of the Prime Minister, and also by the adjustment of our Plan by an additional provision of Rs. 175 crores to provide more employment.

But as I went through the pages of the report of the activities of the Labour Ministry I was really disappointed to find that the Labour Ministry is completely unaware of this important problem of unemployment. The Ministry, so to say, is merely engaged in reproducing the figures of unemployment. It has become a post office or a service bureau, just receiving applications and giving figures. Beyond this, the Ministry is not taking any initiative in solving vital problems.

The magnitude of the unemployment problem can be gauged from the figures that have been given in the report. Nearly 5,22,360 applicants remained on the register at the end of December 1953. The number of unemployed Scheduled Caste candidates who are at present on the live register is 19,188. This is a very large number. These people have a dark future before them. The Scheduled Castes are not advanced and Government ought to give preference to them in all matters. It cannot be said that special attention has been paid to these

[Shri K. L. More]

classes as is enjoined by the Constitution. Poverty and distress among the Scheduled Castes is intolerable. For the betterment of the displaced persons, whose economic conditions are far better than those of the Scheduled Castes, a provision of Rs. 205 crores had been made. But there is no scheme for the economic betterment of the Scheduled Castes. I earnestly request Government to set apart at least half of this amount for the betterment of these classes.

Much is made by political parties of organised labour. Everybody talks about organised labour. The hon. Member on the other side who spoke just now charged that Government are not concerned about the condition of organised labour. My charge is that Government is partial to organised labour and are utterly neglecting the cause of unorganised labour. For unorganised labour, especially the agricultural classes, Government have passed one Act—the Minimum Wages Act—but it is ineffective and the interests of the agricultural classes are not at all protected. This is my view.

The next point I wish to make is about the condition of sanitary labour. The Labour Ministry has completely neglected this class of labourers. No legislation, effective or otherwise, has been passed to better their conditions. The condition of this class of labour which comes from the lowest ladder of society, is very distressing indeed. No legislation has been attempted to be passed for their welfare.

As regards employment proper the Constitution has guaranteed every citizen an adequate means of livelihood. Not only that, our Constitution has further laid down: "It shall be the duty of the State to raise the level of nutrition and the standard of living." It also clearly lays down that the State shall direct its policy

towards securing to the citizens, men and women, an adequate means of livelihood.

In accordance with this directive work must be provided by the State for all the citizens. In case a citizen remains out of work, the responsibility falls on the State. Our Five Year Plan must be tested on the touchstone of this Directive Principle. It is no good saying that increased production will lead to increased employment and that as the Plan goes under way it will afford possibilities of work. Merely aiming to get increased production without corresponding increase in employment is not a good thing. The plan of providing work rests with the State irrespective of working of the Plan. Accordingly Government must be vigilant and the economic development through the Plan must go hand in hand with the provision of work. A complete survey should immediately be made about the employment possibilities and the labour force. In the progress report on the Plan (1951—1953), a rough estimate of unemployment is given and a promise of closer study has been made. The Finance Minister and the Planning Commission deserve our congratulations for this definiteness and calculated adjustment. The other day, the Finance Minister while speaking on unemployment had given us some data about the employment in various river valley projects; he also had quoted the employment potential in certain irrigation and power projects; this is bound to create some optimism among the people. I now suggest that Government must proceed further and undertake the duty of adjusting the jobs.

Another thing which I would like to say is that any scientific calculation about the economic situation as has been stated is likely to be offset by our population problem. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Finance Minister has stated once that

employment possibilities may not keep pace with the increase in population. In this respect I hold a different view; how can the increase in population in the near future, say between 1951—61 affect the employment situation? It is unlikely that the human beings that are born during this period will flock to the employment exchanges. Therefore, I am not fully in agreement with him.

As regards rationalisation, I should say this is another disturbing factor. It is difficult to deal with such topics in a limited space of time. However, I may, in passing, say that the rationalisation which will displace labour from employment must be discouraged till the whole social and economic order is changed so as to secure it on the lines enjoined in the Directive Principles.

For securing employment and work by way of cottage industries or agricultural or industrial development or by giving of protection to the indigenous industries etc., the real solution of the problem lies in the implementation of the Directive Principles, namely:—

“The State shall in particular direct its policy towards securing—

* * * *

(b) that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good;”

and next

“(c) that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment.”

As regards the unemployment amongst the educated classes I may say that unless a very radical reform is effected in the educational policy of our country, this will not be solved. In the end I would like to suggest by way of short-term remedies

that adequate finances should be made available to the agriculturists for their agricultural purposes and allied occupations, and secondly, reclamation of lands on a very large scale by mechanical methods etc. must be made; lastly, recruitment to the services should be made on the basis of merit and economic considerations and of factors like the number of dependents to be supported.

With these words, I oppose the cut motions and support the Demands of the Labour Ministry.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: I wish to take part in the debate on Labour Demands not with a view to propound any theories or policies but to mention the conditions of labour in one or two sectors with which I am familiar.

In the agricultural sectors especially in the non-deltaic areas, unemployment is acute and it is not possible for the labour in those areas to find means of livelihood. Land is not, in most cases, fertile and they do not have any other subsidiary form of employment to depend upon. There is land to a large extent available with the Government. The Planning Commission itself has said that there is an area of nearly 98 million acres of cultivable land which has to be brought under cultivation sooner or later. It is not possible for the labourer in the rural areas to wait for the tractors to come over there and bring the land under cultivation but it is possible in several areas to cultivate the existing lands by the labour that is available locally. In such cases, it has to be pointed out that there is a very urgent need for the free distribution of unoccupied Government lands to the landless labour and they will find to some extent their own means of improving them. If means are not available with them, the co-operative system of working in several States might go to their aid and help them to a large extent.

As it is, the unemployed labour is migrating to other places in search

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

of employment. Thereby it throws out of employment by competition the labour in those particular areas. If the labour is in the vicinity of townships or other urban areas, it is a different matter; they might get some subsidiary employment. But in places far away from the urban areas or far from the deltaic areas, the position is very acute and separate and early measures will have to be taken to relieve unemployment in those areas.

I am glad to inform you that the Andhra State has already thought of distributing the available Government lands to the landless labour. I wish that that matter be examined more thoroughly and carefully, and to the extent possible, it may be adopted in other places where land is available and also where the labour is unemployed.

In the mica sector, I have already brought to the notice of the hon. Minister of Labour the fact that there is some amount of unemployment especially in my District in South India. That should be tackled very soon. On account of the closure of a number of mica mines, nearly sixty per cent. of the listed ones there, much unemployment has been created. The closure is due to a sort of slump that has overtaken the mica business. I have suggested that a portion of the money available from the unspent balances of the Mica Cess Fund might be utilised for the creation of employment either by reviving the mines that have been closed or by taking up some of the properly yielding mines and working through Government agencies. I trust that the hon. Minister must have made enough enquiries in the matter and taken suitable steps to see that there is no unemployment. I have suggested to him that with a couple of lakhs of rupees a few thousands of labourers can be employed. Mines that have had some reputation of good yield and such of the mines that are in the possession of the Government itself,

not having been leased out, might be worked out and what is possible to get out of them by way of mica produce can be sold. I cannot say that the proposition will be cent. per cent. successful from the point of view of profit. But even if it should be a fifty per cent. loss, it is worthwhile undertaking it, more with a view to help the unemployed labour rather than with a view to making any gain, over that.

There is another aspect which I have been trying to impress upon the hon. Minister very often, namely that the unspent balances of the Mica Welfare Fund should be invested in interest-securing deposits. I have once before pointed out that nearly eighty to eighty-five lakhs of rupees of unspent Mica Cess Fund is available. All the amount has been contributed by the labour by way of producing mica, and the export duty of 2½ per cent. has enabled the collection of this huge amount of money. The Government is simply using it, having taken it over to the Consolidated Fund of India. My plea is that whatever money is secured this way should be put into interest-bearing securities or deposits, and whatever money is collected through interest must be added on to the Fund, so that the labourer's money might be spent over the labour whenever there is necessity.

It might be said that since there is a slump in the mica trade today, any money spent upon mica labour would be useless. But I wish to inform the hon. Minister that there is still demand for mica, though not in America and England, in other countries like Japan, Italy and Germany. Only a few miners and a few exporters are able to make good money out of it. Others are lagging behind and they require some help. Unless Government comes forward to investigate the possibility of pushing up our mica sales in other countries, the labour conditions here will deteriorate still further. The hon. the Labour Minister might say it is not his

duty to find out markets for mica. That is exactly where I want to tell him that there should be a greater co-ordination between Labour and other Departments of the Government so that the success of other Departments may have a salutary effect upon labour conditions. It often happens that when Members put questions to hon. Ministers one Minister points to the other Minister as if that particular subject is the lookout of the other Minister. It is exactly in that respect that there should be greater co-ordination, and it is only when co-ordination prevails that there can be greater satisfaction.

Though I do not completely agree with my friend Shri Tripathi that the Government is hydra-headed, I would certainly say that even if it is many-headed it must only be sound headed, and if there is proper co-operation between head and head there will be relief to that extent to the country.

Similar unemployment is prevailing not only in the mica sector but also among tobacco growers and salt producers. Several questions have been put and answered on the floor of this House, and they indicate that on account of the slump in the tobacco market, unemployment has been created in that sector. There also the help of the hon. Minister of Commerce is necessary, so that there might be a pushing out of a lot of tobacco that is available in India to other countries or of utilising it for other manufacturing purposes.

In regard to salt, you know there has recently been a policy of not releasing the so-called sub-standard salt. On account of the non-release of sub-standard salt most of the salt factories have been closed down or are likely to be closed down. Especially, as regards the small producer or the labourer who would have an acre or two at his disposal, if his salt is not released for consumption, naturally it is dumped up there and he cannot find any incentive to work and produce more salt. The system of banning sub-standard salt seems to be

very much adhered to by Government, without noting the difficulties and the grievances of the labourer in that sector.

I am labouring these points just to show to the hon. Minister that his business does not lie merely in looking after his own Department but in co-ordinating the efforts or inviting the co-ordination or co-operation of the other Ministers with a view to help in the progress of trade and the utilisation of production in other sectors to a larger extent so as to provide greater employment facilities to labour in this country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri G. L. Chaudhary. I will only say this. I have received requests from a number of hon. Members belonging to the Congress Party. During the time apportioned to the Congress Party the Ministers have to speak, and both of them want an hour and ten minutes between them. If a larger number of Members want to participate I would request each Member to confine himself to ten minutes so that I can give an opportunity to a larger number of Members. The other Groups have given their names consistent with the time allotted to each Group and I will call them in due course.

श्री जी० एल० चौधरी (जिला साह-जहापुर—उत्तर व खेरी—पूर्व—रमित अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, देश के सामने मखदूरों की जो प्रबल्लेम है वह बहुत ही भयंकर परिस्थिति धारण करती जा रही है। जब कि मखदूरों की समस्या दिन प्रति दिन भयंकर होती जा रही है उसी के साथ जो हमारे मुल्क में ऐसा मखदूर तबका है कि जो खेती का काम करता है, उसकी समस्या और भी कठिन होती जा रही है। उसकी हालत बराबर गिरती जा रही है। मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से उस तबके की पूरी अबहेलना की जाती है। खेतीहर मखदूर के सामने कई

[श्री जी० एल० चौधरी]

मसले हैं, उसके सामने कई समस्यायें हैं। दूसरे मजदूरों के सामने तो अनएम्पलायमेंट की समस्या है, लेकिन खेतीहर मजदूरों के सामने अनएम्पलायमेंट और साथ ही साथ जो एम्पलाय्ड वर्कर हैं, जो काम करने वाले हैं, उनको आधी ही तनख्वाह या एक तिहाई ही तनख्वाह मिलती है, उस की भी समस्या उस के सामने है।

यू० पी० के ईस्टर्न जोन में मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक मजदूर को पन्द्रह रुपये से लेकर बीस रुपये तक तनख्वाह मिलती है। इसी तरह से अगर और भी जोनों में आप देखें तो पायेंगे कि वहां पर भी पन्द्रह बीस रुपये मजदूर को तनख्वाह मिलती है, बारह रुपये से लेकर बीस रुपये तक तनख्वाह मिलती है। अगर आप लिविंग वेज को लें तो आप देखेंगे कि एक आदमी के लिये उसके रहने के लिये उसके खाने के लिये कितने रुपये की आवश्यकता है। इस सिलसिले में मैं आपको यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि :

“Devas suggested that all workers should be guaranteed a decent livelihood, or a living wage must conform to the reasonable degree of the conventional standard of life that prevails in any community or group.

अब आप समझ सकते हैं कि जो मजदूर केवल दस या पन्द्रह रुपया महीना पाते हैं, वह इस रुपये में किस तरह से अपना गुजारा कर सकते हैं। हमारी सरकार के आर्डर के मुताबिक कुछ सूबे की सरकारों ने खेतीहर मजदूरों की तनख्वाहें मुकर्रर की हैं, यू० पी० में २६ रुपये इन्होंने उन की तनख्वाह मुकर्रर की है। जो रोज काम करते हैं उन के लिये एक रुपया रोज और जो माहवारी बेसिस पर काम करते हैं उन के लिये इन्होंने २६ रुपया महीना मुकर्रर किया है। यह २६ रुपये

आजकल की मंहगाई के जमाने में कुछ भी नहीं है, जब कि स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग ५०० और ४०० हो गया है, तो ऐसे जमाने में २५ या २६ रुपये फिक्स कर देना यह अच्छी बात नहीं है। उन के अगर काम के घंटों को लीजिये तो आप देखेंगे जब वह काम करने आते हैं तो उनको सुबह से शाम तक काम करना पड़ता है। आप को उनके काम के घंटे मुकर्रर करने पड़ेंगे। देश की परिस्थिति को देखते हुये यहां पर जो काम हो रहा है उसको देखते हुए अगर आप डेली उन के लिये काम के घंटे मुकर्रर नहीं कर सकते जैसा कि दूसरे मुल्कों में किया गया है। स्वीडन और पोलैंड में साल भर के लिये कलेक्टिव बारगेनिंग के ऊपर काम के घंटे मुकर्रर करते हैं तो इस तरह से अगर आप मामूली खेतीहर मजदूरों के काम के घंटे मुकर्रर कर दें तो इस से उन को कुछ थोड़ी बहुत रिलीफ मिल जायेगी। जहां तक उन की सोशल सिक्वोर्टी का ताल्लुक है कड़ी धूप, बरसात और जाड़े में काम करते हैं। जब वे मजदूर लोग बरसात में खेतों में घुस कर काम करते हैं तो उन के शरीर में तरह तरह की बीमारियां हो जाती हैं। वह गर्मियों में जब काम करते हैं तो उन को सन स्ट्रोक हो जाता है और बहुत से आदमी इस कारण मौत के शिकार हो जाते हैं। मैं आप से मांग करूंगा कि उन के लिये आपको जल्दी से जल्दी इलनेस इश्योरेंस का प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये ताकि उन को इन बीमारियों से छुटकारा मिले। जहां तक औरतों का ताल्लुक है, मजदूर औरतों के काम करने को देखें तो आप पायेंगे कि वे बेचारी दिन रात खेतों में काम करती हैं, दिन रात बेचारी औरतें उन के घरों में काम करती हैं, लेकिन उन के लिये होता क्या है, उन को इतन पैसा नहीं दिया जाता जिस से वह अपन पेट भर सकें। इस सम्बन्ध में इन्टरनेशनल

लेबर कांफ्रेंस ने यह रिक्मेंडेशन भेजी थी :

"Measures should be taken to ensure to women earners employed in agricultural undertakings, protection before and after child-birth similar to that provided by the International Draft Convention adopted by the International Conference in Washington, for women employed in industry and commerce."

इस तरह के क़ानून की अगर आप व्यवस्था नहीं करते हैं तो औरतों की हालत बड़ी नाज़ुक रहती है और उन की तन्दुरुस्ती ख़राब होती है, इसलिये यह बहुत ज़रूरी है कि इसके लिये आप प्रबन्ध करें ।

अब जहाँ तक बच्चों का ताल्लुक है हालत यह है कि आठ आठ या दस दस वर्ष के बच्चे इम्प्लायड होते हैं और वे जाकर खेतों में काम करते हैं और उन की पढ़ाई नहीं हो पाती, पढ़ाई के दिन ख़त्म हो जाते हैं । मैं आप से कहूंगा कि उन की पढ़ाई के लिये सीधा लेजिस्लेशन नहीं कर सकते तो उन के लिये आप कोई एक इनडायरेक्ट लेजिस्लेशन ला सकते हैं । आप उन को शिक्षित करने के लिये कम्पलसरी एज्युकेशन सर्टेन एज तक रखिये जैसा कि दूसरे मुन्कों में होता है । आप अगर मुन्क की बहबूदी और भलाई चाहते हैं, और देश को उठाना चाहते हैं तो देश का जो पिछड़ा वर्ग है मज़दूर तबक़ा है और जो खेतों में काम करते हैं उन के लिये भी आप कुछ सोचिये और प्रबन्ध कीजिये । आप तरह तरह के प्लान बनाते हैं और हज़ारों रुपये खर्च करते हैं लेकिन मज़दूरों के लिये आप कोई स्कीम और प्लान नहीं बनाते हैं । बहुत दिनों के बाद आपने एक इनक्वायरी कमेटी सन् ४९ में बिठाई, वह कमेटी थोड़े से कुछ चुने हुये गांवों में ही गई और इन चुने हुये गांवों का नतीजा निकाल कर आपके सामने पेश किया ।

खेतीहर मज़दूरों की हमारे देशमें काफी संख्या है, और यह बहुत ज़रूरी है कि आप उन के लिये एक कमीशन बिठाइये और उस के द्वारा सारे मुल्क में जो खेतीहर मज़दूर हैं उन के काम पर गौर कीजिये और जब आप उन की दशा में सुधार कर सकेंगे और उन के लिये जीवन की आवश्यकतायें सुलभ कर सकेंगे, तभी मेरी समझ में आप मुल्क का मसला हल कर सकते हैं ।

Shri KeshavaIengar (Bangalore North): Sir, thank you for the opportunity afforded to me for opening my mouth and participating in the proceedings of this august House, for the first time ever since this Session started. It is not possible for us to do full justice in the course of ten minutes, to the various problems that arise in the field of Labour and criticise the way in which the Government is tackling them. Whatever it is, I wish to touch upon some of the problems and suggest a few points for the consideration of the hon. Minister. Sir, one is very much perturbed at the inordinate delay in the process of placing the consolidated Labour legislation that was promised to us long ago, before this House. It is no wonder that people have come to think and also feel that it is not the Ministry or the Cabinet that is in charge of this Government, but it is only the Secretariat that is sitting a little outside this House. I think joint responsibility of all our Ministers concerned must find its way to place the consolidated legislation that was promised to the country, at the earliest opportunity.

Further, the matter connected with the reference of disputes to Arbitration Tribunals is also one which has been very much agitating the minds of the workers.

Whatever may be the joint responsibility or otherwise of the Ministry concerned, the Minister in charge of labour affairs must have his own responsibility to satisfy himself regarding the justice or otherwise on the merits of the case which is required to

[Shri Keshavaiengar]

be referred to the Arbitration Tribunal, and he must find a way to refer the case to the Tribunal at the earliest opportunity. Delayed justice is no justice at all. Already, the workers are greatly hampered for want of such reference to the tribunals. I am personally aware of one such case, with which I am connected, that is, in respect of the Nandidurg Labour Association of Kolar Gold Fields which was kept pending for the last six months. This must have been a sufficient period for making any enquiry or reference to the other departments of the Government concerned. The reference should be made as early as possible. Of course, labour in our country is not so well organised. We have just touched the fringe of agricultural labour. Industrial labour, even though they form a very small part of the population of the country, have not been able to do much in improving their conditions of life.

I would very much implore upon the Ministers concerned to quench, at least to whatever extent possible, the anxiety on the part of the workers, particularly in the matter of rationalisation. The term rationalisation has, I believe, been defined in the International Labour Code as:

“Rationalisation in general is any reform tending to replace habitual inadequate practices by means or methods based on systematic reasoning.”

I am aware of the fact that one of the textile mills, of the labour association of which I happen to be the president, has applied for permission to run a few more looms and that it has been sanctioned by this Government. We are thinking of giving sanction for automatic looms which enable one labourer to handle at least 32 looms. The ways of the capitalists are mysterious. It is not possible to understand the plea that that this kind of rationalisation will not in

any way lead to unemployment of labour. At least I may state before this House that labour is as much interested in the development of the productivity of this country. We are prepared to gird up our loins and work better and harder still, provided, of course, the conditions of the workers are improved and properly maintained. Instead of offering them any other inducement, I think the best inducement for labour to work better would be a share in the proceeds from the extra productivity.

Rationalisation leads to the other question, namely, the apportionment of the cost of the industry itself. What is the cost that could be incurred on the management with reference to the question of rationalisation? The gulf between the wages earned by the workers and those earned by the employers, particularly the managing agent, is enormous. We must find out ways and means of bringing about a change in this difference and see how best this could be managed. I do not want to labour on this point any further. I would only appeal to the hon. Members on the Treasury Benches that any rationalisation must result in improving the standard of living of the workers and also in the cheapness of the products to the community. If neither of these things is done, rationalisation cannot be considered to be for the well-being of the country itself as such.

Another point that I would like to place before the House is this. Somehow, our Government is not interested at all in deputing a Labour Attache to the several Ambassadors of our country in the various countries. The delegations from our country are finding it very difficult to come into contact with labour associations of other countries to which they go. It is very necessary, in order to study the conditions of workers there and the methods employed to tackle the problem of labour welfare, to depute a Labour Attache at least to the important ambassadorial establishments of

ours in the other countries. In fact, I do not know the basis or the way in which our Government deals with the Labour department in this matter. The deputation to the ILO, I understand, is in the ratio of one delegate and five advisers. Of late, I am told that this is being gradually reduced to one delegate and three advisers. I am one of those who feel that these delegations and deputations should not be considered as invitations for foreign tours. On the other hand, we should take it up as a matter of study of the working conditions of labour in those countries and active participation in the various committees of the ILO. Otherwise, our country is left unrepresented in the several committees and our people are not able to attend to all the work that they are called upon to undertake.

I entirely agree with every syllable of what Shri Ramachandra Reddi said about the mica workers. The condition of mica workers is deplorable. The Central enactment regarding mines is said not to apply to these workers. The local Government is not able to tackle the problem. This is a sort of a riddle. It is worthwhile that the Labour Minister interests himself in this matter immediately and tries to give some relief to them.

Only one point, Sir, and I shall close. That is with regard to the implementation of the labour laws. We have enacted already a large number of laws and there is great difficulty in their implementation. The State Governments do not seem to run with the Central Government in this matter. I think this is a very important matter for immediate investigation. Some machinery must be found out to implement as early as possible the several labour laws that we have already passed.

Shri Elayaperumal (Cuddalore—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I am very grateful to you for giving me a chance to take part in the debate on this Demand. Three-fourths of the people of India are occupied in agriculture. They may be divided into three classes: earning dependents, non-earning

dependents and self-supporting people. Earning dependents in the rural areas are 351 lakhs and in urban areas 28 lakhs. Non-earning dependents in rural areas are 1739 lakhs and in urban areas 404 lakhs. The self-supporting people may be divided into two classes that is, agriculturists and non-agriculturists.

5 P.M.

There are 710 lakhs of agriculturists and 334 lakhs of non-agriculturists. The agriculturists can be divided into four classes; cultivators of land wholly or mainly owned by them—457 lakhs; cultivators of land wholly or mainly not owned by them—88 lakhs; non-cultivating owners of land, i.e., agricultural rent receivers—16 lakhs; actual cultivating labourers—149 lakhs. The condition of these 1½ crores of cultivating labourers is worse than those of the industrial workers in India. During the British regime, no action was taken for their benefit. While something has been done for the industrial and factory labour now, nothing has been done for these agricultural labourers. They produce the food and cloth needed by us, but their wives and children are semi-starved and half-naked. They are very hard working people—not only they, their wives and children also—so that the seed is grown in time and the harvest is brought home before uncertain weather damages it. The farmer wends his way to the field in the morning and sweats there till sunset. His midday meals carried to him by his devoted wife. The cultivating labourer gets only two months' work in the cultivating season and another 1½ months' work in the harvest season. Is it possible for him to pull on his life for the whole year with the small income he gets during these 3½ months? There is a proverb in Tamil:

"Uzhavar thame ulahaththani

Uzhu thozhil nirkin maru thozhil nadava."

It was said by the great Tamil poetess Avvaiyar. It means that if the labourers fail to work in the field

[Shri Elayaperumal]

to produce crops, the whole world will suffer without food, and the labourers and the farmers are the backbone of the country. The cultivating labourer is the employee of the cultivator. The cultivator is the manager of a cultivation. The cultivator gets the profit from the cultivation. The cultivating labourer gets after a whole day's work only inferior grains!

Shri Namblar: Let our Labour Minister send some grains to them.

Shri Elayaperumal: They should be happy and contented. Then only they can produce more from the fields. I am very grateful and thankful to our Congress Government for making laws for industrial labour and factory labour, but they have done nothing for agricultural labour.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair.]

10 Centres have been opened in India to give training to industrial and factory labour, but is there a single centre to give training to the illiterate agricultural labourers, to give them proper training to improve agricultural methods? There is none.

Secondly, the Factories Act which was started in 1947 passed in 1948 and came into force on 1st April, 1949, provides that no labourer or worker should be required to carry loads which are likely to cause him injury. There is another Act—Employment of Children Act 1951 which prohibits the employment of children below the age of 14. But, what about the labourer's children? What about their education? In South India, there are more than 50,000 cattle boys who are working in the houses of the landlords or the Mirasdars. Is there any provision made for them? Further, females are working in the houses of the Mirasdars as cattle-shed sweepers. Is there any provision for their daily wages? Nothing is provided. I am distressed to find that even the Minimum Wages Act has not been implemented by several States. Social justice should not be delayed any longer.

and it will lose much of its grace if it has to be forced through the agitation of agricultural labourers.

According to our Constitution, forced labour is abolished, but in Madras State, especially the Harijan agricultural labourers are compelled to beat drums, to remove the dead cattle and to dig burial grounds against their wish.

Shri Namblar: Against the Constitution also.

Shri Elayaperumal: Is there any provision against this? If not, what are the reasons? Is this a system of forced labour or not? I request the hon. Minister to take necessary steps to help the poor agricultural labourers. It is a serious matter affecting six crores of depressed people in India, and it will help eradication of untouchability.

In Madras State, the Tanjore Tenancy Act was passed in 1948, but it was not enforced in the whole of the State, but only in Tanjore, Chidambaram and in some villages of Cuddalore Taluk. It helps only the landlords and tenants and not the agricultural workers. On the 18th of this month, our President also gave his consent to the Tenancy Act, but there is no provision in that Act for agricultural labourers or their children or the cattle-shed sweepers. So, I would request the hon. Minister to give direct instructions to the State Government to implement the Act in the whole of the State.

Last year there was trouble in Trichinopoly District, in Musiri and Karur taluks, to extend the Minimum Wages Act to that District, but no action was taken by the Government. The poor agriculturists were beaten by the police and they were arrested.

Lastly, the real solution of the problem of the agricultural worker lies in a radical agrarian reform. All the intermediaries between the State and the actual tiller of the soil should be

abolished, and the land must be given to the working class people, those who are the actual tillers of the soil. While so many provisions have been made for industrial and factory labourers, I would request the hon. Minister that at least Rs. 2 crores must be allotted for welfare schemes in regard to agricultural workers, such as housing, education, and medical aid.

Shri B. S. Murthy: I desire to make one or two general observations, before I advert to some specific points on the administration of labour laws, with which the Ministry of Labour is mostly concerned. We hear off and on from the press and the platform, the Minister of Labour proclaiming what problems he would like to solve during his regime. I admit—as he does on every conceivable occasion—that he is a trade unionist of some thirty-one or thirty-two years of standing. He has now had adequate, if not ample, time to collect his views to put them together, crystallise them, and to pass them on to the country. But nothing in this direction has so far been done. I have tried to hear from him, as every other person in the country, what his broad policies are, what comprehensive programmes he has formulated, and in what space of time—whether it is two or three years—he would bring his plans into operation. We have had no occasion so far to know or comprehend what his flourishing programme is. It looks as though the Ministry of Labour has no programme at all.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: It must be liquidated then.

Shri B. S. Murthy: If he had any, he should certainly have flourished them in our faces. However, I would still request him to establish in his mind what his programme is and pronounce it for the edification of all interests concerned.

Moreover, in these days of planning, it is but quite imperative that

the Ministry of Labour should have a plan of its own. But it is a pity that this is lacking in this Ministry. From the way in which his plans were once announced in one or two respects, and modified later on, it looks as though the hon. Minister is drifting and drifting. Drift is fatal in trade unionism, and the person in charge of labour welfare should first know his mind. He should be realistic in his approach and establish the rights of the workers. This, I regret to say, is non-existent in our present Minister.

Shri Nambiar: No compliment.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Another observation which I am constrained to make is about the deplorable deterioration in employer-employee relations, broadly put, industrial relations. This is mainly due to the indecision, if not wilful neglect, of the hon. Minister in modulating his determination. Sometime ago, he preached that his faith was in collective bargaining. He declared that his ambition was to foster that system of collective bargaining in India, as was obtaining in the industries of the United Kingdom. Well, this is quite heartening, but what has happened? Step by step, he swerved from this goal and finally seems to have come to the conclusion that this system is not well suited to India; this is quite inexplicable. It passes one's comprehension how a trade unionist Minister like the present Minister of Labour, could come to this escapist conclusion. The only explanation to this is that he was not able to resist the pressure brought to bear upon him by the capitalist and other allied vested interests. I am not prepared to concede that this is due to his conviction as a result of his study of the economic and social conditions obtaining in the country. The results of his vacillation are quite obvious. His policies are vehemently opposed by the employers, employees and perhaps the

[Shri B. S. Murthy]

State Governments and the employ-
ing Ministers as well.

Shri Namblar: And Cabinet Min-
isters.

Shri B. S. Murthy: 'Employing
Ministers' means that.

In fact, he is not able to please anyone. I shall be wrong, much less harsh, if I say that nothing but chaos and confusion prevail today as a direct outcome of this wavering and wayward policy. I am anxious to make the House know that I have great respect and regard for the Minister of Labour for his past services to Indian labour. But it is not only my disappointment at his performance, but my duty to the toiling and moiling millions of India that compels me to speak out my mind.

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): It may be taken as red.

Shri B. S. Murthy: I wish the hon. Member removes his turban, and he shall then be able to hear me well.

Shri Namblar: And puts on a khadi cap.

Shri B. S. Murthy: The fact that the Congress Party's Sub-Committee on Labour has recently convened an emergent meeting to consider the fast deteriorating and deplorable condition of labour in India is a proof that the country is seized with a grave concern regarding the too uncertain policies of the Labour Minister. As one coming from the workers, I can competently voice forth the feeling of a vast majority of the people in the country that these infructuous and embryonic policies have led to untold distress and great disappointment in the rank and file of labour. Many disputes between the workers and employers remain unsolved and unadjudged, as the Minister has been consistently refusing to refer them to adjudication. In this respect, all parties, whatever

complexion they may belong to, are unanimous in expressing their desire at the dilatory attitude of the Labour Ministry. At each successive meeting or conference, the Hind Mazdoor Sabha, the INTUC, the All-India Trade Union Congress and all the other trade union organisations have been expressing their sore disappointment at the indifference shown by the Ministry for the welfare of labour. I have given this to substantiate my argument that none in the country is satisfied with the happy-go-lucky attitude pursued by the Labour Ministry.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): He is always happy-go-lucky.

Shri B. S. Murthy: I shall now proceed to mention a few cases where the present Labour Minister has been guilty of gross neglect in implementing schemes which were introduced by the previous Minister. Let us take the case of the Employees' Provident Funds scheme, about which some scanty particulars have been given in the report of the Ministry for the year 1953-54. Today the Act applies to six industries, viz. cement etc. I am not aware on what basis these industries were singled out for the application of the provisions of the Act. Perhaps the reason is that only well-established industries should be tackled first. This is good, so far as it goes. It may be that it will be simple and easy to operate the scheme in such industries. But I ask the Ministry whether this should be the only criterion for improving the lot of the workers. Is it desirable to introduce this scheme only in industries which are well-established and which had on their own initiated provident funds for their employees, and which are in some respects better than those under the Government's scheme? In my opinion, what the Government did by introducing this scheme in a few of these selected industries only is nothing but an eyewash. Govern-

ment should have certainly adopted a broader and a more humane policy in this respect. The Provident Fund Scheme is intended to make provision for the workers for the rainy days. The first and foremost step should have been to...

Five minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: Only ten minutes for each hon. Member. So far, only ten or twelve minutes have been given to hon. Members.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Excuse me. The rule of ten minutes does not apply...

Mr. Chairman: There is no question of any rule. I find from the list of speakers and the time given to them, that usually only ten or twelve minutes have been taken by each hon. Member. Since the hon. Member is reading out, he must have said much more than any other member who only speaks out. So, I want the hon. Member to finish within ten minutes.

Shri B. S. Murthy: It is not a question of reading. It is a question of refreshing my mind, as regards the points.

Mr. Chairman: I am not objecting to reading. If I had objected, the reading would not have been allowed. But since every hon. Member does like that, it is very right that the hon. Member should have full notes. I do not object to that.

Shri B. S. Murthy: No doubt, the first and foremost step should have been to protect the employees engaged in hazardous and more dangerous occupations. No doubt, the scheme must embrace the workers in the coal mines. It is but necessary for the simple reason that miners are subjected to bad diseases like pneumoconiosis and silicosis. There are other mines where these dreadful diseases are prevalent, but no effort has been made to introduce the scheme in these mines. What is the reason? Why have not the mica, manganese and gold mines been

brought under the scope of this Act? There are the plantations where workers are subjected to virulent misfortunes, where workers do not have the wherewithal for the future. The Ministry should have brought tea and coffee plantations within the orbit of the scheme.

An Hon. Member: Cardamom.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Another major industry, the inclusion of which in the scope of this scheme should be considered, is the sugar industry. No delay should be brooked and I hope that my suggestion to extend the application of the scheme to these industries will receive the earnest consideration of the Ministry.

I will now go to the next important activity of the Labour Ministry, the Employees' State Insurance scheme, which again was brought into force in 1948. The scheme was expected to cover 2½ million people. But has it covered? No. According to the report.....

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Is he refreshing his memory like this?

Mr. Chairman: When he says so, it should be taken that he is doing so.

Shri B. S. Murthy: According to the report supplied by the Government, only 8 per cent. of the total insurable labour have been covered. Is it fair, is it justice to neglect such a nation-building activity like this? In all these six years, the Ministry was able to introduce this scheme in Delhi, Kanpur and in several industrial areas of Punjab. The country cannot but administer the severest condemnation for this slow and sluggish progress so far made in this direction.

In conclusion.....

Mr. Chairman: The time is over.

Shri B. S. Murthy: In conclusion...

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The time is over. The hon. Member has taken 13 minutes. Time has to be

[Mr. Chairman]

given to other Members. If he has got anything very important on which he cannot but speak, I can allow one or two minutes more.

Shri B. S. Murthy: One minute more, Sir.

Please permit me to refer to the remissness of the Labour Ministry in improving the economic lot of the agricultural labourers who form the vast majority in the land. The agricultural population in the country, according to the latest census, is 249 million, i.e. 69·8 per cent. What has the Ministry done to help these helpless and hapless tillers of the soil whose sweat is converted into delicious food for our nation? They form the backbone of the country. They provide us with food but they starve. They exert to keep us in comfort, but they undergo untold privations. I am sure that all the Members of this House will bear testimony with me that the agricultural labourers live in squalor and misery without proper food, raiment and shelter.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): Before I proceed to deal with this subject, I would like to correct one or two errors which my friend, Mr. Murthy has committed in the course of his speech. He charged the Labour Minister with having yielded to the pressure of perhaps—he said—capitalists.....

An Hon. Member: Certainly.

Shri Venkataraman: The Labour Minister gave out the theory of collective bargaining as against reference to adjudication and my friend, Mr. Murthy does not know.....

Shri V. P. Nayar: Let the Minister defend himself.

Shri Venkataraman: The Labour Minister started propounding the theory..... (*Interruption*). If before they begin to object, they do not learn well, they can have their opinions always to themselves. They know that I am going to charge them with a breach of what they profess

to be the guiding principle on which they stood; it is because of that that they are objecting to it before I state it.

Shri Bansal: Why don't they have patience?

Shri Venkataraman: In the Naini Tal Conference where the representatives of labour were gathered, there were representatives of the Indian National Trade Union Congress,—a blighted organisation according to them,—there were representatives of the Hind Mazdoor Sabha, another organisation of the Socialist Party, a tolerable organisation according to them, and then there was the All-India Trade Union Congress represented by no less a champion than Dange himself. At that Conference, when the Labour Minister said that he had faith in collective bargaining, that he had no faith in adjudication and that the system of compulsory adjudication which was introduced in the Industrial Disputes Act of 1948 was not suited to the progress of labour organisations in the country, one after another, the representatives of these major organisations got up and said that they wanted a system of compulsory arbitration for settlement of their disputes—including Mr. Dange, the accredited representative of the All-India Trade Union Congress. Sometime before, when we were doing propoganda on behalf of compulsory arbitration as one of the methods of deciding or settling disputes, the All-India Trade Union Congress protested very vehemently and said that the Bill which was introduced by the hon. Shri Jagjivan Ram was a 'black' Bill. They carried on a tearing propoganda against that Bill and on many occasions I was asked questions by my friends sitting opposite outside in several trade union meetings. But it is the very same persons who came to the Naini Tal Conference and pleaded,—in fact, they were strong and vociferous,—for the retention of adjudication as a method of settlement of disputes, than the

Indian National Trade Union Congress itself. Therefore, I would say that it is because of the pressure of labour organisations that this Ministry has yielded to the continuance of arbitration as a method of settlement of disputes, and not because of the pressure of capitalists. In fact, I would not be giving away a secret if I say that the employers were not very eager about having compulsory adjudication. If anything, the employers' opinion in the country is today not in favour of having reference to adjudication. It is the labour organisations that are anxious to have this reference to adjudication because they have been considering that as an instrument, as a method, for the solution of their problems.

Then, Sir, I find that the Labour Minister's term of office for these two years is one of masterly inactivity.

An Hon. Member: Very good.

Shri Venkataraman: There has not been that amount of legislation which was promised to the people of this country. I am afraid we cannot see the Labour Relations Bill which was promised to the country immediately after the present Labour Minister took office. There is no chance of its being introduced. Even if it is introduced, I am afraid the system of our legislation is so dilatory, the system which has been adopted by the Labour Ministry is so roundabout, that it may not be passed within the life of this Parliament. Once the Bill is introduced, there is discussion in this House and then it is referred to the Select Committee and at the Select Committee stage, organisations of employers and employees want to lead oral evidence. Once oral evidence is allowed to be led, it takes a lot of time before the Select Committee is able to report back. After the Select Committee reports, it again takes a lot of time before it can be passed into law. We have an additional Chamber sitting on the other side of

35 P.S.D.

this building and it will also take some time. Therefore, I am not hopeful that this Bill will be passed.

Meanwhile, there are a few urgent problems to which I would like to draw the attention of the Ministry. One is, there is considerable confusion with regard to the definition of 'workmen'. A number of people who are ordinarily earning their wages and who are normally covered by the term 'workmen' are excluded by the interpretation placed upon the word 'workmen' by the Appellate Tribunal. Many people who are in the skilled category and supervisory staff, foremen and people who are doing intellectual work have been excluded from the benefit of this Act. It is a question of fact in each case, whether a person is or is not governed by the definition of 'workmen'. This has caused such an amount of uncertainty that there is considerable confusion in the country and people have to take the decision of the Tribunal before they can say whether he is a workman or not. Therefore, I would appeal to the Labour Minister, whether he brings in the Labour Relations Bill or not—I am willing to give it up as lost—to immediately bring forward a few amendments which are absolutely necessary to prevent this confusion continuing forever.

When there was a discussion in this House with regard to the working journalists, the Labour Minister said that he had asked the Press Commission to make an interim report. But, we have read in the papers that the Press Commission have refused to send an interim report. I ask, is the Ministry or the Press Commission the superior body? If the Government thought that it is a matter which requires immediate rectification, why should they wait for the Press Commission's report, which they refused to send? The Government ought to go ahead with what they believe should be done about the working journalists. I am not

[Shri Venkataraman]

concerned with the working journalists only; I am concerned with every person who comes within the definition of supervisory, skilled and intellectual staff. Unless the definition is changed these people would be excluded from the benefits of the Act and, to this extent, discontent among the lower middle classes would go on increasing. It is not very difficult, either, to introduce the amendment. In the Labour Relations Bill, as reported by the Select Committee in the Provisional Parliament, we have defined the word 'employee' and the definition can be immediately taken bodily and introduced in this House.

The second point on which I would like the provision to be clarified is with regard to "labour disputes". Even now, people are agitating before the Labour Tribunals and Appellate Tribunals, and they are taking it also to the High Courts, whether a dispute is an individual dispute or an industrial dispute. Suppose there is a trade dispute with regard to the discharge or dismissal of a workman. The management always takes the plea that this is not an industrial dispute but only an individual dispute, and an industrial dispute is one in which a large number of people are involved. All arguments are advanced and ultimately it is not possible for either the Government or the workmen or even the employers to know whether it is a dispute in which they should go through the process of conciliation, mediation, settlement or arbitration or not. Nothing is more irksome than uncertain law. Even let us have a bad law, but let us know where we stand. An uncertain law is the most irksome thing and it is one of the things which add to friction in the industrial relationship.

The third thing is one which relates to the unilateral changes made by the employers in the employer-employee relationship. There are standing orders which have been agreed upon between the parties and

have been registered with the Registrar or the Labour Commissioner. If any party wants to make a change in the existing standing order, he should not have the right to change it unilaterally without the consent of the other party. It is just because the employers are making changes in the standing orders, in the conditions of employment, from time to time, that a large number of industrial disputes are arising in this country. In Bombay, there is the Bombay Labour Relations Act. There they have provided that no change in the standing orders and no change in the existing conditions of employment can be made without 15 days' notice of the change being given to the workers and the matter either settled or taken to the Labour Court. This is a very vital change which ought to be made in our Industrial Disputes Act. If this is done it will go a long way to smoothen the relationship between the parties.

The next thing I would refer to is the Labour Appellate Tribunal. Even at the time when the Appellate Tribunals Act was brought before this House, I contended that this arbitration or adjudication is not a civil or judicial procedure of the kind in a criminal or a civil court. It is an attempt on the part of the parties to come together through the mediation of a person whose decision may be come final. In fact, Ludwick Teller in his explanation of arbitration as distinguished from what a judicial trial or proceeding is, has made this point very clear and he says that the essence of an adjudication proceeding or an arbitration proceeding consists in this that the parties continue to negotiate and conciliate even before a Tribunal whose decision may become final or may not become final according to the laws of the country. Therefore, if you want that this arbitration should be done in the spirit in which we intended it should be done, an appeal against that order is always an invitation for people to

become litigious and carry the matter from court to court. Industrial labour in this country,—and I won't be wrong in saying that the employers also to some extent,—are willing for its abolition. There is no other item of the industrial relationship in India today on which there is greater unanimity of opinion among the several sections of the people than on the question of the abolition of the Labour Appellate Tribunals and we would urge that this should be abolished as early as possible. Until it is abolished, there is considerable difficulty for the people in the South, Madras, Travancore-Cochin, Mysore and Hyderabad because the Appellate Tribunal having jurisdiction over these areas is located in Lucknow and even for small matters these people have got to come to Lucknow at considerable expense and difficulty. I would appeal to the Labour Minister to locate this Tribunal either at Bangalore or Hyderabad or Madras so that the parties may not be put to unnecessary inconvenience and worry.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—West cum Rae Bareilly Distt.—East): Lucknow is a very fine place.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah (Golaghat-Jorhat): May I enquire whether the discussion is sought to be brought to a close?

Mr. Chairman: What is the question?

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): He wanted to know whether the discussion has come to a close.

Mr. Chairman: No.

Shri Abdus Sattar (Kalna-Katwa): Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to bring certain facts prevalent in the Collieries of West Bengal. In this year many pieces of legislation for the benefit of the labourers have been passed, many welfare measures have been introduced, but I am sorry to say that the condition of the coal mine workers has not improved. Coal fields are in my district

and I have the opportunity to come across many labourers and they have approached me for getting things which they do not have. Let alone other things. They do not get even drinking water. The labour quarters which are popularly known as *dha-wras* are not fit for human occupation. I have seen them with my own eyes; they are fit for cattle to live in. The housing schemes have not been implemented. I am ashamed to say that the Indian mine owners are more callous of labour welfare. I have seen European-owned collieries. They are more mindful of the welfare of labour. There are houses according to the scheme, there are pithead baths, creches and canteens. But, I am sorry to say that our Indian owners are unmindful of labour interests. Mr. Tripathi, the I.N.T.U.C. Secretary said uniformity is necessary for the welfare of the workers.

I request my hon. friend to be mindful and bring about the unity in I.N.T.U.C. ranks. In the coalfields of Asansol, I.N.T.U.C. is divided into four parts and even the owners are perplexed because they want one strong union. I request the I.N.T.U.C. leaders to be mindful to bring about union in their ranks. Nobody will deny that a strong union is necessary to see that labour measures are implemented. There are multi-purpose institutions for education and for recreation of the labourers. The officers of the Labour Welfare department say that they find no labour leaders to encourage the labourers to take benefit of these institutions though there are so many unions. I once again request Shri Tripathi to be mindful to the affairs. Burnpur affairs have already been referred to. I am not going to say here how the strike came in, how it was ended and whether it could have been avoided, but I would like to bring the fact to the notice of the Minister and the Deputy Minister who were there the other day that some 300 men have been thrown out of employment as a result of the strike. Government are trying to solve the unemployment problem and

[Shri Abdus Sattar]

they are making schemes to give employment to the unemployed and so it is a matter of pity that about 300 persons have been thrown out of employment, by the management causing great hardship to their families.

There is an institution in the coal-fields which is known as Mines' Board of Health, which is meant to see to the sanitation, health, etc., of the labourers but it has, in fact, got no labour representation. The District Magistrate is the Chairman of the Board and in his absence, the Vice-Chairman presides who is an owner. This is an owners' institution. I have already referred to the housing question—about *dhawras*. The labour welfare officers told me that they were helpless and whenever they brought the housing questions to the colliery owners, they produced certificates from the various inspectors belonging to the Board of Health to the effect that the houses are quite fit. These Boards are under the State Governments, and I think the time has come when these should be brought under the Central Government and there must be co-ordination between the Labour Welfare Department and the Board of Health. With these words I support the Grants.

Mr. Chairman: I now call upon the hon. Deputy Minister of Labour, Shri Abid Ali.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: The hon. Deputy-Speaker was pleased to say that the Minister and the Deputy Minister would be given an hour and fifteen minutes between them both.

Mr. Chairman: What is the objection of the hon. Member to the Deputy Minister being given a chance to speak? Does he say that the Deputy Minister should not be asked to speak?

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: I only wished to know whether I would be given a chance to speak on the important subject, tea labour.

Mr. Chairman: It is very difficult for me to say whether a particular Member would get a chance. If this is the question that every Member is going to put, the Chair is bound to feel embarrassed in informing every member whether he will get a chance or not.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: We want to know whether we will get a chance. I have no quarrel if you say that I will not get a chance.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member will himself realise the difficulty of the Chair and I am sorry I am unable to answer his question.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: I see the difficulty of the Chair. But in a discussion on the Demands on Labour, I like to get a chance to speak as no one has presented the case of a million of sweated labourers that are employed in the tea industry. If it is your choice that case of tea labour should go unrepresented I will sit tight.

Mr. Chairman: The number of intending speakers is so large that I am unable to promise any hon. Member that he will get a chance.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: I am sure that the Chair will regulate the debate so that the various interests are represented.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. It may be that the hon. Member may not get a chance and somebody else may get a chance.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: But he may not represent the interests of the tea industry. Let some one speak on tea labour, I am not keen that I myself should be speaking.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I do not want to enter into a discussion, with the hon. Member. I call upon the Deputy Minister to speak.

श्री उमचंड़ी (श्री आबिद अली) :
माननीय चेयरमैन साहब, सब से पहले में यह बिक्र करना चाहता हूँ कि जब आज डिबेट हो रही थी तो मुझे उस में एक कमी

महसूस हो रही थी और वह थी श्री हरिहर नाथ शास्त्री जी की। पिछले साल की बहस से आज तक जो चीजें हुई हैं उनमें शास्त्री जी का अवसान हिन्दुस्तान के सब लोगों के लिए एक बड़ा नुकसान है और मजदूरों को तो इस बजह से बड़ी मुसीबत का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। मुझे इस बहस के मौके पर उन की याद आ रही थी। अगर शास्त्री जी होते तो वह इस बात का भी जिक्र करते कि इस जिनम में क्या क्या अच्छे काम हुए हैं और इस से अच्छा काम किस तरीके से हो सकता था। इस डिबेट में इस की ख़ास कमी रह गई है।

यह जरूर है कि हम इस बात का दावा नहीं करते कि जितना सब कुछ होना चाहिये था वह हो गया, लेकिन हम यह जरूर समझते हैं, मानते हैं और उम्मीद करते हैं कि हर इन्साफ पसन्द इन्सान इस बात को मानेगा कि जितना हो सकता था उतना जरूर हुआ है। यह जरूरी है कि जितना हासिल होना चाहिए उस सब कुछ को हासिल करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये लेकिन हम को यह भी देखना पड़ता है कि जिन परिस्थितियों से हम गुजर रहे हैं वे उस सब कुछ के हासिल करने के लिए कहां तक अनुकूल हैं। तो हर काम को इस लिहाज़ से देखना चाहिये कि इस से बेहतर हो सकता था या नहीं। जैसा कि मैं अभी अर्ज कर चुका हूँ मेरा ख्याल है हर एक इन्साफ पसन्द विभाग इस बात का ऐतराफ करेगा।

यहां पर जो बंगाल के ऑनरेबिल मेम्बर साहब बोले और उन्होंने ने बर्नपुर के बारे में कुछ चीजें ख़ास तौर पर फरमायीं और कुछ दूसरी चीजें फरमायीं। इस का थोड़ा सा हवाला त्रिपाठी साहब ने दिया। जहां तक गवर्नमेंट का ताल्लुक है, चाहे वह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट हो या स्टेट गवर्नमेंट हो,

वह मजदूरों के ट्रेड यूनियन के हक में कभी भी दखलअन्दाज़ी नहीं करना चाहती और न करेगी। लेकिन दिक्कत उस वक़्त होती है जब लोग ट्रेड यूनियन के नाम से दूसरी चीजें करने लगते हैं उस वक़्त दखलअन्दाज़ी करनी पड़ती है। अब इस में चाहे वह वर्कर हो, चाहे एम० पी० हो, चाहे मिनिस्टर हो, चाहे पुलिस हो, किसी को यह हक़ नहीं है कि वह दूसरे के जायज़ अमल में दखल दे सके। अगर मैं भी जा कर किसी को मारूँ तो पुलिस को मुझे जरूर पकड़ना चाहिये। उस वक़्त में मिनिस्टर नहीं हूँ बल्कि नाजायज़ काम करने वाला एक शहरी हूँ, एक बुरा शहरी हूँ। तब यहां पर इस चीज़ का ऐतराफ़ करना कि बर्नपुर में पुलिस ने क्या किया, कोल माइन्स में क्या किया या हैदराबाद बगैरह में क्या किया, सही नहीं है। पुलिस ने कभी भी ट्रेड यूनियन के काम में दखलअन्दाज़ी नहीं की और न वह कर सकती है। लेकिन जैसा कि मैं अर्ज कर चुका हूँ अगर कोई नाजायज़ काम करेगा तो उस में जरूर पुलिस की दखलअन्दाज़ी होगी। इस बारे में अगर किसी के दिमाग में सन्देह हो तो उस को निकाल देना चाहिये।

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao rose—

Chairman: The hon. Deputy Minister is not giving way.

Shri Abid Ali: The hon. Member may not agree with me.

यह भी गलत काम है जोकि मेम्बर साहब कर रहे हैं। जिस तरह से वह मेरी बात में दखलअन्दाज़ी कर रहे हैं इन्ही तरह वह और जगह भी करते हैं और जिस तरह से कि चेयरमैन साहब इस दखलअन्दाज़ी को नहीं करने देंगे उसी तरह पुलिस गैर कानूनी दखलअन्दाज़ी को नहीं होने देती है।

श्री मेरी अर्ज यह थी कि अभी एक मेम्बर साहब ने कहा कि टैंक्सटाइल मिलों

[श्री आबिद अली]

में ८० पर सेंट लेबर रिट्रेंच हो जायगा। यह बात बंगाल के मेम्बर साहब ने फरमायी थी। मुझे नहीं मालूम कि उन को यह खबर कहां से मिली है। जहां तक मेरा ताल्लुक है और जहां तक वाक्यात का ताल्लुक है मैं उन से अर्ज करूँ कि यह बिल्कुल गलत चीज है और उन की जितनी मालूमात है वह गलत ही रहा करती है। यह हज़ारात जो यहां पर बोले हैं जो चीजें वह फरमा रहे थे मैं उन को गौर से सुन रहा था। उन की बातें सुन कर मेरा यह ख्याल हुआ कि इन हज़ारात की एक मुश्किल यह है कि वह ट्रेडयूनियनिस्ट नहीं हैं।

ट्रेड यूनियन, ट्रेड यूनियन का काम और मजदूर उन से बहुत दूर है। यह तो पोलिटीशियन्स हैं। जिस तरीक़े से वह चीजें पेश कर रहे थे और जो चीजें पेश कर रहे थे, मैं जानना चाहता था कि हमारी मिनिस्ट्री की कुछ गलतियाँ या कुछ कमियाँ जो वह जानते हों उन को वह बतावें जिस से हम उन को बेहतर कर सकें। मैं इस बारे में उन से जानना चाहता था। मैं ईमानदारी से उन्हें यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैं ने उन से जानने की कोशिश की, लेकिन जान नहीं सका, सब कोशिश बेकार रही। उन के साथ मुश्किल यही है कि जब वह खड़े होते हैं तो अप्रैशन, सप्रैशन, यह सब चीजें वह कह जाया करते हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि कुछ वाक्यात वह हमें बतायें। हम ईमानदारी से उन्हें यकीन दिलाना चाहते हैं कि हमारी मंशा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के मजदूर मजबूत हों। हम चाहते हैं कि उन के ट्रेड यूनियन के हक़ उन को हासिल हों। हम चाहते हैं कि वे तरक्की करें और उस में किसी क्रिस्म की रुकावट आ नहीं सकती, उन के बीच में कोई रोक नहीं आ सकती, यह हमारे उसूल हैं।

एक मेम्बर साहब ने पूछा कि वेलफेयर स्टेट कहते हैं, लेकिन किस की वेलफेयर स्टेट? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वेलफेयर स्टेट स्टेट वालों की और स्टेट के मतलब हैं प्रजा और खास कर यहां के वर्कर। उस में सब वर्कर आ जाते हैं, चाहे इंडस्ट्रियल वर्कर हों, चाहे खेती का काम करते हों, चाहे दफ्तर में काम करते हों, या मिल में काम करते हों, या किसी कारखाने में काम करते हों, सब वर्कर हैं और सब के लिये वेलफेयर स्टेट होनी चाहिये। हमें बड़ी खुशी है कि हम अपने इस गोल की तरफ़, इस रास्ते की तरफ़ जा रहे हैं और काफ़ी तेज़ी के साथ जा रहे हैं।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह (हज़ारीबाग़ पश्चिम) : शक।

श्री आबिद अली : हां, आप कह लें, लेकिन शक नहीं है, इन भाइयों के लिये अफ़सोस है। मुसीबत यह है कि यह तो वर्कर्स का फायदा चाहते ही नहीं हैं। अगर अनाज का भाव कम होता है तो वह कहते हैं अब क्या किया जाय, अनाज ज्यादा हो गया, अनाज के खेत को जलाया जाय जिस से अनाज कम हो। वह तो इस तरह की चीज चाहते ही नहीं हैं। हम भी इस को जानते हैं। लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान के किसान, हिन्दुस्तान के मजदूर, हिन्दुस्तान के शहरी, इन बातों को समझ चुके हैं और मुझे उम्मीद है कि आहिस्ता आहिस्ता यह नामुनासिब चीज, अनुचित चीजें जोकि हो रही हैं, वह कम होती जायेंगी और कम हो भी रही हैं।

एक साहब ने कहा कि गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लॉईज जो हैं कहीं कोई ऐसी चीज है ही नहीं कि जिस के अनुसार उन की बातों पर विचार किया जाय। मालूम नहीं, यह कैसे कह दिया गया। जहां तक कि रेलवे एम्प्लॉईज का सवाल है, शायद उन को मालूम नहीं है।

क्योंकि उन का इन बातों से ताल्लुक नहीं है, रेलवे एम्पलाईज के लिये पूरी मैशीनरी मौजूद है। दूसरे भी जो इंडस्ट्रियल वर्कर्स हैं, गवर्नमेंट के इंडस्ट्रियल कनसर्न में एम्पलाईज हैं, उन के लिये भी कनसीलिएशन, मैशीनरी मौजूद है और एडजुडिकेशन का फायदा उन को मिलता है।

हमारे अन-आर्गनाइज्ड लेबर के बारे में मिनिमम वेजेज के लिये एक भाई ने फरमाया। तो मिनिमम वेजेज ऐक्ट तो उन्हीं के लिये बनाया गया था कि जो आर्गनाइज्ड नहीं हैं और जो कमजोर हैं। उन्हीं ने यह भी फरमाया कि साथ साथ म्यूनिसिपैलिटीज के मजदूरों का जहां तक ताल्लुक है उन के लिये कहीं किसी किसम की मदद की कोई गुंजायश नहीं है। लेकिन मिनिमम वेजेज ऐक्ट उन के लिये भी है और वे उस में शामिल हैं, लोकल बाडीज वगैरह।

एक माननीय सबरस्य : नहीं हो रहा है।

श्री आबिद अली : एक हद तक हो रहा है। जो नहीं हो रहा है वह होना चाहिये और किया जायगा। साथ ही यह भी बात है कि कई जगह म्यूनिसिपैलिटी के वर्कर्स की यूनियन हैं और उन को एडजुडिकेशन भी मिला है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हर जगह हर चीज हो रही है। मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि कई जगह हो रही है और इस से भी बेहतर हो सकती है और करना चाहिये। मैं यह भी कह रहा था कि वर्कर्स की यूनियन भी अच्छी होनी चाहियें और जितना हो सके सब को मिल कर यूनियन को अच्छा बनाने के लिये मजबूत करना चाहिये और तरक्की की तरफ जाना चाहिये। तरक्की का दरवाजा कभी बन्द नहीं होता और उस पर कभी फुल स्टाप नहीं होता। जैसे जैसे आदमी बढ़ते जाते हैं वैसे वैसे ही तरक्की की जरूरत भी बढ़ती जाती है और बढ़ना चाहिये।

मैं अब साथ ही साथ कुछ कट मोशनस के बारे में अर्ज कर दूँ। पहले तो मिनिमम वेजेज ऐक्ट के बारे में आप सब को मालूम है कि काफी किया गया है जैसा कि मैं अभी अर्ज कर रहा था। अब जो हमारी कानफ्रेंस मंसूर में हुई थी उस में एक राय से फैसला हुआ है। उस में हमारे कम्पनिस्ट भाइयों के नुमायन्दे भी थे, उस में यूनाइटेड ट्रेड कांग्रेस के भी नुमायन्दे थे और हिन्द मजदूर सभा के नुमायन्दे भी थे, और आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० के नुमायन्दे तो होने ही चाहियें। तो वहां पर एक राय से जो बात पास हुई थी उस पर अमल किया जा रहा है। बम्बई में एक कानफ्रेंस होना निश्चित हो चुका है और यह काम किस तरह आगे बढ़ाया, जाये यह सब बातें उस में निश्चित होंगी।

एक बात यहां पर यह थी कि "फेल्योर टु स्टाप रिट्रेंचमेंट" के बारे में मेरे भाइयों में से किसी ने भी जिक्र नहीं किया। बंगाल के एक भाई ने फरमाया कि हम कैपिटैलिस्टों के असर में हैं। मैं पूछता हूँ कि पिछली दफा हम ने इंडस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट्स ऐक्ट के अमेंडमेंट ऐक्ट में ले आफ और रिट्रेंचमेंट के बारे में जो प्राबीजन किया तो क्या यह कैपिटैलिस्टों के लिये था। इस म इस तरह से देखिये कि जैसे एक ट्रेन दिल्ली से निकल कर गाजियाबाद की तरफ जा रही है या मथुरा की तरफ जा रही है तो वह बिल्कुल एक दूसरे से अलग रास्ते को बदल जाती है। तो लेबर मिनिस्ट्री और गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की पालिसी को देखना है तो यह उस की कसौटी है कि आप देखें कि हम किस तरफ चल रहे हैं। एम्पलायर के असर में चल रहे हैं या इनसाफ की तरफ चल रहे हैं हम ने जो पालिसी अस्तित्थार की उस ने इस रिट्रेंचमेंट को बहुत रोका है। हिन्दुस्तान में केवल अहमदाबाद म ही नहीं, टैक्सटाइल में ही नहीं, बल्कि हर

[श्री आबिद अली]

जगह जो एक रिट्रेंचमेंट की हवा चली थी, इस पालिसी ने उस को रोका है और इस पालिसी ने आप को बता दिया कि हमारे ऊपर किस का असर है और हम किस तरफ जाना चाहते हैं। इस पर अब मैं ज्यादा कहने की गुंजायश नहीं समझता हूँ।

जहां तक ट्रेड यूनियन्स का सवाल है यह कहा गया है कि जो भी ट्रेड यूनियन हो उस को रिकॉग्निशन का आटोमैटिक हक होना चाहिये। अब ख्याल कीजिये कि एक कारखाने में जहां ७०० काम करने वाले हों, अगर इस को माना जाय और ट्रेड यूनियन ऐक्ट के लिहाज से सात वर्कर्स एक ट्रेड यूनियन बना सकते हैं, तो वहां पर सौ यूनियन इस तरह से होंगे। अगर सौ यूनियन रिकॉग्नाइज कर ली जायेंगी तो कौसे काम चलेगा और कौन कब किस क्रिस्म का व्यवहार कर सकेगा, यह बात जरा समझ में कम से कम मेरे तो नहीं आती है। यह चीज वर्कर्स और मजदूरों के हित के बिल्कुल खिलाफ है। और जो रिकॉग्निशन वगैरह की बातें हैं वे जो ऐक्ट आने वाला है उस में आबेगी। मगर यह कभी नहीं होगा कि हर एक यूनियन जो रजिस्टर्ड हो उस को यह हक मिले। यह कभी नहीं होगा और न होना चाहिये।

एडजुडिकेशन के बारे में जहां पर नबी-बुर्ग की बात कही गई है उस में मैं भाई केशवगंगार साहब से कहना चाहता था कि इन गोल्ड माइन्स में हम ने यह कोशिश की कि वर्कर्स की डिमांड्स के लिये एम्पलायर्स के साथ बैठ कर समझौते तक पहुंचा दिया जाय। काफ़ी कामयाबी भी इस में हुई। एक मर्तबा एम्पलायर्स ने उन की डिमांड्स नामंजूर की तो मुश्किल थी। सोच रहे थे, क्या किया जाय। फिर हमारे चीफ़ लेबर कमिश्नर साहब ने बहुत कोशिश कर के एम्पलायर्स से मंजूरी ली। उन को राजी कर लिया कि वे

डिमांड्स को मान लें। तो यूनियन ने, जो बद-क्रिस्मती से उस तरफ़ वालों के असर में है, उस से इनकार कर दिया। अब मुश्किल यह होती है कि एडजुडिकेशन देने में कभी कभी देर हो जाती है, यह मैं मानता हूँ। लेकिन यह न समझा जाय कि सिर्फ़ देर करने के लिये देर होती है। बात यह होती है कि जब डिमांड आती है तो कनसीलियेशन की कोशिश की जाती है। फिर कुछ एडजुडिकेशन इसलिये भी नहीं हो पाते कि लेबर के मामलात में कुछ उसूल जो कायम किये गये हैं, उन को हर रोज़ बदला नहीं जाता।

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I only ask him to refer to the statement of the Chief Minister of Mysore regarding the Kolar Gold fields.

6 P.M.

बहुत अच्छा स्टेटमेंट है। जो उन्होंने ने कहा वह सच है, उस से कौन इन्कार कर सकता है। मेरा तो यह कहना था कि जब गलत डिमांड्स आती हैं जो नामुनासिब होती हैं और जोकि कोई कोर्ट उन को नहीं देगी, तो ऐसी हालत में एडजुडिकेशन देने का कोई मतलब नहीं रहता है। सिर्फ़ एडजुडिकेशन देना और वर्कर्स को हँसान करना, गलत मसदा करना यह एडजुडिकेशन का मतलब नहीं रहता है, इस तरह के एडजुडिकेशन नहीं दिये जाते हैं, लेकिन जो देने चाहिये वह दिये जाते हैं और वह जरूर दिये जायेंगे : इस में देर हो जाती है, उस के लिये हम कोशिश करते हैं कि हम इस में कम से कम वक्त लेवें और ज़दी से जल्दी उस का फ़ैसला कर दें। एक भाई ने फ़रमाया कि एडजुडिकेशन वर्कर्स पर लादा जाता है लेकिन मुझे खुशी होगी अगर मेरे वह भाई आज नहीं कभी भी, दो चार महीने के अन्दर बतलायें कि हम ने पिछले दो साल में एक एडजुडिकेशन भी बगैर वर्कर्स के मांगे हुए

दिया हो या एम्प्लायर्स के केवल कहने से दिया हो, या तो एम्प्लायर और वर्कर इन दोनों ने दरखास्त दी है या वर्कर्स ने उस को मांगा है, वर्कर्स के बगैर मांगे जहां तक मुझे याद पड़ता है हम ने एक भी एडजुडिकेशन नहीं दिया, मैं ने बहुत कोशिश की कोई ऐसा एडजुडिकेशन मिल जाय जिसे मजदूरों ने डिमांड न किया हो, लेकिन मुझे नहीं मिल सका। यह भी कहा गया है कि वर्कर्स पर अत्याचार किया जाता है। हमारी तरफ से अभी तक इंडस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट्स एक्ट के मातहत हालांकि बहुत सी इललीगल स्ट्राइक्स हुई हैं, लेकिन हम ने एक भी मामले में वर्कर्स को प्रासिक्यूट नहीं किया है।

वह कहते हैं कि हम को छोड़ दो, तो हम पकड़ते कब हैं। असल में बात यह होती है कि स्ट्राइक पर चले जाते हैं और एक गलत तरीके से वहां पर स्ट्राइक चलती है, फिर कहते हैं कि देखो स्ट्राइक चल रही है, गवर्नमेंट कुछ करती नहीं। अगर एडजुडिकेशन की जरूरत नहीं है तो वर्कर्स की खुशी उस में हम पर कोई एतराज करने का मौका नहीं आता है।

जनाब, मैं नंदीदुर्ग का जिक्र कर रहा था, हमारे चीफ लेबर कमिश्नर की वह शर्मीद थी कि इस मामले की वह वर्कर्स और इम्प्लायर के बीच में समझौता करके हल कर देंगे, लेकिन बदकिस्मती से वही ज़िद जिस में कि ट्रेड यूनियनिज्म कम और पार्लिटिक्स ज्यादा है, वर्कर्स का फ़ायदा कम और एक्सप्लायटेशन ज्यादा है उस ने इस समझौते को नहीं होने दिया। नंदीदुर्ग के मामले में एक यूनियन ने एडजुडिकेशन मांगा, हम उसे कल ही दे चुके हैं, एडजुडिकेशन मंजूर हो चुका है।

दूसरी यूनियन एडजुडिकेशन नहीं चाहती और यूनियन ने स्ट्राइक का बेलट लिया

हैं मैं ऐलान करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वह उन सवालों पर जिन पर हम दूसरी यूनियन को एडजुडिकेशन दे चुके हैं अगर वह भी हमसे एडजुडिकेशन मांगे तो हम फीरन उस को एडजुडिकेशन देने के लिये तयार हैं, इसका मैं आपको यकीन दिलाता हूँ।

आई० एल० ओ० के बारे में जो रिकमेंडेशन्स और कनवेंशंस का जिक्र यहां पर किया गया है मैं खुद पिछले साल आई० एल० ओ० की रिकमेंडेशन और इनवेस्टिगेशन की कमेटी का चेयरमैन था। हिन्दुस्तान की जगह वहां बहुत उंची थी जब दूसरे मुस्कों से इस की तुलना की गई कि हिन्दुस्तान में यह रिकमेंडेशन्स और कनवेंशन्स कितने माने गये हैं। हमारे यहां दूसरे जो भी कनवेंशन्स रेटिफ़ाई नहीं हुए हैं, उन से यह नहीं समझना चाहिये कि उन कनवेंशन्स के मुतालिक कोई काम नहीं हो रहा है। जहां तक अपने हालात को देखते हुए संभव था, उतने अपना लिये गये हैं। इस के अलावा मैसूर में जो कांफ़ेंस हुई थी वहां एक कमेटी बनाई गई थी जोकि जांच करेगी कि जो कनवेंशन्स रेटिफ़ाई नहीं किये गये हैं, उन में से कितनी चीजें हम एडाप्ट कर सकते हैं और उन पर अमल कर सकते हैं और वह कमेटी बहुत जल्दी मिलेगी और वह हमेशा मिला करेगी ताकि यह मालूम हो कि उन में से कितनी रिकमेंडेशन्स और कनवेंशन्स पर अमल किया जा सकता है और कितनों को पूरा रेटिफ़ाई नहीं करना चाहिये। विष्कृत यह है कि पूरा उस पर अमल न हो सके तो रेटिफ़ाई नहीं कर सकते।

हमारे भाई श्री केशवयंगर ने कहा कि एडवाइजंस कम कर दिय गये हैं, पहले एडवाइजंस ज्यादा भेजे जाते थे। उस की वजह यह थी कि पहले सबजेक्ट्स ज्यादा

[श्री आबिद अली]

हुआ करते थे। अब काफ़ी काम हो चुका है। आई० एल० ओ० की भी नीति ज़रा बदल गई है और वह चाहते हैं कि काफ़ी रेकमेंडेशन्स और कनवेंशन्स बन चुके हैं, अब उन पर अमल होना चाहिये। अब चूँकि आई० एल० ओ० के जो खास बड़े बड़े काम थे, उन कामों को पूरा कर दिया गया है और चूँकि अब काम का तरीक़ा बदल गया है इसलिये अजन्डे पर सबजेक्ट्स भी उतने नहीं आते हैं जितने पहले आया करते थे, इसलिये ज्यादा ऐडवाइज़र्स भेजने की ज़रूरत नहीं है। और हम ज्यादा भेजते नहीं लेकिन अब भी अगर उस की ज़रूरत होगी तो उस पर शौर किया जा सकता है।

जहाँ तक औकूपेशनल डिज़ीज़ का ताल्लुक है, उस के बारे में रिपोर्ट में काफ़ी तज़बीज़ पेश की गई है और मेरा यह ख्याल है कि उस में काफ़ी काम हो रहा है, ज्यादा काम करने की गुंजाइश है, यह मैं मानता हूँ, जहाँ तक Productivity studies without improving the conditions का ताल्लुक है, हमें इस का एतराफ़ है और हम इस को मानते हैं कि वर्किंग कंडीशन्स की तरफ़ भी ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये और उस को बेहतर करना चाहिये, साथ ही साथ प्रोडक्टिविटी भी बढ़ाना चाहिये और मैं मेम्बर्स को यक़ीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उस के लिये कोशिश बराबर जारी है।

घनबाद अस्पताल के बारे में जो ज़िक्र किया गया है, उस के बारे में तहकीक़ात हुई, दो केसेज़ घनबाद के हमारे सामने आये थे, दोनों में तहकीक़ात की गई। इस में एक नर्स की ग़लती मालूम हुई, आख़िर नर्स भी तो बर्कर है, यह कहाँ तक ठीक है कि चूँकि उस ने मामूली ग़लती की इसलिये

उस को फ़ौरन निकाल दिया जाय ? उस की एक सख्त वार्निंग दी गई जिस का उस पर अच्छा असर पड़ा और दूसरे वर्कर्स और नर्सों और स्टाफ़ पर भी अच्छा असर पड़ा। ऐसी शिकायतें आनी नहीं चाहियें, यह हम भी मानते हैं और मैं अर्ज़ करूंगा कि कभी भी इस क्रिस्म की नामुनासिब कार्रवाई कहीं भी होवे, मेम्बर साहबान बिना किसी संकोच के ये चीज़ें हमें बतायें और मैं उन को यक़ीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हम बराबर सख्ती से उस में ज़रूरी कार्रवाई करेंगे, हम नहीं चाहते कि किसी क्रिस्म का कोई नामुनासिब काम हमारी मिनिस्ट्री के सिस्टीम में हो।

एक बात में अर्ज़ करना चाहता हूँ कि अक्सर उस तरफ़ बैठने वाले मेम्बर साहबान ऐसी बातें कह दिया करते हैं जो फ़ैक्ट्स से बहुत दूर होती हैं। अब यह जो Increasing number of fatal accidents in coal mines का ज़िक्र आया, मालूम नहीं कि वह कहाँ से यह चीज़ लाये कि कोल माइन्स में फ़ैटल एक्सीडेंट्स बढ़ रहे हैं और इस के मुताल्लिक़ तो कई दफ़ा यहाँ क्वेश्चन टाईम में इस बारे में मैं उन को बता चुका हूँ।

न सिर्फ़ हिन्दुस्तान के बल्कि बाहर के फ़िगर्स हमारे पास हैं।

The accident rate and death rate due to accidents in mines have progressively been on the decline. The death rate for 1950, that is before taking over the administration in Part B States, was the lowest ever recorded, namely, 0.6 per thousand persons employed. The death rate in the year 1951 and 1952 was, respectively, 0.77 and 0.8. But this slight increase is mainly due to Part B States, in which the accident rate was higher, being brought under the purview of the Mines Act in 1951.

दूसरे मुल्कों से इस की तुलना कर के भी जो नतीजा निकलता है वह भी में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ :

साउथ अफ्रीका	१.६४
कैनाडा	२.५९
यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स	२.१९
जापान	१.६५
फ्रांस	.८३
यूनाइटेड किंगडम	.७५
आस्ट्रेलिया	.९९
न्यूज़ीलैण्ड	.५१

Shri P. C. Bose (Manbhum North): Is the figure per thousand?

श्री आबिद अली : जी हाँ, पर थाउजेंड । मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि हम कोल माइन्स में ऐक्सिडेंट्स बन्द नहीं कर सकते हैं अगर इस को बन्द करना है तो हम को कोल माइन्स ही बन्द करनी पड़ेगी । यह बात जरूर है कि कोल माइन्स में ऐक्सिडेंट्स कम किये जा सकते हैं, उन की सीवियरिटी कम की जा सकती है, और इस के बारे में पूरी कोशिश की जा रही है ।

हाउसिंग के बारे में

Shri Vittal Rao: Does he know that the figures of fatal accidents are 288 in 1952 and 331 in 1953? He cannot mislead the House.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): What is the figure for 1953?

श्री आबिद अली : १९५३ के फ़िगर्स भी बतलाऊंगा । हाउसिंग के बारे में मैं अर्ज कर रहा था, चेअरमैन साहब, कि २९ हजार घर संक्शन हुए हैं । कोल माइन में दो हजार टेनमेन्ट्स बना दिये गये हैं, दो हजार और संक्शन हुए हैं । काम काफी है लेकिन जल्दी से जल्दी पूरा किया जा रहा है ।

बाई पार्टाइट ऐग्रिमेंट के बारे में जिक्र हुआ । मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस साल बाई पार्टाइट का काफी काम किया गया । कलेक्टिव बागौनिंग के लिहाज से बाई पार्टाइट ऐग्रिमेंट के लिहाज से इस पिछले साल में काफी काम हुआ है । लेबर मिनिस्ट्री की इस पालिसी का अन्दाजा वही लोग लगा सकते हैं जिन का कि उस से ताल्लुक है या जिन के दिमाग ईमानदारान तरीके से फ़ैसला कर सकते हैं । खास तौर से मैसूर कान्फ़ेन्स में, कलकत्ते की कान्फ़ेन्स में और अभी हैदराबाद में कान्फ़ेन्स हुई थी जिस में कि हम ने वेज बोर्ड बनाया, दोनों की सहमति से, लेबर और एम्प्लायर दोनों के रिप्रजेन्टेटिव्स बैठे हुए थे, वेज बोर्ड बना । कर्टवट लेबर का हटाना, यह भी बहुत बड़ी चीज़ हुई है । लेकिन यह सब बाई पार्टाइट ऐग्रिमेंट्स से ही हुई है । हमारा बाई पार्टाइट का जो उसूल है वह बड़े अच्छे तरीके से तरक्की की तरफ़ जा रहा है

अब मैं यह अर्ज करूँ कि अभी जिस तरीके से भाई बेंकटारामन साहब ने फरमाया, कि ऐक्ट आये तो गलत, न आये तो गलत । दोनों में मुसीबत है । एक कम्प्यूनिस्ट लीडर से एक साहब ने पूछा कि कैसे चलेंगे, कहा कांग्रेस वालों से उल्टे चलेंगे । ठीक है, कांग्रेस वालों से उल्टे चलेंगे, लेकिन कांग्रेस वाले तो पैर में चप्पल पहिनते हैं, आप क्या चप्पल सर पर पहनेंगे ? आज हमारा काम अच्छी तरह चल रहा है, लेकिन उन को तो हर चीज़ की मुश्कालिफत करना है । ऐक्ट लाबो तो भी गलत और न लाबो तो भी गलत ।

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: It is a cheap argument.

श्री आबिद अली : आखीर में मैं इतना अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि मजदूरों की यूनियन मजबूत होनी

[श्री आबिद अली]

चाहिये। मैं इस बात को भी मानता हूँ कि मजदूरों की ट्रेड यूनियन के हक में उन को दखल नहीं देना चाहिये, चाहे हमारी सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट हो, चाहे स्टेट गवर्नमेंट हो।। इस की तरफ हमारी निगाह पूरी चौकसी से रहती है।। लेकिन वह लोग जो ऐतराज करते हैं वह ट्रेड यूनियन के हक में दखलअन्दाजी करने के लिए नहीं, बल्कि दूमरी चीजों के लिए होता है।

Shri Nambiar: What is the criterion for recognition of a trade union? He says that recognition is not based on the simple fact of registering. Then what is the principle which Government is enunciating?

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Deputy Minister has not enunciated any new principle. What he has said is only this, that the mere fact that there are so many members in a trade union does not entitle it to be recognised. And that is according to the Act of 1946, as the hon. Member knows. That is all that he has said, and no new principle has been propounded so far.

Shri Nambiar rose—

Mr. Chairman: This is not question-hour, nor can the hon. Member be allowed to cross-examine like that.

Shri Nambiar: I want clarification.

Mr. Chairman: Several questions have been put to him by other hon. Members and he has not yielded. If he is not willing I cannot force him.

Shri Nambiar: It is a policy matter and I want clarification.

Mr. Chairman: Order. order.

डा० सत्यवादी (करनाल—रक्षित—
अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : सभापति जी, मैं मजदूरों के उस तबके के लिये कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ जिसे आज तक सभी नज़रअन्दाज

करते रहे हैं। उनमें वह लोग भी हैं जो मजदूरों के लिये काम करने के नारे लगाते हैं और उनमें गवर्नमेंट भी है। यह सफाई पेशा वाले मजदूर हैं। मुझे इस बात से खुशी हुई कि अभी आनरेबल डिप्टी मिनिस्टर ने बोलते हुये म्युनिसिपल लेबर के मुतालिक कुछ फ़िक्के कहे हैं, और यह कि उन के लिये मजदूरों की अदालत से इन्डस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट्स ऐक्ट के मातहत फ़ैसले भी कहीं कहीं हुये हैं। लेकिन सिर्फ़ इतनी बात से सारा मामला हल नहीं होता। इस से पहले भी सफाई पेशा वाले मजदूरों के लिये कितने वर्षों से इस हाउस में आवाज़ लगाई जाती रही है और सन् १९५१ में बजट पर बोलते हुये उस वक़्त के लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी यह बात कही थी, आवाज़ उठाने वाले मेम्बर के मुतालिक, कि उन्होंने मजदूरों के क़वानोिन को नहीं देखा है इसलिये वह ऐसी बात कह रहे हैं कि उन्हें नज़रअन्दाज किया जा रहा है। दलील यह दी थी कि मजदूरों के लिये बाज़ अदालतों से मजदूरों के कानून के मुताबिक फ़ैसले हुए हैं।

मैं पिछले १४ साल से मजदूरों के इसी तबके में काम करता हूँ और अपने तज़ुर्बे की बिना पर मैं यह अर्ज करता चाहता हूँ कम से कम पंजाब की बात तो मैं दावे के साथ कहता हूँ, कि वहाँ के सफाई पेशा मजदूर कानून, असलियत में, टेकनिकल वर्क में, लेबर नहीं माने जाते। इसमें मुश्किल तो यह है कि जहाँ तक इन मजदूरों का ताल्लुक है, जो लो कल अथारिटीज़ के मातहत, म्युनिसिपैलिटियों में काम करते हैं, सरकारी या नीम सरकारी दफ्तरों में काम करते हैं, जब उन की किसी बात को ले कर हम जाते हैं और उन से कहते हैं कि यह आपके मुलाजिम हैं, दूसरे सरकारी मुलाजिमों की तरह से इन के भी हुकूक हैं,

उन को भी छुट्टी की जरूरत है, टाइम स्केल की जरूरत है, उन की बुझापे के वक्त भी इमदाद की जरूरत है, तो हमें यह जवाब मिलता है कि हम उन्हें सरकारी मुलाजिम नहीं मानते। इसलिये उन पर वह सरकारी मुलाजिमों के रूल्स, सिविल सर्विस रूल्स, जो दूसरी मुलाजिमों पर लागू होते हैं, नहीं लागू करते। कहने के लिये उन्हें भी चौथे दर्जे के सरकारी मुलाजिमों में गिना जाता है, लेकिन वह हुकूम जो चौथे दर्जे के दूसरे मुलाजिमों को मिलते हैं, उन्हें नहीं दिये जाते। मिसाल के तौर पर मैं आपके सामने एक ही बात कहूंगा। कोई भी सरकारी मुलाजिम कोई भी मजदूर ऐसा नहीं जिसे हफ्तेवार आराम नहीं मिलता। सिर्फ यह एक मजदूर ऐसा है कि जिस के लिये हर जगह इन्कार कर दिया जाता है कि इसे बीकली रेस्ट नहीं दिया जायेगा।

बाइबिल में हमने पढ़ा था कि खुदा ने ६ रोज में दुनिया को बनाया और सातवें दिन आराम किया। लेकिन यह बद-नसीब मजदूर वह है जिन के लिये कोई मालिक और कोई हुकूमत आराम की जरूरत महसूस नहीं करती। हमारे यहां पंजाब में हमारे काफी शोर मचाने पर कुछ सर्विस रूल्स बनाये गये लेकिन वह कागज की ही चीज है और उन पर अमल कहीं नहीं हुआ। मैं जो यह हफ्तेवार छुट्टी की बात करता हूँ उस के बारे में लिखा है कि उन को हफ्ते में एक दिन की छुट्टी मिलनी चाहिये लेकिन अगर म्यूनिस्पैलिटी यह समझे कि उन को छुट्टी न दी जाये तो उनको अख्तियार है कि उनको छुट्टी न दे। अब मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इनके लिये क्या कानून है। आपका जो इन्डस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट्स का ऐक्ट है उसको छोड़ दीजिये कि नोटिस दे कर स्ट्राइक किया जा सकता है। हमने इस के लिये पंजाब में बहुत कोशिश की। हमने यूनियन्स आरगेनाइज किये और

बाजस्ता काम करके यह कोशिश की कि म्यूनिस्पैलिटी लेबर के मामलात को उसी तरह से तय किया जाय जिस तरह से कि फैक्टरी लेबर के मामलात को तै किया जाता है। मुझे याद है कि इस में हमारे यहां के लेबर कमिश्नर ने कोशिश की। करनाल की म्यूनिस्पैलिटी से वहां के मजदूरों का झगड़ा था, अम्बाला की म्यूनिस्पैलिटी का झगड़ा था और साढीरे का झगड़ा था। करनाल के मुतालिक मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांसिलियेशन आफिसर ने यह बात बताई कि हम इस को ट्राइबुनल के सुपुर्द करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन काफी खतोकिताबत के बाद जब उन्होंने गवर्नमेंट के पास कागजात भेजे तो गवर्नमेंट ने उसे ट्राइबुनल को देने से इन्कार कर दिया। जब हमने लेबर आफिसर के जरिये से फैसले कराये तो हमने वहां पर कनिलियेशन आफिसर को बुलाया मिसाल के तौर पर करनाल में बुलाया, साढीरे में बुलाया और अम्बाला में बुलाया और उन्होंने फैसला किया। लेकिन उस फैसले का क्या नतीजा हुआ। करनाल के मामले में तो गवर्नमेंट ने जवाब दे ही दिया। साढीरा और अम्बाला के मुतालिक लेबर आफिसर को यह कहा गया कि हम ने सेक्रेटरी को तुमसे बात करने का हवा ही कब दिया था। नतीजा यह हुआ कि जब हमने यह रास्ता अख्तियार किया तो कामयाब नहीं हुये। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता था कि जब हम सरकार के पास जाते हैं तो कहा जाता है कि तुम लेबर आफिसर के पास जाओ। जब हम लेबर आफिसर के पास जाते हैं तो वह हमसे कहते हैं कि लेबर कानून तुमको लेबर तसलीम नहीं करता। पिछली बार ५ अप्रैल १९५१ को आनरेबिल लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा था कि हम उनको लेबर में मानते हैं तुमने हमारा कानून ही नहीं पढ़ा।

एक आप का कम्पेन्सेशन लॉ है जिस के मुताबिक मजदूर को नुकसान होने पर मुआ-

[डा० सत्यवादी]

वजा मिलता है। लेकिन क्या आपने कभी इन मजदूरों को मुआवजा दिया। पंजाब में जो स्वीपर्स के लिये सरविस रूल्स बने हैं उन में कहा गया है कि अगर स्वीपर को जानी या जिस्मानी नुकसान हो तो उसे मुआवजा दिया जाय लेकिन शर्त यह है कि जब सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट अपने इस कानून में स्वीपरस को भी लेबर मान लेगी तब हम देंगे वह कहते हैं कि हम उस वक्त इस बात को मानेंगे जब कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट अपने कानून में तरमीम करके स्वीपर को भी शामिल कर लेगी।

इसी तरह से जच्चागी के मामले में है कि जो हमारी बहनें और मातायें काम करती हैं उनको कहीं कहीं १५ या २० दिन की छुट्टी मिलती है। जब हम अपने यहां इस के लिये मूव करते हैं तो कहा जाता है कि अगर सेंटर मंजूर कर लेगा तो हम भी करेंगे। तो हमारी मुश्किल यह है। यह मजदूर वह है जो कि फैक्टरी लेबर की भी सेवा कर रहा है। वह भी इसका एम्पलायर है और इन दोनों के इंटेरेस्ट उसी तरह से टकराते हैं जिस तरह से कि बिड़ला के इंटेरेस्ट एक कपड़े की मिल में काम करने वाले मजदूर से टकराते हैं। तो यह वह बदकिस्मत मजदूर है जिसके लिये फैक्टरी लेबर भी बिड़ला बनी हुई है। और इन के हुकूक देन के लिये तैयार नहीं है।

आपने मिनिमम वेजेज एक्ट लागू किया। वह पंजाब में भी लागू हुआ और वहां एक बोर्ड बनाया गया और उसने सिफारिश की। उसने यह फैसला किया कि इन लोगों को इतना कुछ मिलना चाहिये। जिस वक्त यह फैसला किया गया कि उनको ४० रुपया कम से कम मिलना चाहिये उस वक्त स्वीपर्स को कई स्थानों पर दस दस ग्यारह ग्यारह रुपये मिल रहे थे। तो इस पर क्षमल किस तरह किया गया। म्युनिसिपैलिटियों ने

जो उन के पास बजट था उसको उसी हिसाब से बांट दिया और मिनिमम वेजेज के हिसाब से तनखाह दे दी। नतीजा यह हुआ कि जहां पहले पचास आदमी काम करते थे वहां तीस आदमी रह गये और बीस आदमियों को निकाल दिया गया। तो यह हालत है।

इस के अलावा दूसरी छुट्टियां हैं, बीमारी की छुट्टी है, या जरूरी काम के लिये छुट्टी है। वह भी उन को नहीं दी जाती। अभी मैं कसौली सेनीटोरियम देखने गया था। वह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट का इंस्टीट्यूशन है। वहां मुझे एक शरूस के बारे में बताया गया, उसका नाम मुझे इस वक्त याद नहीं है, लेकिन अगर जरूरत हो तो मैं उसे पेश कर सकता हूँ, कि उसने छुट्टी मांगी इसलिये कि उसके यहां कोई मर गया था और वह उसको फूंकने जाना चाहता था। तो उसको छुट्टी नहीं दी गई और वह अपने मरे हुये को जलाने के लिये भी न जा सका। यह चीज एक ही जगह नहीं है। कई जगह ऐसी चीज है। आप म्युनिसिपैलिटीज को छोड़िये। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को ले लीजिये। मैं कसौली में सेंट्रल रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट में भी गया। वहां २७ साल से स्वीपर मुलाजिम हैं लेकिन वह डेली लेबर की तरह काम करते हैं। उन के कोई हुकूक नहीं हैं। मुझ से डाइरेक्टर साहब कहने लगे कि अब हमने फैसला कर लिया है कि इन को परमानेंट कर दिया जाय। अब २७ साल बाद उसकी पोस्ट पेंशनेबिल की जायेगी। तीन साल बाद वह जब रिटायर होगा तो उसको क्या मिलेगा। आप कहते हैं कि हम उनको लेबर मानते हैं और उनको कानून का फायदा हो सकता है। आप इस बात को फिर सोचिये कि इस बात में सही कितनी है और गलत कितनी है। आप इन बेचारों की तरफ भी ध्यान दीजिये। जरूरत इस बात की है कि जिस तरह और

लेबर के लिये आप कानून बनाना रहे हैं वैसे ही इन के लिये भी एक कानून बनाय तो उनकी भलाई हो सकती है वरना उन की जिंदगी में कोई आसानी नहीं आ सकती। यह लोग बहुत मुसीबत में हैं। यह वह मजदूर हैं कि जो हमारे देश का सबसे पिसा हुआ और मजदूर तबका है। मैं दरखास्त करता हूँ कि जो कुछ आप फैक्टरी लेबर के लिये करते हैं और दूसरे लेबर के लिये करते हैं वहाँ। इन बदनसीब मजदूरों के लिये भी कीजिये।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister.

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): Mr. Chairman,.....

Dr. Rama Rao: I want to ask one point of information.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister has not even started. Let him conclude and then the hon. Member may ask.

Shri V. V. Giri: I heard with great attention and respect the speeches from all sides of the House on the subject of labour policy. I am grateful to my friends on all sides for the very affectionate way in which they have dealt with the matter. I must say that I was pained at the utterances of one good and esteemed friend of mine who was my Parliamentary Secretary twice and who prided himself in thinking that he was my lieutenant; that is my friend Mr. B. S. Murthy. I am glad that he is here. I expected this much from him, that he should have come to me and should have asked me: "Well, Mr. Giri, what is your labour policy; what is your attitude and so forth", but this is a personal matter. I am very sorry to say this, but I do think he will be well advised hereafter when he desires to make such a bitter criticism. He should first try to know my views and then he would have been in a better position to criticise me in a more constructive manner.

However, that is personal. I would like to maintain my former statements of which I am not ashamed of. I am a trade unionist first, a trade unionist last and a trade unionist always. I am not ashamed to say that I still consider adjudication as enemy No. 1 to me. I have always believed that so long as workers are organised, with cent per cent membership in their unions, with sanctions behind their demands, subject to their demands being just and reasonable, they will succeed in their demands to improve the conditions of the working classes. Even an old trade unionist that I am, I must frankly admit that I felt a sort of a depression when I heard my friends on all sides of the House talking in a spirit of pessimism. It is due to the fact that they forget their own defects or deficiencies. We are more accustomed to sit here in these Benches and forget our real work, namely the organisation of trade unions which alone will secure for the workers their just rights. Let me make it perfectly clear. I am one of those who began public life with the beginnings of the trade union movement and I tried to be a humble worker in the cause of trade unionism. We started the movement from scratch, with no laws except the law of section 144 here, there and everywhere. We were prevented even from addressing meetings. The workers were afraid to come and hear us, except from their homes. We had sometimes to address meetings without anybody looking at us or seeing us; but we knew that they were hearing us.

My feeling is that this pessimism will disappear from my good friends, many of whom have been my lieutenants, and very loyal and affectionate friends, who belong to every section of this House. If they will put forth greater efforts, not by the speeches that they make here, but by the volume of work that they do in the field, I am absolutely certain that they will produce greater results for the working classes.

[Shri V. V. Giri]

I would like to reply to the very pertinent question that was put to me when my friends asked me, what is your labour policy, what are you driving at, why are you sleeping and so forth. I respect their wish to know. Let me tell you, Sir, straightaway and through you not only tell this House, but the country that I have always believed in bipartite and tripartite agreements between workers and employers, because I feel that an internal settlement of disputes and differences between workers and employers is far more abiding, far more permanent and leading to greater peace in industry and leading to good relations between workers and employers. That has been the basis of my policy as an agitator. I would yield to none when I say that I led the biggest strikes in this country. I am sure my friends will not say that I am exaggerating my qualifications in that matter. But, in spite of the fact that I was an agitator and leader of strikes I conducted also negotiations with the employers and tried to do my best for the workers. Therefore, if you ask me what is my labour policy as a Minister, I say I stand by bipartite and tripartite agreements.

Shri S. S. More: (Sholapur): But, you must walk now.

Shri V. V. Giri: I am walking. If you want proof, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. That is what I have always said. I shall prove to my hon. friend, Shri S. S. More whether I am sitting or sleeping or whether I am walking.

I believe in agreements between the workers and employers because when once workers and employers come to an agreement on fundamental matters, legislation becomes easy because we merely register what has been agreed to by the workers and the employers.

Now, I shall come to my good friend Shri S. S. More. I am very glad that he asked me whether I am walking or sitting.

Shri S. S. More: Standing.

Shri V. V. Giri: I refer to the fact that on four distinct occasions, on fundamental matters, workers' organisations, belonging to the right, to the left, to the centre, and the employers' organisations came to agreements. I will take the first one, namely, the question of lay-off. In the Labour Standing Committee, top ranking leaders of labour, top ranking leaders and captains of industry and the Government sat together and came to an agreement. Nobody here in this House would dare say that we did not secure by that agreement a social security measure that does not exist today in South-East Asia, a social security measure which enable the workers who are retrenched today, not to be thrown into the streets. They could lift up their heads in spirit of self-respect, go to their homes the moment they are retrenched to their wives and children and tell them, we are not beggars in the street from tomorrow, we have secured something, half a month's wage for every year of service, and notice wage, we need not immediately starve, we can look round for some place where we can work and earn or have some little shop and from that earn a living. I do not say that it is a big thing that has been secured. I say this is a social security measure of an order which keeps and maintains the self-respect of the workers. This was secured by a bipartite agreement and I would ask my hon. friend Shri S. S. More to say how I have not put any view into execution.

It does not end there. I would again tell him what has been done with regard to the plantations. The Plantation Act was passed; it was in cold storage.

Plantation workers who are lakhs in number were not having the benefit of lay-off and retrenchment, and you know, in the plantations—whether it is right or wrong, correct or incorrect—without going into those matters, there was what was known as a depression. I am not discussing that depression, but what I say is that on the 30th and 31st January, after

a series of meetings between workers and employers and Governments, we came to the unanimous conclusion that the workers in plantations will have the benefits of lay-off and retrenchment and the Plantation Act will be put into effect from tomorrow. Could you say that we have not secured an agreement on a fundamental issue which is of service to lakhs of plantation workers in India?

It has not ended there. The other day we met at Mysore where, at tripartite level, we discussed many matters in relation to industrial relations. We discussed the matter of Gorakhpur labour. We decided that a committee should soon sit in order to go into the matter and find out ways and means of reforming it or ending it.

A good deal has been said on the matter of implementation of the minimum wages. I may be allowed to say in some detail what Government has done and what decisions the tripartite conference arrived at under an absolute agreement of the parties only recently on the 10th and 11th January.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the discussions which we had on this subject at the Mysore session of the Indian Labour Conference. The Indian Labour Conference being a tripartite organisation of the greatest importance, I thought that this crucial subject of wages should be placed before it. Having considered the various suggestions made by different interests, the conference passed a Resolution recommending that the time for implementation of the Act in respect of Part I of the Schedule should be extended to 31st December, 1954, that the Central Advisory Board should examine the manner in which the Act was implemented so far with a view to formulating a code of directions to be issued by the Central Government to the State Governments and with a view to laying down principles and criteria for the fixation of wages. The conference also recommended that the Government should issue Notifications for covering additional employments

on the advice of the Central Advisory Board. A meeting of the Central Advisory Board is being held on the 8th and 9th April at Bombay. The Board will consider the recommendations of the Indian Labour Conference held at Mysore and also examine other important matters such as standardisation, methods of collection of statistics, disparity of wages in contiguous States or in the same geographical area, uniformity in regard to payment of overtime, weekly days, rest days etc. The question of reconstituting the Board has also been placed on the agenda, and I have every hope that the Board will be able to reach conclusions which would enable them to take satisfactory action.

I would like to ask you whether as a humble Labour Minister I am not trying to put forward a labour policy which will ultimately lead to agreements on fundamental things in each industry or not?

My Deputy Minister and colleague told you what they did in Hyderabad in the tripartite conference which was held on the 24th and 25th of this month, where they arrived at agreements on the wage structure, the constitution of the Central Wage Board and State Wage Boards, and abolition of contract labour. And what is more, they said for two years, if the agreements are all understood properly, there shall be no adjudication. I ask whether I am not trying to put my views into action, or whether I am simply sitting here and not talking as my hon. friend Mr. More wanted me to talk. Supposing I am able to succeed in these agreements—and I shall succeed if I have the co-operation of all sections of this House—my view is, my labour policy is, the Government's labour policy is to have such agreements at the level of every industry, every organised big and small industry, so that if the conditions of service are agreed to, if principles are agreed to in regard to profit-sharing and big questions like bonus, at bipartite and tripartite meetings, there will be no question of

[Shri V. V. Giri]

adjudication. I want to prove that adjudication shall only be on paper, and shall not be in practice. If I have the co-operation and not the pessimistic statements of my hon. friends I will prove in the course of two or three years that I have secured agreements at the level of every industry, between the parties. If legislation is agreed upon by workers and employers at bipartite and tripartite level, how easy it would be to have legislation!

The bonus question really is responsible for nearly thirty to forty per cent. of the disputes. Supposing at the level of bipartite and tripartite agreements, we arrive at principles or norms regarding bonus, to that extent adjudication is less. If agreements are reached on all matters in every industry between the workers and employers—as I have shown in the course of the last one and a half years, so many agreements with regard to big industries have been produced—then, to that extent, adjudication goes. So, will you tell me whether I am standing by the principles that I enunciated, *viz.* that I stand for internal settlement, that I stand for collective bargaining, that I am against adjudication, which I consider as enemy No. 1?

If today adjudication is there, it is due to the following circumstances. At the Naini Tal Conference, it was a surprise to me how those who were against adjudication and who said that adjudication is a negation of freedom of association, suddenly came and told me, we were for adjudication. It is not the employer who told me that he was for adjudication; he said that he was against adjudication. But his trick was different, his idea was different, his basis was different; his view was, let me get Mr. Giri to agree to take away adjudication from the picture, I shall then refuse also conciliation. That has been my feeling. On the one side, there

was the feeling that the employer was neither prepared for adjudication nor conciliation. On the other side, the workers who believed not in adjudication, but in conciliation, suddenly left me high and dry by saying that they believed in adjudication. That was responsible for retention of adjudication in legislation. I do not want any challenges or counter-challenges. I do not believe in questioning the genuineness of others. In my life I have never questioned the feelings held by others on different subjects, because they have as much right to differ from me, as I have the right to differ from them. That is what the Father of the Nation has taught us, and as a humble follower of his I have tried to follow those ideals in my public life extending nearly four decades.

I do not wish to say more, but I am bound to explain my conduct on one particular matter. My hon. friends on all sides of this House have a right to have an explanation from me as to why that wonderful Industrial Relations Bill has not come up or has not seen the light of day, a bill about which in season and out of season I advertised my wares, saying I have got a wonderful bill. You have a right to expect an explanation and I have a duty to give an explanation. In fact, Sir, when I became Minister for Labour on the 13th May 1952, a Bill brought by my esteemed friend, Mr. Jagjivan Ram, which went up to Select Committee and could not be passed owing to the dissolution of Parliament, was there. And I, with the strong views on adjudication that I had—which I subsequently changed for the reasons that I have already mentioned—also wanted to have the reactions, fresh knowledge and latest views of organisations of workers, employers and the public. A questionnaire of 115 questions was issued and 400 answers were received. The Naini Tal Conference was held on the basis of

that in October when we discussed all these matters. A seven-man Committee was set up representing workers and employers, and they discussed these matters about January; about March 1953 the Labour Ministers' Conference was called and we placed all these matters before them. Certain understandings were reached and we prepared a note. A statement of all these was sent on to State Governments for their views and we sent it also to the Ministries for their views. There were certain really genuine differences on fundamental issues. We were trying to see how to come to an understanding on all those fundamental issues and that took about four or five months. After that, in spite of the fact that a few fundamental differences were still there, we do hope to bridge them, my leader, the Prime Minister said: 'Get the Bill drafted'. Of course, the legal draftsmen took three months and the Bill is now drafted and completed—and I will have to put it before the Cabinet. In fact at the Mysore Conference, the representatives of workers and employers desired to see what that Bill was. The Labour Ministers also wanted to see what that Bill was. But I could not give any word or assurance, because without the permission and sanction of the Cabinet, I could not do so, and the Bill also was at that time still in the drafting stage. Now the Bill is drafted; it is going before the Cabinet.

Whether you accept my explanation whether I really wanted to delay things, I am not much concerned; while workers to some extent were injured in a way, just as Mr. Venkataraman pointed out, where urgently certain things had to be done, I quite agree with him and I do hope that, if we could have the present Act, the Act of 1948 plus those points which were mentioned, it would be very good. Anyway, I can assure you in all humility that I am as anxious as anybody else today to get the Bill through. But I say that there has been in existence the Act of 1948

which generally protects the interests of workers. Certainly, as I have said, some of the lacunæ mentioned by my esteemed friend, Mr. Venkataraman, must be covered by the new legislation so that the workers may be protected in all ways.

Therefore, I am glad that I have been given an opportunity to explain my conduct in the matter of proceeding, if I may say so, very cautiously, because any step in the wrong direction may spoil the whole show. I have been trying to see that conventions are established whereby the workers and employers could sit together and come to agreements on fundamental issues.

Shri Namblar: If the employers refuse to sit together?

Shri V. V. Giri: I have shown in a way, whatever little employers and whatever little workers may be, at the highest level the top ranking workers—leaders like Dange and Khandubhai Desai—and top ranking captains of industry representing their organisation. I did not find it difficult to bring them together and discuss matters. With the expert knowledge that they possess, they would be able to see how far practical results could be achieved and they tried to achieve those results as I have pointed out to Mr. More, on four occasions during the last 1½ years. I can do so and I am almost absolutely certain in my own mind provided the workers strengthen their organisations on a democratic basis with sanctions behind them, with just demands placed before the employers. If they can give me that assurance and co-operation, I shall certainly produce this magic, I am absolutely confident about it; I am always an optimist and therefore let my hon. friends be not mistaken in thinking that nothing is produced or nothing is done. Something is done; it may not be much. But, certainly, it will be done if there is co-operation from every one of you, which I seek.

Shri Namblar: May I know—I asked the hon. Deputy Minister also—what

[Shri Nambiar]

about the recognition of trade unions. He said nothing. We could not understand the Government's policy.

Shri V. V. Giri: We shall deal with it in the Bill which will be placed before the House.

Shri Nambiar: When are we to expect it; when will it be before the House and when will it be got through?

Shri V. V. Giri: I can say very soon.

Shri Elayaperumal: Many labourers in the South are compelled to do work against their wishes such as to remove dead cattles, to beat nasty drums and to dig burial bits by land lords and the public. May I know whether there is any provision in the Minimum Wages Act about that?

Shri V. V. Giri: I am sure there are provisions in the Minimum Wages Act and we are also going into the whole matter in Bombay in the course of the next four or five days. My advice to the hon. Member through you, Sir, is to organise agricultural labourers. They should form unions and run them in the proper way and get resolutions passed.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East): May I ask whether the Minister would consider the setting up of an Industrial Tribunal to adjudicate on the demands of the Insurance employees?

Shri V. V. Giri: That is a matter which is at the highest level now.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: How long will it take at the highest level?

Shri V. V. Giri: I think very soon.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put all the cut motions relating to the Ministry of Labour to the vote of the House.

The cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I will put the Demands to the vote of the House,

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the order paper in respect of Demands Nos. 65, 66, 67, 68, 69 and 130 be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in the course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[The motions for Demands for grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below—Ed. of P.P.]

DEMAND NO. 65—MINISTRY OF LABOUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 28,99,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ministry of Labour'."

DEMAND NO. 66—CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,73,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Chief Inspector of Mines'."

DEMAND NO. 67—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,97,87,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Labour'."

**DEMAND No. 68—EMPLOYMENT
EXCHANGES AND RESETTLEMENT**

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,18,48,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of ‘Employment Exchanges and Resettlement’.”

DEMAND No. 69—CIVIL DEFENCE

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,10,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of

payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of ‘Civil Defence’.”

**DEMAND No. 130—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF
THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR**

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,83,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of ‘Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Labour’.”

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Thursday, the 1st April, 1954.
