

After all the adjustments, the 'Ayes' have 43; and the 'Noes' have 123.

Some Hon. Members: The 'Ayes' have 43? It must be 46.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not 46; there are deductions to be made also on that side.

The result* of the division is as follows:

Ayes: 43; Noes: 123.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, the motion is lost. I need not put the original motion, because that was for purposes of discussion. Now, the discussion has taken place.

Now, we shall pass on to the next discussion.

16.46 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF PAY COMMISSION

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Commission of Enquiry on Emoluments and Conditions of Service of Central Government employees, Government Resolution thereon and the statement made by the Finance Minister in the House on the 30th November, 1959."

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): How long are we sitting today?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: First, let the motion be moved, and then, we shall consider.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I am not happy to have initiated the discussion on the Report of the Pay

Commission, nor do I presume that any of the hon. Members will take this as a happy occasion for this discussion. Never never would the Finance Minister have welcomed such a discussion on this report.

As we go back to those hectic days in the first week of August, 1957, when the Central Government employees decided to go on a strike, and the hon. Home Minister wanted to hustle this House with a Bill in order to meet that strike, every section of this House was all the more anxious at that time to arrive at a reasonable settlement of the whole proposition, to avert a calamity at that time and when at the last moment, Government agreed that a Pay Commission would be appointed, everybody thought that at least a sigh of relief could be heaved then. But when the personnel of the commission was announced later on, a little doubt crept into the minds of many, because, making a departure from the past procedure that was adopted in the case of the First Pay Commission, Government made it exclusive to those who had nothing to do with the problems of either wage fixation or labour policy at all.

During the last session, when doubts were expressed from this side of the House about the possible recommendations of the commission, the hon. Finance Minister was wise enough to caution us, by saying that it might be that the Commission might make certain reductions in the emoluments also, and, therefore, we need not be too optimistic. At that time, we on this side of the House never never did know the forecasting mind of the hon. Finance Minister. But, now, when we read the report of the Pay Commission, we see it very well that the hon. Finance Minister was right, and too right, in asserting that the Pay Commission would do this way against employees.

Regarding the personnel of the commission, when the First Pay

*The figures were corrected as:

Ayes: 45; Noes 121, vide Debates, dated 18-12-1959.

[Shri Narayanankutty Menon]

Commission was constituted, a veteran labour leader was included in that, and quite rightly included, by Government. And because of his presence, the First Pay Commission did lay down certain principles and also recommended certain emoluments to the employees; and these have survived, in spite of everything, for a few years, so that there could be a levelling of the wages at that time. But when we read this report today, we feel that there was quite some justification for the selection of the personnel of the Pay Commission. For, it was practically divided into three air-tight compartments. The first and foremost compartment was two I.C.S. officers, who had nothing to do with the fixation of wages or with labour policy. They looked after the question of the higher-salaried category. They came to the conclusion that there should not be a levelling down of the income of the higher category. They did their job very well. The second compartment was two Congress ex-M.Ps. charged with the duty of looking after the Congress Government and what the Congress Government says today. They too did their job very well, because, whatever Government have said has been accepted by the commission, without looking into the other side, how the case has been presented from the other side before the commission. Then, two economists were there. A cursory reading of the report will convince you that these economists were consulted on certain hypothetical questions of economy, and they have given certain advice of their own, which is incorporated irrelevantly in certain parts of this report.

Because of the composition of the commission itself, because none of the Members of this commission has ever seen face to face how the Indian worker lives, how the ordinary man.....

Shri Subbiah Ambalam (Ramanathapuram): On a point of order. I want to know whether the hon. Member can refer to the members of the

commission, because they are not here to defend themselves.

Some Hon. Members: Why not? Certainly.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): Certainly. It is not a judicial body.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Is that decision to be taken directly by the Members here? I am watching carefully. Though it may not be quite out of order to make a mention of the names, it would be more profitable if we look at the recommendations and then criticise them, by saying that they are not in the interest of the workers, as he is arguing. Instead of just taking one member after the other and criticising him, instead of taking the personnel and criticising them, he should look at what they have produced. That is more material than criticising the members.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): What they have produced is not material at all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not material, mostly—I also think like that. But what they have recommended should be looked into.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I agree with you but for the fact that the reference to the composition or personnel was inevitable even in discussing the pros and cons of this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now that he has made the reference, he may come to the recommendations.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I come to the recommendations—what they have produced. The whole intention of appointing this Commission was to set at nought the discontentment that was prevailing among the two million government employees in 1957, which started as early as 1953 with the demand for the constitution of a Second Pay Commission. The situation almost verged on a countrywide strike in 1957, when in order to find a

reasonable solution, a long-term solution of this problem, namely, removal of this discontentment and rooting out of justice to them, this Commission was appointed. When this Commission was appointed, it was clearly understood that a demand was made for the appointment of a Pay Commission and a demand was made that there should be an increase in the establishments. So it was expected that this Commission would enter into an overall review of the entire wage structure in the country of the government employees with a perspective and historic background behind them and would give a decision whereby this sort of discontentment could be set at naught at least during the Second Plan period or the Third Plan period. But I am sorry to state that the impact of what they have produced today on the two million government employees and also on the country and on the working class in general is utter disappointment because not only do the government employees who wanted this Commission not get anything—some of them stand to lose today—but on the other side, the general working class of India which has fought for the last so many years and built up a wage structure has lost because of certain findings that this Commission has come to.

The first point is regarding the conception of wage itself, how the Commission analysed the wage structure. Right from the time of the Islington Commission in 1915, as they have reviewed, there was no proper assessment of the needs of an ordinary worker in this country. As far as the government employees were concerned, a certain pay structure with graded scales was evolved by the Islington Commission which stood till the year 1946 when a Pay Commission was appointed. The Pay Commission did go into the structure of wages and arrived at certain findings and made certain recommendations and Government accepted the recommendations, the most important recommendation being that relating to

the long-term effect, that is, adjusting the dearness allowance to the cost of living index. Later on, Government failed to fulfil that, and that was exactly why early in 1952 and in 1953 there was a demand that the recommendation of the First Pay Commission should be implemented and also a Second Pay Commission should be appointed.

When the First Commission evolved a wage formula immediately in the postwar period, it was a time when the Industrial Disputes Bill was about to be passed. When the Act was passed at that time, the entire industrial tribunals in this country accepted the findings and formulations of the First Pay Commission as a *magno carta* to decide about the wages. If the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Labour Minister—I wish he were here today—would go over the awards of the late 'forties and early fifties', they would find that the principles of wage have been fixed upon the recommendations of the First Pay Commission.

During the First Five Year Plan period, there was a demand for higher wages in industry, and early in the Second Plan period we had the 15th Indian Labour Conference presided over by the hon. Labour Minister of India when a new formula for the fixation of minimum wage was accepted, in spite of the fact that the industrial tribunals had previously accepted some formula.

In that conference which was held at Delhi the hon. Labour Minister was the Chairman. Shri Morarji Desai, the present Finance Minister was there present in that conference. The hon. Railway Minister was there; Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri was there and one block of seats in the conference was reserved and taken up by a full-fledged Government delegation represented by every conceivable Ministry of the Government of India. After three days' deliberation in which the labour representatives of this country were represented, in which the whole Government was represented and in

[Shri Narayanankutty Menon]

which the employees' organisations were also represented a new formula, a new norm for the minimum wages to be given to the entire working classes of this country was evolved. In his closing remarks the hon. Labour Minister expressed the view that now the demands of the labour and the contentions of the employees and Government have been considered and we have arrived at a compromise—this shall be the new formula for the conception of a living wage in this country. Following that formula that had been laid down in that Indian Labour Conference many Tribunals passed many awards in many places.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): May I correct the hon. Member? I was not present when the minimum wage was fixed. I was present only at the beginning and I know nothing about the other thing. I did not agree with it either.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I do not think he was purposely away. He did not attend the second day. He was represented because the representatives of the Finance Ministry were there; he was not bodily present.

It was a conference in which the Government of India was represented and which was presided over by the Labour Minister. Anybody who took part in the conference or the independent labour organisations that took part never imagined at that time that he will be going behind the decision. We understood that the Conference decided.....

The Minister of Railways (Shri Jagjivan Ram): That is an advisory body.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: We understood that the new norm laid down in the Indian Labour Conference was to be followed. When the Commission wrote to the Government whether the new norm laid down by the Indian Labour Conference was to be followed or not when a doubt arose

in their minds, the Government of India through the Finance Ministry wrote back to the Commission that the Government of India never stands committed to take action on the results of the Indian Labour Conference.

Shri Morarji Desai: We have not accepted it.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: If the Government which was a party to that and which said that this was the norm for a living wage that is going to be fixed and the employers will have to accept it and the workers will have to accept it, if that Government now comes and says that it is not binding upon them then, what for was that conference there and for whose benefit the decision was taken? I accuse this Government of a breach of trust towards the entire working classes in this country because the Labour Minister presiding at that conference said that this was to be the norm of minimum wages in this country and the Finance Minister within a short time wrote to the Commission behind the back of everyone that the Government of India is not committed to this decision.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I again say I was not the Finance Minister then?

An Hon. Member: He was the Minister of Commerce and Industry.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): On a point of order, Sir. The conference to which reference is being made was with regard to industrial labour. Of course, there are certain categories of government servants, for example, the P. & T. and the Railway employees. But generally this report refers not to industrial labour but to government servants. So, the reference to this conference is not relevant. (*Interruption.*)

Sir, the point of order raised is whether it is relevant to refer to that conference which dealt with industrial labour.

An Hon. Member: It is not a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Shall we proceed in this manner?

Shri C. D. Pande: If you have not understood the point of order shall I explain again?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has made clear his own impressions about that (*Interruptions*). Order, order. Where is the need for everybody to speak? The hon. Member may go on.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I maintain that the decision of the Indian Labour Conference is binding upon the Government of India and the Government stands committed to and bound by the decisions that have been taken there. It is a clear breach of faith on the part of Government to offer one norm to their own employees and to offer another to industrial labour in India....

Shri Jagjivan Ram: It was an advisory body.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: In the Second Plan Report it was said that the conditions of work in public undertakings are expected to set the pace for the public sector. If this is going to be the pace for the public sector, if they are going to have one formula for industrial workers and another formula behind their back as far as the government employees are concerned, what is the morality behind it, what is the honesty behind it? Do they really mean that the decision of the conference is to be implemented by employers and labour in India?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Only one hon. Member should speak—not all of them.

17 hrs.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: Right from the beginning, the Government has adopted the attitude that even though it did this in order to meet the strike situation, it had no *bona fide*

intention to settle this dispute properly. From the moment they have decided about the personnel of this Commission, Government saw to it that their recommendations were muzzled and hustled by their own viewpoints which are known to themselves. Reading the report of the Commission, one will know that it is not for the Commission to take into account the necessities of life of an ordinary man in India. They have been discussed but not been accepted. It is not a question of how much money has to be paid to any ordinary man in India. The binding factor upon the Commission was the requirement of the Second Plan. They have been told by the Finance Minister that the Second Plan was in crisis and, therefore, he said: "Do not look into the needs of the employees and the workers". They have been told that there is slowing down of the industrial production and there is slowing down of the agricultural production. Why should it be so? That is shrouded in mystery. The prices are rising and there is no possibility of further taxation, no more of deficit financing, no possibility of increased borrowing. This is what they have told the Commission. There was the foreign exchange crisis and their pre-commitment for payments and they had not provided anything for the recommendations also. Therefore, in other words, they have said: "Do not recommend anything more". A cursory reading of this report will show how the Government has said "We are not prepared to pay anything more". So, the primary consideration was the case presented by the Government. It is almost immoral for the Government to have gone before the Commission like this and present their case like this....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Should they have presented the other side?

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: That is the honest way of presenting a case.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They had to present their own case.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: The Government did not go there as an advocate. After all, there was the view of their own employees.

Coming to the concept of minimum wage, what this Commission has stated will have far reaching influences and reaction upon the industrial working class and also the other employees in this country. For a long time, almost for 12 years, even the Supreme Court has accepted a certain formula for the fixation of wages. Dr. Aykroyd was of the view that the needs of an individual were 3,000 calories a day. That has been accepted by all the tribunals and it has never been questioned so far. Now, this Commission, curiously enough, because of the evidence given by a certain institute in Hyderabad has rejected and had come down to 2,200 calories, taking the example of the people in Japan. That is the essential point that is there. They will go on looking where the minimum is there and they will borrow it and just put it in the report and all the previous requirements laid down to give a decent living for the working class have thus been negatived by the Commission.

The effect of their recommendations will have far-reaching repercussions. They have not fixed any minimum wage to the employees of the Government and the suggestions contained in this Report so long as they remain in that Report will be accepted by the Government and this will have its own general repercussion in the wage fixation in this country and the industrial and other tribunals would only follow this Report.

Now, I come to the way in which they have fixed the dearness allowance. It has been accepted by the First Pay Commission that there should be a part of the dearness allowance in the wage itself because of the way in which the prices were rising. On the basis of the evidence submitted by the Government, the First Pay Commission has said that in the near future, the working class cost of living

index will stabilise somewhere at 185—200 points and, therefore, they just provided for the dearness allowance up to that point. They recommended a sliding scale also for any further rise in the cost of living index. The cost of living index did rise but the Government refused to accept that part of the recommendation to give a sliding scale dearness allowance. In 1952, the Government appointed another committee, because contrary to their own wishful thinking and calculations in 1947, the post-war prices not only did not recede but they continued to rise in 1951-52. So the Gadgil Committee was appointed. The Gadgil Committee, upon the evidence given by the Government came to the conclusion and made a recommendation that the prices will stabilise somewhere at 350 and, therefore, the dearness allowance should be cut and part of the dearness allowance should be merged with the pay—it is going to happen in the near future. Every year the Government has been telling the people that the prices will come down because our industrial production is going up, our agricultural production is going up.

But so far we have been finding a sorrowful phenomenon. Even when the Commission was sitting, the prices not only did not recede but the prices had been rising to a phenomenal level. The Commission has not taken into account the realistic situation that the prices have a tendency to rise. I may point out, Sir, that between the date when the Commission submitted its report and the date when it was presented to this House the working class cost of living index has gone up by 4.4.

While it is an accepted fact that even the meagre minimum wage that has been provided should also be added with a compensatory dearness allowance, because it is admitted that today the prices are going up, the Commission has not made any positive recommendation as far as a sliding

scale for dearness allowance is concerned. Even though good words have been expressed that the Government may, if for twelve months continuously the increase in the cost of living index persists, consider about reviewing the dearness allowance, it will not do any good as far as the employees are concerned, because this Government is a Government which in the face of a positive recommendation to give dearness allowance on a sliding scale refused to do so and, therefore, when there is no mandatory recommendation of the Commission, it will be impossible to get anything from it.

The sum total is that the employees are denied their normal minimum wage. They are also denied the benefits of getting a compensation when the price levels go up. Sir, the hon. Finance Minister and this House know, whatever may be put in the Plan, whatever may be put in the paper, the prices are going up. The sugar prices are going up beyond conception. As referred to by the Commission, the prices are really going up in the case of eggs. One egg today costs 3½ annas. The price of rice is going up, and all other prices are going up. Yet you are refusing to give any increase.

Theoretically, you say that an increase of Rs. 5 has been given. The net result today is that this Rs. 5 which the Commission has given plus another Rs. 7-8 from the pockets of the employees, from their present emoluments are going to be taken away by the traders and mill-owners because prices are going up, and it will be impossible for the employees to make both ends meet.

Coming to the effect of the recommendations, apart from considering the principles of a minimum wage and also dearness allowance, the total effect of the recommendations is that in many cases the employees are really losing because of the introduction of the compulsory provident fund. When the dearness allowance is now merged with the basic pay, an

employee will have to give more to the provident fund, and whatever increase he will get will be taken away for contribution. In many cases, an employee will have to give an additional contribution to the provident fund from his old rates of wages.

Coming to the postal department, in the case of postmen and clerks, there are instances where the employees will every month lose from Rs. 9 to Rs. 14 and even up to Rs. 18. The basis on which the Commission has formulated its recommendation is: "Let them save, because this is not the time for spending", as if these employees were saving to such an extent and they have so much money to have a happy living and also save for the future. The Commission could have seen, from the way in which these employees during the years from 1948 to 1957 have been taking loans from their provident funds, that the employees were never in the habit of saving, they have not saved anything and what is left for them is only to starve. The provident fund borrowings have increased from Rs. 10.9 lakhs in 1948 to Rs. 26.38 lakhs in 1957. Therefore, in the meagre profit that is being given, what could the employees do? If the employees were just progressively taking more and more, an indication would have been given as to the saving capacity of the employees. So, virtually nothing has been received, when it is said that the employees have been given an additional Rs. 5. Not only this. The employees will have to invest more and more in the provident fund, and this has been made compulsory.

The Commission is so unrealistic, because, in respect of the retirement of the employees after 55 years, the statistics of Government show that the average life of an employee after retirement is just 2.5 years. Therefore, if the Commission has recommended that the retirement benefits should be increased, what does it mean? The employee will have to cut his stomach and also the stomachs of his children. Therefore, the sum total of the recommendations, including the

[Shri Narayanankutty Menon]

basic wage and the dearness allowance, is completely illusory. The Commission has taken an unrealistic approach as far as these aspects are concerned.

I shall now make one more important point. Philosophical words have been expressed in the case of Class IV employees when the question of minimum wage is discussed. It is said that the prices will not rise. Are the Government accepting that? Turning to the other aspects of the report, what I find is this. I refer to the question of ceiling to be fixed for the higher category of people. It has been specifically directed by the Varadachari Commission that there should be a ceiling on Rs. 3,000. This Commission has considered the question and says that already the real income of these people has diminished because of rise in prices, and that there is a likelihood of further rise in prices, and, therefore, there is no question of ceiling! Such is the contradictory way of approach that the Commission has made. The Commission has applied one general standard of justice for the Class IV employees and the clerks, etc., and another standard, on a different economic conception, for the higher category of people on salaries of Rs. 3,000 or over, and who may number not more than 1,000. When considering the question of Class I officers and the ceiling in respect of them, in spite of the financial stringency of the Central Government, in spite of the fact that there is no money with the Central Government, the Commission has recommended virtually a Rs. 100 increase in the basic salary of Class I officers, just one increment, without even that much hesitation which they had in giving Rs. 5 to the Class IV employees. That is the standard that the Commission has applied.

I shall now read out for the benefit of the hon. Finance Minister just a few sentences from the report. I do not think that he has ever read that portion. The report says at page 73:

"With knowledge that a better future for all is possible has come

the aspiration that the desired improvements should take place without delay. Whether it is the demand of industrial labour for higher wages and better housing conditions, or of low-paid teachers and government employees for a fair deal and greater security—all these are but manifestations of the new awakening and of the new striving for an economic future which is consistent with the dignity of the citizens of a free society. One cannot merely shrug one's shoulders in the midst of such a situation and say that all these things must wait till somehow or other the financial situation in the country improves. Whatever the difficulties of the moment, the demands of the people—especially of the low-income groups—must be assessed carefully and met to the maximum possible extent."

This is part of a speech delivered by the predecessor of the present Finance Minister while presenting the budget for 1957-58 to this House. Now, it may be possible—and I am not surprised—that the present Finance Minister is not prepared to accept the speeches and formulations of a person who has already gone out of office. Well, he has gone. But the present recommendations are just contrary and against the decision of the Indian Labour Conference which has been presided over by Shri Nanda.

In conclusion, what I would submit is only this. The Commission has made its recommendations. Now, the only best possible way is to remove the anomalies. For that, the Government should call the organisations of these employees and try to discuss matters with them in order to remove those anomalies. That is the only possible way of tackling this problem.

The Commission has rightly observed that the two million employees of the Government of India, even though their emoluments should be cut and tailored according to the needs of the

developmental activities, are the most sharp instruments and care in respect of the developmental activities and unless they are given at least an iota of satisfaction and unless we keep that instrument sharp, the developmental activities will not take place. So, in the interests of the Plan and also in the interests of the general developmental activities, you should try to discuss the problem with the employees and find out an agreed solution whereby the anomalies and also the injustice done to them could be removed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Commission of Enquiry on Emoluments and Conditions of Service of Central Government Employees, Government Resolutions thereon and the statement made by the Finance Minister in the House on the 30th November, 1959."

The time has to be fixed now. Normally such discussions are for 2½ hours. Government finds it difficult to spare time; on the working days we have got, there is already Government business fixed up. If we want to devote more time to it, we shall have to sit after the ordinary hours that we have got. Then again, there is this difficulty that tomorrow the hon. Speaker is giving an At Home to the parliamentary delegation from Nepal. So, tomorrow it will not be possible to sit. The only other days left would be Monday and Tuesday. If the House is prepared to sit after the normal hours on those days, we can extend the time.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How long do we sit today?

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Till 6.30.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip): Why not we sit on Saturday?

An Hon. Member: Why not on Wednesday?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It would be difficult to extend the session to Wednesday, because some hon. Members must have booked their passage on Wednesday. The only possibility is we might sit for longer hours on Monday and Tuesday. Today do we sit till 6 or 6-30?

Shri Nath Pai: 6-30.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are the hon. Members sure they will be able to have the quorum?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): We may sit till 6 today, but we must find 5 hours for this discussion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will sit till 6 o'clock today. **Shri Nath Pai.**

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Why not sit on Saturday?

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): The whole of Saturday can be devoted to this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called **Shri Nath Pai.**

Shri Nath Pai: The time allotted by the Government, the refusal of the Finance Minister to initiate the debate and added to it, the absence of two of the four Ministers in his department are perhaps a measure of the interest and the seriousness with which Government treat the problem of these 2 million employees.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Finance Minister himself is present.

Shri Nath Pai: Does he disown any kind of responsibility for the two others who are in his own Ministry? Does not this House have this right that when a matter so intimately connected with their department is being

[Shri Nath Pai]

discussed here, they should be at least present here?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there are four Ministers, does it mean that all the four should be here?

Shri Nath Pai: The matter is of such importance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are two Senior Ministers here. I do not find so much weight in this argument.

An Hon. Member: There are three senior Ministers.

Shri Nath Pai: There is nothing wrong in my remark.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If they are present, shall we spare time for all the four to reply? Then the complaint would be, they have taken so much time for themselves.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I point out that it would have been wrong if I had not been present. But if I am present and the others are not present, I do not think any objection can be taken. More than that, I want to clarify that one of the two Deputy Ministers is convalescing and is not attending office under medical orders. So, he cannot come here. Without knowing all these things, some allegations are made that they do not realise their responsibility. I think he ought to be sorry for it. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Nath Pai: I know how to take care of myself. Shri Morarji Desai certainly knows his English very well. No allegation was made. All that I said was, perhaps it is a measure of the seriousness. I am profoundly sorry that one of his Deputies is really ailing; I hope and pray for his recovery.

Shri Morarji Desai: His leaders are absent.

Shri Nath Pai: Where is your leader?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. would request hon. Members to confine themselves to the matter that we have got. It is with relevant things that we have to proceed, instead of taking these extraneous things into consideration.

Shri Nath Pai: I do not mind in the least being interrupted by Shri Morarji Desai—today his colleagues are coming to his rescue—and I hope he will extend to us the same courtesy when he is replying.

The leakages regarding the reports, about which we have complained in this House, in the light of what has come from the recommendations of the Pay Commission, seem to many of us that those leakages were not so much the results of the enterprising scoops made by some very daring journalists, but the leakages seem to have been well-planned. There was a reason behind it, and there was a plan behind it, the so-called leakages, the reason and the plan being to prepare the Government employees for the bitter pills which were coming through the recommendations and to soften the shock which was to be administered.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I know again whether my knowledge of English is correct?

Shri Nath Pai: It is fairly good.

May I point out to the hon. Minister that on the 28th of October the *Free Press Journal* of Bombay carried excerpts which tally word by word with the recommendations? I have got every reason to believe, therefore, that since they happen to be verbatim from the report itself, they were aiding deliberately to bring the country, and the employees in particular, for the shock that was to be administered by the disappointing recommendations—you are free to refute it and I shall be very glad; but there seems to be a plan behind it.

Shri Morarji Desai: Say what you like.

Shri Nath Pai: Regarding the recommendations themselves, I shall not be passing any judgment, or talking anything about the gentlemen who composed the Commission. All I will say is that they are all honourable men. That is all I say, and I have got some regard for the talent of some of them. But the Bible says the tree is to be judged by its fruit and not by anything else. I shall, therefore, confine myself to the recommendations of the Pay Commission.

Generally speaking, before I take them point by point, I should like to say this. After 28 months of expectations on the part of the Government employees, came this as a rude shock and bitter disappointment, and this plunged the Government employees in a gloom, in a mood of disappointment and disillusionment. There are some good things in the report of the Pay Commission, and it will be wrong not to mention them; it will be uncharitable. The readiness of the Pay Commission to recommend to the Government that the services of the temporary servants be taken into consideration for purposes of pension and better pensionary returns, these are some of the good things that the Pay Commission has recommended. There is a lot of good data which they have made available in the body of the Report.

But their main attitude seems to be something like this. First they have told the Government employees, "We don't have much to give to you. We would like you to work harder, eat less and live in hovels and serve the country. Yours is the glory to starve and die." This seems to be, in general, the recommendations. You will give that "Yes" with more sincerity if you have bothered to study it.

Now, first and foremost, I will say that the Pay Commission had exceeded its jurisdiction. The Pay Commission's terms of reference were not to curtail such meagre benefits as the Government employees today are still having but to see where they can be

increased. The terms of reference—now there is something here for Shri Morarji Desai—says:

"(iii) recommend, in particular, the extent to which benefits to Central Government employees can be given in the shape of amenities and facilities."

They were never called upon to curtail what they had, but only to see what can be given.

A very important point is that the Pay Commission has tried to take upon itself the functions of the Planning Commission. We have the Planning Commission which the nation has created to tell Parliament and the country our resources and how best to use them. We do not want other bodies to usurp the functions of the Planning Commission, or to usurp the policy-making function of this House. May I point out that the Pay Commission in small words, in simple words, was called upon to look to the budget of the employees—Class III and Class IV men who constitute 93 per cent of the employees of this Government.

17-24 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Instead of bothering about the budget of the small man, they have taken upon themselves this responsibility, and I do not think that Shri Morarji Desai should sit so nonchalantly when somebody is trying to relieve him of his legitimate responsibility of making the budget of the country. They should have worried themselves with the budget of this small man.

Shri Morarji Desai: Do you want me to laugh at it?

Shri Nath Pai: May I point out that Shri Morarji Bhai Desai just now....

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: May I draw the attention of the hon Member to clause (2). If he reads it, he

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

will find that he is completely contradicted.

Shri Nath Pai: Normally you are very logical. But today you are becoming very partisan.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I hope my hon. friend will become logical as soon as he reads clause 2.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: He cannot be logical.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is very inconvenient for him to read it.

Shri Nath Pai: With the postures and the air of a Vishwamitra Shri Morarji Desai declared "बुद्ध न भवे" "This is not mine." Now, I will tell him how it is his. The legitimacy will have to be fastened like this.

In April, 1950, the hon. Prime Minister made a statement in Parliament announcing the fact that the Government were committed to the principle of fair wages as recommended by the Fair Wages Committee. A few months later a Bill embodying those recommendations, the Fair Wages Bill, was introduced. It lapsed on account of the dissolution of the Provisional Parliament.

How were you just now saying that the Government did not ask? He said that and Shri Jagjivan Ram acquiesced in the remark. Their Prime Minister, their leader.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: May I interrupt the hon. Member? Perhaps this reference is to the Labour Advisory Committee's Report.

Shri Nath Pai: Fair Wages Committee.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am coming to that. The Labour Advisory Board met much later than the Fair Wages Committee. The Advisory Board's recommendation has never been considered by Government.

Shri Nath Pai: May I point out that he is nearer the point than his senior colleague, Shri Morarji Desai?

But the principles adumbrated in both are the same to which your Prime Minister, unless you have started disowning him, is committed. The principles are the same.

Shri Morarji Desai: I am misquoted here. I do not know why in my own presence he is misquoting me. I have not referred to the Fair Wages Committee. I was not then in the Government of India. I referred only to one committee which, it was said, I attended. There only I said that I was not present when that resolution was passed and that I was not a party to it. That is all that I have said. I do not see what he wants to say. I have not refuted the hon. Prime Minister's statement. I have not refuted anything. Why is he making incorrect statements?

Shri Nath Pai: My interpretation of constitutional responsibility is that in a democratic parliamentary Government responsibility is continuous and collective.

Shri Morarji Desai: Again, the hon. Member is misleading. I have not disowned what the hon. Prime Minister has stated here. I have not at all disowned it. It binds me. Nothing binds the hon. Member and therefore he thinks that others also are not bound by it.

Shri Nath Pai: I am very happy for the compliment because our Vedas say:

सा मुक्तिः सा विद्याया विमुक्तिः

If nothing binds me I am very happy. You are calling me a yogi. Thank you, very much. So, this being the advice of a yogi, take it seriously.

Shri Morarji Desai: When did I call him a yogi?

Shri Nath Pal: You said that nothing binds me. I am sorry, he... (Inter-
ruption).

Regarding the fair wage, may I
come to the point...

Mr. Speaker: I can only suggest to
hon. Members that let them speak on
the merits instead of quoting the
Vedas and depending on assurances.
Let them go to the merits.

Shri Nath Pal: Provided one is al-
lowed to go. When we make a point,
they say it is generalisation. When we
give them something from the very
Bible which they regard as authority,
they say it is not relevant... (Inter-
ruption). May I point out.....

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West
Bengal):** The hon. Member seems to
be occupied more with Shri Morarji
Desai than with the Pay Commission's
recommendations.

Shri Nath Pal: If it is the Govern-
ment's...

Mr. Speaker: With whatever he
may be occupied, the time is limited.
Nobody need interrupt. Hon. Mem-
ber may kindly go on with the merits
of the case. What is the point that he
is making?

Shri Nath Pal: I have been saying
that the recommendations regarding
the minimum wages made by the Pay
Commission are thoroughly inadequate
and very, very disappointing—disap-
pointing from the points of view of
the requirements and needs and also
from the point of view of not satisfac-
torily taking into consideration the re-
sources of the country.

Somebody said, "Why did I quote
him?" I did it because he is the
Finance Minister. He has made the
statement. They do not know that
Shri Morarji Desai has talked about
the burden. I was very distressed to
see the use of the word 'burden'. Does
a country lose when it tries to get a
civil service which is contented, which
is disciplined and therefore, which is

loyal? I think this is the soundest in-
vestment a country can make, to
create a civil service, a body of civil
servants who will be dedicated, devoted,
efficient and loyal. To call what
we give them a burden is an extra-
ordinary twisting of language indeed.
May I, therefore, point out that the
Fair Wages Committee had made this
very simple recommendation?

"If it is the Government's de-
clared policy that on social
grounds minimum wages in the
private sector should not be allow-
ed to fall below a certain level,
and that that level should be such
as to provide not merely for the
bare sustenance of life but also
for some measure of education,
medical requirements and ameni-
ties, the same social considerations
should obviously apply in the de-
termination of wages and salaries
for the lowest grade of the Gov-
ernment's own employees."

What happens in the private sector?
If we will be taking any company
which is a member of the Bengal
Chamber of Commerce, if we will be
taking any employee at a comparative
level in the Tatas, how does his pay
compare with the pay of a clerk in the
Government of India? I will be tel-
ling what the disparity is within the
Government, where the Government
has got partial control. In the L.I.C.,
in the Reserve Bank and in the State
Bank, a matriculate gets Rs. 90 and
beginning from 90 he rises to Rs. 300
whereas in the Government today, he
gets Rs. 110 and he rises to Rs. 180.
This is what I am telling. There is a
principle adumbrated, accepted,
though it may not have received the
sanction of statute because of techni-
cal reasons.

The whole argument is, where are
we to get the money. May I tell them
once again, you ask, how do we sus-
tain a case. By quoting relevant au-
thorities in the country. Here is what
Justice Rajadhyaksha said. When he

[Shri Nath Pai]

was confronted with similar arguments by the civil servants, in sterling tones he told the country what is the duty towards the employees. Either we maintain them well or we reduce them. What is the other way out? Here is the reply given by this eminent jurist:

"Considering this problem from this point of view, the paying capacity of the department is strictly not a relevant consideration."

You cannot go on trotting out that we do not have. This may sound a slightly irresponsible stand in the sense where are we to get the money when the burden is increased by leaps and bounds.

May I take some small statistics though generally they are not very reliable as we heard from eminent Congress benches when we discussed the Statistical Institute of India. If you take this budget burden of Rs. 16 crores, a large part of it, Shri Morarji Desai's department is going to keep for the Government employees as compulsory provident fund. The burden, therefore, becomes reduced by a half. He has recommended an increase of working hours, has cut down public holidays, has curtailed casual leave and also earned leave. Has any computation been made of these factors? A government employee is called upon now to work an additional 31 days by the four factors that I have referred to. He is going to work one Saturday every month more, his earned leave has been cut down by 12 days, his casual leave has been cut down and also his public holidays have been cut down. In a country which does not boast so much of socialism, Austria, an employee after working 12 months is presented with a pay packet of 14 months' pay. If you doubt it, you may write to Arbeiter Kamer and he will write to you in reply.

The stock argument we are finding is, public holidays in India were too

many. Perhaps, to a certain extent, they were. But, then, they compare them with countries where the living conditions, housing conditions, pay and climate radically differ from similar factors prevailing in our country. That in Britain public holidays are not as numerous as in our country is a fact which one can concede, very easily. But, when we take one factor, can we neglect the others, the kind of housing, the kind of salary, the kind of working conditions and the kind of climate?

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to interrupt the hon. Member. I was not a little surprised when I heard that the 1st of January was not a public holiday in England. I was there recently, in January this year. I was surprised that it is not a public holiday there. The hon. Member may go on.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): That is more important in Scotland. The Scottish people are given a holiday.

Mr. Speaker: I only pointed out what came to my notice.

Shri Nath Pai: Kindly permit me to point out, Sir, may be public holidays in India are numerous; but while making this comparison, the relevant other factors obtaining in those countries also should be taken into consideration. That is my humble submission.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Nath Pai: Thank you very much.

Now I come to this holiday business. One little point regarding the railways alone is very important. By cutting down their holidays, and adding to their work, Jagjivan Ram Babu is making an even more handsome contribution to the General Budget than he usually makes. The railways' contribution in terms of the added labour they are going to make is going to be in the vicinity of Rs. 25

crores. Contrast this, that is my plea. They never calculate, I think, the value of labour. By the new additional burden, 2,017,000 Government employees are going to work for you without any kind of additional pay for the work for 31 days in the year. Now, has it no value, or is labour free? You can give me some statistics if you have.

Since railway employees constitute perhaps nearly 56 per cent. of the total number of Government employees, some pointed reference to them here is not out of place. The present recommendations, therefore, nullify the policy relating to the avenues of promotion evolved by the Joint Advisory Committee of 1950, the new deal of 1957, Justice Shankar's Tribunal award of 1958 and the Class IV Staff Promotion Enquiry Committee of 1958, and lays down a principle inimical to the interests of the employees. On four different occasions, these eminent bodies went into the problems and made certain recommendations. They have been washed away by the work of this Commission.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: You are confused very much.

Shri Nath Pal: Maybe.

May I point out that the curtailment, again, in the medical benefits which his employees were so far getting and making this contributory health service compulsory, is adding to their burden? Of course, eight annas is a very small burden when we take our budget, but we take the budget of the average man working there, it is a big burden. He could get reimbursements of the moneys also, which is to be stopped.

Now I will come to the compulsory provident fund. I have got a table before me here. If you will bear with me, I will show what are the inequities this compulsory provident fund is going to bring about. I am one with the Pay Commission that the habit of

thrift, of saving, has got to be cultivated, but if you are asking one to save who cannot afford, that means you are asking him to lower even those meagre standards which he is having.

There is another very dangerous principle about it. If I have Rs. 5 today and if this Rs. 5 is returned to me after 20 years, it will not have the same value. Recently the Finance Minister disclosed to the House how the rupee has depreciated, how it does not buy what it used to in 1939. The rupee which I am compelled to save, and not use for my family, when it is returned to me after some years will not buy one-third of what I can buy today. This is another inequity. It is quite true that it happens to all savings, but I am pointing out to you how the burden becomes more increased and unbearable in the case of those whose incomes are very low. That is the whole point.

May I point out how the inequity of making this compulsory operates? Here is one example. A man getting Rs. 55 today, or Rs. 105 including his allowance, will get Rs. 2 less after the deduction because 10 per cent. will be deducted from his total earnings. A man getting Rs. 66 plus Rs. 55 dearness allowance gets Rs. 119 today. According to the new scale, he will get Rs. 125 but compulsory provident fund will be deducted, so that the man loses another Rs. 3. Most of these are small categories. Therefore they will get a smaller packet. These are worked out tables.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: His provident fund is 10 per cent?

Shri Nath Pal: Yes.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: You are confused.

Shri Nath Pal: It varies according to the categories. Therefore I refer to the particular category where ten per cent. applies.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Where does ten per cent. come?

Shri Nath Pai: There it is in this category. They are shaking their heads. I would like to have figures rather than their shaking heads. That is the reply he will be giving to a statistical argument I would like counter arguments and counter statistics, not such a platitude that this is confusion.

Shri Morarji Desai: You will get it, something which you do not know.

Shri Nath Pai: All right, I am waiting for you. This will be a novelty for the House to get statistics from you.

Shri Morarji Desai: This is what I am getting from you.

Shri Nath Pai: We normally get only platitudes from you. This time you promise statistics. I look forward to them.

Shri Jadhav (Malegaon): Sir, why this running commentary?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member need not invite that.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I say that if the hon. Member addresses the Chair, I will never say anything? He goes on addressing me.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister is adroitly trying to instigate you against me by suggesting that I am ignoring you.

Mr. Speaker: Both the Members come from the same State, and they know each other.

Shri C. D. Pande: Now, the States are being bifurcated. After the bifurcation, there should be no bitterness.

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Member conclude now.

Shri Nath Pai: I would say a word about housing. Now, a man who gets Rs. 60 pay and Rs. 50 allowance gets in all Rs. 110. The rent is to be charged at the rate of 10 per cent of his pay. Formerly, he was paying

Rs. 6. Now, he will pay Rs. 11. Here, again, he is at a loss. By the merger of pay and dearness allowance, the man is put to a disadvantage. There are a variety of fields in which the inequities can be cited.

Now, I shall come to one point, before I take a very small second point. The first point is regarding the trade union rights. One was very sorry that the Pay Commission had lost this opportunity of putting the entire civil service on a sound basis. The Pay Commission says that the service conduct rules are quite satisfactory. Are these satisfactory rules? Are rules 4A and 4B satisfactory, the rules against which the Government employees have been agitating peacefully and constitutionally through this House and through the High Court, and which they have been trying to remove? I may tell you a very queer experience I had. I went to appeal to a Minister to remove the defects. He said, they must be good. I asked him, 'who made them?'. He said, 'I made them'. I asked him, 'Do you make it a crime in India to come and say, 'I am hungry'? He asked, 'Where is the rule?'. I said, 'This is the service conduct rule'. And these rules, the Pay Commission are satisfied, are good for India. This was, I think, one more opportunity lost for putting them on a satisfactory basis.

Regarding superannuation, may I point out that the Pay Commission's recommendations ought to have been accepted *in toto* or rejected? What Government are trying to do, I say without attributing motives to them, is likely to lead to sinister practices. A man may remain until 55 is reached, but if 'we' need his services—'we' meaning the Ministers—then he will be retained. This may lead to sinister practices. For, we cannot have the assurance that always we shall have Ministers who will be taking into consideration the interests of the State, the services and the country; so, this may lead to nepotism. A man will be, therefore, led to say 'If only I behave, I shall get another three years'. Government ought not to have this

power, except in the case of technical and scientific personnel. Either superannuation should be granted automatically, or it should not be at the discretion of the Ministers. Right now, we may be having Ministers about whom we need not have any doubt. But I am talking on a question of principle, and they should give consideration to that.

Since you have rung the bell, though I have many more points to refer to, may I say one small thing in conclusion? Here is one good opportunity. I would appeal to the Home Minister, the Finance Minister and the Railway Minister that it is not too late to try to sit with the representatives of the employees. That is what the Pay Commission has recommended. One of their good suggestions is the Whitley Council suggestion, and a general council for all. I hope the Home Minister is going to accept that. That will be an opportunity to sit down, to discuss and to modify those anomalies, where they are wrong, and to do justice to the Government employees.

I shall also say that where the Pay Commission has failed our employees, if the Government also do not act, it will be up to this House to try to persuade Government to do justice to the employees. What is happening in Madhya Pradesh should not make us happy, should not make us angry, but should make us think. If we take this caution, we may find a way whereby the legitimate grievances of the Government employees can be redressed, and justice even at this late hour can be done to them, and we may have a thing, which we badly need, an efficient, loyal and dependable service on which alone depends all our dreams for a better and richer India. I think the hon. Minister will look at the whole point, not from the point of view of money only, but from the wider aspect of providing India with a vehicle which we badly need at this hour.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal (Uluberia):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, speakers who have preceded me have already discussed the principles involved in this Pay Commission's Report. As time is very short, I would like to refer to practical, concrete instances how government employees have been deprived not only of what they would have been getting but also of what they were getting.

This Report reminds me of the proverb of a mountain's giving birth to a mouse. In this case, I should say this is not even a living mouse, but it is a dead and rotten mouse. Though I am very much disturbed, like all other trade unionists, for the ultimate result of this Report which is very bad, still I feel more disturbed at the change in the existing notions or concepts of problems of the trade union movement. I am much more disturbed for the changed viewpoint advocated in the Report, through which they have made an attempt to consider the problems of the Government employees.

First of all, there was a departure in not taking a trade unionist on the Commission. This has already been referred to by Shri Narayanankutty Menon. In the Varadachariar Commission, a trade unionist of reputation was taken, due to which they had to take a liberal view of the demands of the employees. The second departure has been in regard to the definition of 'fair wages'. From the very beginning, from the time of the Islington Commission in 1912, to the Lee Commission in 1923 and to the Varadachariar Commission, a liberal construction had been put on the definition of 'fair wages'. Government accepted the principle that there should not only be a bare sustenance wage given but in order to maintain the efficiency of the workers, some more comforts should be given to them; for that reason, they should be given more wages than wages which are meant for their bare sustenance. That principle has been disturbed by the present Commission.

[Shri Aurobindo Ghoshal]

I would like to give some concrete instances. About 93 per cent of the Government employees belong to classes III and IV. Let me cite two instances—one from the Railways and the other from the P. & T. Department. It will be evident from these instances that really the employees have not received anything from the recommendations made in this Report. I would like to refer to the Accounts Clerk of the Railway Department, in Grade I and Grade II. The Grade II Accounts Clerk gets a basic pay of Rs. 60, D.A. Rs. 50 (according to the existing rate), house rent allowance Rs. 15, interim D.A. Rs. 5 and local allowance Rs. 7—all total Rs. 137 per month. What will he be getting according to the recommendations of the Commission? He will be getting a pay of Rs. 110, that is, basic pay, D.A. Rs. 10 and other allowances Rs. 22—total Rs. 142. Now the provident fund contribution was previously Rs. 7-2. So it comes to Rs. 129-14. According to the Commission's recommendations, after deduction of provident fund contribution of Rs. 9-3, the total comes to Rs. 132-13. So the difference comes to Rs. 2-15 (deducting Rs. 129-14 from Rs. 132-13) per month.

As regards accounts clerks, grade I, I give this instance. They are getting only Rs. 4-10 extra per month after the implementation of the award by this new Commission.

As regards class IV staff, peons, before this award the basic pay was Rs. 30, D.A. 40 and other allowances Rs. 20; total Rs. 90, less provident fund Rs. 4-3, net total of Rs. 85-13. After the award the basic salary will be Rs. 70, D. A. Rs. 10, other allowances Rs. 15, total Rs. 95 minus provident fund Rs. 5-13, net total Rs. 89-3; and the net gain is Rs. 3-6.

But on an analysis you will find that they have to surrender about 31

days leave consisting of casual leave 3 days, 7 days holidays, earned leave 8 days and Saturdays 13. They have to surrender 31 days for the benefit of this small amount under this award.

I give another instance of the P. & T. Department, because of the Government employees 75 per cent of the people belong to the P. & T. Department, the Railways and also the Ministry of Defence. They constitute the major portion of the Government employees. I will give an instance of class IV and class III staff of the P. & T. Class IV category of packers, peons etc. were getting Rs. 30 salary and Rs. 45 D.A.; total Rs. 75. After this award they will get Rs. 70 pay and D.A. Rs. 10; total Rs. 80. They get Rs. 5 benefit and there will be a deduction of Rs. 5 for provident fund. So, the net benefit comes to nil. Those persons getting Rs. 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35 will be getting nothing. There will be no benefit except to those who were getting Rs. 35 basic salary, who will get a benefit of Rs. 2 50nP only.

Let us come to the postmen. Here also if we take those getting between Rs. 35 to Rs. 47, we see that none of them gets any benefit from this award; those who get Rs. 47 will get Re. 1 extra per month. Those who are getting Rs. 46 will lose Re. 1.

Then, we take the head postmen grade. All of them are losing. Those who were getting salaries from Rs. 55 to Rs. 85 are losing Rs. 2 to Rs. 4 per month.

If we go to the clerical grades, we find that those who were getting between Rs. 60 and Rs. 170 are losing from Rs. 2 to Rs. 9 per month. If we take the lower selection grade who were getting from Rs. 160 to Rs. 250 we find that they are losing to the extent of Rs. 8 to Rs. 19 per month. This has been the real benefit to the workers after this award.

If we consider these recommendations we will find that the definition of fair wages which was almost accepted and expanded by different commissions has been nullified and negated by the award of the present Pay Commission.

As regards the incremental value of efficiency bars I would like to point out this. We were in favour of abolishing the efficiency bars. But where the efficiency bars are retained the increments after the efficiency bar stage are always increased. But, here in this award we find that after the efficiency bar no increment has been given to the incremental steps. Naturally, the principle that after the efficiency bar the rate of increments should be increased has not been accepted by this Commission. I can give one example from the railways. The scale of an accounts clerk—grade I—is Rs. 130—5—160—8—200—EB—8—256—EB—8—280—10—300. Even after the efficiency bar, the amount of the increment has not been increased.

Regarding dearness allowance also, the Commission has not considered the fixing of responsibility on the Government for the policy of the price freezing so that the Government and the workers are not forced to move in a vicious circle with demands for pay increase and inflation. These salutary principles have not been discussed in the Report. If the standard principle of having a fixed price is accepted and implemented, the workers cannot have a grievance.

There has been bungling regarding categorisation also. All sorts and categories of workers have been bundled together and grades have been wrongly staggered. In that respect also, the normal principle has not been observed.

The Commission has recommended 1st July, 1959 as the date of implementation. But the Government has

changed the date to 1st November, 1959 for giving the cash benefits and we do not know why the Government has arbitrarily changed it. Government is thus depriving the workers even the small lump sum of arrears for the period from 1st July, 1959 to 1st November, 1959 by making an ex-gratia payment to the provident fund of the benefits for that period. There is sufficient ground for the grievance of the employees.

The other benefits such as the holidays, casual leave and other amenities which were enjoyed by the Government employees have also been reduced to such an extent that ultimately the workers have been asked to put in more work in the name of development of the country without a corresponding allowance or increase in the salary.

18 hours:

This Pay Commission was a Pandora's Box. Whenever the workers make any demand, a Commission or a committee is the substitute. When a scandal is to be suppressed, a committee is set up. This is the way in which the Government wants to delay the matter and suppress the real grievances. This time the demands came from the different categories of employees to increase their pay and allowances so that they can live and maintain their families. Government set up this Pay Commission and everybody thought that something would come. Some hope was lingering in everybody's mind that something may come out from this Pandora's box. But we came to know after the publication of this report that the last fly has flown from this box. After this last hope had gone, after the zest in life has gone from the employees, they will become desperate. I know what a desperate man can do. He can do impossible things. As it has been suggested by my friends, I would request the Government and the hon. Finance Minister to sit together with

[Shri Aurobindo Ghoshal]

the employees and the representatives of their unions so that the injustice that has been done by the report of this Pay Commission may be modified. The injustice done should be removed, some compensation should be made and the decisions should be revised. It will not only be in the interest of the employees, but also in the interest of the Government and also our planned developmental works.

Mr. Speaker: The House now stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow. This discussion also will continue tomorrow.

18.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, December 18, 1959/Agrahayana 27, 1881 (Saka).