

of Proceedings of the  
Sixteenth Session of  
the Indian Labour  
Conference

15 hrs.

**MOTION re: SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTEENTH SESSION OF THE INDIAN LABOUR CONFERENCE**

**Mr. Chairman:** Now, we will take up the motion of Shri Diwan Chand Sharma. The hon. Member may move his motion.

**Shri Diwan Chand Sharma (Gurdaspur):** Sir, I beg to move.

"That this House takes note of the Summary of Proceedings of the Sixteenth Session of the Indian Labour Conference laid on the Table of the House on the 11th August, 1958",

I am very happy to have the privilege of initiating the discussion on the Report of the Sixteenth Indian Labour Conference held at Naini Tal during 1958. I am very happy because when all is said and done the Labour Ministry has a good record of work during the last few years since we attained independence. It has been responsible for measures which have done some amount of good to the workers. It has been able to produce a sense of responsibility amongst employers and workers and, if I should be permitted to say so, amongst those officials who deal with the workers' problems.

I remember reading the observations of a foreign team about the developments in India. It was said in their report that our labour legislation was in excess of the social context of our country and also in excess of the economic possibilities of our country.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** Certainly not.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I do not agree with that and I am glad that our Labour Minister has not lent his ears to these observations which have come from this visiting team of foreign experts. But, all the same I speak with some limitations.

There are many leaders of the trade union movement in this House and I do not claim to be one. I am not one of the prosperous employers; nor am I an official who has to implement these recommendations. Of course, I have a certain amount of experience so far as labour goes. I have headed once a union of white-collared workers. I am also interested in unions of skilled and semi-skilled workers. I say all this because I know that some of my remarks will, perhaps, not be very much welcome to some of the aggressive trade union leaders that we find all over the world. All the same, I think this report is interesting reading.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Aggressive!

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** In the first place, I think, the setting up of this conference is a step in the right direction though I find certain gaps in it. I find in this conference the Ministers of Labour, Works, Housing and Supply, a Member of the Planning Commission, the Minister of Commerce and Industry, the Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel and even the Defence Minister. But I do not understand why the Minister of Food and Agriculture should not be there, because the problem of agricultural labour is a great problem in our country. I think it affects so many lakhs of workers. It is to be found in every State in India, in every city of India and in every village of India. I do not see any reason why; when all these Ministers are called to the conference, the Minister of Food and Agriculture should not be invited. He should also be there to see what is happening so far as agricultural labour is concerned.

Again, I would say that I do not see any reason why the Minister of Education should not be there. Most of the teachers in our country want to be classified as workers. In fact, there is legislation brought forward, so far as the West Bengal Government is concerned, which deals with strikes and things like that by hospital workers and teachers. So, the

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

teachers in West Bengal are going to be equated with workers and others. That may be happening in other States also.

I also find that sometimes the relations between the teachers and managements are not very happy. So, if it is the function of the Labour Ministry to smooth the relations between employers of whatever category they may be and workers of whatever category they may be, I do not see any reason why the Minister of Education should not also be there.

Again, I cannot understand why the Minister of Information and Broadcasting had been omitted from this grand list. The Minister of Information deals with a very important aspect of our national life. He deals with the Press. We know the relations between the workers in the Press and the Press owners or the Press Managers have not been very happy. At least I often find that there is some kind of uneasiness always in the relations between the managements of newspapers and those persons who are responsible for running these newspapers.

Recently, there was a threat of strike on behalf of the P.T.I. employees. I do not know what would have happened to all the proceedings in Parliament if that thing had happened. Similarly, there are other things which come up for discussion on the floor of this House. So, I should have thought that he should also have been there to see how the Ministry is working *vis-a-vis* the workers who are engaged in the different aspects so far as this Ministry is concerned.

Then, there is the Ministry of Transport and Communications. It is a big thing. If the Minister of Railways can be there, I do not understand why the Minister of Transport and Communications should not be there. After all, he is also dealing with a large number of employees. So I ask this question why is it that only some Ministers were there

and why other Ministers who also deal with workers of one type or the other were not there.

Shri Goray (Poona): Don't you think that the Home Minister who deals with strikes should have been there?

Shri D. C. Sharma: I think I shall leave it to you. I do not want to exhaust all the points.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member must address the Chair.

Shri D. C. Sharma: What can I do, Sir? This gentleman has such a pleasing face that I cannot help looking at him.

Again, I find that the representatives of the States were there. I think all the States were represented. But, why not the Union territories; why not Delhi and Himachal Pradesh; why not other Union territories? I know there has been a lot of trouble in Himachal Pradesh between the transport workers and the authorities. In Delhi we are up against some kind of problem or other affecting the workers every now and then. Why should these Union territories not be there in order that the conference could have the fullest discussion, could have comprehensive information and adequacy of recommendations?

Of course, I have found a large number of officials attending this conference. I am not very unhappy about that because they function all the time behind the scenes. I do not mind if the conference has more officials provided the other categories are also represented there.

There are employers. I find that only few of the employers were there. I do not know what principle was adopted for the representation of the employers. I would have thought that the employers of almost all the leading industries should be represented there. I am not very fond of employers but I want due considera-

## Labour Conference

tion to be shown to every section that is there: Again, there are workers—I am subject to correction—who represent only four organisations. Some of them are invitees and others were visitors and observers. This classification is very interesting but I would have thought that a little more scope should be there so far as the representation of these organisations is concerned. This would have given this Conference much more solidity of representation and much more authority. So far as the principles of this conference are concerned, I am fully in agreement with them. For instance, decisions must be unanimous before they are implemented. All these recommendations are done on a voluntary basis and they are followed by legislation or executive action. The conference has also formulated certain codes of discipline, grievance procedure, code of efficiency, etc. and I will refer to them later on in the speech. All these things mean a lot of good to the workers.

So far as this conference is concerned, I cannot do better than quote the observation made by Shri Dange, the Leader of the Communist Group here. It shows the cordiality, goodwill and friendly relations that existed there. The report says:

“Shri S. A. Dange congratulated the Chairman on the success of the Conference. He was happy that the Conference was coming to grip concrete problems instead of discussing theory and principles. The Conference was in the nature of an association of friends who discussed problems embracing the whole field of industrial relations and came to agreements about them. If this system continued it would ensure the proper development of national economy.”

In India we are dealing with two problems—problems of production and distribution. There are some countries which are high production and high consumption countries and we

are also trying to move in that direction. But we cannot for this take as our model any highly industrialised country, such as the United States or any country which has advanced very much along industrial self-sufficiency. Since our Government is always sending abroad delegations to study new problems—I am happy that it is done—I would say that our Labour Ministry would be well-advised in sending a delegation to West Germany to study why the industrial relations are so good in that country. Why is production per unit so high? Why is the industrial index rising day by day? How is it that the people were not only able to make good the loss suffered during the war but were able to become one of the biggest industrial countries of the world? We should study the method of production in that country study the welfare agencies for workers and the training system in that country so that we may benefit by what is happening there.

I am very happy that Shri Nanda is presiding over this Ministry.

पंडित ब्रज नारायण “ब्रजेश” (शिवपुरी):  
सभापति महोदय, कोरम नहीं है।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): The Prime Minister is equal to fifty hon. Members!

Shri D. C. Sharma: He is careful about the welfare of the workers and very anxious to implement all the good resolutions of this Conference. I would have liked more dynamism in this Ministry. It works on scientific lines to implement its policies. It has study groups and it has implementation committees. It has all the apparatus for the study of problems and for the implementation of the recommendations. I am very happy about it. After all we have to work within a democratic set-up. But I find that so far as the putting into effect of this resolution is concerned, the position is not as good as it should be. The speed is limited. Perhaps the labour relations are a very complex problem. It is not easy to find one's way in this labyrinth

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

of labour relations. I understand that. But all the same, I would say that the Labour Ministry should develop a new kind of dynamism. When we talk about our Plan, we talk of the take-off stage. I wish that this Ministry should also have that take-off stage. It should develop dynamism which improves industrial relations and adds to production.

For instance, when I look up at the record of this Ministry I feel happy but I do not feel very happy. Of course, about one thing I feel extremely happy and I wish that it should be the pattern of our industrial relations in this country. I turn to page 156 of this report and I find there something which does my heart a lot of good. It should be the basic pattern of employer-employee relations in every country.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member's time is up.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I would need about thirty minutes.

**Mr. Chairman:** The Minister wants to take half an hour.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** How can he take half an hour if I do not take half an hour?

**Mr. Chairman:** He has taken 20 minutes and I will give him another five minutes.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I find here:

"Government have always approved and encouraged mutual agreements between employers' and workers' organisations."

Then I find a list of those agreements given; the management and workers of T.I.S.C.O., Jamshedpur; Bombay Millowners Association, Bombay and its workers and so on. I wish this pattern should be the prevailing pattern of industrial relations in my country, and I hope the Ministry will do something to bring that thing about.

So far as the employees' state insurance scheme is concerned, I do not think I can congratulate the Ministry on its performance, because I find that there are so many cities in which it has not come into full fruition so far. This is something which can give the workers an impression of the welfare State which we are building up. I should be very happy if the employees' state insurance scheme is given a greater momentum.

Again, I find that under the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme there is a recommendation that the rate of contribution should be raised from 6½ per cent to 8-1/3 per cent but it has not yet been receiving as much attention as it should. There was also the question that the Industrial Disputes Act should be amended and District Judges should be there to decide the disputes, but that also has not been done. So far as subsidized industrial housing scheme is concerned, the progress has been good but not adequate. I wish that the progress should become better than what it is now.

So far as productivity is concerned, we are studying this problem in respect of certain industries, but I think it should become a measure embracing every industry.

Sir, I am a teacher. When I think of the workers' education I feel very very sore. I think so far we have got only one institute for workers' education at Indore—if I am wrong I may be corrected, but that was given in reply to a question which was put some time back. Workers' education is one of the urgent needs and I would say that it should receive top priority at the hands of the Ministry.

**Shri Tangamani (Madurai):** One school has completed its course; there is another school going on now.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Regarding workers' participation, it has not made much headway. I am very happy, of course, that the grievances proce-

procedure has been laid down. I think this will promote happy industrial relations to a great deal. It is given on page 148 of the Report. I do not want to read it out, but I think an attempt has been made to simplify the machinery. On page 151 it is said:

"Need to make the machinery simple and expeditious:—

- (a) As far as possible, grievances should be settled at the lowest level.
- (b) No matter should ordinarily be taken up at more than two levels, i.e., normally there should be only one appeal.
- (c) Different types of grievances may be referred to appropriate authorities.
- (d) A grievance must be redressed as expeditiously as possible and towards this end, the employer, in consultation with the workers, should decide upon the time limit required for settling a grievance."

I think this is a very good procedure and I hope it would be put into effect very soon.

Again, I want that the employment relief fund to which the Minister referred should be instituted as early as possible. I think this will also make the workers of our country put their hearts into the work.

I would also like that the public and private undertakings should not be dealt with on a different level and that the workers of public undertakings should be treated in the same way as we treat the workers in private undertakings; perhaps, in certain matters they are better off than the workers in private undertakings but there should be equalisation of advantages.

In the end, Sir, I would say this much, that I do not want to end my speech on a note of complaint, but I

must say that this Report which has been given by the Labour Ministry is a very very good report, not good in this sense that it details only what has been done, but good also in the sense that it has summarised the different view points and that it has also stated what is not done and what remains to be done. Therefore, this report is not a report which is full of pious hopes or vague generalisations, it is a report which deals with concrete reality. These concrete realities affect not only the workers of India but also our country and also our nation. They have got to work much more than ever before. You know, Sir, our relations with China are not very happy, and I think the workers may have to use their energy in a greater degree than before, they will have to work with greater vigour than before.

So I say, this report makes very good reading and it deals with realities. I, therefore, welcome this report and, at the same time, I hope the Labour Ministry will develop a new kind of momentum in solving this problem and in implementing those schemes which it has itself formulated.

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That this House takes note of the summary of Proceedings of the Sixteenth Session of the Indian Labour Conference, said on the Table of the House on the 11th August, 1958."

There are some six names with me. I propose that hon. Members should try to finish within ten minutes; at any rate, they should not exceed 12 minutes.

**Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Vellore):** There are some hon. Members who have not given their names but who would like to participate in the debate.

**Mr. Chairman:** In that case I will have to limit the time further. Let it be ten minutes for each Member.

श्री राध कृष्ण मुत्त (महेश्वर गढ़) :  
सभापति जी, इंडियन लेबर कानफरेंस का जो १६वां सेशन नैरोताल में हुआ था उसके प्रोसीडिंग्स की रिपोर्ट जो हाउस के सामने रखी गई है, उसको देखने से पता चलता है कि उस कानफरेंस में बहुत से ऐसे मैटर्स पर विचार किया गया जो कि लेबर की बेहतरी से बहुत ज्यादा साल्लुक रखते हैं। उदाहरण के तौर पर इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशन्स, सबसी-डाइज्ड इंडस्ट्रियल हाउसिंग स्कॅम, इन्वे-स्यूएशन एंड इम्प्लीमेंटेशन ऑफ लेबर इन्-क्रेमेंट्स, एवार्ड्स, सैटिलमेंट्स, एपीमेंट्स। इस कानफरेंस में इस बात पर भी विचार किया गया कि वर्कर्स डिसिप्लिन और प्रीबॉस प्रोसीज्योर कैसा बनाया जाये और वर्कर्स पारटिसिपेशन इन मैनेजमेंट की स्कीम में कितनी तरक्की हुई है और मैकिड फाइव डयर प्लान के अन्दर जो लेबर पालिसी को इम्प्लीमेंट करने के लिये उसूल तै किया गया था उसमें कितनी कामयाबी हुई है।

इस रिपोर्ट का देखने से पता चलता है कि जहाँ तक इन तमाम चीजों का ताल्लुक है इन तमाम चीजों में काफी तरक्की हुई है। लेकिन इसके साथ साथ दो तीन चीजें ऐसी भी हैं जिनकी तरफ और भी ज्यादा ध्यान देने की जरूरत है।

मैं सबसे पहले उस तजवीज को लेता हूँ जिसके बारे में इस कानफरेंस में भी विचार किया गया था; कि हमारा जो मीजूदा इंडस्ट्रियल डिसप्यूट्स ऐक्ट है उसको अमेंड किया जाय। यह खुशी की बात है। इसके बारे में मेरी सिर्फ एक ही तजवीज है कि जिस वकत इस ऐक्ट को अमेंड किया जाये तो इस बात का भी खास तौर पर ख्याल रखा जाये कि इस ऐक्ट के अन्दर जो सेक्शन ३ है उसके जरिये जो वर्कर्स कमेटीज मुकरर की गई हैं उनके फंक्शन और पावर को बढ़ाया जाय। इस किस्म का सवाल इस हाउस में भी कई बफा उठाया

गया है और यह बाहिर किया गया कि इस पर विचार हो रहा है। मेरा धरना यह विचार है कि अगर सही तौर पर यह माळूम करने की कोशिश की जाये कि जो वर्कर्स कमेटीज बनायी गई थीं वह कितनी कामयाब हुईं तो आप इस नतीजे पर पहुँचेंगे कि वह तकरीबन फेल हो गई हैं। उनकी कोई खास ताकत नहीं, उनके हाथ में कोई खास फंक्शन नहीं। मेरी इस बात की ताईद उत्तर प्रदेश के श्रीक भनिस्ट्र साहब ने भी अपनी इनागरल स्पीच में की थी और उन्होंने यह कहा :

"What shall we do" about the Works Committee? I have always emphasized the importance of its role in the growth of industrial democracy. But it is also my definite view that if it has to exist, it should do so as a live and vigorous institution. At the moment a wide-spread impression is that in most cases the Works Committees are not performing any useful function."

यह बात काफी हद तक दुस्त है और मेरा भी धरना यही इम्प्रेसन है और मेरा कहना है कि अगर वर्कर्स कमेटीज को रियल पावर दी जात। तो हमें जो दूसरी स्कीम तैयार करनी पड़ी कि लेबर को मेनेजमेंट में हिस्सा दिया जाय, शायद उसकी जरूरत न पड़ती। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि माननीय मंत्री इस बात पर जरूर विचार करेंगे। इस विषय में मैंने भी एक छोटा सा बिल इस हाउस में पेश किया था। अगर माननीय मंत्री जी उस बिल को स्वीकार कर लें तो मेरा यह ख्याल है कि उनको काफी पावर मिल सकती है। उस बिल के जरिये मैंने हाउस के सामने यह तजवीज रखी थी कि सेक्शन ३ के सब सेक्शन २ के बाहिर में एक नया सब सेक्शन और लफा दिया जाये और उसके उसकी पावर काफी बढ़ सकती है।

"(3) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Works Committee shall be entitled to exercise all such powers as the employer is authorised to exercise and to do all such acts and things as the employer is authorised to do in the matters of production, workers' amenities and facilities provided under the various provisions of the Factories Act, 1948 and any matter of common interest:

Provided that it shall have no say in the purchase or sale of any goods or property on behalf of the industrial establishment but all accounts shall be placed in the meeting of the Committee.

(4) The Works Committee shall decide all industrial disputes provided in the schedules of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and unanimous decision of the Committee shall be final and binding upon all the parties and no appeal shall lie against the orders of the Committee."

मैं ने यह बात इसलिए कही कि आज सबसे ज्यादा ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि हमारा प्रोडक्शन बढ़े और वह तभी हो सकता है जब कि हम वर्कर्स को फुल कानफिडेंस में लें और उन पर मुक्तकण्ठ तौर पर रिलीज करें। यह ठीक है कि इस तरफ काफी कदम उठाये गये हैं और हमारी सैकंड फाइन इमप्रूव्मन्ट में भी इस बात की तरफ ध्यान दिया गया है और यह पॉलिसी तैयार की गई है जिसमें यह कहा गया है :

Paragraph 18, Chapter XXVII, on Labour Policy and Programmes:

"For the successful implementation of the plan increased association of labour with management is necessary. Such a measure would help in promoting increased productivity, for the general benefit of the enterprise, the employees and the community, giving employees a better understanding of their role in the working of industry and of the process of production and

satisfying the workers' urge for self-expression, thus leading to industrial peace, better relations and increased co-operation."

और इसके लिये कुछ अमर्जी कदम भी उठाए गए हैं। सबसे पहला अमर्जी कदम यह था कि इस परवज के लिए एक एक्सपर्ट कमीशन, स्टडी टीम दूसरे देशों को भेजी गयी। उसने यूरोप के बहुत से मुल्कों का दौरा किया और दौरा करने के बाद एक रिपोर्ट पेश की। इन रिपोर्ट के अन्दर भी इस स्कीम को इम्प्लीमेंट करने के लिए बहुत से सजेसन्स पेश किए गए हैं। मैंने रिपोर्ट के उस चैप्टर को खूब अच्छी तरह से देखा है और मुझे यह देख कर काफी दुख हुआ है कि उस कमीशन ने भी जो सिफारिशें की थी उनमें से भी अभी तक बहुत सी बातों को इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया गया। इसलिए मेरा रिक्वेस्ट है कि इस तरफ हमें मीरियसली ध्यान देना चाहिए। इस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को देखने से पता चलता है कि दूसरे देशों के अन्दर, यूरोप के अन्दर, जो ज्यादा तरक्की हुई है उसका सब से बड़ा कारण यह था कि वहाँ लेबरर्स को कानफिडेंस में लिया गया और उन पर रिलीज किया गया और कारखानों के अन्दर तमाम काम उनकी राय से होता था। इसके बारे में इस रिपोर्ट के अन्दर कई बातों का भी जिक्र किया गया है। बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि इस कानफिडेंस में भी इन तमाम बातों पर विचार किया गया। इसके बारे में मेरा तो पुस्ता खयाल यह है कि हमें इनकी पावर्स को और ज्यादा बढ़ाना पड़ेगा और अगर हमने यह कदम उठाया तो मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि इसका अच्छा असर पड़ेगा। कारखानों का प्रोडक्शन बढ़ेगा और मजदूर विल से काम करेंगे। दूसरे मुल्कों के अन्दर जहाँ जहाँ यह ग्रुप गया उन्होंने वहाँ के बारे में जो बातें कही हैं उनको देखने से भी मेरी बात की ताईद होती है। इस रिपोर्ट के सुफा ५६ पर यह कहा गया है :

[श्री राम कृष्ण गुप्त]

"Our impression of the German experiment is that, on the whole, it has worked. Germany is free from the problem of rival trade unionism and good working arrangements have been made regarding the division of functions between the trade unions and works councils as also regarding collaboration between them.....The German worker's feeling for his plant and the fact that in spite of low wages and bad food, he has done a wonderful job of rehabilitation of industry are factors which have impressed both employers and legislators."

इसलिए मेरी यह तर्जवीज है कि हमें भी इस तरफ कदम उठाना चाहिए और इन मैनेजिंग काउंसिल्स की पावर बढ़ानी चाहिए। ७ तारीख को भी इस किस्म का सवाल हाउस के सामने आया था और माननीय मंत्री जी ने यह जवाब दिया था कि इस मामले पर विचार किया जा रहा है और इंटरस्टेट पार्टीज की एक कानफरेंस बुलाई जा रही है। यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि इस कानफरेंस के अन्दर इस बात पर पूरा विचार किया जाएगा और इन मैनेजिंग काउंसिल्स के जो फंक्शन्स हैं उनको बढ़ाने की कोशिश की जाएगी। मैं इस पर इसलिए ज्यादा जोर दे रहा हूँ कि डिमाक्रेसी की कामयाबी के लिए इस बात का होना सब से ज्यादा जरूरी है कि हमारा जो लेबर और कॅपीटल प्राबलम हो वह हल हो। जरमनी का एक बहुत बड़ा ट्रेड यूनियनिस्ट लीडर हुआ है उसकी भी यही राय है :

"If democracy is to be assured as a way of life and as a form of Government, then a practical solution of the problem of capital and labour must be found."

इसके बाद दूसरी तर्जवीज जो कि म हाउस के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि इस किस्म की कामयाबी के लिए हमें

वर्कर्स की एजुकेशन की तरफ भी पूरा ध्यान देना पड़ेगा। इस रिपोर्ट में भी इस बात की तरफ इशारा किया गया है। आज दो किस्म की एजुकेशन की सबसे ज्यादा जरूरत है। एक तो हमें उनको बिबिन इंडस्ट्री ट्रेनिंग देनी चाहिए और दूसरे उनमें ट्रेड यूनियनिज्म की एजुकेशन देनी है, क्योंकि आज हम देखते हैं कि इस कमी के कारण उनके खिलाफ अक्सर यह इल्जाम लगाया जाता है, और यह दलील दी जाती है कि अगर उनको ज्यादा जिम्मेदारी दी गई, तो वे इस बोझ को नहीं उठा सकेंगे। यह कमी तभी पूरी हो सकती है, अगर उनको मुकम्मल ट्रेनिंग दी जाये। इसका फायदा यह भी होगा कि इससे वर्कर्स में कानशेसनेस पैदा होगी। आज हम देखते हैं कि बहुत ज्यादा यूनियन बन जाती हैं और उनमें ऐसी यूनियन्स भी होती हैं, जो बांगस होती हैं और जो एम्प्लायर्स के हाथों में खेलती हैं। यह ट्रेनिंग देने से वे इस से भी बच जायेंगे। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि उनकी एजुकेशन की तरफ पूरा ध्यान दिया जायेगा।

इस कानफरेंस में ट्रेड यूनियन्स को रेकग्नाइज करने के लिए जो मैथड सजेस्ट किए गए हैं, मैं उनसे इन्तिलाफ रखता हूँ। मेरी राय यह है—और मैं पन्द्रह बीस साल तक लेबर मूवमेंट में काम करने के बाद इस नतीजे पर पहुँचा हूँ—कि अगर हम सही तौर पर मजदूरों का भला चाहते हैं, तो हमें इस तरफ कदम उठाना पड़ेगा और हमारा स्लोगन यह होना चाहिए—**बन यूनियन फार इंडस्ट्री**। इसलिए हमें अपने ट्रेड यूनियन एक्ट को भी अमेंड करना पड़ेगा, ताकि बांगस यूनियन न बन सकें और मजदूरों को एक्सप्लायट न किया जा सके।

आखिर में एक दो छोटी छोटी बातें और हाउस के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। सीकंड फ़ाइव थ्रीयर प्लान में लेबर की तरफकी के लिए जो प्रोग्राम बनाया गया था, इस



कांफ्रेंस में इस बात पर भी विचार किया गया कि वह प्रोग्राम कहां तक कामयाब हुआ है। जहां तक मैं देखता हूं, उस प्रोग्राम को कामयाब करने के लिए काफी कोशिश की जा रही है। इस बारे में एक छोटी सी तजवीज यह है कि एक ऐसी कमेटी बनाई जाये, जिसमें इस हाउस के नुमाइन्दे और मजदूरों के नुमाइन्दे हों और वे इस बात का पता लगायें कि कहा तक इस मामले में तरक्की हुई है, ता कि जब हम थर्ड फ्राइव थीयर प्लान बनायें, तो जो कमियां रह गई हैं, उनको उसमें हम पूरा कर सकें।

मेरी आखिरी तजवीज यह है—और मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि माननीय मंत्री जो इस बात को जरूर तमनोम करेंगे—कि जो लेबर कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी के पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं, उनको भी आइन्दा सालाना कांफ्रेंस में जरूर इनवाइट किया जाये। हम देखते हैं कि जो एग्जल कांफ्रेंस होती है—भमलन वर्कर्स, हाउसिंग एंड सप्लाय डिनिस्ट्री की—उनमें कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी के पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को भी इनवाइट किया जाता है। मेरी इस तजवीज का मानने में काफी फायदा होगा।

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** They were invited, but a decision was taken in the conference not to invite them. We cannot do anything.

**Shri Ram Krishan Gupta:** Therefore, I am saying this.

यह जो रिपोर्ट हाउस में रखी गई है, वह बहुत अग्रिम है और मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि उसमें जो तजवीजें मजदूरों की बेहतरी के लिए दी गई हैं, उनको पूरा करने के लिए पूरी कोशिश की जाएगी और आइन्दा जो सालाना रिपोर्ट आयेगी, उसको देखने से जरूर इस बात का पता लगेगा कि इस तरफ और भी ज्यादा तरक्की हुई है।

**Shri Tangamani:** Sir, I am one of the three Members who have given notice of this motion to discuss the

decisions taken at the sixteenth Indian Labour Conference, held in Naini Tal, on the 20th May, 1958, to which I was also one of the delegates. At the outset, I would like to say that the decisions taken at that conference are very important both for the development of industry and the development of industrial relations. As the House is aware, yearly Indian Labour Conferences are held. They are tripartite in nature and the representatives from the various State Governments are also present in these conferences.

The fifteenth Indian Labour Conference held in Delhi in July, 1957 probably marked a turn. Certain decisions were taken on the question of wage policy, casualisation, housing and the code of discipline. These four items are really an integrated whole and form the basis of the new turn I am referring to this as a new turn because of late the Indian Labour Conferences, the standing labour committees and various industrial committees are forming the national forum for discussing the various issues raised and also arriving at certain specific decisions.

Just before the sixteenth Indian Labour Conference, two important events took place. On the question of recognition of union, there was a strike which started on 12th May, 1958 in Jamshedpur and a strike was threatened as a result of the closures that were going on in the textile industry in Bombay. In this particular conference, so far as labour was concerned, not only the representatives of the four central trade unions, viz. All India Trade Union Congress, Indian National Trade Union Congress, Hind Mazdoor Sabha and the United Trade Union Congress, but the representatives of various other federations were also invited. The representatives of the All India Bank Employees' Association and the All India Defence Employees' Federation and also the employees of the textile industry in Bombay—it is not a recognised union—were also invited, viz., Shri S. M. Joshi and others.

[Shri Tangamani]

In the course of the discussions, many decisions were taken. References have already been made by Shri Sharma and the previous speaker about the decisions of the works committee, grievance procedure and the training of the employees. An important event which took place in this particular conference was the meeting initiated by the Labour Minister himself on the 24th May to avoid inter-union rivalry. So, a code of conduct was formulated, as to how the various central trade union organisations should behave themselves. I am not going into the details of those things.

My point is, when certain important decisions have been taken, how far they have been implemented? I will mention half a dozen instances to show how decisions taken for advancing the industrial relations have not been acted upon with speed by Government and have been negated by the employers. If certain decisions are taken, amendments to the various legislations should follow. For instance, it was decided that in future, before trade unions are registered, they must have four annas per mensem as the subscription fees for membership; and also, if one of the seven promoters of the union is discharged before it is registered, but who was an employee at the time of application, he will be taken to be an employee. That was agreed to, but to this day no amendment of the Indian Trade Unions Act has come.

Then, regarding the employees' state insurance, there was a prior conference of the Labour Ministers of the States and the Centre and certain specific decisions were taken. Various decisions like Rs. 30 for confinement of the wives of the insured, improvement in cash benefits, Government's share should be one-eighth of the total expenditure, etc. were taken. There was also a specific decision about the revision of the waiting period. For that, an amendment to the Employees'

State Insurance Act, 1948 is necessary, but that has not been done to this day.

So far as cash benefits to the sick persons are concerned, an employee is not entitled to it if he has not paid for seven weeks out of a period of 24 weeks. A case may arise where during these 24 weeks, there is a legal lock-out, a legal strike or a lock-out in dispute for more than 7 weeks. I may mention the case of the Madurai Mills workers. The mill was locked out for more than 8 weeks. Naturally, there will not be any contribution for those 8 weeks. If out of 24 weeks, there is no contribution for 8 weeks, according to the law, as it is today, the workers will not be entitled to cash benefits in the case of illness.

Then, employer's contribution has to be 4½ per cent as it is provided by law. But I do not know why even to this there is resistance on the part of employers. I can understand the resistance on the part of employers, but there is resistance on the part of Government and naturally there is resistance on the part of the Corporation, because the Corporation is to this day sleeping over it.

Then, at present according to the Employees' Provident Fund Act, a worker gets that privilege only if he is employed in a unit employing more than 50 workers. It was definitely accepted that it can be extended to units employing 20 persons and more. For that an amendment of the Act is necessary. What has happened to that?

Another point raised more or less in every Indian Labour Conference and resisted by the employers is the question of raising the employee's and the employer's contribution from 6½ per cent to 8-1/3 per cent. The hon. House knows that after particular decisions are taken, in the next conference the position how far these decisions are implemented is reported to the conference. Subsequently, the

17th Indian Labour Conference did take place in Madras. We were told that there was a conference and that the employers are still resisting it.

Now I will refer to another question of implementation. In the 16th Indian Labour Conference the question of amending the Industrial Disputes Act came in, particularly sections 7(a)(3) and section 24(3). Then it was agreed that a sub-committee will be set up, which will go into the various provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and also into the various decisions of the High Courts and Supreme Court and they will devise ways and means of suitably amending the Industrial Disputes Act itself. A sub-committee was set up and I understand that the recommendations of the sub-committee have been made to this committee. Still, nothing has been done for implementing these recommendations of the sub-committee. As I said, this is a real onslaught on the labour.

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abd Ali): Which is the sub-committee that the hon. Member is referring to? When was it appointed and where did it meet?

Shri Anthony Pillai (Madras North): It met in January 1959 in Bombay.

Shri Tangamani: Because of want of time, I am rushing through and I cannot deal with all the details.

The question of closures did come up and I think Nandaji told the representatives from Bombay and Kanpur to devise ways and means to prevent these closures, particularly in the textile units, plantations and also engineering industries. Regarding plantations,—I hope the hon. Minister will not deny it—it was agreed that there is no question of bringing in legislation by the State Governments. Assam Government was willing to bring in legislation to protect the employees. But it was agreed in that conference that a Central legislation

will come in, covering plantations specifically. I would like to know why no legislation has come to this day. This decision was taken in May 1958 and closures of small plantation units are taking place here and there. Still, nothing has been done about this.

Regarding cotton textiles, it is true that a textile enquiry committee was set up, and their report has been published. So, it is quite probable that closures in future are not going to increase. We were told that certain units have been taken over, particularly Model Mills in Nagpur, Ajudhya Mills in Delhi and Atherton West Mills in Kanpur. These are some of the good steps that have been taken in the case of *mala fide* closures.

The last point which I would like to mention in this connection is this: how far the decision taken in the 15th Indian Labour Conference on the question of rationalisation is being implemented. The hon. Minister knows that it is not implemented at all. It is implemented in negating it, because the implementation has to be done by the employers themselves. Unless there is a national necessity, and unless certain other conditions are satisfied, there should not be any rationalisation. But rationalisation is taking place, particularly in the textile industry in South India. The eight week lock-out in the Harvey unit was as a result of the arbitrary step taken by the employers in preventing the implementation of the decision of the 15th Indian Labour Conference.

For want of time I do not propose to say anything more and so I now come to the last point, and that is the question of the Code of Discipline. The note on implementation says:

"We did refer this matter to the Public Sector Conference which was convened subsequent to the Naini Tal Conference."

In the Public Sector Conference what was the reaction of the Government?

[Shri Tangamani]

Government is also an employer, and there are employees in the public sector also. Are they, or are they not, willing to accept the code of discipline, which has been accepted by the four central organisations, which has been accepted by the Indian Labour Conference? I would like to have a categorical reply from the Government, from the Minister, as to what is the attitude of the Government when they are employers, to the decision of the 16th Indian Labour Conference? I am asking this because the attitude of the Labour Ministry on this point is, I think, quite clear, and that is that the code of discipline must be extended to the public sector also.

**Shri Anthony Pillai:** The 16th Indian Labour Conference cannot be taken in isolation. The decisions of the said conference partially relate to the decisions of the 15th Indian Labour Conference and the 17th Indian Labour Conference. In a sense, these three Indian Labour Conferences promised a new deal to the Indian workers, a revision of the concept of industrial relations and, to that extent, they were welcomed by all sides. These ideas are not now. In fact, in 1947 there was the Industrial Truce Resolution which, unfortunately, never got implemented. But, this time, an expectation was created in the minds of all that here would be a determined effort to give a new deal to the workers and to bring about a new pattern of industrial relations. Whereas in the past such efforts were in the direction of bringing in new legislation, or amending existing legislation, an effort was made to bring about a change by consent, and various codes were formulated, like the Code of Rationalisation, Code of Discipline and the Code of Conduct. Now, these expectations were alive till 1958. But, I am afraid, now we are coming into a period of disappointment and recrimination. Workers, were under the impression

that since many of these matters were initiated by the Ministry of Labour in the Government of India, they would be purposive and some firm steps would be taken to get these decisions implemented. What labour regrets most is that despite these intentions, the sincerity of which I am not doubting, there has been a hesitancy in getting them implemented. Why has there been this hesitancy, it is very difficult to analyse. Some of it undoubtedly rests with the Government of India, and some of it rests with the State Labour Ministers.

I would like to point out first of all the omission on the part of the Labour Ministry at the Government of India level. One would normally expect that where decisions have been arrived at unanimously with regard to amending legislation, there should have been no difficulty whatsoever and no hesitation whatsoever for the Government of India to implement them without any delay.

Let us take the first one which apparently seems to be a very simple one—that the Employees' Provident Fund Act should be amended to increase the rate of contribution from 6-1/3 per cent to 8-1/3 per cent.

**Shri Abid Ali:** Where was it decided?

**Shri Anthony Pillai:** I think the Indian Labour Conference at Naini Tal.

**Shri Abid Ali:** Please see and quote their decision.

**Shri Anthony Pillai:** I will quote it in a minute. I still remember my friend who just interrupted me at that Conference pleading with the employers not to oppose the suggestion of increasing the rate of contribution from 6-1/3 to 8-1/3 per cent. I remember very well what he told the employers: why are you opposing this legislation? Even if you oppose it, Government will bring in legislation to increase the rate of contribution. Your decision is of no worth-

while purpose. Therefore, it is in your own interest to agree to the suggestion to increase the rate of contribution and save your prestige, your dignity and your self-respect. Accordingly, faced with this threat, which apparently seemed to be very strong, and which was applauded by all the labour representatives there, the employers succumbed and agreed.  
16 hrs.

Shri Abid Ali: No.

Shri Anthony Pillai: At least they gave up their opposition.

Shri Abid Ali: No. All right; proceed.

Shri Anthony Pillai: After that, there has been hesitancy in implementing this particular proposal that the rate of contribution should be increased. The employers have been resisting it. The employers have been called and persuaded. Lastly, we were told that a circular would be sent out to the various associations of particular industries to ask them to show cause why the rate of contribution should not be increased. I can understand one or two industries being able to plead that they have not got the capacity to pay in a given set of circumstances. What about many industries where the paying capacity is indubitable, like, for instance, the cigarette making industry, the petroleum industry. Can it be pleaded that these industry has no capacity to pay? If it is possible for an industrial unit of 50 workers to be able to bear the financial burden of a Provident Fund, I do not see any reason why this long held out promise that the benefits of the Employees Provident Fund Act would be liberalised to benefit the workers employed in factories employing 20 and more could not be implemented. It was also promised that Provident Fund would embrace workers in commercial establishments. These are long-standing promises. Commercial employees have been expecting that something would be done long long ago. Nothing has been done, despite

the decision of the Naini Tal Labour Conference. In this respect, it is not a question of the employers being held responsible for non-implementation or the State Governments being held responsible for non-implementation. The responsibility lies at the door of the Ministry of Labour.

Let us take another decision, where we would have thought that implementation would have been quick. It was unanimously agreed at the Indian Labour Conference at Naini Tal that there was a sufficient amount of money with the Employees State Insurance Corporation to enhance the benefits and extend them to the families of the insured workers. But, the implementation has been very slow. It is true that in one or two industrial centres, like for instance, Bangalore, these benefits have been extended to the families of the workers. Why there has not been sufficient momentum given to enable the extension to be done as rapidly as possible, there has been no explanation forthcoming. Some excuses are trotted out. If the Mysore Government can extend the benefits, I do not see why the Madras Government cannot do it. It is not that the revenues of the Madras Government are insufficient compared to the State of Mysore. We cannot believe it. There is nothing on record to show that there is incapacity.

Shri N. E. Muniswamy: They are practising economy?

Shri Anthony Pillai: They are practising economy at the expense of the workers and ultimately at the expense of industry, because, unless we have got proper health services, we are not going to get industrial production.

Take another promise that was made that the Industrial Disputes Act would be amended. A Sub-committee was set up. Various proposals and detailed proposals were submitted by various labour organisations. Nothing has been heard about that afterwards.

[Shri Anthony Pillai]

When we see that the Ministry of Labour does not move ahead to implement its promises, surely, there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction.

I will quote another instance. All these codes were accepted as good codes at the Naini Tal Indian Labour Conference. Therefore, it was suggested that it should be extended to the public sector as well. The hon. Minister of Labour was kind enough to say that he would use his influence and good offices with the other employing Ministries of the Government of India and get them to accept the code which has been unanimously approved by even, the employers. What has been done? A Conference has been convened but the code has been set aside by the employing Ministries of the Government of India, which undoubtedly is a sad reflection of the validity of the agreement. In Sweden there are annual tripartite Labour Conferences and the tradition has been set up that whatever is decided by the Labour Conference will be carried out implicitly and expeditiously by all the parties represented at that Conference. It is a sad reflection on the traditions that we are setting up in this country that unanimously approved resolutions are not implemented, and if this tradition is allowed to be persisted in, I am afraid the Indian Labour Conference will merely be a platform where pious wishes are expressed, and nothing will really be done.

I would like to place emphasis on the State Governments being unable to or unwilling to implement the recommendations. Ultimately, the administration of labour laws in many cases and in many respects rests with the State Governments. The Minister of Labour has been trying to sell this code of discipline to the various parties, the employers, the workers and the State Governments. It is the State Governments which are more recalcitrant than even the employers. The implementing machineries have been nominally set up, and in some

States not set up at all. The overburdened Commissioners of Labour are supposed to be also the implementing officers, and the net result is that nothing gets done. Even at the Delhi level, there is an implementing machinery, and I am glad that it is working, but I am afraid that that is an over-worked section of the Ministry. There is not adequate staff. A code can only be implemented by an adequate mediation machinery, and unless that mediation machinery is in existence and is sufficiently wide and staffed with adequate personnel, it will not work and the code would be a failure.

This code is an important change in the pattern of industrial relations. Once upon a time trade unions were thought to be criminal organisations, and therefore they had to be registered and licensed. Then came a stage when trade unions were tolerated, but the new code, as far as I have understood it, puts emphasis on the value of trade unions both for the workers and for the industry. It implies the acceptance that trade unionism is not some criminal tendency, but a social good, and that instead of amending the Trade Unions Act to compel recognition, employers are required, or are made to agree, to recognise representative unions, the representative character of the unions being determined by certain tests and certain rules which have been unanimously accepted.

With regard to the recognition of unions, the only sanction of this code is public opinion. So far very little has been done by way of invoking the sanction of public opinion. Some enquiries are held, enquiries have been held by the implementing machinery of the Government of India, but up to date not one of these reports has been brought to the notice of the public. When an industrial dispute or a strike or a lock-out takes place in contravention of the code, if you accept that the code can only be implemented through the sanction of

Proceedings of the  
Sixteenth Session  
of the Indian  
Labour Conference

public opinion, there should be an immediate enquiry and the facts found by that enquiry should be immediately published so that public opinion may work its way. Without invoking public opinion, this code will be a nullity, and I am afraid there has been great hesitancy on the part of the Ministry of Labour to invoke this potent sanction of public opinion. I do not know why this hesitancy is there. Perhaps the reason is that they think that without unnecessarily wounding the feelings of the employer or a union which has violated the code, by some discussion it can be settled, but surely in practice this hush-hush method is not delivering the goods. Take for instance the Premier Automobile case in Bombay State. Nothing has been done. No doubt some efforts are being made to persuade the employer, but when the efforts fail, you should release the facts. It may be that the union has made a mistake, or the employer has made a mistake, but surely the publication of the facts can only lead to a healthy tendency.

I hope and trust that as a result of this discussion in Parliament, the Government of India would exert itself a little more to implement the decisions, the proposals for which emanated from itself.

**Dr. Melkote (Raichur):** The Indian Labour Conference is being held annually for the past few years, and to an extent, it can be compared to a replica of the ILO conference. Representatives of Government, representatives of the employers and representatives of the trade unions are all present; they discuss the various aspects that affect them, and decisions are arrived at. Whenever differences of opinion arise, matters are postponed for further consideration. But, in any case, unanimous decisions are accepted, and Government try to implement them.

It is in the wake of this that we have got to consider the present report, the motion for the considera-

tion of which has been moved by Shri D. C. Sharma. He has highlighted many a point. After Independence, we have our Five Year Plans to bring the country on a par with the most advanced countries of the world, to give a better deal to the workers, and to raise the standard of living of our people. In the wake of this, numerous decisions have been taken in these conferences, and quite a good deal of them had been implemented by Government through the various Acts that they have passed in this House.

As I said, we are too near the picture. The Naini Tal conference was a historic turning-point in the relations between labour and management. The industrial relations between management and labour were highlighted in this conference. It was in this conference, for the first time, that matters like code of discipline, code of efficiency, and code of conduct were first discussed, and decisions were arrived at. These decisions that have been arrived at are still being discussed and being thrashed out. They were discussed again at Madras recently in the recent conference that was held there.

I think this is a historic turning-point, for the simple reason that in a country which has four hundred million population whose standard of life has been very low, and which wants to catch up with the rest of the world as quickly as possible, production is a very important factor; and production must go up. The worker is an important element in any industry in this regard; it is neither management nor capital nor machinery; granted that all these things are there, unless the worker is satisfied, and he puts forth his best effort, nothing could be achieved.

Therefore, Government sought the help of the working class for productive purposes. In the wake of this, they invited the management's attention to many of the drawbacks the labour has been suffering from

[Dr. Melkote]

throughout, and the affairs are being set right now.

One of the decisions that the Naini Tal conference took was that the efficiency of the industry should be improved, and for that purpose, there should be a code of discipline that the worker would put in his very best. The workers, on the other side, put in a number of counter-proposals that there were strikes, there were lock-outs, the wages were low, and that the management saw to it that the workers did get a fair deal. The conference came to certain decisions on this matter, and it is this aspect of the matter that I want to highlight today. It decided that wherever and whenever a strike or a lock-out took place, an assessment of the situation would be made. The management or the management's representatives on their side would try to assess the situation, and if the management were cussed in respect of the lock-out or in any other matter, they would be advised by the representatives of the management to give a fair deal to the workers. If they did not, then they would not get the support of Government. Government would withdraw their support and help the labourers to strike and go ahead. This is a very important decision.

Similarly, production has to go up. Unnecessary strikes on the part of labour are also not welcome in the country. If, therefore, an unnecessary or un-called for strike was resorted to by the working class, the representatives of labour would also undertake to examine the situation and advise the different unions. If the union concerned had resorted to the strike unnecessarily, the representatives of labour at the national level would not lend their support to that union. They would ask the union to withdraw the strike. If the union did not withdraw the strike, it would not get support from the trade unions and from the working class in the

country. Government also would not support it and the management would become more vigilant and more strong.

It is in this way that the whole aspect of the question is being looked into. It is not a question of an individual management or of an individual union. It is at the national level that every aspect of individual industries and unions are being looked into and decisions taken to resolve problems. Thereby an attempt is made to avoid lock-out by the management and strike by the workers.

This assessment of the Naini Tal Conference is already reflecting itself in the number of strikes and lock-outs that has been there. During this year, the number of strikes and lock-outs has been the minimum and the number of working days lost has been the minimum. As a consequence, productivity in the country has gone up very much. This is a welcome feature for the whole country. This is an aspect of the question which is to a large extent responsible for the present better relations between management and labour. Of course, we are too near the picture as things stand. These things have got to be tackled and more and more adjustments and understandings have to be arrived at between labour and management.

There is also another aspect of the question which was being touched upon by a few Members. That was with regard to the code of conduct. Here in India unfortunately, we have numerous trade unions and on account of these trade unions and their differing ideologies, in the same industry there are various unions. This will certainly not help the workers for getting a better deal from the management whenever occasion arises. It would be nice if these things are no longer there. But as things are, this situation is inevitable. So far unions have been abusing each



other, much to the benefit of the management. Oftentimes, the management also takes notice of this and helps itself by trying to divide the unions. The trade union leaders themselves came to an understanding—this kind of thing did not take place openly and publicly—that they would, so far as the management is concerned, act unitedly. This is again one other feature which is most welcome.

The reflections of these decisions at the Naini Tal Conference would be seen in the future. It is from this point of view particularly that I welcome the decisions and the Report of the Naini Tal Conference and hope that in future things would be better.

**Shri N. E. Muniswamy:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I shall be very brief. From the discussion I find there are three interests involved in this. One is the workers, the other is the management, that is the employers and the third is Government.

I find that speeches here have invariably been having the interests of the workers in mind; and there have also been speeches for the employers. And, there is going to be a speech by Government where the Government is interested as a third party.

16.21 hrs.

[**MR. SPEAKER** in the Chair]

All these three parties, I think, are running a race, as much as possible for their own benefit. (*Interruptions*). So far as the workers are concerned they want to get as much money as possible and as little of work. As far as the employers are concerned, they want to give less money and get more work. In this dispute, the Government want to have industrial relations and the maintenance of peace.

We are all aware that for the industrial or economic development of our country two things are essential, the maintenance of industrial relations as also the building up of sound

labour management relations. One has also to bear in mind that these labour organisations are being controlled by outsiders. I am against the principle that trade unions should be led by politicians or outsiders. Many of these strikes and lock-outs could be avoided provided we do not have this system of having outsiders to manage the affairs.

So far as trade unions are concerned, unlike other countries even the politicians who enter into the trade unions . . .

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Is this relevant to the Report of the Conference?

**Shri N. E. Muniswamy:** I am not repeating something given out by other Members. That will not help us. We are in a different era altogether, an era of industrialisation. . . .

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I ask your ruling; are we going into extraneous matter?

**Shri N. E. Muniswamy:** I am not yielding. The time given to me is only 5 minutes and I cannot be listening to the hon. Member. In this respect it may affect him because he wants to have leadership. I am only saying that if industrial development is to be made by all these conferences, outsiders should be avoided. I am only saying that we want to develop our country economically and industrially and, as far as possible, we should see industrial relations and sound labour-management relations established. On that basis I am saying that if outsiders are allowed to enter into these things they create trouble. If there is no such thing and if there is only legislation, whereby outsiders will not be allowed, then we can have everything done and done amicably. Both labour and management can work very well.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member thinks this will not be necessary if outsiders are not allowed. That is

his point (*Interruption*). It applies to all sections; it applies to this conference; it applies to the INTUC also.

**Shri Anthony Pillai:** The Minister of Labour is also an outsider. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** All that Shri Muniswamy seems to imply is that all these disputes etc. seem to be between politicians and therefore no real labour dispute is there. If it is there it will be solved if the labour executive consists only of labour. That is the point, I think.

**Shri N. R. Muniswamy:** Government is interested in maintaining good relations because we are interested in productivity. They want productivity to go up. Between these two people, the employers and the workers, Government have to come in. They cannot be watching these disputes.

Leaving aside the general discussion let me come to some of the points that have been raised in the conference. Much has been said about the code of discipline, training in industries and housing facilities and other things to workers. I do not have any grievance about these. They must be given everything. But I should insist upon one thing before the House.

There are certain industries where there is no organised labour union. So people who have not been guided by the workers or even by outsiders have started these strikes etc. as a result of which there is no production. Productivity is jeopardised. So, so far as these small-scale and village industries are concerned, where there is no organised labour union or even outsiders guiding, in those cases, I want Government to take into account that they should also be included in any remedy that may be suggested in this conference. It has been stated in the earlier conferences that the principle of equal pay for equal work should be vigorously implemented. Here the emphasis is given to equal

pay. Now, it must be true conversely also. There must be equal work for equal pay. Unless this is insisted upon it will work havoc and there will be no production.

Now, with regard to the training given within the industries, I wish to say this. In certain industries, training facilities are not given to the workers. People are asked to do certain work without giving them training in the techniques or even the necessary facilities. In some cases, the training facilities are not adequate or consistent with the work that they are called upon to do.

Some other aspects have been pressed by my friends who spoke earlier. Cordial relations between the employer and the employee are necessary for our economic and industrial development. Government should not interfere unnecessarily where there are no disputes at all or in disputes that could be settled among themselves. Even where a dispute is likely to arise but has not actually arisen, if the Government gives certain suggestions which are not quite relevant at that stage, they take a hint and start further trouble. Talk of consultation or conciliation before the contingency has arisen will always lead to some suggestion and it will lead to trouble. So, consultation with the labour union in likely disputes should be avoided. Of course if the strike actually takes place, it may be started. On the whole, I approve some of the recommendations and the House may approve the recommendations made in the light of the observations made here.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall not refer to the many things that have already been referred. I will just refer to one or two items of great importance. This Labour Conference actually reviewed what has been laid down in the chapter on labour programme and policy in our Second Plan. It reviewed the appointment of wage boards. This

was very important because since the beginning of the Second Plan, there was a fall in the real earnings of the workers as compared to the previous years. Keeping the index of real earnings of the workers in 1939 at 100, the index went up to 113 in the beginning of the Second Plan. After that there was a steady drop in the real earnings and it has reached the level of 105 in 1957 and it is bound to have fallen further below even the 1939 level. That is the condition of the wage earners in our country. We improved the position of the workers in the First Plan and reached a level which was more than the 1939 level, but during the Second Plan we come to the 1939 level when our country was ruled by foreigners. Is this the way that the wage policy of the Government is to be guided? It was decided to appoint wage board for the iron and steel industry. It was decided to appoint wage boards for the chemical industry. Even after two years we do not know what has happened. We were told in the last meeting of the consultative committee held in September that wage boards for chemical industry and iron and steel industry will be appointed. There is no news about them. I do not know when they will be appointed. This is the way, Sir, how decisions are being implemented.

In the Second Plan, it was decided that wage boards are to be appointed for industries and on the basis of the recommendations of the wage boards we should have a Wages Commission which should formulate a wage policy for the wage earners and the Government's policy regarding wages. Whenever we raise any question they say that the consumer's interest will be affected. Increase in the wages of workers has never led to inflation; it has been proved beyond doubt. That myth was exploded long long ago by economists; they have said that inflation depends entirely on the fiscal and monetary policy pursued by the Government. I do not know when a stop will be put to this sort

of non-implementation of the decisions taken by the Indian Labour Conference.

I will not take up the work of the evaluation and implementation committee. It was our Labour Minister who conceived this idea and it was he who put this suggestion before the Standing Labour Committee in the year 1957. On the basis of the recommendations of the Standing Labour Committee it was further discussed in the Labour Conference and a shape was given to the proposal. I happened to take part in the first meeting of the Evaluation and Implementation Committee. Some good work was done during the first six months. What has happened after that? A sort of complacency has set in; not only there is complacency but they act in a slow way. I referred one case to the Ministry and I got a reply after nine months that there was no breach of the award. On a complaint that there was a breach of the award the evaluation and implementation Committee took nine months to say that there was no breach of the award. Is this the way that our Evaluation and Implementation Division is going to work? If that is so, the workers will never have any confidence in this committee.

This was mainly meant to see that industrial disputes in our country are reduced and awards are properly implemented by the employers. In the beginning the workers had some confidence in this committee. If work goes on at this rate I am sure that confidence will be shattered. What about the report of the enquiry into the Calcutta Tramways workers strike? When did the strike take place? When was the committee appointed? We were told that it was a one man committee with six assessors. We can understand the delay when there are six assessors, but delay beyond a point cannot be understood. Where is that report? If it had been placed on the Table we could have discussed it. It was a

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

strike conducted by all the trade unions together against the British employers of the Calcutta Tramways who were supported by the State Government then. If we had the decision with regard to that strike we could have known whether the workers' representatives, the trade unions were wrong or the employers were in the wrong.

Shri Anthony Pillai pointed out about the enquiry into the Bombay strike. We would like to know whether the workers were justified or not in going on strike. I can only point out here, Sir, that justice delayed is justice denied.

Then I come to the question of the employees' provident fund. What is it that prevents the Government from increasing the contribution from 6½ per cent to 8½ per cent? Our Labour Minister goes and says that the workers should be saving-minded. A worker is already suffering a real cut in his real earnings. The worker is asked to contribute to the national savings. He is prepared to contribute to the provident fund. But the employer are not prepared. Wherever it affects the employers, this Government have been taking the attitude which is in favour of the employers as against the workers. How long has this question of increase in the rate of provident fund been pending? We were told that the matter was under consideration of the Study Group appointed to go into the question of comprehensive social security measures for workers. That Study Group also recommended that immediately the rate should be raised, because a person who retires now, due to the delay in the enforcement of the increased rates in the Employees' Provident Fund and the Coal-mines Provident Fund, gets a very meagre amount. A person who retires today after 30 years' service in a factory or a mine receives a paltry sum of Rs. 400 to Rs. 500 as his provident fund. Is it sufficient to sustain him in his old age? I do not know

why these delays are occurring. Industrial production has increased, according to the statistics of the Government themselves, from index 100 to 140, from 1951 to 1953. According to the Government's own statistics, there has been a steady increase in production in many fields of industry. But yet, the Government does not touch the employers. There has been a steady growth of profit which the employers have been receiving. Whenever the employers say that they are affected a little by an increase in the cost of raw material, the Government are ready to give them a price increase, but when it comes to the question of workers, their attitude is most unhelpful.

Is this the way that we are going to implement the decisions as outlined in the second Five Year Plan and is this the way we are going to build up a socialist pattern of society? On workers depends the production in the country. On the labour force depends the production of the country. Is this the way the workers are going to be treated? Is this the way the Government are going to enforce or implement what has been laid down in the labour policy? The policy has been arrived at on the unanimous recommendation of the representatives of the workers, representatives of the employers and the Government, sitting together. It is these three representatives who have evolved this policy. The Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission was present; the Finance Minister was present; the Planning Minister was present; the Labour Minister was present. The representatives of the Government were present. And yet, if this is the way these recommendations are going to be treated. I am sure this policy is not at all going to enthuse the workers. It will only lead to come more disharmony. The patience of the workers has reached the saturation point and the workers cannot wait till the Government moves. If action is not taken quickly, I am afraid there will be more indus-

trial disputes and your code will go out.

I have only one more point, and that is regarding the closure of the factories. In the 16th Labour Conference, certain formulations were made on this subject. The Bengal Nagpur Cotton Mills who were producing the best mosquito curtains in India have had to close down and are shown to have incurred some loss due to the mismanagement of the owners of the factory. First, a technical survey team was appointed and it went into the question. Then another committee known as the Somani Committee was appointed to go into the question and find out whether the textile factory is good or not. If this is the way in which things are done, what is the use of having a conference and taking decisions and not implementing them? Therefore, if you want to do justice to the workers who have increased the production and who have increased the national income and wealth of the country, these recommendations should be implemented.

Shri S. M. Banerjee rose—

Shri K. N. Pandey (Hata) rose—

Mr. Speaker: Shri K. N. Pandey.  
 Only a few minutes are left.

Shri K. N. Pandey: Within the few minutes that I have at my disposal, I shall try to put a few points before this House. First of all, I refer to the point raised by Shri T. B. Vittal Rao about the prices having gone high in this country. Recently I had been to Switzerland for a week to attend a seminar on "workers education". I had been there in 1953 also. There, I found that although developmental work on a very high scale has not been undertaken by Switzerland, the prices have gone up one and a half times. So, taking into consideration such large-scale development having been taken in this country, inflation is bound to come. Nobody can avoid prices having gone up. But we have to see whether the Government is sincere to do something for the

workers or not. They have appointed four wage boards and they are going to make their recommendations. Can we doubt the sincerity of the Ministry in trying to improve the wages of the workers? They are going to appoint several other wage boards.

About the code of discipline, the purpose of calling that conference at Naini Tal was to minimise the number that the strikes lock-outs. Can we say that the number has not gone down? If it has gone down, then I think the Naini Tal conference has succeeded. Good atmosphere can be created with regard to other problems also if tripartite conferences of similar nature are convened and decisions are taken.

Under the employees' State insurance scheme, if the benefits are extended to the families of the insured persons, it will affect a large number of people and adequate arrangements for hospitals have to be made by the States before it is extended. The moment that is done, it will be come all right and the scheme may be extended to the families. In my State it is being done and in some other States also, it is going to be extended. So, the Ministry cannot be charged further on that score.

About the enhancement of the provident fund rate, I appreciate the idea that the rate should be enhanced. I agree there is a pressing demand that the Government should take concrete steps, so that the rate may be enhanced.

One Member referred to the fact that although there was a conference here of the representatives of public undertakings, the code of discipline has not been introduced there. Taking the biggest public undertaking, i.e. the railways, the employees themselves have objected to the code of discipline being introduced there, because some of the advantages they are availing of at present are more than what can be given to them by the introduction of this code. So, some hindrances are coming from the

[Shri K. N. Pandey]

workers' side also. We cannot doubt the sincerity of the Ministry, because they are making sincere efforts so that the code of discipline may be introduced there also.

Shri Sharma referred to invitations being extended to the Ministers of Food and Agriculture and Information and Broadcasting. I have no objection. So far there is no provision to guarantee the security of service to the agricultural workers. If somebody is ousted, his case cannot be referred anywhere. Of course, I support the idea of inviting the Food and Agriculture Minister because I represent sugar workers and that is the subject of the Food and Agricultural Minister. Let the Broadcasting Minister also be present, so that if some cases about Press workers are raised, he can give a proper reply and he will also be bound to apply the decisions taken in the conference. Referring to the decisions taken in the Nainital Conference, we have to see whether the Ministry is sincere or not to get those things implemented.

So far as the works committee is concerned, a Member made a reference to its failure. I proposed this idea sometime before in this House, viz., let a committee be formed to enquire as to why the works committee failed. What are the effective measures which can be taken to activate them, or to make them more effective? That is a matter which will take some time. So, if the Ministry also things it necessary, as I think, because I actually work in the labour field, let a committee be appointed, so that an enquiry be made as to how the works committee can be made effective. That will be a very profitable thing in the interests of the Ministry, the workers and everybody concerned.

Shri Abid Ali: These Conferences are of the ILO pattern, except that there vote is taken for or against and ~~issues~~ decided by majority whereas here these conferences take decisions unanimously, though sometimes it

becomes necessary to take a sort of unwilling consent. So far as we are concerned, we are also parties to these decisions and we earnestly make all possible efforts to implement them within the shortest possible time. But it has always a comparative value. Locusts lay eggs and these eggs produce locusts within a few hours, whereas chicken take 21 days and human beings nine months and so on. Now, you cannot say that because the chicken are not able to lay eggs within a few hours so there is delay. Everything can be done only within the time according to the requirements of the particular subject.

With regard to attendance in these conferences, it is not proper to assume that some of the Ministers have not been invited, because their presence is not mentioned in the report. We invite all the concerned Ministers. It may be that some could not attend for various reasons.

So far as agriculture is concerned, that subject is within the State sphere, and all States which are represented in these conferences are certainly very much alive to their requirements also.

The territories which are administered by the Centre are represented through the Central Ministers. Therefore, we purposely did not invite anyone from these territories.

My good friend has made a reference to Germany. It is true that it was a defeated nation and has made substantial progress. We are very much in contact with what is happening there and in other countries. Some of our friends visit those countries and we get reports also from them. The progress which they have made is, of course, because of the non-existence of anti-national elements there.

I fail to understand the criticism with regard to the Employees State Insurance Corporation, because the family members are already covered

by this scheme. Actually, the people covered by this scheme is increasing and about 6,80,000 family members have been covered in recent months. Also, it is being extended to areas which are now not covered by the scheme. I am sure hon. Members already know the programme of work.

Some reference was made to public sector. As a matter of fact, in some of the public sector a section of workers are much better off than in the private sector. They have got security of service and other amenities. And, as has just been mentioned by my friend from Uttar Pradesh, the feeling among the workers themselves is that perhaps they may not be so better off if they accept this system which is under discussion now, than what they are getting at present.

The hon. Member, Shri D. C. Sharma, referred to our relations with China. Then, another member from that side was saying "if this is not done" "if that is not done" and so on. There is no question of "ifs" and "buts" so far as the Indian workers are concerned. They are sufficiently Indians and patriots and they do not want any bribe to become good Indians whenever they are needed to produce more. Even now, as has been admitted by everybody, their production has increased considerably and they will increase more. It is good that our Indian workers have realised who are the real Indians and who are anti-Indian. They are disowning that element which is anti-Indian and they are being just separated as a fly is put off from the milk.

A friend from Punjab said about Works committees. Hon. Members who are connected with this will be aware that so far as this particular subject is concerned, investigation is in progress and whatever is necessary will be done to make these committees more effective. So far as the appointment of a committee on that, particularly of M.P.s, is concerned, my feeling is that this will not be very much helpful.

Also about the Five Year Plans, a suggestion was made that a committee should be appointed. We ourselves are having a study about the progress which is being made with regard to the programmes undertaken by the Five Year Plans. We feel that sufficient progress has been made and will continue to be made.

My hon. friend from Madras, Shri Tangamani has mentioned about the amendment of the Trade Union Act concerning application by seven members. It was said that after they apply, even though they may cease to be workers, the application should remain. It is true that even now, seven workers are required to submit an application for registration of a trade union. After the adoption of the proposed amendment during the Naini Tal Conference, not one complaint has been received on that account. It will be a small amendment. Unless it becomes a very urgent matter, we do not come forward with one amendment to an enactment. Whenever necessary, we are ready to amend the Act. There is no question of delaying it. When other amendments also become necessary, it will be undertaken.

Regarding provident fund, when my hon. friend Shri Anthony Pillai was speaking, I meant that so far as 50-20 factory employees were concerned, it was not accepted by the employers. The other one was accepted at Naini Tal. What we have to ensure is that because of the imposition of the additional burden on the industry, no factory should close. The workers will always prefer not to have provident fund, but to have employment. By adding the provident fund, if the factory is closing, certainly, it will be not only to the detriment of the workers, but it will be detrimental to the country also. Therefore, we should be very careful. We are having a study to be sure that because of this additional burden, the factories will not close. Wherever it will be found that this will be bearable by the industry it will be imposed.

**Shri Anthony Pillai:** I referred to industries whose capacity is undebatable—petroleum and cigarette making industries. Where is the question of an enquiry in such cases?

**Shri Abid Ali:** Wherever we are sure that the application of this will not adversely affect, we will enforce.

One point was made about fragmentation. I may submit that the present Act covers gardens having 25 acres or more or 30 workers or more. A draft Bill is already ready and I hope that it will be introduced during the course of this session and if not, possibly early next session, to check fragmentation about which both my hon. friends from the south have made complaint. Regarding publication of reports of some enquiries, I was very sorry. It is like

बोर पुलिस इंस्पेक्टर को डंडे मारें ।

I do not make these things public but as it has been forced on me, I may submit with all humility that if the organisations to which the respective hon. Members belong or the unions concerned write to us to publish the relative report, I will do it, the very day I receive that letter. I am making that statement here. Let the HMS or the union concerned write to us. The day we receive the letter that the report should be published, it will be published.

Similarly, with regard to the tramways, I may tell my hon. friend who has made the complaint, that he should make enquiries from his colleague from Calcutta who was on that committee as to how many months he has sat on the notes which were sent to him for approval so that the report may be drafted. It is because of him that the report has been delayed.

About Jamshedpur, I make the same statement. Let the Jamshedpur union of the hon. Member or his organisation, the AITUC, write to us. The day they write to us, we will publish the report. I am making that statement here.

There was some understanding. Now they want us to do something else. We accommodate them also. About that I am making no complaint, but after having accommodated them if they make this criticism here I cannot stand that.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** As a responsible office-bearer of the All-India Trade Union Congress, I hereby tell the Minister to publish these reports.

**Shri Abid Ali:** No, that will not be proper because some more responsible office-bearer than him has told us something else.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** On the floor we want it.

**Shri Tangamani:** He is throwing out a challenge.

**Mr. Speaker:** He is not satisfied. There are the heads of particular unions. Now what he has said is going to be published in the newspapers. There is nothing secret. Therefore, in view of the hon. Minister's statement, the hon. Members may make enquiries amongst their own people and then write to them in a formal manner, and certainly the hon. Minister will stand by his assurance.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** I will write a letter tomorrow morning.

**Shri Anthony Pillai:** That particular point may be applicable to my hon. friend, but I am the highest office-bearer in my organisation, and I ask the Minister to publish the report.

**Shri Abid Ali:** That will be done. We will publish the report as it is.

As the hon. Member has made a reference to it, I may say that after the report was submitted, the union concerned submitted a rejoinder. Now we have to think what to do with it. Should we have the employer's point of view after the report is ready? All this procedure has to be followed. There is no end



of anything here, and we have to accommodate because it is a tripartite conference, because we want the code to function. We do not want to stand with a whip and say, "You have committed a mistake, you have behaved like a bad boy", and expose them. That is not our intention. The intention is there should be industrial peace and as it is called **शान्ति की शर्म** but if it results in this sort of criticism, then have it. I will be sorry for it.

With regard to the speech of Shri Vittal Rao, perhaps he was under the impression that it was a Budget debate and not restricted to a discussion concerning this particular item. He has referred to earnings and so many other things which are not at all relevant to this subject. However, I may submit that the earnings of the workers have definitely gone up to the extent that in the Ahmedabad textile industry dearness allowance was paid up to Rs. 95. It goes up and down according to the cost of living index, but there are some places, I quite realise, where very recalcitrant elements have influenced the minds of the workers and disturbed the atmosphere which has come in the way of organising real trade union movement, genuine, sound trade union movement, for the good of the workers. Such exploitation by some of the political parties has resulted in the workers not getting enough of earning and their full share in profit. That is quite obvious.

**Mr. Speaker:** Do the wages not depend upon the quantum of work always?

17 hrs.

**Shri Abid Ali:** Not everywhere.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there no minimum fixed?

**Shri Abid Ali:** A minimum is fixed, but the minimum does not keep pace with the requirements of the increased cost of living always.

**Mr. Speaker:** I want to know whether there is a standard by which a minimum has been fixed for which so much of wage will be given; if the minimum is not reached, I found in some of the East European countries, there is 20 per cent deduction; if the minimum is exceeded, then *pro rata* higher wages are given.

**Shri Abid Ali:** That is so in some of the sectors and in some of the industries here also.

**Shri Anthony Pillai:** Did you find any sound and strong trade unionism in Eastern Europe where that is done?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have got my own story about all that.

**Shri Abid Ali:** Take, for instance, coal. The rate of Rs. 10 a week has been more than doubled, because some good people there interested themselves in a sound trade union organisation, and they have been able to benefit the workers substantially.

**Shri Tangamani:** In some industries, there are piece-rates, and in some others time-rates.

**Shri Abid Ali:** That is correct.

About Employees' State Insurance Corporation, something was said regarding maternity benefit. Maternity benefit has already been increased; the quantum has been increased as per the decision, and I do not know why this complaint has been made here. Although there may or may not be any change in the Act, yet, the workers have already started getting the benefit of it.

**Shri Tangamani:** I may also refer here to the Rs. 30 benefit to the wives of the insured persons during their confinement period. It was stated that the matter was being discussed in consultation with the State Governments. I want to know what has happened to that.

**Shri Abid Ali:** My hon. friend knows that we are in consultation with the State Governments, because this is a concurrent subject, and they have also got to bear a part of the expenditure. Their feeling is that they are spending much more on the insured persons as compared with that on other citizens. So, we do persuade them. And their budget provisions also have got to be taken care of.

About amendments to the Industrial Disputes Act, as hon. Members know, some of the items were discussed at the various conferences. Then, we called a special committee for this in Bombay in January last, to which my hon. friend has already made a reference. Our difficulty is that we are required to go on consulting central trade union organisations and employers' organisations and so many others concerned at various stages, as it happened in the case of the Mines (Amendment) Bill. After three years of discussion, the Bill was introduced in the last session of Parliament, but, yesterday, we again had a demand that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. Although every interest had been consulted jointly in the tripartite committees and separately as well, and all concerned were given opportunities to discuss with us and place their points of view which have been always taken into consideration. Consequently, we have ourselves submitted amendments to the Bill which is under discussion. So, all points of view are met, and yet, reference of the Bill to a Select Committee is being demanded.

My submission is that we do try to meet the various points of view; we try to convince everybody of the necessity of these proposed changes, and, therefore, much more time is taken than we ourselves would have liked, to bring forward the Bill before the House. Some of the amendments have been finalised, so far as we are concerned. I hope that the amending Bill will be introduced, I do not think, in this session, because it will not be possible, but perhaps during the next session.

Therefore, these delays are taking place. Hon. Members themselves demand after a conference—in the conference they will never decide—that the matter may be referred to their organisations; and their organisations take time. To blame us for this in the House is not very fair.

Therefore, I am very sorry I do not find anything genuine with regard to the complaints made so far as the decisions of the Naini Tal Conference or their follow-up are concerned. However, this debate has been fruitful, and we shall try to implement as far as is possible and practicable whatever suggestions are given.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Certain mutual agreements were arrived at the Naini Tal Conference about ending inter-union rivalry, and certain suggestions were placed before the conference by the AITUC. May I know what action has been taken by the Minister thereon?

**Shri Abid Ali:** Inter-union rivalry is likely to end when these parties will come to an end.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** This is no reply. After this Conference, the hon. Deputy Minister formed a parallel federation of Defence Ministry employees. That is my charge against him.

**Shri Abid Ali:** Yes, that is very true. I am very glad that a national federation has been formed by the Defence employees. What is wrong in it? They are at liberty to do it. In Bombay, there is a representative, recognised, legal, popular, full-fledged working textile labour union. Still my hon. friends thought that it would be helpful to themselves to form another organisation there.

As I said, these rivalries among trade unions will come to an end when, as my hon. friend from Madras suggested, those who are working in the trade unions, the 'outsiders' as they are called, leave the trade union field or political parties stop exploit-

ing them. So far as I am concerned, I will never leave it because I have been a worker myself since my childhood. I will be in it always.

Hon. Members can be sure of that.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** This is a very serious matter. I can tell you that the hon. Member was a party to that decision at the Naini Tal Conference that inter-union rivalries should come to an end because it is necessary in the larger interests of the country. Now the hon. Minister is defending himself regarding the formation of another union.

**Shri Abid Ali:** Not a party. If patriot workers want to get rid of traitor workers, why should I come in the way?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** What does he mean by 'patriot workers'?

**Mr. Speaker:** Some workers do so. As Shri N. R. Muniswamy said, the only other alternative is that others should not enter into these organisations.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I agree.

**Shri Tangamani:** Let there be no outsiders in trade unions.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** The hon. Minister has not said anything about the Wage Board for the chemical industry regarding which a decision was taken at the 15th Labour Conference, which was stated at the 16th Labour Conference to be under the consideration of Government.

**Shri Abid Ali:** So far as my recollection goes, I am not prepared to admit that the 15th Labour Conference passed any particular resolution mentioning a particular industry for the constitution of a Wage Board. If I remember aright, a long list was mentioned. If the hon. Member is under the impression that if any one delegate mentioned the name of any particular industry for the appointment of a Wage Board, it is a Con-

ference decision, it is not correct. They made a suggestion that there should be Wage Boards for these industries. I remember that. We did not make any commitment. Of course, this is subject to verification as I am speaking from memory.

**Shri Anthony Pillai:** With regard to the question of extending the Code to the public sector, no reference at all has been made by the hon. Minister.

**Shri Tangamani:** That was referred to by many hon. Members.

**Shri Abid Ali:** I said that some of the workers in some industries feel that they have got better security of service and rules concerning settlement of disputes etc. Also, the matter is under the consideration of the Ministries concerned. They have to settle with their workers. If both of them agree, we shall be happy.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Whenever any question relating to the workers of our country is discussed in this House, there is an exhibition of tempers. I have always seen that.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thought it was cool.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I am very glad that today the discussion has been held in a very calm manner and the whole question has been discussed in a very friendly atmosphere.

Three things have emerged from the discussion. In the first place, I am very glad to hear from the Deputy Labour Minister that the workers are in good heart and that whatever may be said about them, they will not be found wanting. They are already working very hard for the country's good and if an emergency arises, they will be at their very best. I am very happy to hear that.

The second thing that has emerged is this, that this Central Labour Ministry has very good intentions, and wants to improve the lot of the workers. There is some kind of slack-

[Sbri D. C. Sharma]

ness on the part of the State Governments. After all some of these measures have to be implemented by the State Governments. And, unfortunately, the State Governments do not have as much of social urgency as the Union Ministry feels. I hope the Central Ministry will be able to infuse the State Governments with a sense of social importance of these measures and they would not be found wanting in implementation.

The third thing which has emerged from this debate is that implementation even at the Centre is not as adequate as it should be. It is because this machinery was set up or devised, perhaps, for the good old days. Now we have undergone a great deal of change. Our country is more and more progressive. We have to deal with larger and larger numbers every day. Our problems are increasing day by day. Therefore the implementation machinery has got to be increased. At the same time, this machinery requires to be given a new sense of fulfilling its task, of doing its work in as short a time as possible.

I am sorry to find that there is inter-union rivalry in the country; and I find something like that on the floor of the House also. It is reflected in a very small way in this House. I think one of the greatest problems that the Labour Ministry faces and the workers of India face today is this. There should be no inter-union rivalry and there should be one union for every industry and that union should work for the maximum benefit of the workers. I think the workers will gain greatly, my country will gain greatly and we will all gain very greatly if the workers are kept away from political influence of any kind. We also say that the workers should

be kept away from professional leadership of any kind which is not always desirable. If that happens, I am sure our workers will find that this country is a very fine country to work in and the employers will find that the workers are very good allies in the adventure of building up the country; and all of us will feel happy because employer and labour relations will improve.

I do not agree with some of the remarks made about the Ministry that it is pro-employer. From the employers I hear that it is pro-worker. So, the Ministry is very often pro-worker and sometimes pro-employer. I have not seen such cases. But I hope the Ministry will continue to hold the traditions of being pro-workers, of giving the workers a fair deal, a good deal and an adequate deal. I hope the lines along which it has been working all these years will be the lines along which it will continue to work in future also.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House takes note of the Summary of Proceedings of the Sixteenth Session of the Indian Labour Conference, laid on the Table of the House on the 11th August, 1958."

*The motion was adopted.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now stand adjourned till 11 o'clock tomorrow.

17.15 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, December 10, 1958/Agrahayana 29, 1881 (Saka).*